Chapter 2
ALTERNATIVE 6 DESCRIPTION

2.1 FORMULATION OF ALTERNATIVE 6

As described in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Alternative 6 was formulated as a result of input provided by various commenters and stakeholder groups during and after the public review period of the DEIS. Through a series of conversations between TRPA staff and these commenters, TRPA identified the need to formulate an additional alternative that would address stakeholder concerns related to scenic impacts, water quality, drinking water intakes, simplicity and clarity of the program, and other concerns. For this reason, TRPA staff devised a new alternative, Alternative 6 that would meet most of the project objectives but would address these issues.

2.2 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The DEIS published in July 2004 considers five alternatives:

(1) Alternative 1 is the “No Project Alternative” and would result in maintaining the current Code.

(2) Alternative 2, identified in the DEIS as the “Proposed Alternative,” represents previous input of the Shorezone Partnership Committee, comments from the TRPA Governing Board Shorezone Policy Committee, and determinations of TRPA staff’s professional opinion. The general goal of this alternative, as proposed, was to ensure that all littoral parcel owners would be eligible to apply for a pier and sufficient buoys to access the lakes of the Region, that all impacts would be mitigated, and that all applicable environmental thresholds would be attained.

(3) Alternative 3 would result in lifting the restrictions related to development in fish habitat areas.

(4) Alternative 4 would allow development of public structures only.

(5) Alternative 5 would result in the reduction of existing development.

The alternatives analyzed in the DEIS were developed to represent the following range of options. The No Project Alternative (maintaining the current Code) is required to be evaluated under the TRPA Code, and the former Proposed Alternative (a new Shorezone Ordinance permitting increased development with mitigation) was originally crafted as the preferred alternative, intended to meet the needs of multiple stakeholder groups. The third alternative was selected because TRPA has been asked many times over the years to lift the prohibition on construction in prime fish habitat as a sole Code amendment. The fourth alternative was selected as a type of reduced alternative in that it would allow only public structures to be placed in the Shorezone and at the same time would address TRPA’s Recreation Threshold management standards (providing a fair share for public access) and Recreation Goals and Policies. Alternative 5 would achieve a reduction of structures over the existing baseline number but would include the other code revisions from Alternative 2.
that are consistent with the development reduction principle. All other alternatives (1, 3, and 4) contain the existing code provisions.

Alternative 6 is the “Density-based, 230-Pier Alternative” and represents a different type of approach to limiting development in the shorezone. Rather than identifying a development rate that would be extended to buildout, Alternative 6 limits development to a maximum number of piers allocated each year over a 20-year planning horizon, at which time the program must be enacted anew. This new alternative is described in more detail below.

2.3 ALTERNATIVE 6 – DENSITY-BASED, 230-PIER ALTERNATIVE

This alternative proposes revisions to the Shorezone provisions of the Code similar to those of Alternative 2, with several key differences in approach. The general goal of this alternative is to limit shorezone development to a level that would have minimal environmental impacts because of up-front environmental protection measures that would be included in the Code. This goal, minimizing the environmental impacts of development, would be achieved through dual means: (a) limiting development in the shorezone to 220 private piers and 10 public piers over the planning period, with a maximum of 10 private piers allocated each year (see Table 2-1); and (b) designing new structures and mitigation measures to promote threshold attainment and maintenance.

| Table 2-1. Alternative 6 Projections at Full Implementation (2027) |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Structure Type          | Private | Public | Total |
| .......................... | .......................... | .......................... | .......................... |
| **Piers**               | .......................... | .......................... | .......................... |
| Exist                   | 727     | 41     | 768   |
| New                     | 220     | 10     | 230   |
| Total                   | 943     | 51     | 988   |
| **Buoys**               | .......................... | .......................... | .......................... |
| Exist                   | 3440    | 1014   | 4454  |
| New                     | 1686    | 176    | 1862  |
| TOTAL                   | 5127    | 1200   | 6327  |
| **Ramps**               | .......................... | .......................... | .......................... |
| Exist                   | 19      | 18     | 37    |
| New                     | 0       | 6      | 6     |
| Total                   | 19      | 24     | 43    |
| **Slips**               | .......................... | .......................... | .......................... |
| Exist                   | 1746    | 948    | 2694  |
| New                     | 0       | 235    | 235   |
| TOTAL                   | 1746    | 914    | 2660  |

Table 2-2 provides a comparative summary of the buildout numbers for the five originally proposed alternatives and full implementation of Alternative 6.
Table 2-2. Full Buildout/Full Implementation (2027) by Alternative, including Alternative 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Alternative 6</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5 (2:1 Reduction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>998*</td>
<td>839*</td>
<td>1,196*</td>
<td>1,399*</td>
<td>788*</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoys</td>
<td>6,316</td>
<td>5,826</td>
<td>8,135</td>
<td>10,487</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td>4,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>128*</td>
<td>72*</td>
<td>706*</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slips</td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>2,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals do not include new extensions/expansions.

Under Alternative 6, the allocation program would use an adaptive management process similar to that now being used by TRPA to provide ongoing opportunities for review and revision of identified limits and restrictions. Currently, TRPA evaluates the status of attainment and maintenance of its threshold carrying capacities every 5 years. With the adoption of the new PATHWAY 2007 Regional Plan, a new requirement will be imposed that the Shorezone Ordinance evaluation process be revisited every 5 years to facilitate attainment and maintenance of thresholds.

The evaluation conducted for this alternative is linked to the PATHWAY 2007 Regional Plan program and involves a slow authorization of development with performance criteria, monitoring, and adaptive refinement of density and design criteria in 5-year increments until the 2027 planning horizon is reached, to ensure that thresholds are met and with the intent of avoiding significant environmental effects.

PIERS

All private littoral properties suitable for a private residence that do not have an existing pier and are not otherwise restricted would be eligible for consideration for a new pier, regardless of the length of littoral frontage or if they are served by a multi-use facility. Each parcel with clear private ownership to high water in both states would be eligible for no more than one pier. The littoral frontage of all properties that have a pier or have shared legal access to a pier would be considered “retired” from consideration for new piers. Applications for new piers would be prioritized based on the amount of littoral frontage that would be retired. For a property or group of properties to be eligible, existing structures on all properties included in an application must have implemented current best management practices (BMPs), and these properties must be brought into compliance with shoreland scenic ordinances as a condition of permit approval. The determination of compliance with shoreland scenic ordinances may be based on attainment of a 25 contrast rating or compliance with TRPA’s visual dominance curve (described in Chapter 6, “Scenic Quality,” of the DEIS).

Under Alternative 6, approximately 705 parcels would be eligible for allocation of a pier. Of these, approximately 630 piers could be granted under the density standards described below. The restriction to multi-use piers in scenic nonattainment areas reduces the number of possible piers that could be allocated to approximately 400. Regardless of the number of possible piers, however, the allocation process for Alternative 6 is limited to 10 new private piers per year, with a maximum of 220 new private piers and 10 new public piers being
allocated over the planning period. This compares to an existing total of 768 piers (727 private and 41 public) (see Table 2-1 and Chart 2-1).

**Eligibility Restrictions**

Eligibility is restricted for parcels in several categories:

- Parcels with existing deed restrictions because of access to a multi-use pier on another parcel are not eligible.
- Parcels in stream mouth setbacks are not eligible.
- Parcels within ¼ mile of public water intakes (Figure 2-1) may not be eligible for piers without permission from the water purveyor.
- Private parcels with pier restrictions placed by homeowners associations, such as the lakefront properties at Tahoe Keys, are not eligible for new piers. Also excluded from new piers is that portion of Glenbrook currently closed to new piers. These restrictions will remain in place even if the homeowners associations change their rules.
- Parcels located in shoreline units that are not in compliance with the scenic standards are not eligible for single-use piers but may be allocated multi-use piers.
- Resource Protection Zones would be established in areas of the Shorezone where no structures would be allowed, to protect large portions of the pristine shoreline of Lake Tahoe and resources such as wildlife, scenic, sensitive plants, and other significant resources. These lands have been identified (Figure 2-2) by TRPA staff through land use planning in balance with recreation needs of the Region. For the most part, Resource Protection Zones have been identified on publicly owned shorezone lands.
- A parcel located landward of a strip parcel or easement, where the upland landowner does not own the underlying fee title to high water, will not be considered a littoral parcel.
- All boundary line adjustments, including quiet title of quit claim adjustments, in the Shorezone would need TRPA review and approval as a project consistent with existing requirements for boundary line adjustments in the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

**Setbacks**

New piers must be set back at least 50 feet from any other pier. No piers may be built within the mapped variable setbacks from stream mouths (Figure 2-3) with migratory fish habitat or major discharge streams to Lake Tahoe. No piers or other structures may be built within ¼ mile of any public drinking water supply intake, unless a risk assessment (including demonstration of current status) allowing a shorter setback is approved by the agency responsible for the drinking water supply and quality to maintain the avoidance of filtration exceptions for lake intakes and other factors.

Properties within any of these setbacks are eligible for inclusion in applications with other owners for a pier and the littoral frontage will be included in the total retired upon approval.
### Chart 2-1. Alternative 6 Projects at Full Implementation (2027)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>% of Maximum Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piers</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoys</td>
<td>6316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slips</td>
<td>2929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maximum buildout is the level of development under Alternative 3 in the DEIS.*
Maximum Pier Design

Private Single-Use Pier
Design standards for single-use piers are proposed to ensure that new piers reasonably minimize scenic impacts associated with new visible structure. Based on the maximum pier design (depicted in Chapter 6, “Scenic Resources”), a private single-use pier is 150 feet long and 6 feet wide, with a maximum 200-square-foot visual magnitude. In this document, as in the DEIS, the term “visual magnitude” describes that area seen from 300 feet away from the pier and from a composite of views. According to these standards all new single-use piers would be required to comply with the design standards as conditions of approval. The maximum pierhead would be 30 feet long by 10 feet wide. Pile placement would be limited to single piles except for double piles at the pierhead. Piles must be placed at least 15 feet on center. Pile length does not extend above the deck. Maximum dimensions for a single catwalk are up to 30 feet long by 3 feet wide. The maximum single-use pier extends perpendicular to the shoreline and does not include doglegs, L’s, or other deviations. In no case can the pier extend beyond pierhead line or 6,219 feet, whichever is less.

Private Multi-Use Pier
To encourage the consolidation of piers between parcels and the associated removal of existing structures, retirement of shoreline from eligibility, and voluntary deed restrictions for multi-use piers applied to vacant parcels, the ordinance would include more liberal design standards for multi-use piers. All new multi-use piers would be required to comply with the design standards as conditions of approval. The maximum visual magnitude allowed for a multi-use pier is 280 square feet. The maximum multi-use pier extends perpendicular to the shoreline and does not include doglegs, L’s, or other deviations. The pier may extend beyond the pierhead line to the minimum degree necessary to gain navigable water. Beyond these criteria, the single-use pier standards are guidelines.

Public Multi-Use Pier
Public facilities are not limited by private pier standards. However, public shorezone structures will be required through the environmental documentation process to fully mitigate impacts within the same scenic unit, either horizontally in the shorezone or vertically in the upland.

Density Criteria
The number of private piers allowed in any shoreline unit would be based on density. Each shoreline unit would be categorized as visually sensitive, visually modified, visually dominated, or naturally dominated.

- Visually modified and visually dominated units (influenced by prominent existing structures, such as developed areas and marinas, respectively) would be allowed an average density of no more than one pier per 100 feet of shoreline. Marina expansions are additionally subject to TRPA’s Marina Master Plan requirements under Section 54.12 of the Code of Ordinances.

- Visually sensitive shorelines (highly scenic or vulnerable landscapes, including sandy beaches, that exhibit the influence of human modifications in an otherwise natural setting) would be allowed an average of no more than one pier every 200 feet.

These allowable densities would be determined as a whole for the unit, including both public and private piers. No new piers would be allocated to a shoreline unit once it exceeded the allowable density unless piers were removed elsewhere in the unit.
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Shoreline areas categorized as naturally dominated shoreline (such as natural-appearing landscapes or historical/traditional locations in highly scenic locations), areas in stream mouth setbacks, and areas designated for Resource Protection Zones would be excluded from the density calculations for those units. Shoreline areas within water intake setbacks would be included in the density calculations.

**Pier Repairs**

Repairing existing structures in place as built for the safety of the users would not result in the imposition of new project mitigation requirements by TRPA. Repairs below the water line in areas of fish spawning must take into consideration seasonal restrictions (the same as those defined in Alternative 2). Repairs that consist of nothing more than replacement in-kind in the same dimensions and same footprint will be considered exempt from TRPA review.

**Pier Modification and Expansion**

Property owners may modify an existing structure within the confines of its existing visual magnitude with the requirement that the modification must result in a net benefit to any environmental threshold and no detrimental effect on any other threshold.

Pier expansion would be allowed to the maximum pier visual magnitude. Parcels must have current BMPs in proper maintenance, a 25 contrast rating or attainment of a score of 25 on TRPA’s visual dominance curve, and a visual magnitude of 200 square feet for single-use piers or 280 square feet for multi-use piers.

**Public Piers**

Piers accessible to the general public would not be subject to the private pier allocation system or the recreation threshold mitigation fee, but would be subject to allowable densities and setbacks. However, conversion of a publicly accessible pier to restricted public access would subject the owner to the recreation threshold mitigation fee. Private or publicly owned piers that have any restrictions to access by the general public are not considered public piers. Public piers would be subject to the new development standards for public facilities.

It is anticipated that public waterborne transit centers including piers will be identified for urbanized centers around the Lake through revisions to the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan in PATHWAY 2007. Depending on the nature of the transportation these piers support, new development standards would be developed specifically for these piers. Vessels used in waterborne transit will be required to meet specific vessel standards, Lake Tahoe Outstanding Natural Resource Water (ONRW) sticker requirements, and other programs.

**Removal and Modification to Restore Littoral Processes**

Sheet pile piers, rock crib piers, boat ramps, manmade jetties or breakwaters, and other such structures in areas that impede or unnaturally influence the natural littoral drift along the shoreline and degrade the shoreline of adjacent properties shall be removed within 12 years of approval of these ordinances. For those structures that are piers, TRPA may approve replacement with a pier that meets TRPA design standards.

All structures to be removed would be identified by TRPA within 2 years of approval of these ordinances. This determination would be made through a scientific study by an outside contractor that would be peer reviewed, resulting in a specific list of structures subject to modification or removal. Consideration would be given to the environmental impacts caused
by removing such structures in balance with the benefits accrued from such removal, and whether alternate structures are feasible to construct. As an incentive to owners of non-pier structures requiring removal, TRPA may allow some additional amenities. These amenities will be identified as part of the approved list.

SCENIC REQUIREMENTS

Existing shoreland structures must be brought into compliance with scenic code existing at the time of application before approval would be given for building new piers, relocating piers, or expanding piers. New piers, relocated piers, and pier expansions must meet design standards for minimum piers as established by TRPA. Only multi-use piers could be approved in shoreline travel units that have not attained scenic thresholds. The design standards (a draft of which is provided in Appendix B of this Supplemental DEIS) would be included as part of the ordinances and would include maximum width, maximum length (pier head or to 6,219 feet elevation, whichever is shorter), profile, allowable colors, lighting, and allowable ancillary facilities (such as boatlifts). Applicability of design standard elements would vary by type of shoreline, backdrop, littoral drift concerns, and legal pedestrian accessibility. New or relocated piers that are built shorter or smaller than is allowable under the code may qualify for additional amenities as prescribed in the design standards.

ACCESS

Lateral (along the shore), public recreational access along the shoreline below high water (6,229’) in California and below low water (6,223’) in Nevada is allowed under California and Nevada state law. The degree and extent of real access around the Lake changes with topography, public accessibility to the shoreline, and other obstacles. The increasing amount of tourist activity at Lake Tahoe has led to increased potential for incidences of trespass on private property; these incidences, in return, prompt some private landowners to illegally restrict access to these important adjacent public areas.

New, modified, or expanded shorezone structures would not be permitted to unreasonably impair legal, lateral, public recreational access. Pier design would provide for public access over, under, or around the structure as appropriate for each property. Current legal structures must meet this standard when undertaking any modification or expansion. Where ongoing trespass issues are identified, TRPA would encourage those agencies responsible for public access to public lands or easements to work with private homeowners to solve such issues, and would facilitate resolution of such situations by considering appropriate access deterrent methods as well as acquisition of alternative public accessways.

BUOYS

Permits

TRPA would work with California State Lands, Nevada State Lands, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to develop a consolidated process for buoy permitting. All fees, requirements, and authorizations of these agencies would be consolidated to assist the boating public to bring their buoys into legal compliance. Application fees and/or lease payments would be considered by the three agencies in determining how the buoy recognition and enforcement program would be implemented, including monitoring, mitigation, and compliance.
Buoy Recognition Program

Two buoys would be allowed for every private littoral parcel with a minimum 25-foot setback from adjacent property boundaries as measured from extended boundary lines. No private buoys may be located more than 350 feet from high water (shoreline). In coves, where the setbacks would otherwise preclude additional buoys, TRPA will consider the number and density of buoys already permitted by TRPA and/or by the USACE before new buoys are recognized or permitted.

At public marinas, common areas controlled by homeowners associations or other such entities, or on public properties where piers are allowed, the number of allowable buoys is determined by the dimensions of the property, the 350 foot limit, and the 25-foot setback from extended property lines and a minimum distance of 50 feet from other buoys. Buoy field controlled by homeowners associations may not contain more buoys than homes served. The maximum number of new buoys that would be permitted by this alternative is 1,862 (1,686 private and 176 public). This compares to an existing total of 4,454 buoys (3,440 private and 1,014 public), some percentage of which do not have all or any of the required agency permits.

Annual Removal and Maintenance of Buoy Floats and Chains

Alternative 6 includes a requirement to remove and, if necessary, repair buoy floats and chains on an annual basis. Annual removal and maintenance requirements would include float removal and a means of securing chains to prevent disturbance of the lake bottom during high wind events. Buoys shall be removed from October 15 through April 30. This requirement addresses water quality, public health and safety, navigation, scenic, and recreational access issues. Poorly maintained buoys have resulted in loss or damage of boats (through sinking, capsizing, or running aground) during storm events. This may result in the discharge of fuel, oil, and possibly sewage into Lake Tahoe. Unsecured chains can move around the anchor during winter, causing bottom scouring. Removal of buoys during the off season improves navigability and recreational use of the nearshore (out to 350 feet) for motorized and non-motorized craft.

Although demand is limited, there is a need for some available buoys year-round for public health and safety, research, and recreation. Therefore, managers of public buoy fields may submit a plan that defines an annual buoy maintenance program and supporting evidence of need for a specific limited number of buoys to be maintained year-round.

TRPA will coordinate with California State Lands and Nevada State Lands to incorporate this requirement into their respective permitting processes.

OTHER FACILITIES

Boat Ramps

Alternative 6 would allow the construction of up to six new public ramps. This compares to 37 existing ramps (19 private and 18 public). These structures would be required to be located outside of the resource protection zones and spawning habitat and at locations where bathymetric data support such facilities and where frequent dredging would not be required (e.g., shallow shelf areas).
Floating Docks/Swim Platforms

A floating dock/swim platform may be substituted for one buoy; however, boats may not be moored on a swim platform. A floating dock/swim platform is a free floating structure that is not attached to the backshore. (Compare to a floating pier, which connects to the backshore and extends lakeward.)

Slips

Alternative 6 would permit approval of no new private slips; however, up to 235 new public slips would be permitted. This compares to 2,694 existing slips (1,746 private and 948 public).

WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

ONRW Boat Sticker Program

To help reduce pollutants and meet noise standards from motorized boats in Lake Tahoe, which has been designated an Outstanding Natural Resource Water, an ONRW boat sticker program would be implemented. Revenues from the sticker program would be used to administer the program and for water quality monitoring, monitoring of thresholds affected in the Shorezone, Tahoe yellow cress monitoring, and aquatic weed monitoring at launch sites. The program would provide funding assistance for education and ongoing monitoring of high boating use areas and tracking of boating activity that is the source of petroleum products into the lake. The program would also help fund ongoing public education programs directed to prevent discharges due to boating activity into the lakes of the Region.

Under the program, before a yearly boat sticker could be issued, a boat would be inspected to determine compliance with TRPA regulations. Inspections would include engine type, bilge containment, sewage controls, engine noise, engine tune, and boat washing.

Boat Wash Stations

Because of the increasing water quality impact risk and importation of exotic aquatic plants and the potential danger these species pose to the Lake, all publicly accessible boat ramps would be required to provide boat wash facilities and Shorezone-approved BMPs and be staffed during the boating season (Memorial Day to Labor Day). Plans and implementation schedules for such facilities must be submitted to TRPA within 2 years of approval of these ordinances.

Limits to Motorized Use of Emerald Bay

High levels of boating traffic in Emerald Bay during the boating season have been found to result in unacceptably high concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and other hydrocarbons, which are fuel oxygenates or are formed through the combustion of the oil and gas mixture burned by all combustion motors and some of which are known to be carcinogenic and mutagenic. Because of the high PAH concentrations measured in Emerald Bay during high use days in the summer, TRPA will develop a plan to prohibit private motorized boats in Emerald Bay during July and August on one weekend day per week. Public tour boats would continue to operate during these times. Based on monitoring results, such non-motorized days may be changed to gain the greatest environmental benefit.
CODE AMENDMENTS

Chapter 2 of the original DEIS identifies the proposed amendments to the TRPA Code that would take effect if Alternative 2 were adopted. For Alternative 6, all of the proposed Code amendments are the same as those identified for Alternative 2 except where specifically defined in this chapter. The proposed Code amendment changes are identified in Appendix E of the DEIS.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applications for new piers, buoys, slips, or boat ramps will be accepted and processed by TRPA on an annual cycle. Completed applications will be submitted to TRPA by December 31, beginning in 2005. TRPA staff will review the submitted applications and select up to 10 projects to be permitted based on the number of linear feet to be retired.

FEES

Two categories of fees would be charged for all shorezone structures. First, an application filing fee would be set by TRPA based on the cost of processing the application for new piers, pier reconstruction, or pier expansion and may be adjusted annually. A second category of fees would address threshold mitigation and maintenance. These fees may only be used for the planning and implementation of the following:

- Recreation threshold fee of $100,000 for each new private pier—This fee is part of the package of actions to be required under Alternative 6 to reduce impacts on recreational access, in particular the loss of open foreshore and nearshore water and decreases in unimpeded lateral access to the Shorezone from additional structures. This fee may only be used for:
  - acquisition or improvement of public access to the Lake,
  - construction or modification of public access facilities,
  - operation or maintenance of such facilities, or
  - backshore restoration of impacts from public access on public lands
- Air quality, water quality, and noise threshold mitigation fee of $5,000 for each new single-use buoy and $7,500 for a second buoy. New buoys include those not previously permitted by TRPA
- Air quality, water quality, and noise threshold mitigation fee of $5,000 for each buoy in a buoy field, each slip, and each swim platform
- Fisheries mitigation fee of $5,000 for each pier, slip, or boat ramp expansion or modification
- Boat sticker program fees

Other shoreline structures will be assessed for their environmental threshold impacts and mitigation fees will be assigned, as appropriate.

No more than 10% of the total amount contributed to the fund may be used for planning.

The recreation threshold fund would be available to public agencies or private owners of facilities open to the general public in the Tahoe Basin by application on an annual basis. Priority would be given to projects that also help attain other thresholds, such as non-
motorized access or compliance with the boat sticker program. Contributions to the recreation threshold fund would not entitle pier owners in any way to block legal public access.