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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 8, 1998, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

March 30, 1998

By: [Signature]  
JerryWelks  
Deputy Director

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

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

April 8, 1998
9:30 a.m.

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

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

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

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

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 111, Tahoe Island, Special Area #1, to Allow Professional and Health Care Services and to Add the Special Designation of Transfer of Existing Development Into Certain Developed Sites in This Area

B. Discussion of Amendment to Chapter 93, Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program, Relative to Coordinated Transit System (CTS) Mitigation

C. Amendment of the Kings Beach Community Plan to Add Timesharing (Hotel/Motel Design) and Timesharing (Residential Design) to the Permissible Use List of Special Area #2, West Entry Commercial Area, and Plan Area Statement 028, Kings Beach Residential, to Add Residential Care to the Permissible Use List
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VI. PLANNING MATTERS
   A. Discussion on Collection of Project Securities From Local Jurisdictions and Special Districts
   B. Performance Review Committee Recommendation on Commercial Special Projects Allocation
   C. Amendment of Chapter 71, Tree Removal, to Add Protection for Old Growth Trees

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

North Tahoe Conference Center
6318 North Lake Tahoe Boulevard
Kings Beach, California

February 11, 1998

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Chairperson Bob Jepsen called the regular February 11, 1998, meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") to order at 9:45 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Mr. Doughty, Mr. McDowell, Ms. Kemper (arrived at 9:55 a.m.), Ms. Rohr, Mr. Joiner, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Haen (arrived at 9:46 a.m.), Ms. Kvas, Mr. Combs (arrived at 9:50 a.m.), Mr. Marchio, Mr. Jepsen

Members Absent: Mr. Thompson, Mr. Hust, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Baldrica, Mr. Barham, Mr. Porta, Mr. Poppoff

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Director, Jerry Wells, recommended that Agenda Item No. VII be heard first and then Item V.B. be heard next.

MOTION by Mr. Jepsen, with a second by Mr. Lawrence, to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Mr. Don Komreich of Incline Village, stated that within 90 days, the Nevada Tahoe Conservation expects to issue Requests for Proposals on ten million dollars worth of stream environmental zone restoration projects and erosion control projects. We hope to have most of those contracts awarded sometime this Summer. In addition, Mr. Komreich stated that both boards of the Tahoe Transportation District and TRPA have approved unanimously the possible formation of the North Tahoe Transportation District. He hoped that by the end of 1998 something positive will come out of this on the North Shore.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Morgan, with a second by Ms. Kvas, to approve the January 14, 1998, APC minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project #3, Draft EIS (Project Adjacent to the California/Nevada Stateline)

Chief of Project Review Rick Angelocci presented the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project #3 Draft EIS (project adjacent to the California/Nevada Stateline).
Mr. Lew Feldman, representing the project, showed a slide show displaying the project.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Jim Jordan, of Balloffet & Associates, the environmental consultant on the project, made a presentation and elaborated on the project.

A discussion ensued.

B. Scope of Impacts for Environmental Documents Relative to Proposed Alternatives to Current Parking and Other Recreational Use Patterns Along the East Shore of Lake Tahoe

Senior Planner Paul Pettersen presented the staff summary on the scoping of alternatives to parking and use patterns along East Shore, in addition to a slide show.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Don Komreich, a resident from Incline Village, stated that Incline Village has a better than 50% probability that a shuttle bus will be funded this summer. He commented that seven to 14 passenger vans will be used and will run every 20 – 30 minutes from the 4th of July through Labor Day, 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. In addition, Mr. Komreich stated that an additional 150 – 200 more parking spaces are needed to accommodate the parking situation.

Mr. Jeff Cutler, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that he was pleased to hear about the shuttle bus in Incline Village. He stated that the League's position on the East shore is that they want to eliminate all off-shoulder parking in an attempt to get the erosion problems under control. The League is in favor of the internal lots and would like to see new off-road parking in lots sufficient to handle the maximum capacities for the non-peak hours.

Mr. Sam Foley, Managing Director of the Lake Tahoe Shakespeare Festival, stated that last year the Festival averaged over 900 an evening which is a lot of people. Mr. Foley commented that if transit would be available at the right hours, he believed that the Festival could advertise it in such a way that we could encourage people to take that transportation as opposed to driving their own cars. He hopes to attract more people this year with more shows. The Festival recycles cans, bottles and newspapers and hopes to extend this to encouraging other forms or additional forms of transportation like public transit, completing their environmental contribution. In addition, Mr. Foley asked if construction could be done when people are not coming in and out of the Festival.

Ms. Rohr questioned if the existing parking at Sand Harbor handled the 900 people, and Mr. Foley responded yes.

Ms. Rohr also questioned if it was realistic for people who ride the transit bus to bring picnics, and Mr. Foley stated that they have people help those using the transit system carrying their picnic baskets to the festival area.

Mr. Mark Edwards, a bonafide beach goer, stated that he is skeptical of the Nevada Department of Transportation doing a good job of erosion control on the roads. He stated that crime is also a big problem and a lot of people get their cars broken into. As a result, a lot of people tend to use the shoulder of the road because of the continuous flow of traffic along the
Highway 28 and the amount of crime in the area is substantially reduced. Mr. Edwards commented that without some sort of security in the parking lots, there will be resistance to parking in the lots because of the crime.

Mr. Reinhart Reichter, a citizen from Incline Village, stated that he is a hiker and sees a big problem with parking for hikers in the area and would like to see access to the Flume trail.

Craig Hartman, a citizen from the area, stated that he was in favor of the paved parking lot. He stated that he did not like the shuttle and believed that money would be better spent funding a Lake lapper-type bus system as a direct point-to-point.

Ms. Trisha Lincoln, a Carson City resident, believed that it was important to maintain all the access that we have to all points that we have on the Lake for recreational use and keep it pretty. She was support of expanding parking lots. Ms. Lincoln was of the opinion that regular schedules of shuttles makes it more available to users who are not familiar with the local newspapers and don’t read the regular schedule and want to be able to go to a hotel front desk and find out what time they can catch the next bus.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

Mr. Pettersen thanked everyone in the audience for coming to the meeting. In addition, he thanked the Reno-Gazette Journal and the Tahoe Tribune for their keeping the issue in the public eye. Mr. Pettersen stated that the comments would be included in the scoping process. He thanked the public for their input.

A discussion ensued.

(Break taken at 11:05 a.m.)

(Reconvened at 11:16 a.m.)

A. Amendment of Code Section 54.4.B(4) (Prohibition of Superstructures)
   To Allow Exceptions for Health and Safety Facilities and Scientific Research Facilities

Coleen Shade, Associate Planner, presented the staff summary amendment of Code Section 54.4.B(4) (Prohibition of Superstructures) to Allow Exceptions for Health and Safety Facilities and Scientific Research Facilities.

Mr. Clem Shute, representing the applicant, Dr. Kleppe, explained the project proposal in detail.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

Dr. John Kleppe, a professor at the University of Nevada and the applicant, passed out a handout entitled "Fallen Leaf Lake: A Microcosm of Lake Tahoe" explaining what he would like to do at Fallen Leaf Lake.

A discussion ensued.
MOTION by Sharon Kvas, with a second by Mr. Doughty, to recommend approval to the Governing Board to amend Code Section 54.4.B(4) (Prohibition of Superstructures) to Allow Exceptions for Health and Safety Facilities and Scientific Research Facilities with the addition that the structure be removed when it ceases to be part of the EIP project. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Amendment of Code Chapter 4, Section 4.7, and Appendix A to Modify the List of Projects Requiring Governing Board Review and A Hearings Officer Review, Amendment of the TRPA Rules of Procedure by the Addition of Article XIV Pertaining to Hearings Officer Procedures

Senior Planner Jim Lawrence presented the amendment of Code Chapter 4, Section 4.7, and Appendix A to modify the list of projects requiring Governing Board review and a hearings officer review, amendment of the TRPA Rules of Procedure by the Addition of Article XIV pertaining to hearings officer procedures.

A discussion ensued.

MOTION by Mr. Haen, with a second by Mr. Marchio, to recommend approval to the Governing Board amending Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities Relating to the Establishment of a Hearings Officer. The motion carried with Mr. Doughty voting no.

Mr. Doughty stated that he voted no on the proposed amendment because he wanted to see the 2500 square foot requirement provision modified.

C. Amendment of Boundary Line Between Plan Area 104, Highland Woods, and Plan Area 103, Sierra Tract-Commercial, to Move a Portion of El Dorado County APN 31-290-05 From PAS 104 to PAS 103

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett presented the staff summary amending the Boundary Line between Plan Area 104, Highland Woods, and Plan Area 103, Sierra Tract-Commercial, to move a portion of El Dorado County APN 31-290-05 from PAS 104 to 103.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Ms. Kemper, with a second by Mr. Joiner, to recommend approval to the Governing Board amending the boundary line between Plan Area 104, Highland Woods, and Plan Area 103, Sierra-Tract Commercial, to move a portion of El Dorado County APN 31-290-25 from PAS 104 to PAS 103. The motion carried unanimously.

(Lunch break taken at 12:25 p.m.)

(Messrs Joiner and Doughty left at 12:30 p.m.)

(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)
G. Morris, Amendment of Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Man-
Modified Determination, Douglas County APN 07-180-04

Senior Planner Joe Pepi presented the staff summary amending the Regional Plan Overlay
Maps for man-modified determination, Douglas County APN 07-180-04.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Paul Kaleta, representing the applicant, stated that he agreed with the TRPA’s staff decision
and the change requiring that the installation of BMP’s be done by October 15 1999.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Ms. Rohr, with a second by Mr. Haen, to recommend approval to the Governing
Board to amend the regional plan overlay maps for man-modified determination, Douglas
County, APN 07-180-04, with the modification that the installation of BMP’s be done by October

D. Amendment of the Regional Transportation Plan to Incorporate Projects Proposed in
the 1998 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and Adoption of the
1998 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Associate Planner Bridget Cornell presented the staff summary amending the Regional
Transportation Plan to incorporate projects proposed in the 1998 Regional Transportation
Improvement Program (RTIP); and adoption of the 1998 Regional Transportation Improvement
Program (RTIP).

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Bob Kosta, Engineering Manager for the Placer County Department of Public Works,
thanked the TRPA staff and the City of South Lake Tahoe for working together to come up with
a compromise that worked for everyone. He stated that this was an important project and
hoped to start construction in 1998.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

Mr. Baetge complimented the City of South Lake Tahoe and Placer County for working so well
together.

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Mr. Marchio, to amend the Regional Transportation
Plan to incorporate projects proposed in the 1998 Regional Transportation Improvement
Program (RTIP) and adoption of the 1998 Regional Transportation Improvement Program,
along with the proposed amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan. The motion carried
unanimously.

VI. PROJECT REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD
A. Stateline Casino CORE AreaWide Drainage Environmental Assessment and Project

Senior Planner Paul Pettersen presented the Stateline Casino CORE AreaWide Drainage Environmental Assessment and Project.

Mr. Jim Yost, representing consulting engineers West Yost & Associates, presented a slide show of the proposed project.

Mr. Doug Moore, also representing consulting engineers West Yost & Associates, presented a slide show demonstrating the water quality impacts and flooding.

Ms. Sue Rae Ireland, project manager and sub-contractor on the project, reviewed the community plan issues presented, in addition to a slide show related to the community plan.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Haen questioned if there were provisions for parking lot cleaning and sweeping. Mr. Gary Midkiff, the project coordinator for the Storm Water Association, stated that each of the properties have their own program and there are routine sweeping programs, as well as the rest of their treatment collection system.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Jeff Cutler, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that the League was generally happy with proposed project. The main problem the League has with the project is that it is a bad precedent to evaluate a range of alternatives and not have any of them aim for 100% treatment and to allow the practicalities of “well, it’s going to cost us $400,000 to get 4% more treatment” to slip in and become the deciding factor. He believed that this analysis should be in the middle of the environmental assessment.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

A discussion ensued.

(Break taken at 3:25 p.m.)

(Reconvened at 3:30 p.m.)

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

E. Adoption of the Environmental Improvement Program

EIP Coordinator Carl Hasty presented the adoption of the Environmental Improvement Program.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Combs stated that his concern with the EIP is that it goes way beyond the County’s CIP list and if the County doesn’t comply with the EIP because of budget constraints, is the County at risk of having failed to meet its compliance with the EIP and thus face a punitive role. Mr. Hasty replied that no, the County would not be in a punitive position.
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Mr. Combs questioned if the EIP doesn't work, will the local governments be penalized. Mr. Hasty replied that would be a policy question that would have to be addressed.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Bob Kosta, Engineering Manager for Placer County, stated that he was not sure about the adoption of the EIP because the County doesn't understand what the implications are of the document as a program. Mr. Kosta further stated that he wants to make sure the County is not overcommitted and thus suffer repercussions if they don't meet the EIP requirements.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Mr. McDowell, with a second by Mr. Morgan, to recommend to the Governing Board adoption of the EIP. The motion carried unanimously.

VIII. REPORTS

A. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Executive Director Jim Baetge stated that the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles has set aside 200 of the new license plates for the APC members. Ms. Drum further discussed the new license plates.

B. APC Members

Special Projects Attorney Susan Scholley stated that the Governing Board retained the services of Remy, Thomas and Moose to represent the Agency in the Suitum and Barbieri cases, which are single parcel, inverse condemnation cases; one in Nevada and the other in California. The Board also hired the firm of Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger to represent the Agency in the Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council case. She also announced that she would be leaving the Agency at the end of March. A status conference has been scheduled in the Suitum case for February 23, 1998. Ms. Scholley commented that she would miss all of the APC members and enjoyed working with them all.

C. APC MEMBERS

Mr. Haen stated that he would miss Susan, also. He complimented the staff on streamlining and creating the Hearings Officer Review position.

Ms. Kemper stated that the State Water Resources Control Board approved $50,000 for the motorized watercraft study.

Messrs. Combs and McDowell stated that they would miss Susan very much.

In addition, Mr. McDowell stated that they are delivering the deliverables on the Presidential Commitments; they are increasing their staff and making great strides.

Mr. Lawrence wished Susan good luck. Ms. Kvas stated that she would miss Susan. Mr. Jepsen stated that Susan has been a faithful friend the entire time he has been on the APC and thanked her.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Sue Mikanovich
Clerk to the Commission

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call (702) 588-4547 to make an appointment. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA office, 308 Doria Court, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

March 11, 1998

Horizon Casino Resort
U.S. Highway 50
Stateline, Nevada

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Chairperson Bob Jepsen called the regular March 11, 1998, meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (“APC”) to order at 9:38 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Mr. Thompson (arrived at 9:44 a.m.), Mr. Hust, Mr. Doughty (arrived at 9:46 a.m.), Ms. Baldrica, Mr. McDowell, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Porta, Ms. Rohr, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Haen, Ms. Kvas, Mr. Combs, Mr. Marchio, Mr. Jepsen

Members Absent: Mr. Hansen, Mr. Barham, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Joiner, Mr. Lawrence

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Director, Jerry Wells, advised that Agenda Item VI.B. had been continued until May.

MOTION by Ms. Baldrica, with a second by Mr. Combs, to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – There were none.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Baldrica, with a second by Mr. Morgan, to approve the October 8, 1997, APC minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously. Chairperson Mr. Jepsen stated that the February 11, 1998 would be acted upon after a break.

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

B. Prim, Amendment of Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Man-Modified Determination, Douglas County APN 07-120-08

Senior Planner Joe Pepi presented the staff summary amending the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map pursuant to a proposed man-modified determination, Mehrtens, APN 07-120-08, 155 U.S. Highway 50 at Kingsbury Grade, Douglas County, Nevada, in addition to the recent changes to the amendment submitted by the applicant.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Paul Kaleta, with Basin Strategies who represents the property owner, discussed the property in detail.
Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Mr. Doughty, with a second by Ms. Baldrica, to recommend approval to the Governing Board to amend the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map pursuant to a proposed man-modified determination, Mehrten's, APN 07-120-08, 155 U.S. Highway 50 at Kingsbury Grade, Douglas County, Nevada, with the understanding that the alternative mitigation would not affect what had already been done. The motion carried unanimously.

A. Douglas County, Amendment of Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Man-Modified Determination, Douglas County APN 07-130-04

Senior Planner Joe Pepi presented the staff summary amending the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map pursuant to a proposed man-modified determination, Douglas County; APN 07-130-04, Kahle Park, Kingsbury Grade, Douglas County, Nevada.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Paul Kaleta, with Basin Strategies representing the applicant, questioned if some consideration could be given to reviewing whether or not counties should be required to post security deposits.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

Mr. Doughty agreed with Mr. Kaleta's comments about reviewing the requirement that counties are obligated to post a security.

Mr. McDowell requested that TRPA staff look into and research the requirement that counties are obligated to post a security. Deputy Director Jerry Wells stated that the Agency was looking into this issue.

MOTION by Mr. Thompson, with a second by Ms. Rohr, to recommend approval to the Governing Board amending the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map pursuant to a proposed man-modified determination, Douglas County; APN 07-130-04, Kahle Park, Kingsbury Grade, Douglas County, Nevada. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Tahoe City Public Utility District Bicycle Trail Draft EIS

Associate Planner Kathy Canfield presented the staff summary Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Tahoe City Public Utility District Community Trail Intertie Project.

Mr. Bob Lourey, Assistant General Manager for the Tahoe City Public Utility District, introduced Ms. Cindy Gustafson, Director of Resource Development and Community Relations for the Tahoe City Public Utility District, and presented an overview of the Tahoe City Trail System and the proposed project itself.

Mr. Ray Lacy, with the California Tahoe Conservancy and representing the Resources Agency of the State of California, stated that there was a time crunch in that the money available for the project expired at the end of the fiscal year which is May unless an environmental document is
adopted. He expressed both the State's and the Conservancy's commitment to the project to increase the viability of the biketrail network.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Charles Zeier, representing Resource Concepts, who prepared the environmental document, discussed the environmental document in depth.

Mr. McDowell stated that he appreciated all the hard work and effort and the support of the Conservancy and believed that the Tahoe City Public Utility District was the leader in biketrails in the Lake Tahoe Basin. He supported the project and was just trying to get an understanding of the project. The project goes along with the Regional goals.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for public hearing.

Mr. Steve Teshara, person at large and Chairman of the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association, appreciated Mr. McDowell's comments and stated that we need projects like the biketrail to fund.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Ms. Baldrica, that when the environmental document comes back to the APC for action, that the Commission be given the opportunity to comment and give their input on the project itself. The motion carried with Mr. Haen voting no.

Mr. Haen stated he voted no in the spirit of streamlining because of the extra burden on the APC and the cost of the applicants paying for the consultant's fee.

Mr. Jepsen thanked the Tahoe City Public Utility District for taking the time to present the bicycle trail draft EIS.

(Break taken at 10:50 a.m.)

(Reconvened at 11:50 a.m.)

D. Amendment of Boundary Line Between Plan Area Statement 040, Incline Village #1, and Plan Area Statement 030, Mt. Rose, by Deleting Washoe County APN 125-211-02 From PAS 030 and Adding it to PAS 040

Senior Planner Andrew Strain presented the staff summary amending the boundary line between Plan Area Statement 040, Incline Village #1, and Plan Area Statement 030, Mt. Rose, by deleting Washoe County APN 125-211-02 from PAS 030 and adding it to PAS 040.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Paul Kaleta, with Basin Strategies and representing the applicant, explained the project in greater detail.
Mr. Joseph Gausselin, an adjacent property owner, voiced his concerns over access to the building site and runoff from the rain and snow in the Summer months.

Mr. Les Barta, a resident who lives on Jeffery Court, reiterated Mr. Gausselin's concerns about runoff and would like to see the alternative methods of access considered.

Mr. Jeff Cutler, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that he was opposed to expanding the urban boundary. He urged the APC to look at the bigger picture and the precedent that this item was setting. Mr. Cutler stated that there was no reason to bend over backwards and allow this project to happen and allow the potential impacts to occur.

Mr. Kaleta addressed Mr. Gausselin's concerns about water runoff.

Mr. Gausselin made further comments about the property in question.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

A discussion ensued.

**MOTION** by Mr. Doughty, with a second by Ms. Kvas, to recommend approval to the Governing Board to amend the boundary line between Plan Area Statement 040, Incline Village #1, and Plan Area Statement 030, Mt. Rose, by deleting Washoe County APN 125-211-02 from PAS 030 and adding it to PAS 040. The motion carried with Messrs. McDowell and Haen voting no and Ms. Kemper abstaining.

Mr. McDowell stated that he voted no because he is not convinced that there was a mistake in the original zoning of the property.

Mr. Haen stated that he voted no because of the urban boundary problem. Ms. Kemper stated she abstained because she was uncomfortable with voting on this land use issue until she understands some of the situations.

E. Cole, Amendment of Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Geomorphic Hazard Unit Douglas County APN 01-080-27

Senior Planner Joe Pepi presented the staff summary amending the Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Geomorphic Hazard Unit Douglas County APN 01-080-27.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen stated that he had property in the Glenbrook area but the proposed project had no bearing on his property.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Paul Kaleta, with Basin Strategies and representing the applicant, believed that a mapping error had occurred in the past with the project. He stated that the amendment would benefit the adjacent property owners.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.
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MOTION by Mr. Doughty, with a second by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval to the Governing Board amending the Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Geomorphic Hazard Unit Douglas County APN 01-080-27. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Thompson, Amendment of Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Geomorphic Hazard Unit Douglas County APN 01-030-16

Senior Planner Joe Pepi presented the staff summary amending the Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Geomorphic Hazard Unit Douglas County APN 01-030-16.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Ms. Baldrica, with a second by Mr. Morgan, to recommend approval to the Governing Board amending the Regional Plan Geomorphic Unit Maps for Geomorphic Hazard Unit Douglas County APN 1-030-16. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Scope of Impacts for Environmental Documents Relative to Proposed Alternatives to Current Parking and Other Recreational Use Patterns Along the East Shore of Lake Tahoe.

Senior Planner Andrew Strain presented the staff summary scope of impacts for environmental documents relative to proposed alternatives to current parking and other recreational use patterns along the East Shore of Lake Tahoe.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Cutler, with the League to Save Lake Tahoe, voiced his concerns over off road parking and believed weekend parking lots, parking fees, and shuttles should be available.

Mr. Craig Hartman, representing a users group on the East Shore, stated that he was encouraged by the movement of the parking lots and the cooperation from all the agencies, including the TRPA.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen commented that the February 1998 APC meeting minutes would be acted upon next month.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Executive Director Jim Baetge announced that Susan Scholley's going away party would be held on March 25th, 1998. A contractor to do the local revenue generation would be selected at
the March Governing Board meeting. The study should be completed by the end of the fiscal year. The Nevada Legislative Oversight meeting would be held Friday, March 13th, 1998.

B. Legal Counsel

Agency Counsel R. J. Nicolle stated in the Lake Tahoe Water Recreational Association, et al. v. TRPA case, a status conference is to be held Friday, March 13th, 1998, and the judge would be setting the trial date, the discovery date, etc., and is proceeding with heavy discovery requests. In the TSPC v. TRPA case, the judge dismissed the right of the plaintiffs to have a jury trial and dismissed all the claims under the 1987 regional plan and ruled that they are not valid. She stated that the plaintiffs may file a motion for reconsideration and seek appellant review of the decision. In the Suitum v. TRPA case, it has been sent to the U.S. District Court in Reno and discovery has been reopened. Ms. Nicolle continued that the Governing Board authorized the hiring of two new outside counsel firms; the Remy, Thomas & Moose firm who will be working on the Suitum case and on the Barbieri case, and Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger who would be working on the TSPC case.

(Mr. Doughty left at 12:00 p.m.)

C. APC Member

Mr. Morgan urged the TRPA staff to try and get the packet out sooner so the members have more time to read it.

Mr. McDowell stated that TRPA and the Forest Service have held a couple of meetings and will be holding more meetings on the issue of Cave Rock. He announced that he would be on vacation in April. He asked if Carl Hasty and the Forest Service could be invited to the APC meeting for a presentation on the Presidential commitments package and the movement on that.

Mr. Baetge commented that May would be a better time for that.

Mr. McDowell also stated that the Forest Service would be holding an open house on March 23rd, 1998, from 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Porta stated that the Clean Water Action Plan had recommended significant funding increase for non-point source controls and his Division is looking into this.

Mr. Thompson announced that the April meeting would be his final meeting as a representative from NRCS to the APC. He had accepted a position with NRCS as the area resource conservationist which would entail program quality oversight for the area that extends from the California deserts to the San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. Combs stated that the West Shore General Plan Update had been released. In addition, a document entitled “A Notice of Preparation” to solicit comments on the environmental impact report for the Village at Squaw Valley had been circulated.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Sue Mikanovich
Clerk to the Commission

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call (702) 588-4547 to make an appointment. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA office, 308 Dorla Court, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

March 27, 1998

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area Statement 111, Tahoe Island, Special Area #1, to Permit Professional Offices and Health Care Services and to Add the Special Designation of Transfer of Existing Development Into Certain Developed Sites in This Area

Proposed Action: The owner of two parcels along Highway 89 in South Lake Tahoe (APNs 023-141-08, and -151-03), proposes to amend Plan Area 111 to:

1. Add Professional Offices and Health Care Services as new allowable commercial uses, and

2. Designate Special Area #1 as a Receiving Area for the Transfer of Existing Development on parcels with legally existing commercial uses. This will be accomplished through a new Special Designation and a new Special Policy.

Refer to Exhibits A through D which show the vicinity map, surrounding land uses, and proposed Plan Area Statement changes.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission conduct the public hearing as noticed and, based on its outcome, recommend approval of the amendment, as modified by staff, to the TRPA Governing Board. The staff modification would require installation of design and site planning improvement identified for this roadway threshold travel unit in TRPA's Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) as part of project development. It is shown in existing Special Policy #6 of the Plan Area Statement (Exhibit D) which the Governing Board added in 1994 for another commercial use amendment in this plan area. This policy would be modified to apply to parcels eligible to use the provisions now being considered.

Discussion: The subject parcels are located within Special Area #1 of Plan Area 111. This plan area is a residential plan area with certain commercial and tourist accommodation uses permitted in the special areas. Plan Area 111 lies along Highway 89 between the South "Y" (a preliminary community plan) and National Forest lands at the edge of town. The applicant's site
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is composed of two parcels. One presently has a commercial use on it, Dixon's Restaurant, along with some residential uses in the back. The other parcel contains the Emerald Pines Resort (tourist accommodation use).

The Highway 89 corridor is a mix of tourist, commercial, and residential uses. It has been identified in TRPA's Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) and the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) as an area targeted for scenic and community design restoration. Special Area #2 lies adjacent to Special Area #1 and together the areas possess a strip commercial appearance and use pattern.

Special Policy #3 in the Plan Area Statement encourages the City of South Lake Tahoe to prepare and implement a redevelopment plan for the Highway 89 corridor. It is a worthwhile goal, however, it does not appear to be a high priority. In the meantime, property owners do not have many options available to them to undertake redevelopment on their own. In order to develop sites such as this, make them economically viable, and make needed environmental improvements, the applicant proposes to expand the list of permissible uses and allow commercial expansions through the transfer of existing development. Presently, existing commercial floor area may not be transferred into the Special Area. Since this is a residential plan area, it does not, and will not, have new commercial floor area allocated to it. The Transfer of Existing Development Special Designation is needed to allow transfers and expansions.

To limit the potential applicability of this amendment which would likely worsen the form and function of the existing commercial/tourist strip, the applicant proposes to limit the transfer provisions only to parcels with legally existing commercial uses. That would result in one of the applicant's two parcels eligible for the transfer. The applicant estimates that the Special Designation would be available to two additional sites in Special Area #1.

City of South Lake Tahoe Zoning and General Plan Designations: The subject parcels are zoned by the City of South Lake Tahoe as Tourist Commercial (TC). The General Plan designation is Tourist Accommodation. Medical and professional offices are permitted as special uses in areas zoned TC. The amendment, therefore, would be consistent with the underlying City zoning.

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

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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

Rationale: The proposed amendments to the Plan Area Statement will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan because commercial uses are already permitted and the amendment will only apply to a limited number of parcels within the Special Area.
2. Finding: That the project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The amendment has been conditioned to require the installation of scenic and community design threshold improvements as part of project development. Any projects that are proposed due to this amendment, will be required to comply with all aspects of the Regional Plan package, including applicable thresholds.

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

Rationale: Any new or expansion of development due to this amendment will continue to be subject to federal, state, and local air and water quality standards.

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

Rationale: For reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Regional Plan will continue to achieve and maintain the threshold. It will not utilize any resources, nor have any "project-type" impacts discussed in Section 6.3.B of the TRPA Code.

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

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above

B. Chapter 13 Findings:

1. Finding: Prior to adopting any plan area amendment, TRPA must find the amendment is substantially consistent with the plan area designation criteria in Subsection 13.5.B and 13.5.C.

Rationale: The amendments will add a limited amount of additional commercial uses to an area which is already zoned for commercial uses. The amendment will not expand the area of commercial uses beyond that which presently exists. The new Special Designation of Transfer of Existing Development will enhance the Region's ability to implement threshold improvement projects by requiring scenic threshold improvements as a condition of project development.
Environmental Documentation: Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist for the proposed action. Staff recommends that a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) be made based on the following:

1. The amendment will have limited applicability. The applicant has supplied information suggesting the Transfer of Development provisions would only be permitted on two other parcels within the Special Area.

2. Threshold-related improvements which have been discussed with the applicant are anticipated as part of project development (including scenic, community design, and water quality).

3. The amendment would not approve development greater than contemplated by the Regional Plan. Adding the two additional uses and allowing the Special Designation to existing developed sites merely rearranges the location of transferred development.

4. Additional vehicle trips and associated vehicle miles of travel (VMT) which may be created by project development must be offset by mitigation measures. Since the additional development is expected to come through a transfer of existing commercial floor area, the increase is expected to be insignificant.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions regarding this matter.
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CALIFORNIA 99
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PLAN AREA STATEMENT 111 - TAHOE ISLAND

SPECIAL POLICIES:

8. Special Area #1 shall be permitted to receive new commercial floor area only on parcels with existing commercial development.

PERMISSIBLE USES:

Special Area #1:

Commercial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eating and drinking places (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage retail sales (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor retail sales (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional offices (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care services (S)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
111
TAHOE ISLAND

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification
RESIDENTIAL

Management Strategy
MITIGATION

Special Designation
TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:

1. Existing Development (Special Areas #1 & #2 Only)
   (Refer to Special Policy #8)

2. Multi-Residential Units (Special Area #2 Only)

SCENIC RESTORATION

PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA

MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This Plan Area is located north of the South Tahoe "Y" and south of the Tahoe Keys
and is depicted on TRPA maps G18 and F-18.

Existing Uses: The predominant use of this area is residential although non residential
development includes motels, restaurants, and heavy equipment and storage area. The area is
approximately 70 percent built out. Residential density is primarily one single family dwelling per
parcel although some high densities are associated with duplexes, apartment buildings, and a
planned unit development. Three Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association (TKPOA) single
family dwelling subdivisions and TKPOA's water treatment facility are located within this area.

Existing Environment: Nearly half of this area (250 acres) is classified as SEZ. Substantial
portions of the area classified as SEZ have been disturbed by existing development.
Undeveloped lots within the SEZ total 322. The balance of the area is low hazard land with 238
undeveloped lots remaining. Over half of the planning area is disturbed with hard and soft
coverage. Vegetation consists of fir, lodgepole pine, willow, and marsh grasses. Two TKPOA
subdivisions in this area have been reclassified as man-modified.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to be residential, maintaining the exiting
character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. There is an excess of land coverage and disturbance within the SEZ.
2. Portions of the area are subject to flooding.

3. This area contains a site reserved for possible affordable housing.

4. Additional fire hydrants and water system improvements are needed in this area.

5. This area is the location of Tahoe Valley ball field and Tallac Park (20 acres).

6. Thresholds require the scenic restoration of the Highway 89 corridor.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Drainage problems on developed parcels should be remedied.

2. Restoration of disturbed SEZ and reduction of soft coverage have high priority.

3. Redevelopment is encouraged along Highway 89 consistent with a City of South Lake Tahoe redevelopment plan. Noncommercial and tourist accommodation uses permitted in this area should be located on Highway 89.

4. Expansion of the Tahoe Valley ball field and Tallac Park may be permitted, consistent with a TRPA-approved master plan, which specifies the PAOT capacity of the improvements.

5. A senior citizen affordable housing project of up to 80 units may be permitted to be developed on a six-acre parcel optioned to the City in this area. The option must be exercised by the City prior to 1987 or the land reverts to Dillingham for any use authorized by law.

6. Extensions of commercial development should be limited to Special Area #1 along Highway 89 to help facilitate concentration of commercial development, except for parcels within Special Area #2 adjacent to Highway 89, which had previously legally existing commercial uses and have existing commercial floor area as verified by TRPA.

Any project proposed on parcels fronting Highway 89 within Special Areas #1 or #2 must comply with the Recommendations for Improving the Scenic Quality as listed in the Scenic Quality Improvement Program Appendix B pages B-6 through B-7 (b.(1) through (5)). If the improvements are not completed within two years from the date this policy becomes effective, PAS 111 Permissible Uses, General Merchandise Stores and Nursery, will be eliminated from the Special Area #2 Permissible Uses list.

7. Special Area #2 in the Eloise area should be primarily a multi-residential area and professional offices and health care services shall be limited to parcels fronting the east side of Tahoe Keys Blvd.

8. Special Area #1 shall be permitted to receive transferred commercial floor area only on parcels with existing commercial development.

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed
shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

**General List:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area (except as noted in Special Areas #1 and #2):

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

**Public Service**
- Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), schools-kindergarten through secondary (A), and day care centers/pre-schools (S).

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

**Resource Management**
- Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), Management special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).

**Special Area #1:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1.

All the uses listed on the General List plus the following additions:

**Residential**
- Multiple family dwellings (A).

**Tourist Accommodation**
- Hotel, motel and other transient dwelling units accommodations (S) and bed and breakfast facilities (S).

**Commercial**
- Eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (S), nursery (S), and outdoor retail sales (S), professional offices (S), and health care services (S).

**Recreation**
- Outdoor recreation concessions (S).

**Special Area #2:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #2.

All the uses listed on the General List plus the following additions:

**Residential**
- Multiple family dwellings (A), nursing and personal care (S), and residential care (S).

**Commercial**
- Professional offices (S), health care services (S), nursery (S), and general merchandise stores (S).
MAXIMUM DENSITIES: Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwellings 1 unit per parcel</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel and Other Transient Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• with less than 10% of units with kitchens</td>
<td>40 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• with 10% or more units with kitchens</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast Facilities</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS: Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 80 units. MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area, including the Highway 89 corridor is 55 CNEL.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION: The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time.

SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT WINTER DAY USES 0 PAOT OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by Volume IV of the Water Quality Management Plan.
2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.
4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway 50 and 89 corridors.
March 31, 1998

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Discussion of Amendment to Chapter 93, Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program, Relative to Coordinated Transit System (CTS) Mitigation

Proposed Action: No formal action requested at this time. Staff is requesting input and comments on the concept of the proposed amendment to Chapter 93 of TRPA’s Code, relative to air quality mitigation credit for participants in the Coordinated Transit System (CTS).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC review, in concept, the proposed amendments to Chapter 93 of TRPA’s Code of Ordinances, and provide input to staff for incorporation into the final recommended amendments.

Background: The concept of the Coordinated Transit System (CTS) was developed to provide for a means of mitigating traffic and air quality impacts from large projects that were proposed at the time. Rather than providing “the usual” physical improvements, CTS was allowing for the development of a transit system that would reduce vehicle trips, thus relieving the need for capacity increasing improvements.

In order to develop a truly “coordinated” transit system, it would be necessary to incorporate all the existing transit systems operating in the area, which in this case includes both public and private operators. For this reason, the private transit providers were approached about participating in the program. As opposed to the other participants who were participating in order to offset impacts from proposed projects, the private providers were asked to participate with no need to mitigate any impacts. In order to provide some incentive to participate, TRPA is proposing to develop a mitigation credit program.

Because TRPA’s air quality mitigation program is based on the number of vehicle trips generated by a project, the number of vehicle trips that will be reduced as a result of the participation of the various private participants and other transit operators will be calculated. The vehicle trips reduced will be “allocated” to each of these participants based on their level of contribution. For each vehicle trip reduced beyond those required as mitigation for the original participants, an air quality mitigation credit would be given. The participants can use these credits for their own future projects, or they can bank it and sell or trade it with other projects that may need it. At this time, it is suggested that these credits be used for projects within the CTS service area. Because of the potential risk involved in participating in CTS from the beginning, TRPA proposes that a minimum credit be given to these participants. The ridership on the system will be forecasted to five years after implementation. This ridership level will be given as a minimum air quality credit. If it turns out that the actual ridership is higher than the forecast, credit will be given based on the actual ridership. If it is lower, the original forecast numbers will be used. No credit will be given beyond the first five years that the system is in operation. This will allow for an overall reduction in vehicle trips in the CTS service area.

At the APC meeting, staff will begin with a presentation on the overall concept of the proposed amendments. Please contact Bridget Cornell at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item.
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March 30, 1998

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of the Kings Beach Community Plan to Add Timsharing (Hotel/Motel Design) and Timsharing (Residential Design) to the Permissible Use List of Special Area #2, West Entry Commercial Area, and Plan Area Statement 028, Kings Beach Residential, to Add Residential Care to the Permissible Use List

Proposed Action: At the request Placer County, TRPA staff proposes to amend Permissible Use List of Special Area #2, West Entry Commercial, of the Kings Beach Community Plan to add Timsharing (Hotel/Motel Design) and Timsharing (Residential Design) as permissible uses. In addition, Placer County requested TRPA consider under the TRPA system to amend the Permissible Use List of Plan Area Statement 028, Kings Beach Residential, to add Senior Housing as a permissible use. TRPA does not regulate senior housing projects and therefore does not have a use under which this use is defined. At the time the request was made by Placer County, it was determined that the appropriate use was Residential Care. Since that determination staff and Placer County has agreed the appropriate use is actually nursing and personal care. Therefore, staff request that the portion of the amendment to add Residential Care be deleted from the amendment.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) conduct a public hearing on this item and recommend adoption of the amendment of the Kings Beach Community Plan, Special Area #2 (West Entry Commercial Area) to add Timsharing (Hotel/Motel) and Timsharing (Residential Design) to the Permissible Use List (See Exhibit A for project location and Exhibit B for amendment to Chapter II of Kings Beach Community Plan). Staff recommend the Placer County request for the amendment to PAS 028 to add Residential Care be deleted. The use that the county envisioned for PAS 028 is already a permissible use.

Background: On February 27, 1998, the Placer County Planning Department requested that two minor changes be made to the North Tahoe Community Plans to further implement the adopted community plan. The county requested that timesharing be added to the Kings Beach Community Plan Special Area #2 Permissible Use List and Senior Housing be added as a special use to the Permissible Use List of PAS 028, Kings Beach Residential.

The County has taken action on these two amendments. On November 4, 1997, Placer County adopted an ordinance amending the Kings Beach Community Plan and PAS 028. Subsequently, the county has requested that the TRPA amend the Kings Beach Community Plan and PAS 028 to match the county’s actions.
Analysis: The Kings Beach Community Plan was jointly adopted by Placer County and TRPA in April, 1996, and is designed to serve as the guiding doctrine for land use related decisions in the area for the next ten years. The Plan establishes goals and objectives, special policies, programs, and strategies for funding and implementation. The Plan further serves to assign commercial and tourist accommodation allocations, and to direct the redevelopment and rehabilitation of the community.

Kings Beach has historically been one of the primary commercial and recreational centers of the Tahoe Basin and should continue in that role. Land use patterns in this area widely varied, although the predominant them of business is tourist-related, with a sizable numbers of motels, restaurants, and tourist oriented retail shops. A key part of the Community Plan is to provide the opportunity and incentive to upgrade and expand the businesses of Kings Beach. The Land Use Element envisions a cluster of distinct areas within Kings Beach unified with specific design elements. Each area has a plan design theme and a list of permissible uses.

Since the adoption of the King Beach Community Plan, two specific cases have come to staff's attention of uses that were not included on the list, which are consistent with the general theme for their areas, whose absence was not intentional exclusion, but, rather, an oversight.

In the case of the Kings Beach Community Plan, Special Area #2 (West Entry Area Commercial), timesharing tourist accommodation units were not added to the list. Currently, there is an approved and constructed timesharing development (Sweetbrier Cove) in that area.

The Community Plan has designated this area as Special Area #2 (West Entry Area) and envisions building on the established motel complexes, the lake front amenities, and the North Tahoe Conference Center to encourage the tourist overnight use of Kings Beach. The design concept is to establish a resort like atmosphere similar to that found in a resort town with amenities within walking distance. Furthermore, the Community Plan encourages a mixture of tourist accommodations, supporting retail and restaurants in this area.

The planning statement for the Kings Beach Community Plan is to continue to serve as a regional tourist and commercial needs of the north shore. The area should be redeveloped to concentrate uses and the overall planning goal is to proved an attractive destination resort community. In Special Policy #1, Urban Design and Development, the overall theme for Kings Beach is “Major Tourist Accommodation, Retail, and Services”. Commercial activities with direct frontage on State Route 28 should be oriented toward tourist needs, e.g., accommodation, dining, and retail sales. The plan encourages a mix of tourist, commercial and residential uses.

The amendment of Special Area #2 (West Entry Area) is consistent with the special policies and planning goals of the Kings Beach Community Plan and will continue to implement the goals and policies of the community plan and the goals and policies of the Regional Plan package.

TRPA only regulates the type of residential development that can occur and does regulate who can live or rent within the residential unit. The Code of Ordinances provides for a variety of residential types that may be use for senior housing projects and are already permissible uses within PAS 028. Although TRPA does not regulate senior housing uses,
Amendment of the Kings Beach Community Plan
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Placer County does have the option to add that particular use to the list as part of their zoning to regulate senior housing projects.

Findings: Prior to amending the TRPA Code of Ordinances, TRPA must make the following Findings.

Chapter 6 Findings

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

Rationale: The amendment to the Kings Beach Community Plan, Special Area #2 will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including applicable Goals. The adopted Kings Beach Community Plan provides the opportunity and incentive to upgrade and expand businesses of Kings Beach but yet maintain a balance between economic health and the environment by correcting past deficiencies in land use and being responsive to the needs and opportunities of Kings Beach. The Community Plan goals, objectives and policies encourages continual use of special area #2 as a center for tourist overnight use and to create a resort like atmosphere similar to that found in resort towns with amenities within walking distance and to encourage a mixture of tourist accommodations, supporting retail, and resort amenities land uses. The amendment to add timesharing uses to the permissible use list of Special Area #2 is consistent with the adopted community plan and the Regional Plan package.

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

Rationale: The amendment will not cause environmental thresholds to be exceeded. The adopted Kings Beach Community Plan provides goals and policies that require drainage improvements, stream zone restoration, and scenic improvements. All projects that may be proposed due this amendment will require to be consistent with all aspects of the Community Plan, the Code of Ordinances and the Regional Plan Package.

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

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.
Chapter 13 Findings

1. **Finding:** The amendment is substantially consistent with the plan area designation criteria in Subsections 13.5.B and 13.5.C.

   **Rationale:** See findings 1 and 2 above. The Community plan has designated the Kings Beach Community Plan Area as a commercial/public service area which provides commercial and public service to the region. The purpose of this classification is to concentrate such service for public convenience, and separate incompatible uses.

   Special Area #2, has been designated as an area for a mixture of tourist accommodation uses, supporting retail, and resort amenities that will encourage the tourist overnight use in Kings Beach and encourage redevelopment to concentrate uses. The amendment to add Timesharing uses to the permissible use list is consistent with the land use classification and special designations outlined in the community plan and will help achieve the goals and policies of the community plan.

**Environmental Documentation:** Staff has prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the proposed amendment. Staff proposes a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) based on the Chapter 6 findings shown above and on the following:

1. From a regional perspective, no additional land coverage or disturbance would be permitted by the amendment than is otherwise permissible under the Regional Plan; and

2. The amendment will provide the ability to development tourist accommodations uses as envisioned in the goals and policies of the Kings Beach Community Plan.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact John Hitchcock at 702-588-4547, or via email at trpa@sierra.net, if you have any comments regarding this item.
Special Area #2 - (West Entry Commercial Area): The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Special Area.

Residential
Employee housing (S), Multiple family dwelling (S), Multi-person dwelling (S), Residential care (S), Single family dwelling (A).

Tourist Accommodation
Bed and breakfast facilities (A), Hotel, motel, and other transient dwelling units up to 20 units (A), greater than 20 units (S/CUP), *Timesharing (hotel/motel design) (S)*, *Timesharing (residential design) (S)*.
Memorandum

March 28, 1998

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Local Jurisdiction Project Securities

Currently TRPA requires that local jurisdictions, such as the City of South Lake Tahoe and counties, post project securities in rare circumstances. Ordinarily Agency policy is to not require project securities of local jurisdictions. TRPA does require that public utility districts, general improvement districts, fire protection districts, water companies, and school districts post project securities.

Chapter 8 of the Code of Ordinances provides for the posting and release of securities. Project securities are required to ensure that project conditions of approval are followed through with. These primarily involve revegetation, slope stabilization, drainage facilities and TRPA Code of Ordinance restrictions such as height, coverage, scenic, parking and others as the project dictates. As TRPA resources become tighter, project securities become more important as insurance that projects are completed as approved. Securities have proven to be an efficient tool in reaching that objective.

TRPA staff have recently discussed the requirement for posting of project securities with staff of local public utility districts. Discussions were conducted with Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD), South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD), Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID), and North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD).

Some of the districts have set up revolving accounts with TRPA that work very well with the majority of projects. Some of these are letters of credit. The district staff agree that the security posting procedure and return process work well. They are not “project stoppers” and do not represent a hardship for the district. Most felt that the current requirements are working fine and no needed changes were apparent at this time.

School districts and other special districts sometimes decide to contract and bond building and other heavy construction but not revegetation and certain other TRPA conditions of approval, because it is more cost-effective for them to schedule their own crews for this work. In cases such as this, the TRPA security ensures that those project components are completed.
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Local jurisdictions, such as the City of South Lake Tahoe, counties, school districts, fire districts, and public utility districts, are permanent entities in the Region. It is possible that through improved communication, contracting and bonding of projects and sharing of resources we can adequately assure that projects are completed as approved. Although TRPA cannot guarantee inspections of all aspects of all projects with the current level of staff resources provided, we will strive to reach that goal.

Options for Discussion:
- Create revolving project security accounts for each entity
- Have TRPA named as bonded party on construction contract bonds (TRPA conditions only).

This is a discussion item at this time and no action is required. If there are any questions on this agenda item, please contact Steve Chilton at (702) 588-4547, ext 265.
MEMORANDUM

March 30, 1998

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Staff Recommendations for Special Project Commercial Floor Area Allocations

Proposed Action: Staff requests that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) review the staff evaluation of the four projects requesting Special Projects Commercial Floor Area Allocations and, if appropriate, recommend the allocation distribution as suggested by TRPA staff to the TRPA Governing Board.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the pool of 150,000 square feet of commercial floor area (cfa) set aside for Special Projects be distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Amount of CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Avenue Project</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42,600 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No. 3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44,926 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks Relocation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47,844 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135,370 s.f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth project, the Prim Project, did not qualify under the evaluation system and requested more than the remaining allocation. Therefore, staff does not recommend any allocation be distributed to this project.

After the above distribution of allocation, 14,630 square feet of commercial floor area would remain in the pool for distribution next year. This number may increase if TRPA, City of South Lake Tahoe, Meeks, and California Tahoe Conservancy can arrange for the transfer of approximately 32,000 square feet of existing floor area on the Meeks site to the Park Avenue Project.

KC/
Background: Subsection 33.3.D(3) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets aside 150,000 square feet of commercial floor area for projects that demonstrate threshold-related environmental improvements, transfer of development that result in substantial environmental benefits and rehabilitation of substandard development. These projects must be located within a designated community plan or master plan area. The review criteria for these projects was developed by the TRPA Performance Review Committee (PRC) which included representatives from all the local jurisdictions. The review criteria developed by the PRC was presented and acknowledged by the APC and Governing Board in October 1997. The review criteria is included as an Exhibit to this staff summary.

Applications to be considered for Special Projects Commercial Floor Area Allocations were accepted from November 1, 1997 through January 30, 1998. During that time period, four applications were received; Park Avenue Redevelopment Project, Project No. 3 Redevelopment Project, Meeks Relocation Project and Prim Commercial Project.

Staff reviewed the applications and gave a preliminary score for each project. As was included in the published review criteria, a minimum score of 75 would be required to receive a TRPA staff recommendation for an allocation. A meeting with each applicant was held in February where staff reviewed the initial scoring of the project and provided the applicant with additional time to respond to questions or modify the project in areas where scoring was low. Staff required all responses to the meeting to be submitted by March 20, 1998. The scores identified in the recommendation section above, are based on the information received in the original application and in the response letters of March 20, 1998.

Scoring: Included as exhibits are project descriptions for all four applications and the staff scoring of each application. The scores are based on applying the review criteria and comparing the projects against each other. The review criteria is as follows:

1. Priority of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 20.
   
   All the submitted projects included Priority A Environmental Improvement Projects (EIP) and were awarded 20 points.

2. Cost and Contribution Considerations: Maximum number of points is 25.
   
   A. Contribution by Applicant (maximum of 10 points)
   B. Total Cost of EIP portion of project (maximum of 10 points)
   C. EIP Cost as a Percentage of Project Cost (maximum of 5 points)

As staff reviewed portions A and C of the above criteria, it became apparent that the criteria did not account for the total dollar amount being spent to implement the projects. Applying percentages of cost did not discriminate between a project costing millions versus a project costing thousands of dollars. As a result, staff added its own criteria for A (above) that if the applicant contributed over $10,000,000 to EIP, the maximum 10 points would be awarded, regardless of the percentage to the total cost of the commercial project. The same was applied to
C (above) with the criteria that if the total cost of the EIP was over $20,000,000, the maximum 5 points would be awarded.

To determine the number of points assigned for portion B above, staff used the ratio of one point per one million dollars of the cost of the EIP. For example, an EIP project costing 5 million dollars would be awarded 5 points.

3. **Commitment Plan: Maximum Number of points is 10.**

The more assurances for EIP completion, the higher number of points assigned. Staff awarded points if the project included funding by a public entity, if the project and the EIP were at the same site, if the construction date was 1998 or 1999, if permitting/environmental documentation was in process, and if funding was secure.

4. **Transfer: Maximum Number of points is 10.**

Amount of transfer, both units of use and land coverage, was considered. Transfers from low capability land classes received higher points.

5. **Rehabilitation of Substandard Development: Maximum Number of Points is 5.**

All of the project applications were awarded 5 points.

6. **Public/Private Partnerships: Maximum Number of Points is 5.**

The amount of public partnership and the extent of public benefit were considered in the awarding of points for this section.

7. **Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum Number of Points is 15.**

The projects were evaluated based on the nine threshold categories. Points ranging from 0 for no benefit, 1 point for a minor benefit, 2 through 5 points for a significant benefit, and 6 through 10 points for a major benefit.

8. **Other Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum Number of Points is 10.**

The projects were evaluated on benefits other than threshold related categories. These other benefits included drainage, access, scenic, restoration and/or redevelopment and community benefits.

**Prim Commercial Project:** This project application received a score of 70 points and therefore is not receiving an allocation recommendation from staff. The original project application included a parcel at the northeast corner of Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade (the Love Chapel site). Inclusion of this site would have generated more points as removal of the existing building was proposed. This would have provided transfer of land coverage and commercial floor area, intersection improvements and scenic quality benefits. The applicant did pursue obtaining this parcel, but at this time no agreement for acquisition has been reach, and as such, these improvements can not be considered in the scoring of the project.
The project description also includes the construction of a parking garage and shared surface parking for Kahle Park. The description states that the parking garage would be constructed by Douglas County and could include space for Park and Ride associated with the proposed transit center. The estimated construction time would be the year 2005. Although staff agrees that the parking garage concept is good, this garage is not an identified EIP project and cannot be considered in the scoring of an EIP project. In addition, the timing of the garage construction is beyond the estimated construction of the commercial project.

Conclusions: Staff recommends that the Park Avenue Project, the Project No. 3 and the Meeks Relocation project receive allocation recommendations for the reasons stated above, and based on the additional information included as Attachments to this staff summary.

Environmental Documentation: Environmental documentation is not required for this portion of the allocation process. Environmental documentation was included with the establishment of the allocation system and will be required for each project approval.

If you should have any questions related to this matter, please contact Kathy Canfield or Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.
EXHIBITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit A</th>
<th>Special Project Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit B</td>
<td>Park Avenue Redevelopment Project: Staff Evaluation and Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit C</td>
<td>Project No. 3: Staff Evaluation and Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit D</td>
<td>Meeks Relocation Project: Staff Evaluation and Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit E</td>
<td>Prim Commercial Project: Staff Evaluation and Project Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following criteria will be used by TRPA staff in evaluating requests for allocations under the Special Project Allocation System. Based on the applicant's submittal addressing the criteria, a panel of TRPA staff will score each applicant's proposal from 0 to 100 points. A minimum score of 75 will be required for a positive recommendation. Based on the scores, all the applications will be ranked. The staff's recommendation to the Advisory Planning Commission and the Governing Board will be based on the ranking. The allocations will be distributed based on applicants' requests starting with the highest ranked proposal. Unused allocations will be deferred to the next evaluation. There will be no recommendations for partial allocation.

1. Priority of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 20.

All projects are required to implement an EIP project. Points will be given based on the importance of that project to TRPA and local government. Priority considers immediate needs and benefits, cost and magnitude of the project, relationship to community planning efforts, and project need for assistance. Priority A (20 points) would be the most sought after, Priority B (10 points) would be projects not scoring as well in the categories, or Priority C (5 points) would be EIP projects not relating to community planning efforts or being implemented through other processes. Examples of most sought after EIP projects that TRPA and local government would like to see implemented are attached.

2. Cost and Contribution Considerations: The maximum number of points for this section is 25.

A. Contribution by Applicant: Maximum number of points is 10.

The amount of the applicant's contribution to the EIP project will be considered. The higher the percentage, the higher the number of points assigned.

B. Total Cost of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 10.

The total cost of the EIP project will be considered. The higher the project cost, the more points awarded.

C. EIP Cost as a Percent of Total Project Cost: Maximum number of points is 5

The total cost of the EIP project as a percent of the total project cost will be considered.

3. Commitment Plan: Maximum number of points is 10.

The more the assurances for the EIP project to be completed, the higher number of points assigned. This includes consideration of property acquisition, financing, grants, committed funding, and time schedules. The preferred schedule would show the applicant acquiring complete project application within one year of the allocation. Construction starting in the second year after the approval.

4. Transfer: Maximum number of points available is 10.

Matching transfers of development with allocations for the proposed project is encouraged. The more transfers proposed that result in environmental benefits, the higher the points. Transfers of development from sensitive lands will score higher than transfers from high capability land.

5. Rehabilitation of Substandard Development: Maximum number of points is 5.

Rehabilitation of existing development, the use of disturbed sites and restoration of disturbed sites will score the highest.

6. Public/Private Partnerships: Maximum number of points is 5.

Proposals that utilize a public/private partnership will be awarded points based on the amount of cooperation and the extent of the public benefit.
7. **Substantial Environmental Benefits:** Maximum number of points is 15.

Substantial environmental benefits will be judged by the nine threshold categories, the amount of threshold improvement, and the number of thresholds improved. Also, projects will be evaluated on the difficulty to implement the project, e.g. not funded, not approved, in need of property acquisition, etc.

8. **Other Substantial Environmental Benefits:** Maximum number of points is 10.

This is based on the evaluation of the environmental benefits of the proposed commercial project. Projects producing non-required benefits such as improved drainage treatment, improved access, scenic improvements, and restoration will score the highest.
RECOMMENDED EIP PROJECTS

The following Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects are the most sought after projects and would be scored as A priority projects. There are more projects listed in the TRPA EIP, some of which may also be rated high priority. See the TRPA EIP or TRPA staff for project description.

DOUGLAS COUNTY:

Scenic Road Unit 32, Casino Area. Project # 0097. U.S. 50 at Stateline.
Pedestrian Improvements from Stateline Ave. to Loop Road. Project # 0415. U.S. 50 at Stateline to Loop Road.
Burke Creek Culvert Replacement, Habitat Restoration. Project # 0409. U.S. 50 at Burke Creek.
Kingsbury-Lake Tahoe Trail. Project # 0369. Kahle Drive from U.S. 50 to Lake Tahoe.
Burke Creek SEZ Restoration. Project # 0161. Burke Creek at former Tahoe Nugget.
Elks Point Road Intersection Improvements. Project # 0069. U.S. 50 at Elks Point Road
Kingsbury Pedestrian/Drainage Improvements. Project # 0068. State Route 207.
Casino Core Mountain Lake Pedestrian Improvements.

EL DORADO COUNTY

U.S. Forest Service Meyers Visitor’s Center, Phase 2. Project # 0141. U.S. 50 and 89.
U.S. 50 Scenic Improvements, Underground Utilities. Project # 0058. U.S. 50 at Meadowvale Drive

CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE

South Shore Redevelopment, Phase 3. Project # 0484. Redevelopment along U.S. 50
Harrison District Improvements. Project # 0158. U.S. 50 between Los Angeles & San Jose
South Y Intersection Improvements. Project # 0048. U.S. 50 & State Route 89
Trout Creek Watershed, Meeks SEZ Restoration. Project # 0023. U.S. 50 at Trout Creek.
South Y Industrial Tract SEZ. Project # 0013. Lake Tahoe Boulevard at the Industrial Tract.
U.S. 50 Sidewalk. Project # 0011. Ski Run to South Y.
Bijou U.S. 50 Improvements. Project # 0002. U.S. 50 at Bijou
Park Avenue Redevelopment. Project # 0003. U.S. 50 at Park Avenue
South Shore Transit Fleet Replacement. Project #0478.
PLACER COUNTY

Tahoe Vista/Kings Beach Pedestrian Improvements. Project # 0393. S.R. 28 from Kings Beach to Tahoe Vista
California Parks SEZ Restoration. Project # 0351. Tahoe State Recreation Area.
Fanny Bridge Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements. Project # 9240. S.R. 28 at Fanny Bridge
Scenic Shore Unit 15 Improvements. Project # 0106. Tahoe City.
S.R. 28 & 267 Intersection Improvements. Project # 0078, Kings Beach
Carnelian Creek Phase I. Project # 0052. S.R. 28 at Carnelian Creek.
64 Acre Tract Transit Center. Project # 0006. Tahoe City

WASHOE COUNTY

Third Creek Fish Habitat Restoration. Project # 0327, 0443. Incline Village
Third Creek SEZ Restoration. Project # 0264, 0562. Village Blvd. to Peepslight.
Incline Creek SEZ & Fish Habitat Restoration. Project # 0123. Hyatt Property.
North Stateline Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements. Project # 0109. North Stateline Casino Core.
Scenic Road Unit #25 Improvements. Project # 0095. Ponderosa Area.
Incline Village Commercial SEZ Restoration. Project # 0118.
Incline Village #1 BMPs. Project # 0228, 0229, 0230, 0231.
Scenic Road Unit # 21 Improvements. Project # 0502. North Stateline
Scenic Road Unit # 22 & 23 Improvements. Project # 0094, 0499. Crystal Bay.

PROJECTS REQUESTED TO BE ADDED TO THE EIP LIST

City of South Lake Tahoe:
U.S. 50 Sidewalks, Ski Run to Stateline.
Lake Access to the Stateline Area.
Environmental Learning Center in the Stateline Area.
SPECIAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA
Park Avenue Redevelopment Project
Score of 95

1. Priority of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 20.

All projects are required to implement an EIP project. Points will be given based on the importance of that project to TRPA and local government. Priority considers immediate needs and benefits, cost and magnitude of the project, relationship to community planning efforts, and project need for assistance. Priority A (20 points) would be the most sought after, Priority B (10 points) would be projects not scoring as well in the categories, or Priority C (5 points) would be EIP projects not relating to community planning efforts or being implemented through other processes. Examples of most sought after EIP projects that TRPA and local government would like to see implemented are attached.

The Park Avenue Project is an EIP project and is listed as a Priority A project. Twenty points were awarded.

2. Cost and Contribution Considerations: The maximum number of points for this section is 25.

   A. Contribution by Applicant: Maximum number of points is 10.
      The applicant is contributing over $10,000,000. Ten points were awarded.

   B. Total Cost of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 10.
      The total cost of the EIP is approximately $30,000,000. Ten points were awarded.

   C. EIP Cost as a Percent of Total Project Cost: Maximum number of points is 5.
      The EIP cost exceeds $20,000,000. Five points were awarded.

3. Commitment Plan: Maximum number of points is 10.

The more the assurances for the EIP project to be completed, the higher number of points assigned.

The City of South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency is an active partner in the project, the commercial project and the EIP are one in the same, construction is scheduled to begin in 1999, the TRPA project permit has been obtained (but not acknowledged). Funding is not yet secured. Eight points were awarded.

4. Transfer: Maximum number of points available is 10.

Matching transfers of development with allocations for the proposed project is encouraged. The more transfers proposed that result in environmental benefits, the higher the points. Transfers of development from sensitive lands will score higher than transfers from high capability land.

The project includes a transfer of commercial floor area, tourist units and the relocation of land coverage out of sensitive land. Seven points were awarded.

5. Rehabilitation of Substandard Development Maximum number of points is 5.

Five points were awarded.
6. Public/Private Partnerships: Maximum number of points is 5.

Five points were awarded.

7. Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>minor</th>
<th>significant</th>
<th>major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils/SEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the maximum 15 points were awarded.

8. Other Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic (non-threshold)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/Redevelop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the maximum 10 points were awarded.
EIP Project Description

The Park Avenue Project itself is designated as an EIP Project by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. This is in recognition of the fact that the Project goes beyond compliance with the requirements and provides area-wide benefits as well.

The following lists these area-wide benefits:

Traffic Benefits

- The Park Avenue Project incorporates the development of an area-wide central dispatch and passenger transit center for the Coordinated Transit System (CTS). The intermodal center has been designed to initially handle rubber-tired vehicles. It has an area for future expansion and it has also been designed to handle an elevated fixed guideway system in case one is developed between the Stateline area and the Ski Run public lake access in the future. The building itself has inside waiting area, an area to observe the dispatcher at work, office space, public restrooms, and a visitor information center. This will be the central hub for the CTS.

- An integral component of the intermodal transit center is its juxtaposition to a new gondola to transport people to Heavenly Resort. The proximity of this conveyance to literally thousands of tourist accommodations should greatly reduce the vehicle miles traveled by rubber-tired vehicles going to the mountain. This includes not just skier use but also summertime mountain users and sightseers riding up the mountain to see the lake vistas.

- Looking toward the future, land parallel and adjacent to Lake Tahoe Boulevard has been reserved for future transit use. This could include the right-of-way for an elevated fixed rail system. When combined with other redevelopment projects, there is enough land reserved to actually install a system all the way to Ski Run Boulevard.
The development of the intermodal center necessitates circulation improvements for the transit vehicles. A new "street" is included in the plan, called Transit Way. This artery connects Lake Tahoe Boulevard to Van Sickle adjacent to the easterly edge of the transit center. Van Sickle is going to be acquired and improved as a public street. (It is currently a private roadway that is poorly maintained and congested with cars parked along both dirt shoulders.) Park Avenue is realigned as a "Lazy S" configuration to improve its capacity for area-wide traffic. In addition to the two lanes of traffic, one in each direction, a third lane is being added for continuous left-turn movements.

A continuous right-hand turn lane for eastbound traffic is being added to Lake Tahoe Boulevard between Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue. This turn lane has been a desired improvement to the area for a number of years.

As part of the overall improved circulation plan, Fern Avenue, which now empties in a one-way pattern onto Pioneer less than 25 yards from Lake Tahoe Boulevard, will be terminated as a cul-de-sac in the residential neighborhood.

The number of driveways in the project area along Lake Tahoe Boulevard between Embassy Hotel and Park Avenue is being reduced from 13 to 2. This improvement, besides reducing the amount of potential traffic conflicts, will enable the City to add raised medians in the Boulevard when both sides have been redeveloped.

Bicycle paths and wide, sheltered pedestrian walkways are incorporated throughout the project. This includes the portion of Bikeway 2000 on Lake Tahoe Boulevard through the project area.

The emphasis of the project is clearly away from the automobile and onto other means of transportation, including transit, bicycle, and foot traffic.
Water Quality Benefits

- Urban run-off from that portion of the project area between Embassy Suites Hotel and Park Avenue currently drains into a pipe located under Park Avenue. It commingles with run-off from the mountain that enters the pipe at its place of origin on Montreal Avenue. This pipe carries the run-off to the mouth of the north ditch in the Tahoe Meadows Subdivision, which is located at Pine Boulevard. There are two problems with this system - the existing pipe does not have the capacity to handle all of the run-off and the north ditch is overgrown, so that water ponds on Pine Boulevard. The Park Avenue Project has chosen to treat urban run-off from the project area in a manner that will vastly improve the operation of the remaining system. A second pipe will be placed under Park Avenue to handle project area drainage exclusively. This will leave only the relatively clean run-off from the mountain in the existing pipe, thus allowing it to operate under capacity and reducing the flow into the north ditch. The project run-off will be taken to new sedimentation basins at Park Avenue and Pine Boulevard.

- The new basins planned for Park and Pine will be oversized so that they can handle more run-off for treatment. City staff is currently working with the California Tahoe Conservancy on what is being called the Rocky Point Erosion Control Project. A plan is being developed to capture and treat run-off flowing from the high urbanized area on Rocky Point through the Pioneer Trail area onto Highway 50 and into a CALTRANS pipe that then simply spills without treatment into the Tahoe Meadows Subdivision. This project will collect this run-off and bring it to the oversized Park Avenue Project sedimentation basins for treatment.

Scenic Benefits

- While not required, the Park Avenue Project proponents have chosen to install an integrated system of street furniture, decorative pedestrian lighting, and signage throughout the project. This will enhance the scenic quality of the new village.
A pocket park at Highway 50 and Park Avenue will create important open space and an expanded view corridor to the mountains.

The sedimentation basin for the Crescent V Shopping Center has been placed strategically along Lake Tahoe Boulevard at the entrance to the project area to relieve the wall of development along the Boulevard, thereby helping to announce the entry into a new zone of development.

The use of natural materials, like stone and wood, by the project proponents enhances the scenic component of the project.

Setting back all structures from 30 to 60 feet along Lake Tahoe Boulevard allows the Boulevard to be lined with trees and flowers that again add to the scenic quality of the roadway.

The development of the area-wide sedimentation basins at Park Avenue and Pine Boulevard will create a new major view corridor to Lake Tahoe from Park Avenue. Currently, on traveling northerly on Park Avenue looks directly at a complex of three motels - the Stateline Lodge, the Park Avenue Motel, and the Meadowood Lodge. These three motels will be removed for the drainage treatment area and open up the view to the sparsely developed residential area leading to the Lake.

Other Benefits

Recreation is being enhanced with the development of the Park Avenue Project. An outdoor skating rink is the focal point of center plaza in the Park Place development. This rink has been developed in an amphitheater setting that will lend itself to other summertime uses, primarily performances by a variety of entertainers, from string quartets to jugglers and mimes. Other recreation available in the project area will include a cinema complex and a children's play area.
- The incorporation of vertically-mixed development into the project area represents a major change in land use to patterns which support environmental concerns.

- The extensive use of snow melt systems in the project area both allow for the easy capture and treatment of snow run-off and enhance the quality of the experience for the pedestrian in inclement weather.

COMMERCIAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The basic Park Avenue Project, without enhancements, has vast environmental improvements inherent in its implementation. The following lists these improvements:

- New curb and gutter throughout the project area (Lake Tahoe Boulevard, Van Sickle, Montreal, and Park) will better define the separation of automobile space from pedestrian space, will clearly define driveways, and will help direct urban run-off into drop inlets for piping to treatment areas.

- The project proponents will contribute $180,501 to the Coordinated Transit System in lieu of enlarging various intersections through the City.

- The signalization of both Park Avenue and Pioneer Trail at Lake Tahoe Boulevard will be improved.

- The project will reduce existing hard land coverage by 8.3 acres.

- The project will treat urban run-off from a 34-acre area that currently does not have Best Management Practices. This storm water management system consists of collection systems, catch basins, drop inlets, pretreatment vaults, and underground piping to detention and treatment ponds.

- As a result of adding development to a man-modified area, two acres of Stream Environment Zone will be restored.
The incorporation of design standards consistent with a look of rustic alpine elegance will enhance the scenic quality of the area and the travel rating along Highway 50. This includes a new facade on the Crescent V shopping center.

The gondola plaza will be the first piece of an open space corridor transecting the Stateline Area from south to north. It will continue on the north side of Lake Tahoe Boulevard with a creek flowing into the replica of Lake Tahoe in Project 3, which in turn will tie visually with Project 3's sedimentation ponds on the far side of Cedar Avenue.

Public art will be incorporated in both the private development and the public open spaces via a coordinated art program.

All parking will be either underground or in garage structures, adding to the scenic quality of the project area.

All obsolete appliances, asbestos and soil contamination in the 17-acre demolition portion of the project area will be removed. The appliances will be replaced with low-flow, low-energy fixtures and double pane windows, all of which will be more efficient and environmentally sound.
March 20, 1998

Cathy Canfield
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P O Box 1038
Zephyr Cove NV 89448-1038

Re: Special Project Allocation Packet Supplement - Park Avenue Project

Dear Cathy:

Thank you for the opportunity to supplement our application for a special commercial floor area allocation for the Park Avenue Project. Since Park Avenue and Redevelopment Project No. 3 are so similar, I would like to begin with a couple of general comments that will be similar in both supplements.

First, I would like to reiterate that I believe the TRPA staff has done an excellent job of scoring our projects. I do not envy you your task!

Second, I do think that in actually scoring projects for the first time, a potential weakness in the scoring system has been revealed. This weakness is that the financial cost and physical size of a project does not result in more points and in fact can even result in lower scoring than "smaller" competitors.

For example, we are aware that there is a proposal involving the relocation of the Love Wedding Chapel, which is certainly a desirable project. That project will visually improve possibly 200 feet of Highway 50 frontage. The Park Avenue Project and Redevelopment Project No. 3 will each visually improve over 1200 feet of Highway frontage. However, in scoring, one asks is the project making visual improvements; the answer for each is "yes" and each is given an extra point or half point. The difference in scope or size is not acknowledged. The same is true for the amount of land area that is being upgraded to best management practices and so forth.

The expense of a larger project can also result in lower scoring in the Cost and Contribution Considerations, which total 25 points. In Park Avenue, the applicant is contributing 49 percent of the total EIP cost. What is not considered is that this contribution totals $14,500,000, and the total EIP cost is $29,750,000. It seems logical to
assume that the more expensive the EIP project is, the more it may rely on partners to accomplish the EIP project. Yet the applicant is penalized for this partnership.

A similar ratio comes into play when comparing the EIP project cost to the total project cost. The Park Avenue EIP project, costing $29,750,000, only got 2 points out of 5 because the total project cost is in excess of $140,000,000. It is hard to understand that a commitment of almost $30 million to environmental improvement is worth 40% of the total points in the cost category.

To this same end, both of our applications are hampered by the fact that the project itself has enormous benefit but the “basic project” does not receive points for cost and contribution considerations, even when, as in the case of Park Avenue and Redevelopment No. 3, the projects themselves are on the EIP list. If the benefits of accomplishing the basic project were acknowledged, the cost and contributions scoring would be substantially higher.

Finally, there is no way to quantify or acknowledge the fact that while the Redevelopment Agency is paying for certain improvements, the revenue source for these costs is from the private sector’s construction. Our hotel people cannot build rooms for $60,000 each that rent for $100 a night. They must build rooms that cost $120,000 and rent for $200 a night. This substantially increases their risk but is required by STRA to ensure enough revenue to fund the bonded improvements. Again, if this were acknowledged, the cost and contributions scoring would be substantially higher.

We hope that the experience of this first round of scoring can be used to strengthen the format so that size and expense are rewarded and not penalized and that bonded costs that rely on the private sector’s performance for repayment can be acknowledged as applicant contributions.

**Park Avenue Specific Project Comments**

We have one clarification related to the Park Avenue application. In the section on transfers, the final paragraph consists of one sentence noting that a portion of the off-site drainage area is classified as SEZ and will be restored. We want to add the information that this SEZ zone is currently improved with the Stateline Motel, which has 15 units and manager’s quarters, all of which will be transferred to higher capability land in the primary project area. The site contains 0.37 acres, the great majority of which has hard coverage.
If you have any questions about these observations or our clarification, please call me directly at (530) 542-6044. And again, thank you for your good work on this enormous endeavor.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judith A. Von Klug
Redevelopment Manager

cc: Lewis Feldman
SPECIAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA

Project No. 3 Redevelopment Project

Score of 90

1. Priority of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 20.

All projects are required to implement an EIP project. Points will be given based on the importance of that project to TRPA and local government. Priority considers immediate needs and benefits, cost and magnitude of the project, relationship to community planning efforts, and project need for assistance. Priority A (20 points) would be the most sought after, Priority B (10 points) would be projects not scoring as well in the categories, or Priority C (5 points) would be EIP projects not relating to community planning efforts or being implemented through other processes. Examples of most sought after EIP projects that TRPA and local government would like to see implemented are attached.

The Project No. 3 Project is an EIP project and is listed as a Priority A project. Twenty points were awarded.

2. Cost and Contribution Considerations: The maximum number of points for this section is 25.

A. Contribution by Applicant: Maximum number of points is 10.

The applicant is contributing approximately 1/3 of total EIP cost. Three points were awarded.

B. Total Cost of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 10.

The total cost of the EIP is approximately $21,000,000. Ten points were awarded.

C. EIP Cost as a Percent of Total Project Cost: Maximum number of points is 5.

The EIP cost exceeds $20,000,000. Five points were awarded.

3. Commitment Plan: Maximum number of points is 10.

The more the assurances for the EIP project to be completed, the higher number of points assigned.

The City of South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency is an active partner in the project, the commercial project and the EIP are one in the same, construction is scheduled to begin in 1999, the Environmental Impact Statement is at the circulation for public comment stage. Funding is not yet secured. Seven points were awarded.

4. Transfer: Maximum number of points available is 10.

Matching transfers of development with allocations for the proposed project is encouraged. The more transfers proposed that result in environmental benefits, the higher the points. Transfers of development from sensitive lands will score higher than transfers from high capability land.

The project includes a:transfer of 57 tourist units. Five points were awarded.

5. Rehabilitation of Substandard Development. Maximum number of points is 5.

Five points were awarded.
6. Public/Private Partnerships: Maximum number of points is 5.

Five points were awarded.

7. Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>minor</th>
<th>significant</th>
<th>major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils/SEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the maximum 15 points were awarded.

8. Other Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic (non-threshold)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/Redevelop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the maximum 10 points were awarded.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. 3

Redevelopment Project No. 3 compliments the redevelopment effort known as the Park Avenue Project. While Park Avenue will redesign the mountain side of Highway 50, Project No. 3 redesigns the lake side of the highway from Stateline Avenue to Park Avenue, between Lake Tahoe Boulevard and Cedar Avenue.

About 22 parcels of land with tourist-commercial uses will be purchased by the South Tahoe Redevelopment Agency and razed for new development. A new convention center with attached four-star convention hotel will occupy the space next to Stateline Avenue. A replica of Lake Tahoe will separate that facility from a second tourist lodging development. The environmental center focused on the lake replica will also include an indoor learning center. The second hotel will have first-floor retail uses to keep the street front active and also the entrance to a corridor under Lake Tahoe Boulevard, exiting into the gondola plaza in the Park Avenue Project. Parking for the two resorts and the convention center will be underground.

The Stardust Lodge will remain but some commercial floor space may be incorporated into the frontage of the property, again to keep the highway edge active and interesting. This addition will be a separate project; this block is an "out block" and not included as part of the Project No. 3 Area.

The last block which is in the core Project Area, bounded by the Stardust, Highway 50, Park Avenue, and Cedar Avenue, will be a unique place of discovery, with an artists' colony of studios and residences, an outdoor bazaar area, and children's activities, including child care for both tourists and locals. This block will have the only at-grade parking in the project area.

As with all redevelopment endeavors, rustic alpine elegance design standards will be imposed; pedestrian movements will be encouraged with attractive, functional walking areas; and all development will be generously set back from Lake Tahoe Boulevard.
EIP PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Redevelopment Project No. 3, Project #0484, is designated as an EIP Project by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. This recognizes the fact that the Project goes beyond compliance with the basic development requirements and provides desirable area-wide benefits as well.

The following lists these area-wide benefits:

Water Quality Benefits

- Urban run-off in Project No. 3 Area is currently untreated and runs freely through the Stateline Area toward Lake Tahoe. The project proponents have incorporated a replica of Lake Tahoe into the Project Area and this amenity could easily have served a dual function of acting as a sedimentation basin for the area’s run-off. Another alternative would have been to pipe the run-off directly into the Stateline Erosion Control Project for treatment, since this system was designed to handle the drainage from the Project Area. However, the Project is instead constructing separate a sedimentation basin, thereby increasing the amount of coverage reduction as a result of the project, increasing the amount of open space for visual enhancement, and incorporating the expanded basin area into the walkway system described above that leads to Lake Tahoe. Three motels will be acquired and removed for the construction of this water treatment facility.

- The dedicated treatment area will also be able to treat run-off from adjacent properties and roadways not located in the project area, including the Stardust and the Viking Lodge and Highway 50 and Cedar Avenue.

- The project is removing 15 percent of the impervious coverage in the Project Area, thereby increasing the natural percolation opportunities.
Traffic Benefits

- The land use planning for Project No. 3 continues the vision of developing a new all-inclusive village at the Stateline area that will diminish reliance on the automobile and enhance the desirability of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movements. This design is based on the premise that tourists will continue to arrive to the South Shore primarily by automobile and airport shuttle, but once at their lodging in the Stateline area, all desired amenities will either be within walking distance, including access to the mountain and to the lake, or easily accessible by the Coordinated Transit System.

- An integral component of the success of any transit system is accessibility. The main hub for the CTS will be located in the Park Avenue Project Area, on the other side of Lake Tahoe Boulevard. Since this roadway can be daunting to cross, Project No. 3 is constructing an underground corridor to facilitate passage from one side of the Boulevard to the other. The corridor connects the edge of the Lake Passage with the gondola portion of the intermodal transit center.

- In keeping with the theme of de-emphasizing the automobile, three streets are being removed within the Project No. 3 Area. These are Laurel Avenue, Poplar Street, and LaBelle Street. Cedar Avenue will be improved to a three-lane street with a continuous left-turn lane.

- The number of driveways in the project area along Lake Tahoe Boulevard is being reduced from 13 to 1; in addition, the abandonment of the three streets in the Project Area eliminates three street intersections with Lake Tahoe Boulevard.

- Bicycle paths and wide, sheltered pedestrian walkways are incorporated throughout the project. This includes the portion of Bikeway 2000 on Lake Tahoe Boulevard through the project area.
• A pedestrian pathway cutting through the Stateline Area from the gondola plaza to Lakeside Marina will be completed with Project No. 3. The gondola plaza in the Park Avenue Project is connected underground to the Lake Passage in Project No. 3. The walkway and open space is continued on the "north" side of Cedar Avenue, where sedimentation basins will be constructed to treat urban run-off from Project No. 3. That walkway will terminate at Manzanita Avenue, but a new sidewalk along Manzanita will connect that walkway to the one already existing along the main treatment basins for the Stateline Erosion Control Project, which connects Manzanita to Pine Boulevard. From there an existing sidewalk runs along Pine Boulevard to Park Avenue. The final piece of the system will be a new sidewalk along Park Avenue from Pine Boulevard to the Lakeside Marina. There is ample existing right-of-way area to construct this improvement. (A drawing is attached to visually illustrate the walkway that will traverse the lodging district and terminate at Lake Tahoe.)

Scenic Benefits

• While not required, the Project No. 3 proponents will be using the integrated system of street furniture, decorative pedestrian lighting, and signage through the project that is also being incorporated into the Park Avenue Project. This will demarcate the boundaries of the new village on both sides of Lake Tahoe Boulevard and enhance the scenic quality of the village.

• A plaza at the corner of Stateline Avenue and Lake Tahoe Boulevard will complement the plaza on the other side of the Boulevard at the corner of the Embassy Suites Hotel. The two plazas together open up the Stateline corridor formed by Harvey's and Harrah's development, introducing sunlight into the open space and breaking the wall of development.

• The use of natural materials and particularly the massive use of wood in the Convention Hotel revives the era of mountain lodges. Even the railway trestle design from Cave Rock has
been incorporated into the design of the actual Convention Center to continue the concept of rustic alpine elegance.

- Again mirroring the Park Avenue Project, the Project No. 3 Area along Lake Tahoe Boulevard will incorporate generous setbacks that allow for a planting area parallel to the Boulevard, which will add to the scenic quality of the roadway.

- The replica of Lake Tahoe will open a large area into a park setting that will greatly enhance the scenic value of the Stateline Area. Even the Park Avenue Project could not maximize the use of softscape because of the need to accommodate people in ski boots carrying ski poles through the gondola plaza and intermodel transit center.

- As noted under water quality, three motels will be removed along Poplar between Cedar and Manzanita for an optional sedimentation basin. This will remove dilapidated structures and create another green space in this over-developed area.

Social and Cultural Benefits

- The re-creation of Lake Tahoe provides a wonderful environment that blends recreational and learning opportunities. Whether it be radio-controlled boating at Emerald Bay or fishing in Trout Creek, learning about Cave Rock’s sacred meaning to the Washoe or discovering how the Basin was clear cut in the Comstock era, this area will be a premiere attraction for locals and visitors alike.

- The inclusion of arts and low-cost artist housing into Project C in the No. 3 Area will enhance the cultural value at Stateline and increase affordable housing opportunities.

- For the first time child care needs for both the tourist and the employee in the Stateline Area will be addressed with complimentary child care facilities at Park and Cedar Avenues.
The Project incorporates the concept of vertically-mixed development to put parking underground, both to reduce the visual blight from that land use and to reduce the amount of land coverage in the Project Area; to put commercial activities at grade to keep the area active; and to put lodging units on the above-ground floors, enhancing their privacy and reducing noise levels.

COMMERCIAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The basic components of Redevelopment Project No. 3, without enhancements, has vast environmental improvements inherent in its implementation. The following lists these improvements:

- New curb and gutter throughout the project area (Lake Tahoe Boulevard, Stateline Avenue, Cedar Avenue, Friday Avenue, and Park Avenue) will better define the separation of automobile space from pedestrian space, will clearly define the one new driveway access, and will help direct urban run-off into drop inlets for piping to treatment areas.

- The project proponents make a contribution in excess of Chapter 93 air quality mitigation fees to the Coordinated Transit System.

- The signalization of both Park Avenue and Stateline Avenue will be improved.

- The project will reduce existing hard land coverage by 15 percent; the surface of the Lake Tahoe replica (size) is considered as hard coverage because the lake will be lined with an impervious material.

- The project will treat urban-runoff from a 19.4-acre area that currently does not have Best Management Practices. This storm water management system consists of collection systems, catch basins, drop inlets, pretreatment vaults, and underground piping to detention and treatment ponds.
- The replacement of the 1950's hodgepodge development, with its lack of cohesive design, with a coordinated master plan of development will dramatically enhance the scenic quality of the Project Area.

- The incorporation of design standards consistent with a look of rustic alpine elegance will also improve the scenic quality of the area and the travel rating along Highway 50.

- Public art will be incorporated in both the private development and the public open spaces via a coordinated art program.

- No parking will be visible from Lake Tahoe Boulevard.

- All obsolete appliances, asbestos, and soil contamination in the 19.4-acre project area will be removed. This is particularly significant since there are two service stations in the project and at least one out-of-use buried fuel tank. The appliances will be replaced with low-flow, low-energy fixtures and double pane windows, all of which will be more efficient and environmentally-friendly.

- After construction, noise levels both inside and outside will be lower because of landscape buffering along the roadways and modern construction techniques.
March 20, 1998

Cathy Canfield
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P O Box 1038
Zephyr Cove NV 89448-1038

Re: Special Project Allocation Packet Supplement - Redevelopment Project No. 3

Dear Cathy:

Thank you for the opportunity to supplement our application for a special commercial floor area allocation for Redevelopment Project No. 3. Since Park Avenue and Redevelopment Project No. 3 are so similar, I would like to begin with a couple of general comments that will be similar in both supplements.

First, I would like to reiterate that I believe the TRPA staff has done an excellent job of scoring our projects. I do not envy you your task!

Second, I do think that in actually scoring projects for the first time, a potential weakness in the scoring system has been revealed. This weakness is that the financial cost and physical size of a project does not result in more points and in fact can even result in lower scoring than “smaller” competitors.

For example, we are aware that there is a proposal involving the relocation of the Love Wedding Chapel, which is certainly a desirable project. That project will visually improve possibly 200 feet of Highway 50 frontage. The Park Avenue Project and Redevelopment Project No. 3 will each visually improve over 1200 feet of Highway frontage. However, in scoring, one asks is the project making visual improvements; the answer for each is “yes” and each is given an extra point or half point. The difference in scope or size is not acknowledged. The same is true for the amount of land area that is being upgraded to best management practices and so forth.

The expense of a large project can also result in lower scoring in the Cost and Contribution Considerations, which total 25 points. In Redevelopment Project No. 3, the applicant is contributing 33 percent of the total EIP cost. What is not considered is that
this contribution totals $7,000,000, and the total EIP cost is $21,000,000. It seems logical to assume that the more expensive the EIP project is, the more it may rely on partners to accomplish the EIP project. Yet the applicant is penalized for this partnership.

A similar ratio comes into play when comparing the EIP project cost to the total project cost. The Redevelopment Project No. 3 EIP project, costing $21,000,000, only got 1 points out of 5 because the total project cost is in excess of $200,000,000. It is hard to understand that a commitment of almost $21 million to environmental improvement is worth 20% of the total points in the cost category.

To this same end, both of our applications are hampered by the fact that the project itself has enormous benefit but the “basic project” does not receive points for cost and contribution considerations, even when, as in the case of Park Avenue and Redevelopment No. 3, the projects themselves are on the EIP list. If the benefits of accomplishing the basic project were acknowledged, the cost and contributions scoring would be substantially higher.

Finally, there is no way to quantify or acknowledge the fact that while the Redevelopment Agency is paying for certain improvements, the revenue source for these costs is from the private sector’s construction. Our hotel people cannot build rooms for $60,000 each that rent for $100 a night. They must build rooms that cost $120,000 and rent for $200 a night. This substantially increases their risk but is required by STRA to ensure enough revenue to fund the bonded improvements. Again, if this were acknowledged, the cost and contributions scoring would be substantially higher.

We hope that the experience of this first round of scoring can be used to strengthen the format so that size and expense are rewarded and not penalized and that bonded costs that rely on the private sector’s performance for repayment can be acknowledged as applicant contributions.

Redevelopment Project No. 3 Specific Project Comments

We have one clarification related to the Park Avenue application. The section on transfers discusses that units of use are being acquired within the project area and rearranged. However, we should clarify that the project area jogs “north” of Cedar Avenue to incorporate the acquisition of three motels that will be removed to create the optional water treatment area. Therefore, 57 tourist accommodation units are being transferred from an area outside the redevelopment plan boundaries into the redevelopment plan area.
If you have any questions about these observations or our clarification, please call me directly at (530) 542-6044. And again, thank you for your good work on this enormous endeavor.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judith A. Von Klug
Redevelopment Manager

cc: Lewis Feldman
SPECIAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA
Meeks Relocation Project
Score of 77

1. Priority of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 20.
All projects are required to implement an EIP project. Points will be given based on the importance of that project to TRPA and local government. Priority considers immediate needs and benefits, cost and magnitude of the project, relationship to community planning efforts, and project need for assistance. Priority A (20 points) would be the most sought after, Priority B (10 points) would be projects not scoring as well in the categories, or Priority C (5 points) would be EIP projects not relating to community planning efforts or being implemented through other processes. Examples of most sought after EIP projects that TRPA and local government would like to see implemented are attached.

The Meeks Relocation Project is an EIP project and is listed as a Priority A project. Twenty points were awarded.

2. Cost and Contribution Considerations: The maximum number of points for this section is 25.
   A. Contribution by Applicant: Maximum number of points is 10.
       The applicant is not contributing to the EIP. No points were awarded.
   B. Total Cost of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 10.
       The total cost of the EIP is approximately $5,300,000. Five points were awarded.
   C. EIP Cost as a Percent of Total Project Cost: Maximum number of points is 5.
       The EIP cost is approximately 40% of the total project cost. Four points were awarded.

3. Commitment Plan: Maximum number of points is 10.
The more the assurances for the EIP project to be completed, the higher number of points assigned.

   The City of South Lake Tahoe and the California Tahoe Conservancy are active partners in the project, the project has received a "Linked Project Area" approval from the TRPA Governing Board. No environmental documentation has been completed. Funding is not yet secured. Four points were awarded.

4. Transfer: Maximum number of points available is 10.
Matching transfers of development with allocations for the proposed project is encouraged. The more transfers proposed that result in environmental benefits, the higher the points. Transfers of development from sensitive lands will score higher than transfers from high capability land.

   All land coverage and units of use will be transferred from the existing Meeks site which is classified as Stream Environment Zone. Ten points were awarded.

5. Rehabilitation of Substandard Development: Maximum number of points is 5.
Five points were awarded.
6. Public/Private Partnerships: Maximum number of points is 5.

Five points were awarded.

7. Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>minor</th>
<th>significant</th>
<th>major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils/SEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the maximum 15 points were awarded.

8. Other Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic (non-threshold)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/Redevelop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the 9 points were awarded.
PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

EIP Project:
Existing development includes 33,826 sf of Commercial Floor Area. The existing 3.4 acre site contains a fully developed lumber yard, parking area, warehouse and hardware supply store. The site does not have TRPA required water quality improvements and the development negatively affects scenic quality along Highway 50.

The relocation of the lumber yard could result in the following environmental, economic, and land use benefits:

- Restoration of more than three acres of high quality stream environment zone adjacent to Trout Creek—the second largest tributary stream to Lake Tahoe;
- Restoration of a scenic view from Highway 50 to a large, naturally appearing wetland with Lake Tahoe in the backdrop;
- Creation of treatment areas for Highway 50 storm water run-off;
- Restoration of wildlife habitat adjacent to Trout Creek;
- Relocation of an existing bicycle trail near Trout Creek to a more appropriate location;
- Elimination of undesirable traffic patterns at the existing lumber yard location;
- In-filling of a vacant highway frontage property in the South Tahoe "Y" commercial district;
- Reduction of existing strip-style development in favor of more efficient "nodal" development at the "Y";
- Creation of a new highway frontage retail commercial space at the "Y", and
- Construction of a newer, larger, more attractive, and more economically viable lumber yard and store.

Commercial Project:
The proposed project will need 48,852 sf of Special Allocation Commercial Floor Area (82,678 at new site – 33,826 sf at existing site). The 5.3 acre proposed relocation site contains a combination of vacant land; neighborhood storm drainage treatment ponds; partially developed and undeveloped city streets; a paved bicycle trail; and various drainage improvements. The vacant land area was used as a lumber yard as late as the mid-1970's. This lumber yard was destroyed by fire and the site was restored to a stable condition in the mid-1980's. Both properties front highway 50, and are separated by approximately one and a half miles. The proposed site contains several large trees, has a gentle slope, and is located between two developed commercial properties.

The proposed project is located in TRPA Plan Area 110, and may encroach into a portion of Plan Area 110, Special Area Number 2. Building Materials and Hardware, and General Merchandise Stores, are special and allowable uses, respectively, in Plan Area 110. Neither of these uses are permissible in Special Area Number 2, however, and a plan area amendment or adoption of a community plan would be required prior to allowing these uses there. Plan area 110 (including Special Area Number 2) has been identified as a future community plan area.

PROPERTY RESTRICTIONS (list any deed restrictions, easements, or other restrictions on the property):

See Plans

PRIOR APPROVALS (list any prior CTRPA/TRPA approvals/permits received for the subject property):

TRPA Linked Project Application
March 18, 1998

Meek's Relocation Project
SPECIAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA

CLARIFICATION OF SELECTED ITEMS

Initial Commercial Floor Area Request: 48,852sf
Revised Commercial Floor Area Request: 47,844sf

Initial evaluation of this linked project by TRPA Staff resulted in a preliminary score of 64 points, 9 points short of the 75 minimum requirement. Criteria 2 and 3 were not scored at all and Criteria 8 was identified as being the possible source of one additional point.

This response is intended to provide additional information that could increase the project score by as much as 17 points, placing it well above the minimum score required.

Item 2. Cost & Contribution Considerations (Request 10 points total)

B. Total Cost of EIP Project (Request 5 points)

Site acquisition (estimate) $4,000,000
Site restoration (CTC estimate) 1,100,000
New bike trail 84,000
Existing bike trail restoration 32,000
New curb, gutter and walk 80,000
EIP Project Cost $5,296,000

C. EIP Cost as Percent of Total Project Cost (Request 5 points)

Relocation site preliminary cost estimates as currently proposed range from $4,545,000 (low) to $6,108,000 (high), with the median at $5,327,000:

EIP site cost @ $5,296,000 equals 99.4%
Relocation project cost @ $5,327,000

Item 3. Commitment plan (Request 6+ points)

Calendar of Actions to Date

Committee to Consider the Relocation of Meek's:
Preliminary Relocation/Restoration Analysis.................October 1994

Predevelopment Agreement
Meek's, TRPA, CSLT, CTC, LRWQCB.........................August 1996
South "Y" Intersection Study - Final (CSLT)....................April 1997
Land Coverage Verification Applicat'n (Y site)...Completed December 1997
Commercial Floor Area Verification (EIP site)......Completed January 1997
Special Project Allocation (CFA) Application....................Pending
THIS REQUEST IS A CRITICAL STEP IN MAKING THIS PROJECT POSSIBLE: DENIAL WILL VIRTUALLY GUARANTEE ITS DEMISE as without this commercial floor area the proposed linked project will definitely NOT be financially feasible.

The level of commitment to this project is extremely high. Originally conceived by TRPA and CSLT, this project is now supported by TRPA, CSLT, CTC, and LRWQCB, with Meek's Lumber a willing cooperative participant. We all want this project to happen. Meek's, to date, has expended over $100,000 toward this end. If, as we proceed through the process, the relocation can be found to be financially feasible, the project is 100% "GO".

The CTC has scheduled appraisal of the EIP and Relocation sites to be completed in May/June 1998, and have provided a preliminary cost estimate for EIP site restoration work. To follow is a cooperative CTC/CSLT/TRPA (and possibly CalTrans) detailed project design process, establishing of firm funding sources, obtaining of project approvals, project bidding and selection of contractor. Actual construction could start Spring/Summer 2000 (see Project Schedule below).

The CTC has expressed confidence that significant EIP project funding will be provided by existing sources. CalTrans will be sought as a new project participant. Also a new funding source, American Land Conservancy, is being approached by CSLT, TRPA, and Meek's. While funding is not set in concrete at the moment, the momentum of this EIP project provides the greatest guarantee of its funding.

**Project Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Action/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 1998</td>
<td>Receive Special Allocation CFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate source of coverage and CFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receive CTC appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Fall 1998</td>
<td>Finalize source of coverage, CFA and mitigation fee costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1998/Spring 1999</td>
<td>Confirm EIP site acquisition funding, do restoration design, get TRPA approval and confirm funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get TRPA Relocation Site project approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Relocation Site construction drawings and coverage transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get TRPA Relocation Site project sign-off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start Relocation Site project construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meek's move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start EIP site demolition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1999</td>
<td>Construct EIP site restoration project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999 (pre-October 15th)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 8. Other Substantial Environmental Benefits (Request 1 additional point)

A. Drainage
The EIP site has the potential for a CalTrans off-site drainage sedimentation basin to pretreat US Hwy 50 storm runoff before it enters Trout Creek. This could be a significant improvement over current untreated storm flows being directly funneled into the Creek.

The Relocation Site design offers a possible location for storage of off-site snow removal accumulation from Tahoe Valley Center and other adjacent properties. Located in an on-site pretreatment drainage basin, melting of the snow would no longer contribute directly to downstream water quality degradation.

B. Access/Scenic/Community Benefit
The relocation of EIP and Relocation Site existing bike trails will shorten distances for travelers and improve SEZ function. Currently the EIP site bike trail skirts the property and is primarily in an SEZ. Relocation will put this trail primarily on high capability land.

Because of its size, the high capability portion of the EIP site offers the potential for a small parking area for youth fishing in the nearby stream, and/or bus turnout/bus shelter use. These concepts can be reviewed during actual project design.
SPECIAL PROJECTS EVALUATION CRITERIA
Prim Commercial Project
Score of 70

1. Priority of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 20.

All projects are required to implement an EIP project. Points will be given based on the importance of that project to TRPA and local government. Priority considers immediate needs and benefits, cost and magnitude of the project, relationship to community planning efforts, and project need for assistance. Priority A (20 points) would be the most sought after, Priority B (10 points) would be projects not scoring as well in the categories, or Priority C (5 points) would be EIP projects not relating to community planning efforts or being implemented through other processes. Examples of most sought after EIP projects that TRPA and local government would like to see implemented are attached.

The Kingsbury Transit Facility is an EIP project and is listed as a Priority A project. Twenty points were awarded.

2. Cost and Contribution Considerations: The maximum number of points for this section is 25.

   A. Contribution by Applicant: Maximum number of points is 10.

      The applicant is contributing 100% of the cost of the transit facility and approximately 10% of the Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade roadway improvements. Ten points were awarded.

   B. Total Cost of EIP Project: Maximum number of points is 10.

      The total cost of the EIP is approximately $1,800,000. Two points were awarded.

   C. EIP Cost as a Percent of Total Project Cost: Maximum number of points is 5.

      The EIP cost is approximately 40% of the total project cost. Four points were awarded.

3. Commitment Plan: Maximum number of points is 10.

The more the assurances for the EIP project to be completed, the higher number of points assigned.

The EIP project and the commercial project are located at the same site, the roadway improvements are scheduled to be implemented by the Nevada Department of Transportation in 1998, an application schedule has been submitted to TRPA. No environmental documentation has been completed. Funding is not yet secured. Five points were awarded.
4. Transfer: Maximum number of points available is 10.

Matching transfers of development with allocations for the proposed project is encouraged. The more transfers proposed that result in environmental benefits, the higher the points. Transfers of development from sensitive lands will score higher than transfers from high capability land.

Some land coverage will be relocated from low capability land to high capability land within the project area. Two points were awarded.

5. Rehabilitation of Substandard Development: Maximum number of points is 5.

Five points were awarded.

6. Public/Private Partnerships: Maximum number of points is 5.

NDOT is currently in the process of implementing the Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade roadway improvements. Three points were awarded.

7. Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>minor</th>
<th>significant</th>
<th>major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils/SEZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the 12 points were awarded.

8. Other Substantial Environmental Benefits: Maximum number of points is 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic (non-threshold)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration/Redevelop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above points, the 7 points were awarded.
January 23, 1998

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND NARRATIVE

Project: Prim / Mehrten Professional Development - Douglas County APN 07-130-08
155 U.S. Highway 50 at Kingsbury Grade

The project is located at 155 U.S. Highway 50, and situated at the Northeast corner of U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade.

The project site is surrounded by the Douglas County Administration Building Complex to the North, The Lakeside Inn to the West, Love's Chapel to the South, and Kahle Park and the Lakeview Professional Office Building to the East.

The Douglas County Planning Commission has previously allocated approximately 3,585 square feet of Commercial Floor Area to the Lakeview Professional Office Building, in order that the existing 5,000 square foot building could be demolished and re-constructed as a larger building, totaling approximately 8,500 square feet. Additionally, we are proposing a parking area of approximately 20 spaces, beneath said proposed building, and as well, the construction of a new, approximately 50-space, shared parking lot for the joint benefit of Kahle Park and the Lakeview Professional Building, to be situated in that area east of the new building.

Since the Planning Commission awarded the previous floor space and Douglas County Staff subsequently requested the building site location be moved westward and an expanded, shared parking area be provided, the Prim / Mehrten family purchased the vacant / disturbed 2.6 acre parcel at 155 U.S. Highway 50, and proceeded to master-plan a commercial development complex together with Douglas County and Nevada Department of Transportation Staff.

In addition to the 8,500 square foot office building already approved by TRPA, the proposed project is a new 36,100 square foot, Office / Public Service / Retail Shopping Complex, and a new, three-level, 135-space parking garage. The project will be comprised of five new and separate buildings, described as follows:

1. A 12,000 square foot, two-story professional office building.

2. A 17,000 square foot, two-story building, comprised of 8,500 square feet of retail shopping area on the first level, and 8,500 square feet of professional office area on the second level.

3. A 3,700 square foot, single-story building, with space divided equally between retail and restaurant uses.

4. A 3,400 square foot single-story building, housing public service / tourist assistance services, and a coordinated transit terminal.
5. A three-level parking garage of approximately 54,600 square feet - providing 135 parking spaces.
PROJECT BENEFITS

This development has been planned with overall community benefit as its first priority. In addition to the obvious advantages of sales tax revenue inherent in retail establishments, and the creation of many new professional service and sales employment opportunities, this facility will provide the local community and visitors as well, with many varied and desirable features and services.

1. TRANSIT TERMINAL

As an integral part of this facility, we are proposing the construction of a much-needed transit center, to serve the local community, and as well provide tourists and Lake Tahoe Visitors convenient access to various means of transportation in and around the Tahoe Basin.

The Prim / Mehrten Family will construct this new 3,400 square foot transit terminal / public service / tourist assistance building on Douglas County property southwest and immediately adjacent to the Douglas County Administration Building.

This Transit / Visitor Assistance Terminal is strategically located to complement the proposed new commercial center, Kahle Park, Douglas County's Administration Center, and the adjacent retail, and gaming / lodging establishments, including The Lakeside Inn.

The transit terminal will support CTS and will provide for the coordination of numerous basin transit services.

 Associated with this transit terminal will be a new bus parking area constructed east of the terminal for southbound U.S. Highway 50 traffic, a bus turnaround within the facility proper, and a new 160 foot long bus turnout / parking lane in the U.S. Highway 50 right-of-way, for northbound public transit vehicles.

2. HIGHWAY 50 AND 207 BIKE LANE / PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

This project includes the construction and extension of a bike lane westbound on Highway 207, from Kahle Park’s Kingsbury entrance, for a distance of approximately 550 feet, then provides access around the intersection or through the subject property in a northerly direction to the new CTS transit terminal and continuing to the signalized intersection of Kahle Drive and U.S. Highway 50.
3. **HIGHWAY 50 and 207 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS**

A dedicated right-turn deceleration lane is proposed for the north-side, westbound traffic of Kingsbury Grade for a distance of approximately 350'. This new traffic lane will provide safe ingress to the project site for westbound traffic and continue around the Highway 50 / 207 intersection to facilitate all northbound traffic and minimize vehicle stacking due to no dedicated right turn lane. Furthermore, along northbound U.S. Highway 50, north of the intersection of Highway 207, a deceleration lane of approximately 160', is proposed into the project area and transit terminal, in order to minimize intersection conflicts for this turning movement.

4. **HIGHWAY 207 and 50 DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS**

This project also includes the partial interception, conveyance, containment, and ultimate infiltration of stormwater runoff that currently travels unmitigated down Kingsbury Grade toward the Lake.

The project will compliment right-of-way storm-drainage improvement work currently underway by NDOT along Highways 207 and 50. The project proposes to intercept a significant portion of stormwater from Kingsbury Grade right-of-way and infiltrate this water throughout the western one-third of the Prim / Mehrten project site by utilizing a network of permeable underground culverts placed above the seasonal high groundwater levels in permeable soil.

5. **VISITOR'S CENTER / CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OFFICES**

The proposed relocation of the Tahoe Douglas Chamber of Commerce and Visitor’s Center, will be a great move for everyone. These offices should be located more centrally for use by residents and visitors alike, and this facility will provide the Chamber and Visitor Center the visibility and availability that will make it more user-friendly to everyone.

Both of these public service facilities are to be situated within the area of the Transit / Visitor Assistance Center, and as a result, will be easily located and readily accessible to residents and visitors alike.

6. **SHARED PARKING**

In combination with the transit center, this development proposal includes the provision of shared parking areas. These new, shared parking areas will be available for use not only by clients, customers, and employees of the new businesses located there, but additionally, by employees of, and visitors to the Douglas County Administrative Center, and the Kahle Park Recreation Center as well.
7. PARK and RIDE - PARKING GARAGE

Douglas County has indicated that they have a five-year goal to construct a 3-level parking garage of approximately 135 spaces. This new structure will be located between Kahle Park to the east, Douglas County Administration Center to the north, Lakeside Inn to the west, and the Prim / Mehrten Office / Retail Complex to the south. The structure will be immediately adjacent to, and complement the Transit Terminal.

8. DINING

Included most-prominently in the 1,850 square feet earmarked for restaurants / dining areas, will be the construction of at least one, fine-dining type, restaurant establishment.

In contrast with food service facilities of a fast-food nature, we anticipate with the inclusion of a fine-dining establishment, the creation of employment opportunities including several of a professional nature. As in any food-service facility, this establishment will, of course, contribute considerably to the total sales-tax revenue generated by the center.

9. PROFESSIONAL OFFICE SPACE

A significant, 20,500 square foot portion of this development is designated for use as professional office space.

These professional offices will provide a number of employment opportunities in a variety of professions, among which may be those necessary to the operation of a medical / urgent care facility, a stock brokerage firm, real estate offices, and / or other professional and professional support services.

10. RETAIL

Of the total facility, 10,350 square feet will be utilized for various retail shops, among which are included a sports equipment and apparel store that will attract individuals and teams participating in sports at the Kahle Park facility.
11. **VISUAL / SCENIC BENEFITS**

This building site, previously excavated and left with exposed cut-banks and the presence of construction debris, has long been a prominently-placed eyesore. Most-notably for visitors arriving over Kingsbury Grade southwest-bound on U.S. Highway, this blot on the landscape detracts considerably from one of the most spectacular views available of the Lake Tahoe area and of Mount Tallac in the background.

In addition to the proposed on-site building and landscaping improvements, this project proposes the demolition of the building and parking improvements associated with Love’s Chapel, situated on Assessor’s Parcel 07-120-09. This non-conforming land coverage will be retired and relocated to the Kahle Park site to facilitate construction of a shared parking lot adjacent to the Lakeview Professional Office and Phase II of Kahle Park’s proposed expansion.

Inherent in the buildings proposed for this project, will be harmonious integration with the structures of the existing Douglas County Administrative Building and the Kahle Park Recreation Center. Extensive use of natural wood timbers and trim, and rock work will blend with the proposed landscaping of mature, native-species trees and shrubs.
Basin Strategies
Planning and Consulting Services
March 20, 1998

Gordon Barrett, Chief, Long Range Planning
Kathy Canfield, Associate Planner
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Re: PRIM / MEHRTENS / Douglas County Project,
APNs 07-120-08, 07-130-03, and 07-130-04

Dear Gabby and Kathy:

As previously discussed, please find attached for the above-referenced project, our amended report including project revisions and corrections to the original report.

The major changes to this proposal are as follows:

1. Dropping the site acquisition (and subsequent demolition) of Love’s Chapel from the project area.

2. Withdrawing the dedicated right turn lane on NDOT’s easement at the intersection of Kingsbury and Highway 50.

3. The addition to the project area of the Prim Lakeview Office Center and the shared parking lot at the southwest corner of Kahle Park.

4. The addition of utility undergrounding at the southwest corner of Kahle Park

5. The addition of pedestrian improvements at the southwest corner of Kahle Park

6. The addition of costs associated with enhancement of parking opportunities, (108 vehicle spaces) at the Douglas County Admin. site.

As always, we remain available should you have questions or require additional information.

Kindest regards,

Paul Kaleta

PK/tl

attachments

P.O. Box 11945 Zephyr Cove, NV 89448 (702) 588-8722 Fax 588-8689
March 20, 1998

REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND NARRATIVE

Project:  Prim / Mehrten's Professional Development - Douglas County APN 07-120-08
          155 U.S. Highway 50 at Kingsbury Grade

          Kahle Park Improvements - Douglas County APN 07-130-04

          Douglas County Admin. Bldg. Site Improvements - Douglas County APN 07-130-03

The project encompasses portions of the three above-referenced properties, and is situated at the
Northeast corner of U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade.

The project site is surrounded by the Douglas County Administration Building Complex to the North,
The Lakeside Inn to the West, Love's Chapel to the South, and Kahle Park and the Lakeview
Professional Office Building to the East.

The Douglas County Planning Commission has previously allocated approximately 3,585 square feet of
Commercial Floor Area to the Lakeview Professional Office Building, in order that the existing 5,000
square foot building could be demolished and re-constructed as a larger building, totaling approximately
8,500 square feet. Additionally, we are proposing a parking area of approximately 20 spaces, beneath
said proposed building, and as well, the construction of a new, approximately 30-space, shared parking
lot for the joint benefit of Kahle Park and the Lakeview Professional Office Building, to be situated in that area
east of the new building. The 30 space shared parking lot will provide parking for the proposed 2nd
phase expansion of the Kahle Park Recreation Building.

Since the Planning Commission awarded the previous floor space and Douglas County Staff subsequently
requested the Lakeview Professional Office Building site location be moved westward and an expanded,
shared parking area be provided, the Prim / Mehrten family purchased the vacant / disturbed 2.6 acre
parcel at 155 U.S. Highway 50, and proceeded to master-plan a commercial development complex
together with Douglas County and Nevada Department of Transportation Staff.

The project proposes to utilize 39,000 square feet of Commercial Floor Area for an office / public
service / retail shopping complex, and a new, three-level, 135-space parking garage. The expanded
project area will be comprised of six new and separate buildings, described as follows:

1. A 12,000 square foot, two-story professional office building, located on the eastern portion of
   parcel 07-120-08.
2. A 17,000 square foot, two-story building, comprised of 8,500 square feet of retail shopping area on the first level, and 8,500 square feet of professional office area on the second level. This building will be located on the southern portion of parcel 07-120-08.

3. A 3,700 square foot, single-story building, with space divided equally between retail and restaurant uses. The building is to be located at the northwestern corner of parcel 07-120-08.

4. A 5,000 square foot, split-level building, housing public service / tourist assistance services, and a coordinated transit terminal. (80% public service / tourist assistance, 20% transit terminal) This building will be located at the southwest corner of the Douglas County Admin. Building parcel, APN 07-130-03.

5. An 8,500 square foot, new commercial office building, (3,585 square feet Commercial Floor Area previously allocated) located at the southwest corner of, and immediately adjacent to Kahle Park. This property is currently surrounded by Kahle Park and will be adjusted by boundary-line amendments to accommodate the new project. This parcel is known as APN 07-130-06.

6. A three-level parking garage of approximately 54,600 square feet - providing 135 parking spaces; a net increase of 108 spaces above and beyond the current 60 space parking capacity of Douglas County Admin. Center’s southerly parking lot. This new garage will be proposed immediately south of the Admin. Center on parcel 07-130-03.
PROJECT BENEFITS

This development has been planned with overall community benefit as its first priority. In addition to the obvious advantages of sales tax revenue inherent in retail establishments, and the creation of many new professional service and sales employment opportunities, this facility will provide the local community and visitors as well, with many varied and desirable features and services.

1. TRANSIT TERMINAL

As an integral part of this facility, we are proposing the construction of a much-needed transit center, to serve the local community, and as well provide tourists and Lake Tahoe Visitors convenient access to various means of transportation in and around the Tahoe Basin.

The Prim / Mehrten Family will construct this new 5,000 square foot transit terminal / public service / tourist assistance building on Douglas County property southwest and immediately adjacent to the Douglas County Administration Building.

This Transit / Visitor Assistance Terminal is strategically located to complement the proposed new commercial center, Kahle Park, Douglas County’s Administration Center, and the adjacent retail, and gaming / lodging establishments, including The Lakeside Inn.

The transit terminal will support CTS and will provide for the coordination of numerous basin transit services.

Associated with this transit terminal will be a new bus parking area constructed east of the terminal for southbound U.S. Highway 50 traffic, a bus turnaround within the facility proper, and a new 160 foot long bus turnout / parking lane in the U.S. Highway 50 right-of-way, for northbound public transit vehicles.

2. PARK and RIDE - PARKING GARAGE

Douglas County has indicated that they have a five-year goal to construct a 3-level parking garage of approximately 135 spaces. This new structure will be located between Kahle Park to the east, Douglas County Administration Center to the north, Lakeside Inn to the west, and the Prim / Mehrten Office / Retail Complex to the south. The structure will be immediately adjacent to, and complement the Transit Terminal. The parking garage will provide a net increase of 108 parking spaces to the current 60 space parking lot.
3. **HIGHWAY 207 and 50 DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS**

This project also includes the partial interception, conveyance, treatment for sand and oil, and partial infiltration of stormwater runoff that currently travels unmitigated down Kingsbury Grade, then northward down U.S. Highway 50 toward the Lake.

The project will compliment right-of-way storm-drainage improvement work currently underway by NDOT along Highways 207 and 50. The project proposes to intercept a significant portion of stormwater from both the U.S. Highway and 50 Kingsbury Grade right-of-ways and infiltrate this water throughout the western portion of the Prim / Mehret project site, and the new Lakeview Office Center site, by utilizing a network of permeable underground culverts and / or retention ponds, placed above seasonal high groundwater levels in suitable and permeable locations.

4. **SHARED PARKING**

In combination with the transit center, this development proposal includes the provision of shared parking areas. These new, shared parking areas will be available for use not only by clients, customers, and employees of the new businesses located there, but additionally, by employees of, and visitors to the Douglas County Administrative Center, Kahle Park Recreation Center, and patrons and employees of Lakeside Inn and commercial businesses adjacent to these properties.

5. **VISITOR'S CENTER / CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OFFICES**

The proposed relocation of the Tahoe Douglas Chamber of Commerce and Visitor’s Center, will be a great move for everyone. These offices will be located more centrally for use by residents and visitors alike, and this facility will provide the Chamber and Visitor Center the visibility and availability that will make it more user-friendly to everyone. Both of these public service facilities are to be situated within the area of the new Transit / Visitor Assistance Center.

6. **PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS**

There will be a new pedestrian/bicycle path proposed from Kahle Park to the Douglas County Administration property through the new parking garage facility. Additionally, a new sidewalk is proposed from Kahle Park Drive to the southeast corner of 07-120-08. This sidewalk will connect with currently permit Nevada Department of Transportation improvements along Kingsbury Grade.
7. VISUAL / SCENIC BENEFITS

This building site, previously excavated and left with exposed cut-banks and the presence of construction debris, has long been a prominently-placed eyesore. Most-notably for visitors arriving over Kingsbury Grade southwest-bound on U.S. Highway, this blot on the landscape detracts considerably from one of the most spectacular views available of the Lake Tahoe area and of Mount Tallac in the background.

Additionally, 260 feet of primary overhead electric utility lines are proposed to be placed underground at the southwest corner of Kahle Park. These utility lines are located along the northerly border of westbound Kingsbury Grade. Above-grade electric utility lines are also proposed to be underground along the subject property’s southern boundary with Kingsbury Grade. This scenic benefit is seen, however, as an offset to the potential impact of the proposed new buildings and is not considered a public benefit.

Inherent in the buildings proposed for this project, will be harmonious integration with the structures of the existing Douglas County Administrative Building and the Kahle Park Recreation Center. Extensive use of natural wood timbers and trim, and rock work will blend with the proposed landscaping of manure, native-species trees and shrubs.

8. PROFESSIONAL OFFICE SPACE

A significant, 29,000 square foot portion of this development is designated for use as professional office space.

These professional offices will provide a number of employment opportunities in a variety of professions, among which may be those necessary to the operation of a medical / urgent care facility, a stock brokerage firm, real estate offices, and / or other professional and professional support services.

9. RETAIL

Of the total facility, 10,350 square feet will be utilized for various retail shops, among which are included a sports equipment and apparel store that will attract individuals and teams participating in sports at the Kahle Park facility.
10. HIGHWAY 50 and 207 IMPROVEMENTS

A dedicated right-turn deceleration lane is proposed for the north-side, westbound traffic of Kingsbury Grade for a distance of approximately 350'. This new traffic lane will provide safe ingress to the project site for westbound traffic. Furthermore, along northbound U.S. Highway 50, north of the intersection of Highway 207, a deceleration lane of approximately 160’, is proposed into the project area and transit terminal, in order to minimize intersection conflicts for this turning movement. These right-of-way improvements are seen as being required mitigation for the proposed project and are not considered public benefits.

11. DINING

Included most-prominently in the 1,850 square feet earmarked for restaurants / dining areas, will be the construction of at least one, fine-dining type, restaurant establishment. In contrast with food service facilities of a fast-food nature, we anticipate with the inclusion of a fine-dining establishment, the creation of employment opportunities including several of a professional nature. As in any food-service facility, this establishment will, of course, contribute considerably to the total sales-tax revenue generated by the center.
Memorandum

March 28, 1998

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 71, Tree Removal, to Add Protection for Old Growth Trees (Discussion Only, No Action Requested)

Nearly a year ago, the TRPA Governing Board adopted an Environmental Threshold for Late Successional/Old Growth (LSOG) Forests. A component of the Governing Board adoption of the LSOG Forests Threshold was direction to TRPA staff and the Lake Tahoe Basin Forest Health Consensus Group to further develop implementation language to protect, promote and enhance LSOG Forests. Staff and the Consensus Group have been working diligently on this language and during the summer of 1997, determined that scientific research was needed to assess the extent, condition, and historic range of variability of LSOG Forests of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Towards that end, the Consensus Group was successful in receiving significant support through the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum. Forest Ecosystem Restoration became one of the main issues discussed at the Forum, and members of the Consensus Group were directly involved in the discussions. This was evident by inclusion of a Presidential Forum Deliverable specific to the Group.

The Presidential Deliverable provides for $50,000 per year for five years to assist the Consensus Group in its efforts to shape, monitor, and update a comprehensive forest management strategy for the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Group has identified LSOG Forests as the key component of this strategy and recommended to the U. S. Forest Service specific products needed to effectuate that strategy.

A key interim strategy is to protect what remains of this limited resource, while providing for needed management activities for fire protection and public safety. The proposed regulation to be included in Chapter 71 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances is designed to
be an interim regulation until results of the work outlined under the Presidential Deliverable are completed. At that time these products will guide development of a lasting ordinance. Final language, formatted to ordinance standards, will be presented to the APC and Governing Board in May 1998. The language presented today provides a basis for discussion of the merits of protection of LSOG trees.

The Consensus Group is adamant that the regulation must have a date upon which it must be reviewed. The basis for this is the knowledge that the research to be conducted in the Lake Tahoe Basin regarding LSOG is the cutting edge of research in this field, and the results will be integral to shaping a comprehensive forest management strategy that may differ from today’s management strategy.

The proposed language applies only to conservation and recreation land use classifications and riparian areas. It does not apply to residential, commercial, public service, tourist accommodation lands, recreational residence tracts, developed recreation facilities, campgrounds, and urban interface areas.

On March 17, 1998, the Lake Tahoe Basin Forest Health Consensus Group met and reached consensus on recommending to the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board the following interim regulation. Consensus was contingent upon the language returning to the Consensus Group at its April 21, 1998 meeting for another reading.

**Proposed Interim Regulation for the Protection of Late Successional/Old Growth (LSOG) Trees**

In order to begin implementation of TRPA’s 1997 LSOG threshold, the following interim regulation will govern forest management activities. The threshold requires that planning and implementation activities will promote and perpetuate LSOG forests.

Within TRPA’s conservation, and recreation land use classifications, and riparian areas, protect (no cutting) all live, dead and dying trees greater than or equal to 30” (inches) diameter at breast height (dbh).

This regulation does not apply to residential, commercial, public service, tourist accommodation lands, recreation residence tracts, developed recreation facilities, campgrounds, and urban interface areas. Urban interface areas are defined as: all undeveloped lands within a 0.5 km zone immediately adjacent to residential, commercial, public service, tourist accommodation lands, and recreation residence tracts. In urban interface areas, fire management strategies favoring the retention of 30” dbh trees will be considered.
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AGENDA ITEM VLC
Where this regulation does apply, hazard trees greater than or equal to 30" dbh may be felled, treated or removed if the land manager determines they pose an unacceptable risk to humans, improvements or personal property. In addition, where immediate treatment and removal is warranted, severely insect infested trees may be removed. Trees to be felled, treated or removed are subject to TRPA approval on a tree-by-tree basis, within 30 days of written notification by the land manager.

Where land managers determine that a hazard constitutes a physical emergency (imminent threat of falling on people or property), they may document that condition with photography and remove the hazard immediately. Documentation shall be reported to TRPA within two working days.

This interim regulation expires two years after adoption, at which time it may be reviewed and renewed by TRPA.

NOTE: TRPA’s adopted 1997 LSOG Threshold language is as follows:

Provide for promotion and perpetuation of late successional/old growth forests. The goal is to increase late successional/old growth conditions across elevational ranges of the Lake Tahoe Basin forest cover types.

Individual trees greater than 30" dbh shall also be favored for retention because of their late seral attributes.

Background Information

The Late Successional/Old Growth Threshold is a result of Governing Board direction in the 1991 Threshold Report. The direction was to add a threshold standard to preserve old growth forest and to work with the Forest Service and other land management agencies to identify appropriate standards and connecting corridors for maintenance or enhancement of old growth forest and associated wildlife species.

The evolution of a definition and standard for late successional/old growth forests has not been without controversy. Many groups have provided information and expressed their opinions during the consensus process. The Consensus group has utilized a wealth of information available from inside and outside the Region, including the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project, 1992 Forest Service old growth definitions and characteristics, the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Forest Plan and numerous papers on the subject.
The adopted threshold language calls for promotion and perpetuation of late successional/old growth forests. As seedling trees are added to a stand and other trees in a stand grow, mature, and eventually die, both the appearance and the ecological function of the stand, and the forest of which it is a part, evolve until they reach a condition referred to as late successional (SNEP Report, Volume 1, Page 92). Late successional refers to many attributes, including, but not limited too: big trees, broad crown, heavy limbs, decadence and structural complexity. Because late successional incorporates so many characteristics, the FHCG agreed to focus on "big trees" i.e. greater than 30" dbh as a means of identifying these areas. Late successional refers to forest types in which structural complexity continues to increase with stand age for at least several centuries, and for which the ecological differences between late successional and earlier successional stages are distinctive and relatively well understood (SNEP Report, Vol. 1, Page 92).

30" dbh is the minimum diameter of trees to qualify as LSOG. Dbh is the diameter of the tree at breast height, defined as 4.5 feet above the ground. Based upon Forest Service research many forest stands begin to develop features characteristic of older stands in approximately 150 to 200 years (depending on site class). Height-diameter relationships for these stands show that 30" dbh is closely associated with trees in the 150 to 200 year range. This number (30" dbh) was used by Forest Service researchers as a cut off point to calculate average number of trees/acre in old growth stands for the forest cover types (except Lodgepole Pine and Aspen). Hence, the threshold language contains this number to most closely reflect current research statistics.

If you have any questions, please contact Steve Chilton at (702) 588-4547.