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SECTION 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chapter 15 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances establishes a process for the development and adoption of redevelopment plans pursuant to the goals and policies of the Regional Plan and as provided for in the plan area statements. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency (Redevelopment Agency) proposes to establish North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans (Area Plans; Redevelopment Plans), which cover four Placer County communities on or near the north shore of Lake Tahoe. These plan areas are: Kings Beach/Stateline; Tahoe Vista; Lake Forest; and, Tahoe City/Gateway. The Redevelopment Agency also proposes to amend the current Chapter 15 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances (Redevelopment Plans) to allow the establishment of redeveloped areas outside of adopted community plans. At present, Sections 15.1, 15.2.E, 15.6.B of Chapter 15 of the Code of Ordinances states that no redevelopment plan shall be adopted unless it is within an adopted community plan.

Consistent with Section 5.3 and 15.10.B (1) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as well as Section 6.5 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure, this environmental assessment (EA) has been prepared to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans. Given that the preliminary North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans (Area Plans) does not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects or proposed development allocations, the EA evaluates potential reuse of existing development based on the development concepts set forth in the Area Plans. In addition, the EA evaluates the preliminary North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans proposed assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds through the support of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP).

This EA concludes that the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans are not expected to result in any unavoidable significant environmental effects with continued application of TRPA’s existing regulatory process and requirements, implementation of the TRPA EIP associated with attainment of TRPA environmental thresholds.

It should be noted that within five years of approval of the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans, the Redevelopment Agency would be required to submit a Final Redevelopment Plan that would provide details on redevelopment activities as well as proposed redevelopment projects that would require further environmental review.
SECTION 2 - INTRODUCTION

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency (Redevelopment Agency) proposes to establish North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans (Area Plans; Redevelopment Plans), which cover four Placer County communities on or near the north shore of Lake Tahoe. These plans are: Kings Beach/Stateline; Tahoe Vista; Lake Forest; and, Tahoe City/Gateway. The Redevelopment Agency also proposes to amend Chapter 15 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances (Redevelopment Plans) to allow the establishment of redeveloped areas outside of adopted community plans. At present, Sections 15.1, 15.2.E, 15.6.B of Chapter 15 of the Code of Ordinances states that no redevelopment plan shall be adopted unless it is within an adopted community plan.

ESTABLISHING PRELIMINARY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AREAS

Section 15.10 of Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances outlines the process of establishing preliminary redevelopment plan areas in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Section 15.10 states that redevelopment plans shall be developed in accordance with the procedures summarized below.

Selection of Redevelopment Plan Area

In cooperation with TRPA, a proposed redevelopment plan area shall be selected, including boundaries, consistent with applicable state law, and Chapter 15. TRPA shall determine that the area is suitable for redevelopment consistent with Chapter 15 prior to commencement of the preliminary plan. Studies, or such other information as TRPA may reasonably require, shall be submitted to demonstrate the economic feasibility of proceeding with a preliminary redevelopment plan for the area, and the economic and environmental benefits which may be obtained from the proposed redevelopment.

Preparation of Preliminary Redevelopment Plans

Upon selection of a redevelopment plan area, a preliminary redevelopment plan shall be prepared in cooperation with TRPA in accordance with the current Regional Plan. A preliminary redevelopment plan shall contain the following information:

- An environmental assessment (EA).
- A description of the proposed redevelopment plan area boundaries and project area boundaries including a preliminary determination of which areas are blighted and urbanized.
- A general statement of the proposed land uses, anticipated development, proposed targets and objectives related to attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds, layout of the principal streets and transportation patterns, and a general description of the standards to be used for redevelopment of the area.
- A general statement of how the proposed redevelopment plan conforms to the provisions of the Goals and Policies, the applicable plan area statements, the Code, and the environmental thresholds.
A general description of the provisions for existing and new affordable housing and the expected impact of the proposed redevelopment plan on the residents of the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods.

A statement of how the preliminary plan differs from and conforms to the adopted community plan.

An economic feasibility and needs assessment.

Reasonable provisions for public participation, including notice to, and comment by, affected property owners and residents.

**Action on Preliminary Redevelopment Plans**

The Advisory Planning Commission shall review preliminary redevelopment plans and make recommendations to the Governing Board. The Governing Board shall review and either approve, deny or modify the preliminary redevelopment plan. Upon approval of a preliminary redevelopment plan, a final redevelopment plan needs to be submitted within five years, or a new preliminary plan will be required.

**Preparation of Final Redevelopment Plans**

The final redevelopment plans shall be consistent with the approved preliminary redevelopment plan and comply with applicable state laws. The final redevelopment plans are expected to include the following:

- A program and schedule for bringing all roadway and shoreline units, or segments thereof, which are located within a redevelopment plan area into attainment with the scenic resources travel route rating thresholds.

- A description of the proposed methods of financing the redevelopment projects that are part of the final redevelopment plan.

- A description and schedule of the mitigation measures and public benefits that are required to be implemented as a part of the plan.

- A list and schedule of priority public benefits and related mitigation measures that are required to be implemented to attain the identified environmental targets.

- A list of related mitigation measures and priority public benefits required as conditions of approval for each redevelopment project.

- A plan and schedule to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) within the redevelopment plan area.

- A program to ensure that affordable housing is provided as part of a redevelopment plan to the extent required by applicable state law and that no net loss of affordable housing units occurs.

- A program to ensure that the redevelopment plan shall not result in a net increase in the amount of land coverage existing within the redevelopment plan area prior to adoption of the redevelopment plan.
• A redevelopment plan shall address the use of parcels or other lands from which development or development rights are transferred. A redevelopment plan shall also include revegetation and maintenance of the open spaces which are created as a result of the transfers.

• A recreation needs assessment, which identifies existing recreational needs within the redevelopment plan area and any additional recreational needs created by the redevelopment plan, and a recreation development program and schedule which meets the identified needs.

• Such other information as TRPA may reasonably require to review and approve the final redevelopment plan.

Process for Final Redevelopment Plans

Final redevelopment plans shall be processed in accordance with the following provisions:

• The Advisory Planning Commission shall review and make recommendation to the Governing Board prior to adoption of a final redevelopment plan.

• The final redevelopment plan shall be considered as a regional plan amendment and the Governing Board shall approve, deny or modify the final redevelopment plan.

Findings for Adoption

Prior to adopting a redevelopment plan and in addition to any other required findings, TRPA shall find:

• The plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies;

• The plan is consistent with the Code;

• The plan is consistent with the applicable plan area statement and adopted community plan;

• The plan is consistent with the adjacent Plan Area Statements or any inconsistencies are identified and evaluated and measures specified to correct the inconsistencies.

• The plan does not propose the development of residential units, tourist accommodation units, commercial floor area, recreational Persons at One Time or other projects, in excess of applicable limits set forth in the Regional Plan;

• The plan is substantially more likely to result in progress toward the attainment and maintenance of environmental threshold carrying capacities than the adopted community plan;

• Affordable housing is provided as part of a redevelopment plan to the extent required by applicable state law;

• The redevelopment plan shall not result in a net increase in the amount of land coverage existing within the redevelopment plan area prior to adoption of the redevelopment plan; and
The redevelopment plan in conjunction with other adopted plans and programs of TRPA shall attain and maintain thresholds.
SECTION 3 - NEED FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT

North Lake Tahoe was originally developed primarily as an area of vacation cabins, trailers and 1950’s era motels. In recent years, the area has become a year-round residential community with limited supporting commercial and public services. The housing stock, commercial buildings, infrastructure and environmental improvements have not been upgraded to adequately meet the increased needs of the communities. Poor land use patterns, limited public transportation, inadequate drainage and infrastructure, and a lack of good quality permanent affordable housing and neighborhood services has contributed to a reduced population of full-time residents. As a result, many of the communities in North Lake Tahoe reflect the neglected properties, dilapidated structures and outdated infrastructure. Other housing and economic conditions in the North Lake Tahoe area include the following (as documented in the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans):

- **Workforce Housing** - The current workforce housing situation is challenged by the need to provide adequate permanent and seasonal living quarters that also addresses overcrowding which results from rents that exceed the median income of workers. Many of the affordable units are dilapidated and often require lengthy commutes for workers. The captive workforce housing market provides no incentive for landlords to properly maintain their rental units and does provide an incentive for owners of properties not intended for permanent housing, such as trailer parks and motels, to allow their properties to be used to house local workers.

- **Retail Conditions** - Retail markets in the redevelopment area are dwindling. Many buildings currently housing retail uses were not originally constructed for retail purpose and lack the space and amenities required, such as display windows, restrooms, appropriate ceiling heights and associated features. Building locations are not conducive to shopping and lack pedestrian connectivity. Another key issue is traffic management and pedestrian safety.

- **Tourist Accommodations** - The existing stock of visitor accommodations in the redevelopment area is non-competitive with neighboring resorts.

Within the proposed Area Plans, the existing conditions described below further illustrate the need for the proposed project:

- **Kings Beach/Stateline.** A majority of the Kings Beach area contains rectangular lots designed for summer cabins, most with dimensions of 25 feet in width and 125 feet in length. As a result, much of the development has been constrained by this inefficient lot size. Additionally, much of the residential uses, schools, motels, public uses, and private industrial uses contain blighted economic and social conditions, as well as the critical physical conditions leading to storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, inadequate infrastructure, substandard housing, haphazard parking, scenic blight and a lack of water quality BMPs. The commercial core contains abandoned buildings, vacant lots, inadequate and irregular shaped parcels, and substandard public and private physical improvements, all of which contribute to the degradation of the water quality of Lake Tahoe. Lastly, the lack of affordable housing in Kings Beach, including affordable workforce housing, has led to a proliferation of housing which is dilapidated, substandard, and potentially hazardous. It should be noted that there has been redevelopment and improvement of conditions in this area that includes access and scenic improvements to the Kings Beach State Recreation Area, redevelopment of individual properties (Caliente Restaurant at 8791 North Lake Tahoe Boulevard), and the
approved Domus Affordable Housing project and the Kings Beach Commercial Core project.

- **Tahoe Vista.** Land use patterns within the Tahoe Vista Area vary widely. Several buildings and public facilities in the area are poorly constructed or were constructed before the adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and do not comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. There is a general lack of infrastructure, sidewalks, storm drainage improvements, and odd shaped parcels which pose development challenges, particularly along National Avenue. Several hotels and motels that front State Route (SR) 28 were constructed in the 1960’s. However, these properties have outlasted their useful life as consumer demands have increased for a more comprehensive hotel/motel experience. The area contains an aging and run-down commercial and industrial strip adjacent to National Avenue that provides evidence of impaired investments and economic maladjustment. National Avenue has a mix of dwelling types, from older cottage style wood frame residences to newer homes along Toyon, to a run down trailer park in disrepair. Many of the private parcels fronting the lake are built out and scenic views are obstructed. There have been improvements planned and proposed for this area including California Tahoe Conservancy public access improvements at the end of National Avenue as well as the proposed Tahoe Vista affordable housing project.

- **Lake Forest.** Development conditions have deteriorated to the point of meeting TRPA’s definition of blight. The commercial center of Lake Forest fronting Lake Forest Road lacks BMPs and is in a general state of deferred maintenance and dilapidation. There is a general lack of infrastructure, sidewalks, storm drainage improvements, undergrounding of utilities, and odd shaped parcels which pose development challenges. The commercial/industrial district borders on residential developments which constrain growth and uses for the area. Overall, the area contains blighted economic and social conditions as well as the critical physical conditions leading to storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, haphazard parking, and scenic blight.

- **Tahoe City/Gateway.** The community overall lacks strong organizational and land use principles resulting in social and economic maladjustment on certain parcels. The area suffers from under utilized commercial structures located in the urban centers, as well as restrictive commercial land uses due to the current local regulatory codes. The community lacks high quality tourist accommodations or facilities with marketable conference or meeting facilities. Several of the motels that are located along State Route (SR) 28 are in various states of dilapidation. Some of buildings that house the available tourist accommodations are well past their effective building life. The small industrial area, commonly known as the “Gateway” is outside the commercial core along Highway 89. These industrial uses fronting along the Truckee River may not be in the most suitable locations. The demand for local retail services has decreased and many Tahoe City businesses are economically struggling. Some properties have been abandoned, leaving them vacant and blighted, while others have continued operations in facilities in need of rehabilitation or replacement. However, it should be noted that there have been improvements in Tahoe City area associated with redevelopment of properties and streetscapes along both SR 89 and SR 28.

The Placer County Board of Supervisors adopted the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan under California redevelopment law in July 1996. The North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area, created by this plan, is comprised of 1,731 acres and consists of three communities; Tahoe City, Kings Beach, and Tahoe Vista. The goals of the plan are to eliminate blight, redevelop
communities, improve public infrastructure, improve the environment, and increase housing opportunities. Since 1996, the Redevelopment Agency has assisted or directly managed numerous improvement projects, such as upgrading substandard infrastructure, improving streetscapes, creating vibrant new public spaces, providing free public parking lots, and assisting in the development and rehabilitation of commercial buildings and housing.

Establishment of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would assist in further implementing the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan in eliminating blight, as well as achieve development, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of residential, commercial, industrial, and retail districts. Through the redevelopment, the project area would receive focused attention and financial investment to reverse deteriorating trends, create jobs, revitalize the business climate, upgrade public facilities, rehabilitate and add to the housing stock, and gain active participation and investment in the community by citizens. The proposed Area Plans would help new housing and businesses locate within areas that are already developed. It would reduce long vehicle commutes and promote affordable housing.
SECTION 4 - PROPOSED NORTH LAKE TAHOE PRELIMINARY REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLANS (PROPOSED ACTION) AND ALTERNATIVES

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans provides the required information set forth in Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and covers four Placer County communities on or near the north shore of Lake Tahoe that would consist of separate redevelopment areas. These plan areas are: Kings Beach/Stateline; Tahoe Vista; Lake Forest; and, Tahoe City/Gateway (see Figures 1-4). The Redevelopment Agency also proposes to amend the current Chapter 15 of the Code of Ordinances to allow the establishment of some of the redeveloped areas outside of adopted community plans (however, it is noted that TRPA anticipates that Chapter 15 would be amended as part of the Regional Plan Update). At present, the Lake Forest and Gateway plan areas in their entirety, as well as portions of the Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe Vista, and Tahoe City plan areas, are outside of adopted community plans (see Figures 5-7).

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans are conceptual policy and program documents; they do not identify specific project locations or propose specific activities. They do identify the intent to pursue certain targeted redevelopment activities that would focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the current Regional Plan as well as the anticipated update to the Regional Plan.

As identified in each of the proposed sub-redevelopment area plans, the overall intent of the proposed Area Plans is to provide additional development incentives provided under Section 15.9 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (land coverage limitations, density, grading, relocation of development, and best management practices standards) in combination with current Redevelopment Agency activities under the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan in order to improve existing residential, commercial and lodging conditions as well as provide assistance and funding for TRPA CIP projects in the North Lake Tahoe area for improvement of Tahoe Basin conditions and attainment of TRPA environmental thresholds.

KINGS BEACH/STATELINE REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN

Existing Conditions

The Kings Beach/Stateline redevelopment area (Kings Beach/Stateline area) consists of approximately 484 acres, and extends from Stateline to SR 267 and from Speckled Avenue to Lake Tahoe (see Figure 1). This area is currently covered by the Kings Beach Community Plan, Kings Beach Industrial Community Plan and North Stateline Community Plan, and Plan Area Statements 019 (Martis Peak), 027 (Woodvista), 028 (Kings Beach Residential), and 031 (Brockway).

The neighborhood streets consist of a series of north-south and east-west streets that result in an interconnected grid roughly eight blocks (east-west) by ten blocks (north-south) north of SR 28 and east of SR 267. Brockway Vista Avenue parallels SR 28 one block to the south, between Coon and Chipmunk streets. These streets largely serve single-family residential land uses. The preponderance of commercial land uses is located along SR 28, or within one block of the state highway. The area is currently serviced by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit System (TART). Most, if not all of Kings Beach, contains rectangular lots designed for summer cabins, most with dimensions of 25 feet in width and 125 feet in length. As a result, much of the development has been constrained by this inefficient lot size.
A substantial portion of the Kings Beach/Stateline area is outside the TRPA community plan area, the bulk of which is locally called the “Grid” (see Figure 5). The Grid extends north from a commercial corridor to Speckled Avenue and contains a mix of residential, schools, motels, public uses, and private industrial uses. The Grid has been included in the Kings Beach/Stateline area because of the blighted economic and social conditions as well as the critical physical conditions leading to storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, inadequate infrastructure, substandard housing, haphazard parking, scenic blight and a lack of water quality BMPs.

The commercial core and primary tourist area that fronts SR 28, is marked with abandoned buildings, vacant lots, inadequate and irregular shaped parcels, and substandard public and private physical improvements, all of which contribute to the degradation of the water quality of Lake Tahoe and limited access to public open space.

Tourist accommodations are largely one and two story motels that have surface parking lots. Nearly all of the hotel/ motel stock need significant renovation or replacement to meet current market standards. There are several hotel and motels which were constructed in the 1950’s and 1960’s. However, these properties have outlasted their useful life as consumer demands have increased for a more comprehensive hotel/motel experience. There are several motels, some in the residential grid and some along SR 28, which have been converted to full time apartments and are leased primarily to low income families and entry level workers on both a short and longer term basis.

Nearly all of the retail and commercial space in Kings Beach/Stateline area is housed in buildings that originally served other uses and are in critical need of upgrading or replacement. Most buildings are stand alone and have little potential for mixed-use. The industrial portion of Kings Beach/Stateline area supports a variety of uses including residential, light industrial and storage. There is little growth in the industrial uses as most industrial business owners can find less constrained options outside of the Lake Tahoe basin. The industrial area is also constrained by its close proximity to residential housing which is interspersed throughout the industrial area and more concentrated directly adjacent in the Grid.

The housing stock ranges from old camp cottages or Quonset huts with no kitchens, to overcrowded trailer parks, converted motels, small cottage style single-family homes, and newer, large single-family residences. A mix of this housing stock can be found on a number of streets. Single-family homes are dispersed throughout the area. Homes located along the shoreline tend to be larger, newer single-family or multi-family units. In the Grid, homes vary from newer multi-million dollar homes, to older trailer parks and modest wood-frame structures.

The lack of affordable housing in Kings Beach, including affordable workforce housing, has led to a proliferation of housing which is dilapidated, substandard, and potentially hazardous. The latest federal census estimates that 20% of all households in Kings Beach suffer from overcrowding. More recent local surveys and studies suggest that this percentage may be significantly higher.

A number of proposed development projects that are expected to add development within the proposed Kings Beach/Stateline area, including reservations under the Community Enhancement Program (CEP) as well as other major projects such as the recently approved Domus Housing Now development. These projects include the following: 8931 North Lake Blvd – Pastore Ryan; Ferrari Family Resort; Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project; A Kings Beach Resort (Potentially Lakeside); and Kings Beach Town Center BBLLC. While not located within the Kings Beach/Stateline area, it should be noted that the proposed Boulder Bay project
is immediately east of the area and would compliment proposed redevelopment activities (if ultimately approved and built).

**Proposed Land Uses**

The proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plan for Kings Beach/Stateline redevelopment area is a conceptual policy and program document that does not identify specific project locations, propose development allocations, or propose specific activities. The proposed preliminary redevelopment area plan presents a discussion on the intent to pursue certain targeted redevelopment activities that would focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the existing Regional Plan and the future updated Regional Plan. It is anticipated that if the Preliminary Plans are approved, the final Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Area Plan would propose detailed proposed projects and programs. The Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plan for Kings Beach/Stateline redevelopment area does not propose seeking any development allocations beyond what is currently available under the Regional Plan and associated provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Blighted conditions of the properties in this area, and all planned land uses would align with the current Regional Plan and anticipated updated Regional Plan goals. Land uses would exemplify development in urbanized areas that promote mixed-use development with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated, and encourage the construction of TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects and the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. Live-work environments would be promoted and incentivized.

There are two main drainage courses affecting land capability (Griff Creek and an unnamed tributary) that run through the community, with surrounding Stream Environment Zones (SEZs) along those courses. Areas along the shoreline tend to also have sensitive land capability classifications, while most of the “Grid” is Class 5 (high capability). The final Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Area Plan would present strategies for land coverage reductions, where necessary and environmentally desirable. See discussion below under “Thresholds” regarding environmental improvements.

**Anticipated Development**

As stated above, the proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plan for Kings Beach/Stateline is a conceptual policy and program document and does not identify specific project locations, propose specific activities, or development allocations. However, it is anticipated that if the Preliminary Plans are approved, the final Redevelopment Plan for the Kings Beach/Stateline community would propose detailed proposed projects and programs.

Future development would focus on identifying infill sites which are close to transit and services for the employee population, and where appropriate, develop mixed-use housing. The construction of rental housing to serve the households who now reside in trailer parks or makeshift motel rooms, not meant to serve as permanent housing, is critical to revitalization efforts in the Kings Beach/Stateline area.

It is the goal of this plan to implement orderly growth and development consistent with TRPA thresholds and the future adoption of the new Regional Plan. Infrastructure improvements would cover a variety of public works projects that would range from correcting and installing utilities, traffic capacity projects, accommodations for transit options, storm drainage, sewers, soil stabilization, etc.
Following is an overview of the proposed vision planned for the Kings Beach/Stateline area broken into sub-areas.

The Eastern Gateway

The Eastern Gateway is marked from Stateline to approximately Fox Street.

The Redevelopment Agency has purchased abandoned contaminated gas station sites and certain nearby properties. The potential for a mixed-use/commercial retail development is supported. Development projects would compliment the mixed-use commercial and retail development planned for the Town Center (see description below).

The Eastern Gateway to California is known to have varying levels of blight. As one enters California and approaches Kings Beach from Nevada, the dilapidation and deterioration of land uses is apparent. Near Stateline single family homes mark stable and possibly historic neighborhoods and the Agency desires to retain that character. However, storm water runoff and other drainage concerns indicate an immediate need for environmental improvements. Consolidation of land uses and construction of infrastructure improvements can be accomplished by acquisition of properties to provide a commercial center in combination with low scale retail, office, multi-residential, renovated commercial development and pedestrian focused activities. While many Redevelopment Agency dollars have already been committed to the Eastern Gateway, establishment of the Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Area Plan under Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances is proposed to further incentivize private investment with development incentives provided under Section 15.9 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The Western Gateway

The Western Gateway centers on Secline Avenue and the 500-foot radius from SR 267, Lake Tahoe and midway from Brockway Vista/SR 28 to Rainbow Avenue.

The area serves as the western entrance to Kings Beach. It is evidenced by a gas station, retail, visitor services, and other land use mixes which range widely in deteriorating physical condition. There is a large outdated pumping station on the lakefront and limited BMPs are present in the area.

The emphasis of any development and preservation of Kings Beach is its access to Lake Tahoe. Reducing the coverage on parcels along the lake front in exchange for resort or hotel building height, not only opens up the lake’s scenic views to the general public, but ensures that dilapidated sewer and water treatment infrastructure is replaced or updated.

As funds become available, the Redevelopment Agency is interested in pursuing site development discussions with the various public agencies which own the majority of the parcels under consideration. The Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Area Plan would provide opportunities for a physical upgrade of this neighborhood to include a small lakeside community park, off-street public parking, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, lighting and landscaping.

Redevelopment Implementation Plans will provide that neighborhood improvements, in conjunction with private, mixed-use development projects, be integrated with the goals and objectives of the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project.
Town Center

The creation of an urban commercial center that includes live and work opportunities is a major focus of this planned activity. Town Center would include the area of Brook/Trout Avenue to the Lake and east-west Fox to Bear Avenue.

Town Center design concepts include a pedestrian village serving both tourists and residents. Using an “Old Tahoe” theme oriented toward SR 28 and Lake Tahoe, the scale would be pedestrian in nature and rely on off-street parking, public transportation, and small public plaza areas and visual corridors.

Commercial and residential development would be combined vertically with retail and office space occupying the ground floor. Residences and offices on floors above, with ground floor commercial frontages on SR 28, would create mixed-use configurations that support the goals of compact land uses.

Housing

Workforce housing projects would be dispersed throughout the Kings Beach Grid. The Grid has randomly interspersed parcels of market rate units. These are single-family second homes and permanent home both old and new. Much of the current housing is small cabins, trailers and converted motel rooms which have outlived their useful life. Overall, the area is typified by deteriorating conditions due to a lack of off-street parking, no curbs, no gutters, no sidewalks, neglected maintenance from absent landlords, overcrowding of people within each unit and non-existent BMPs.

This Plan would create opportunities for the infill of vacant lots with new housing units as well as an enhanced rehabilitation program for existing housing units. These efforts would improve the public infrastructure and the visual quality of the neighborhood as well as stabilize the area from further deterioration and assist in the construction of community-wide environmental improvement projects and BMPs.

The Plan envisions upgrading the residential areas containing cabins, trailers, old motels, apartments and houses. The goal would be to develop a better distribution of density as well as increase the net number of new and rehabilitated permanent affordable housing.

Thresholds

The Redevelopment Agency has determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) as the standard for project evaluation. The TRPA EIP encompasses hundreds of capital improvement, research, program support, and maintenance projects designed to restore and protect Lake Tahoe’s clarity. Placer County is partner with TRPA in constructing and maintaining EIP projects of mutual benefit. Therefore, as development projects come forward for approval within the Kings Beach/Stateline community, they would be measured against the TRPA EIP and TRPA Thresholds, as well as the Placer County approved five–year environmental improvement project list. The Redevelopment Agency would provide assistance to private property owners who can achieve pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area. Table 1 provides a summary of approved EIP projects in the Kings Beach/Stateline area:
TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF EIP PROJECTS IN KINGS BEACH/STATELINE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP PROJECT No.</th>
<th>EIP THRESHOLD</th>
<th>EIP PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach - Residential</td>
<td>Drainage improvements for residential area north of SR 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Stateline Area</td>
<td>Includes conveyance, stabilization, re-vegetation and road runoff treatment for sediment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach - Industrial</td>
<td>Drainage conveyance stabilization, re-vegetation, road runoff treatment for sediment in industrial developed area (mainly Speckled Ave.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach Commercial Core: Source Controls</td>
<td>Erosion source controls associated with the county and state roadways. Improvements include re-vegetation of disturbed soils, drainage stabilization and infiltration, and sediment ponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach Commercial Core: Treatment controls</td>
<td>Erosion storm water treatment facilities associated with the county and state roadway. Improvements include re-vegetation of disturbed soils, drainage stabilization and infiltration and sediment ponds, as well as potential use of filtration media for treatment of fine sediment. (See below for delineation of Kings Beach watersheds).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIP PROJECT No.</td>
<td>EIP THRESHOLD</td>
<td>EIP PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Identified Areas to Complete Storm Water Outfall Treatment Facilities</td>
<td>Griff Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deer Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bear Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coon Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fox/Chipmunk Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chipmunk Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Scenic Resources</td>
<td>Scenic Road (SR 28) –Tahoe Vista (Kings Beach) Imprv</td>
<td>Multi-phase project with landscape frontage improvement, access controls, walkways, architectural upgrades. Screen or relocate satellite dishes / sign conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>Griff Creek-Stream Habitat restoration</td>
<td>Improve culverts for fish passage, stabilize banks with vegetation and improve. substrate through urban area for spawning, for morphology and facilitate water diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>KB Recreation Area Public Pier</td>
<td>Public partners (CTC, etc.) will relocate and improve existing pier may serve water borne transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>CTC Secline Beach Improvements</td>
<td>CTC will construct additional site improvements-day use recreation improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>KB Curb, Gutters, Sidewalks &amp; Bike Trails</td>
<td>Concurrent with Water Quality Improvements (#10060) - Class II Bike Trails and Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>North Shore Trolley Service</td>
<td>Service expanded by reducing headways and adding service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>Passenger Facilities</td>
<td>Region wide construction of transit shelters at existing or future transit stops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAHOE VISTA REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN

Existing Conditions

The Tahoe Vista redevelopment area (Tahoe Vista area) consists of approximately 85 acres of land and is generally located beginning at Donner Road south to Lake Tahoe and generally Agatam Avenue on the east to Estates Drive on the west (see Figure 2). This area is covered by the Tahoe Vista Community Plan and Plan Area Statements 021 (Tahoe Estates), 023 (Tahoe Vista Subdivision), 024A (North Tahoe Recreation Area), and 024B (Snow Creek).

The community centers on National Avenue, a major roadway which is predominately industrial in use. SR 28 is the primary highway and transportation link between Kings Beach and Tahoe City. Within Tahoe Vista it consists of four travel lanes, with two through lanes in each direction. Parking within the community is composed of a mixture of public parking and private parking. The Tahoe Vista community is currently serviced by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) system. Land use patterns within the redevelopment area vary widely. Commercial activity fronts along SR 28 and there are areas which may provide opportunities for open space or environmental preserves. Additionally, there is a trailer park which may pose an opportunity for residential improvements. Many of the private parcels fronting the lake are built out and scenic views are obstructed.

Several buildings and public facilities in the area are poorly constructed and/or were constructed before the adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and do not comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. There is a general lack of infrastructure, sidewalks,
storm drain improvements, and odd shaped parcels which pose development challenges, particularly along National Avenue. Several hotels and motels that front SR 28 were constructed in the 1960’s. However, these properties have outlasted their useful life.

The area contains an aging and run-down commercial and industrial strip adjacent to National Avenue that provides evidence of impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The industrial area along the eastern side of National Avenue is adjacent to preserved areas owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy and designated for recreational uses. On the other side of National Avenue, a mix of dwelling types are situated, from older cottage style wood frame residences to newer homes along Toyon, to a trailer park in disrepair.

The redevelopment boundaries have been set to maximize the effectiveness of redevelopment as a tool for the revitalization of the area. The boundaries have been structured to include a targeted number of substandard and deteriorated commercial and industrial buildings as well as residential buildings that are substandard and in need of rehabilitation.

Homes located along the shoreline tend to be larger, newer single-family or multi-family units which cater to the vacation rental market. To the north, residences vary from newer multi-million dollar homes, to condos and timeshares, to an older trailer park, to cottage style wood-frame structures. Several of the residential developments in the area lack adequate drainage facilities.

A portion of the proposed Tahoe Vista Preliminary Redevelopment Plan Area is outside the TRPA community plan area (see Figure 6). The Redevelopment Agency would like to explore the possibilities of incorporating the village concept with an open space preserve.

The Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Affordable Housing and Interval Ownership Project would potentially add development within the proposed preliminary redevelopment area plans.

**Proposed Land Uses**

The proposed Preliminary Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Area Plan is a conceptual policy and program document and does not identify specific project locations, propose development allocations, or propose specific activities. The proposed preliminary redevelopment area plan presents a discussion on the intent to pursue certain targeted redevelopment activities that would focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the current Regional Plan as well as the future updated Regional Plan. It is anticipated that if the Preliminary Plans are approved, the final Redevelopment Plan for the Tahoe Vista area would propose detailed proposed projects and programs. The Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plan for Tahoe Vista area does not propose seeking any development allocations beyond what is currently available under the Regional Plan and associated provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Blighted condition of the properties, and all planned land uses would align with the Regional Plan and the anticipated updated Regional Plan goals. Land uses would exemplify development in urbanized areas that promote environmentally sensitive open space and low intensity recreational uses with a focus on creating uses that will encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. Live-work environments will be encouraged and incentivized.

In conformance with current community plan goals, for redevelopment purposes this community is proposed to continue primarily as a regional tourist and recreation area with some industrial, mixed-use commercial uses.
Anticipated Development

As stated above, the proposed Preliminary Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Area Plan is a conceptual policy and program document and does not identify specific project locations, development allocations, or propose specific activities. However, it is anticipated that if the Preliminary Plans are approved, the final Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Area Plan would propose detailed proposed projects and programs.

It is the goal of this plan to implement orderly growth and development consistent with TRPA thresholds and the future adoption of the new Regional Plan. Infrastructure improvements would cover a variety of public works projects ranging from correcting and installing utilities, traffic capacity projects, accommodations for transit options, storm drainage, sewers, soil stabilization, etc.

Following is an overview of the proposed vision planned for the Tahoe Vista Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plan.

Roadway / Pedestrian Improvements

The streets within the Tahoe Vista area are inadequately served by pedestrian improvements. While over the years, many efforts have been made to upgrade these roads and drainage facilities, many remain substandard when viewed in terms of modern engineering and construction. Therefore, under the preliminary Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Area Plan, the streets and pedestrian facilities would be improved.

Commercial Renovation

There are a variety of outdated commercial and industrial structures and properties in various states of disrepair. The Redevelopment Agency plans to encourage use of its commercial loan rehabilitation program and to incentivize new development where feasible.

Recreational Open Space

Although the beaches of Lake Tahoe provide spectacular recreational opportunities for residents and tourists alike, there are Tahoe Vista neighborhoods which could be served by natural preserves. The Redevelopment Agency would examine the feasibility of using redevelopment programs, as funds become available, in conjunction with the California Tahoe Conservancy to develop suitable, resident serving recreational and open space preservation opportunities.

Workforce Housing

The Redevelopment Agency would explore opportunities for infill new construction and rehabilitated affordable workforce housing, including opportunities for improving the community’s trailer park facilities. Workforce housing includes very low, low and moderate income levels as defined by California law.

Thresholds

The Redevelopment Agency has determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the TRPA EIP as the standard for plan...
evaluation. Therefore, as development projects come forward for approval within the Tahoe Vista community, they will be measured against the TRPA EIP and TRPA Thresholds, as well as the Placer County approved five–year environmental improvement project list. The Redevelopment Agency would provide assistance to private property owners who can achieve pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area. Table 2 provides a summary of approved EIP projects in the Tahoe Vista area:

**TABLE 2**
**SUMMARY OF EIP PROJECTS IN TAHOE VISTA AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP Proj. No.</th>
<th>EIP Threshold</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Tamarack ECP</td>
<td>Water Quality improvements including treatment of public ROW runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Scenic Improv.</td>
<td>Utility Underground</td>
<td>Undergrounding of overhead utilities along SR28 and sections of County roads near the lakeshore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649/436</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Snow Creek Wetlands Restoration</td>
<td>Removal of fill material placed in SEZ and restoration of wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10038</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Nat’l Ave Tahoe Vista Connection Trail</td>
<td>Class I bike trail connection between TV Recreation Beach to No. Tahoe Regional Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Four Corners Bikeway Summit to TV Recreation Trail</td>
<td>Bike trail connection at Sawtooth Ridge into North Tahoe Regional Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAKE FOREST REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN**

**Existing Conditions**

The Lake Forest redevelopment area (Lake Forest Area) consists of approximately 28 acres, and centers along Lake Forest Road (see Figure 3). The area includes Lupin Lane on the north to Sierra Vista on the south; and Manzanita on the east to Bristlecone on the west. The entire redevelopment area is outside of a TRPA community plan area and consists of Plan Area Statements 008 (Lake Forest) and 009A (Lake Forest Commercial).

In 1994, the Lake Forest Commercial area was considered as a candidate for community plan area status. However, it was determined that due to the limited size of the community, the
limitations on new development, and the nature of environmental improvements needed in the community, that the Plan Area Statement process was more appropriate. The redevelopment area boundaries for the proposed project are consistent with boundaries shown under the current Lake Forest Commercial Plan Area Statement – 009A, Special Areas 1 and 2.

Development conditions have deteriorated to the point of meeting TRPA’s definition of blight. The commercial center of Lake Forest fronting Lake Forest Road (specifically PAS 009A) lacks BMPs and is in a general state of deferred maintenance and dilapidation. The area’s structures have had limited renovation since they were constructed around the 1960’s. There is a general lack of infrastructure, sidewalks, storm drain improvements, undergrounding of utilities, and odd shaped parcels which pose development challenges. The commercial/industrial district abuts residential developments which constrains growth and uses for the area. Recreational uses are located adjacent to the residential developments. The lakeside development is catered toward recreational and large single-family structures. Overall, the area contains blighted economic and social conditions as well as the critical physical conditions leading to storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, haphazard parking, and scenic blight.

Proposed Land Uses

The proposed Preliminary Lake Forest Redevelopment Area Plan is a conceptual policy and program document and does not identify specific project locations, propose development allocations, or propose specific activities. The proposed Preliminary Lake Forest Area Redevelopment Area Plan presents a discussion on the intent to pursue certain targeted redevelopment activities that would focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the Regional Plan as well as the future updated Regional Plan. The Preliminary Lake Forest Redevelopment Area Plan does not propose seeking any development allocations beyond what is currently available under the Regional Plan and associated provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Redevelopment efforts within Lake Forest would include installation of BMPs, façade updates, curb, gutters, sidewalk improvements, defined parking and landscaped areas, and screened outdoor storage areas. Due to the blighted condition of commercial properties in the proposed plan area, planned improvements would align with TRPA’s Regional Plan goals.

Anticipated Development

As stated above, the Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plan for Lake Forest is a conceptual policy and program document and does not identify specific project locations nor propose specific activities. However, it is anticipated that if the Preliminary Plans are approved, the final Lake Forest Redevelopment Plan would propose detailed proposed projects and programs.

Future development would focus on commercial renovation. In order to achieve environmental and land use goals, development would be focused on activities which in the short run bring about public awareness that positive change is occurring, and long term solutions to the actual construction of environmental improvement projects. The Redevelopment Agency proposes to focus its activities on seeking grants to support a commercial rehabilitation program and assisting developers, where appropriate, with new development.

Infrastructure improvements would cover a variety of public works projects ranging from correcting and installing utilities, traffic capacity projects, accommodations for transit options, storm drainage, sewers, soil stabilization, etc.
Thresholds

The Redevelopment Agency has determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the TRPA EIP as the standard for plan evaluation. Therefore, as development projects come forward for approval within the Lake Forest community, they would be measured against the TRPA EIP and TRPA Thresholds, as well as the Placer County approved five-year environmental improvement project list. The Redevelopment Agency would provide assistance to private property owners who can achieve pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area. Table 3 provides a summary of approved EIP projects in the Lake Forest area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP PROJECT No.</th>
<th>EIP THRESHOLD</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10144</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Lake Forest SEZ Improvements</td>
<td>Meadow wetland restoration and water quality improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Lake Forest Highlands ECP</td>
<td>County ROW water quality improvements in Highlands Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10061</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Lake Forest Commercial/Industrial ECP</td>
<td>County ROW water quality improvements primarily in commercial or industrial developed areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Lake Forest Beach Public Access Improvements</td>
<td>Extension of water lines to provide for water service, fire protection and permanent restrooms. Rebuilding of public docks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAHOE CITY/GATEWAY REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN

Existing Conditions

The Tahoe City/Gateway redevelopment area (Tahoe City/Gateway area), approximately 328 acres in size, begins at the western edge of the Rocky Ridge Road Plan Area Statement on the east to roughly the entrance to Tahoe City on the west; Olympic Drive on SR 28 on the south; to just south of the Wye along SR 89; and the Tahoe City Golf Course to Lake Tahoe (see Figure 4). This area is covered by the Tahoe City Community Plan and Plan Area Statements 001B (Tahoe
City Industrial), 002 (Fairway Tract), 003 (Lower Truckee), 005 (Rocky Ridge), and 174 (64 Acre Tract).

State Route 28 passes through the center of the community and is the focus of commercial, residential and recreational activity. The Gateway portion includes the small commercial strip between Alpine Meadows and Tahoe City along the north side of SR 89. The Gateway portion and Tahoe City Golf Course, which comprise approximately 130 acres, are outside of the Tahoe City Community Plan area.

These Tahoe City/Gateway areas were chosen because of the blighted economic and social conditions as well as the critical physical conditions leading to a lack of adequate water quality BMPs, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, substandard housing, haphazard parking, and scenic blight. There is a general lack of infrastructure, missing storm drain improvements, and odd shaped parcels which pose challenges to private development. While there are several properties that are improved and upgraded, most properties in the proposed area lack the private sector investment needed to mitigate deterioration and extend the useful life of the property. The area also suffers from underutilized commercial structures located in the urban centers, as well as restrictive commercial land uses due to the current local regulatory codes.

The community overall lacks strong organizational and land use principles resulting in social and economic maladjustment on certain parcels. The Tahoe City Golf Course, for example, suffers from the inability to incentivize private dollars to invest in renovating the environmental and economical infrastructure. While this could be a major community contribution, it is currently isolated and located behind a series of underutilized buildings and service areas. The golf course lacks updated BMPs and public improvements which would make it more of a contributory site to the Tahoe City community.

The community of Tahoe City lack high quality tourist accommodations or facilities with marketable conference or meeting facilities. Several of the motels which line SR 28 are in various states of dilapidation. The buildings that house the available tourist accommodations are well past their effective building life and do not inspire the increasingly sought-after and demanding tourist.

The small industrial area, commonly known as the “Gateway” is outside the commercial core along SR 89. These industrial uses fronting along the Truckee River may not be in the most suitable locations and are currently non-conforming uses. River frontages should be encouraged for development of more public and/or recreational uses. The Tahoe Gateway area is located in a hazardous area where shale falling from the adjacent hill poses a threat.

The demand for local retail services has decreased and many Tahoe City businesses are struggling for survival. Some properties have been abandoned, leaving them vacant and blighted, while others have continued operations in facilities in need of rehabilitation or replacement. Still other owners have continually upgraded their properties in hopes of drawing both desirable retail tenants, and increasing their customer base. The result is that dedicated land owners are forced to survive adjacent to properties that are either abandoned or in disrepair. One large retail development located in Tahoe City’s town center stands out as blighted, visually unappealing and negatively impacts the character of the commercial core.

The lakeside of Tahoe City is largely built out, with a large beach and park area operated by the Tahoe City Public Utility District. The area is served by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) system. There is a bike trail throughout most of the city, however it is disconnected by a
condo/timeshare development by the Wye. The Wye area has a high degree of vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle traffic which is congested during this summer peak tourist months.

**Proposed Land Uses**

The proposed Preliminary Tahoe City/Gateway Redevelopment Area Plan is a conceptual policy and program document and does not identify specific project locations, proposed development allocations, or propose specific activities. The preliminary redevelopment area plan presents a discussion on the intent to pursue certain targeted redevelopment activities that would focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the updated Regional Plan. It is anticipated that if the Preliminary Plans are approved, the final Redevelopment Plan would propose detailed proposed projects and programs. However, the Preliminary Tahoe City/Gateway Redevelopment Area Plan for does not propose seeking any development allocations beyond what is currently available under the current Regional Plan and associated provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The Tahoe City/Gateway proposed redevelopment area plan would incorporate the land use guidelines in the Regional Plan as well as the future updated TRPA Regional Plan. Due to the blighted condition of the properties in the proposed plan, planned land uses would align with TRPA Regional Plan goals. Land uses would exemplify development that promotes mixed-use development with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transportation, bicycles and walking. Live-work environments would be promoted and incentivized.

**Anticipated Development**

Infrastructure improvements would cover a variety of public works projects ranging from correcting and installing utilities, traffic capacity projects, accommodations for transit options, storm drainage, sewers, soil stabilization, etc.

Following is an overview of the proposed vision planned for the area, which would focus on an open space preserve, commercial uses, and workforce housing.

**Open Space Preserve**

There are large parcels of land currently cited at the Tahoe City Golf Course that are in a SEZ or have soil capability that renders them undevelopable. The Redevelopment Agency would examine the possibility of a land/nature preserve for this area that includes upgraded BMPs and ensures ongoing maintenance.

**Commercial Development**

In addition to the parcels identified at the Tahoe City Golf Course as SEZ, the location also contains large parcels which lend themselves to compact, mixed-use development.

In targeted areas located in the Town Center, the “Wye,” and the land adjacent to the dam and Fanny Bridge, there are opportunities for recreation and support retail. Acquisition of land and easements to create an open space link from the Tahoe City Marina to the Fanny Bridge State Recreation Area would open up opportunities for private development and the installation of modern BMPs.
Workforce Housing

The Redevelopment Agency would explore opportunities for infill new construction and rehabilitated housing. The Redevelopment Agency would promote its affordable housing rehabilitation loan program where appropriate in Tahoe City, as well as examine the feasibility to construct new affordable workforce housing in the Tahoe City Industrial Plan Area Statement 001B. The preliminary redevelopment area plan proposes special height, density and coverage considerations be given to projects that provide affordable housing.

Thresholds

The Redevelopment Agency has determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the TRPA EIP as the standard for plan evaluation. Therefore, as development projects come forward for approval within the Tahoe City/Gateway communities, they would be measured against the TRPA EIP and TRPA Thresholds, as well as the Placer County approved five-year environmental improvement project list. The Redevelopment Agency would provide assistance to private property owners who can achieve pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area. Table 4 provides a summary of approved EIP projects in the Tahoe City/Gateway area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP PROJECT NO.</th>
<th>EIP THRESHOLD</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>254,231 &amp; 796.1</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Tahoe City Residential ECP</td>
<td>Water quality improvements and treatment of public ROW runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.3</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Lower Ward Valley</td>
<td>Water quality improvements and treatment of public ROW runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Tahoe City Transit Center</td>
<td>Participation in ongoing O&amp;M of built facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action alternative, the Redevelopment Agency would not establish the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans for the following communities on or near the north shore of Lake Tahoe: Kings Beach/Stateline; Tahoe Vista; Lake Forest; and, Tahoe City/Gateway. There would be no Code of Ordinance amendments to exempt the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans from the requirement to be located within a community plan area. Redevelopment activities by the Redevelopment Agency would continue to occur in the project area under the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan under California redevelopment law. However, this alternative would not be able to utilize development incentives provided under Section 15.9 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances regarding land coverage, density, grading, relocation of development and other associated provisions.
This would likely limit the extent and success of redevelopment and improvement of infrastructure and the timing of TRPA EIP projects.

**Modified Project Alternative**

Under the Modified Project alternative, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would be modified to be consistent with the current TRPA community plan boundaries. As a result, the redevelopment areas for Kings Beach/Stateline would be reduced to 300 acres, Tahoe Vista would be reduced to 15 acres, and Tahoe/City Gateway would be reduced to 130 acres. Under this alternative, the Lake Forest Area Plan would be eliminated.

Under the Modified Project alternative, approximately 445 acres would receive focused attention and utilize development incentives provided under Section 15.9 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances to reverse deteriorating trends, upgrade public facilities, rehabilitate and add to the housing stock, and contribute to TRPA EIP projects. However, because the redevelopment area would be reduced under this alternative, approximately 470 fewer acres would not receive these benefits and would likely limit the success of redevelopment of these areas.
SECTION 5 - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION AND ANALYSIS APPROACH

This section addresses potential environmental impacts of the implementation of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans (Proposed Action) and amendments to Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The impact of the No Action Alternative and Modified Project Alternative are also evaluated.

As identified in Section 1 (Executive Summary), this environmental assessment (EA) has been prepared to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans. Given that the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans (Area Plans) does not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, the EA evaluates potential re-use of existing development based on the development concepts set forth in the Area Plans. In addition, the EA evaluates the Area Plans proposed assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds through the support of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). While this EA utilizes the analyses provided in the 2008 EA for the TRPA Affordable Housing Code Amendment and the 2006 EA for the Interim Allocations for the Period 2007 to Adoption of Updated Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, this project does not propose any specific project, land disturbance activity, or request for development allocations under Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances that can be quantified into specific effects on environmental resources and TRPA thresholds (e.g., Table 2 in the 2006 EA for the Interim Allocations for the Period 2007 to Adoption of Updated Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin). Thus, this analysis is based on a qualitative analysis of potential impacts on environmental resources and TRPA thresholds and assumes continued implementation of TRPA regulatory provisions and requirements (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances) as well as continued implementation of TRPA EIP projects.

It should be noted that within five years of approval of the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans, the Redevelopment Agency would be required to submit a Final Redevelopment Plan that would provide further details on redevelopment activities as well as proposed redevelopment projects that would require further environmental review.

IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The following analysis is based on the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist provided below.

1. Land

Land Coverage Impacts

The Proposed Action would not alter land coverage standards set forth in the TRPA Code of Ordinances under Chapter 20 (Land Coverage). Specifically, Section 20.6 of the Code defers to Chapter 15 (Redevelopment Plans) for land coverage requirements. It is anticipated that redevelopment under the Proposed Action (North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans) would largely consolidate existing development and use disturbed sites. In addition, the North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate that the redevelopment plan are in compliance with the approved Regional Plan in existence at the time and would not result in a net increase in the land coverage (see TRPA
Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [8]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of impervious cover (SC-1) threshold.

Topography and Ground/Soil Stability Impacts

The Proposed Action would result in subsequent development activities in the North Lake Tahoe area that could alter ground conditions. However, the Proposed Action would not alter land coverage, grading and development standards associated with the regulation of topography and land areas including SEZs (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 28 ([Natural Hazard Standards] and 54 [Shorezone Project Findings and Development Standards] and Placer County grading standards). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on topography, land stability, erosion and water quality in the Tahoe Basin. In addition, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans include provisions to further assist the implementation of TRPA EIP projects in the area. The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of impervious cover (SC-1) or SEZ (SC-2) thresholds.

2. Air Quality

Substantial Air Pollutant Emissions and Deterioration of Ambient Air Quality Impacts

The Proposed Action would result in subsequent redevelopment activities in the North Lake Tahoe area that could increase traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and an associated deterioration of existing air quality. The development, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of existing commercial, industrial, retail, and residential uses could also increase traffic volumes and VMT and an associated deterioration of existing air quality.

Vehicle Miles of Travel

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but does set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans also propose assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds through the support of the TRPA EIP, which would include such improvements as bike trails and sidewalks, expansion of North Shore Trolley service, replacement of TART vehicles, transit operating funds and development of facilities to support water borne transit (see Tables 1 through 4). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans and its associated projects would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds, which includes AQ-7 (reduction in VMT) (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, implementation of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans is expected to result in a reduction of vehicle trips ends from 2010 levels. Therefore, the increased traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled would be offset by reductions in total trips by increasing the use of non-auto transportation modes and reducing trip length by increasing density in the urban core areas.
Furthermore, according to the Mobility 2030 Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, demographic and economic changes have caused a decline in traffic volumes in the Tahoe Basin, improving air quality in the Basin. Assuming that basin-wide VMT, vehicle trip and traffic volumes continue to decline, the site-specific increases in traffic from redevelopment made possible by the Proposed Action would not be considered significant and associated air quality impacts would not be considered significant. Nonetheless, air quality mitigation fees for new vehicle trips related with new housing projects would be collected by TRPA to mitigate air quality impacts (see TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 93 [Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program]). Please see the Transportation and Circulation discussion for more information about the decline in traffic volumes in the Basin.

Stationary Emissions

Subsequent redevelopment activities and projects would be subject to current development standards and compliance measures in place (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 91 [Air Quality Control] and 93 [Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on air quality and include such measures as payment of air quality mitigation fees and emission standards for new wood stoves. The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans and its associated projects would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds, which includes AQ-1 (carbon monoxide), AQ-2 (ozone), AQ-3 (particulate matter), AQ-6 (wood smoke), AQ-7 (reduction in VMT), AQ-8 (atmospheric nutrient loading) (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F[6]).

Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of air quality thresholds.

Objectionable Odor Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but it is not expected that redevelopment activities would result in the establishment of a land use activity that could generate objectionable odors. All development would be subject to Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rule 205 (Nuisance) that prohibits any discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause to have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property. Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts related to odors.

Alteration of Air Movement or Change in Climate Impacts

Subsequent development under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans is not expected to result in any direct changes in climate conditions in the North Lake Tahoe area or the larger Basin. While TRPA currently does not have any adopted thresholds or regulations regarding climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, TRPA has been evaluating this issue in recent EIS documents (Colina Village Project Final EIS and the Addendum to the EIS for the Lake Tahoe Shorezone Ordinance Amendments). In addition, TRPA thresholds do indirectly address climate change and greenhouse gas emissions in regards to reducing VMT (AQ-7) as well as restoration of natural conditions in the Tahoe Basin that would provide carbon sequestration opportunities (V-1, V-4, SC-2).
The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but does set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans also propose assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds that would reduce mobile greenhouse gas emissions through the support of the TRPA EIP, which would include improvements to bike trails and sidewalks, expansion of North Shore Trolley service, replacement of TART vehicles, transit operating funds and development of facilities to support water borne transit (see Tables 1 through 4). Redevelopment would also result in the replacement of buildings and structures with more energy efficient structures that could result in a net decrease in greenhouse gas emissions from existing development. Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts related to climate change.

3. Water Quality

Alteration in Drainage Patterns and Rate of Runoff Impacts

While the Proposed Action would result in subsequent development activities that could alter drainage conditions, subsequent development would be subject to land coverage, grading, best management practice (BMP) and development standards and compliance measures in place (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 28 ([Natural Hazard Standards] and 54 [Shorezone Project Findings and Development Standards]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on watershed processes (drainage) in the Tahoe Basin. This includes the provision of BMPs with development projects that are designed to retain or infiltrate runoff from new impervious surfaces. In addition, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans include provisions to further assist the implementation of TRPA EIP projects in the area that include water quality control and improvement features. The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]).

Water Quality Impacts

The Proposed Action would result in subsequent development activities that could alter drainage conditions and introduce pollutants to surface water conditions from construction, urban runoff, snowmelt, and atmospheric deposition. Subsequent redevelopment activities and projects would be subject to water quality, land coverage, grading, best management practice (BMP), development standards and compliance measures in place (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 28 ([Natural Hazard Standards], 54 [Shorezone Project Findings and Development Standards], and 81 [Water Quality Standards]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on water quality. This includes the development and implementation of storm water pollution prevention plans for construction, provision of BMPs with development projects that are designed to treat/capture pollutants and post-project monitoring of the effectiveness of BMPs. In addition, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans include provisions to further assist the implementation of TRPA EIP projects in the area that include water quality control and improvement features and commits to a minimum 20% sediment load of the
computed total sediment load. The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of water quality thresholds (WQ-4, WQ-5 and WQ-6).

**Groundwater Flow and Quality Impacts**

The Proposed Action would result in subsequent development activities that could result in development activities involving the construction of basement features that could potentially impact groundwater flows. Subsequent redevelopment activities and projects would be subject to TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 15.9.C and 64.7.B prohibits excavations in excess of five feet in depth unless certain findings are made that demonstrate that no interference or interception of groundwater would occur. In addition, compliance with water quality development standards and compliance measures described above would ensure that groundwater quality is protected. Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts.

**Water Supply Impacts**

While the Proposed Action would result in subsequent development activities, this development is currently anticipated to consist of re-use of existing development based on the development concepts set forth in the Area Plans and is not expected to result in substantial increases in water demand. TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 27.3 includes requirements that water service be adequate to meet both domestic consumption and fire flow requirements for development, while potentially contaminating activity located within a source water protection zone, roughly equivalent to any area within a 600-foot radius of identified water sources such as wells, lake intakes, and springs, would be required to undergo special review and application of specific BMPs as well as a spill control plan under Chapter 82, Section 83.2.D. Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts.

4. **Vegetation**

**Alteration of Native Vegetation and Habitat/Rare Plant Species Impacts**

Redevelopment activities under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would primarily involve existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and are not expected to result in significant impacts to native vegetation, habitat conditions or rare plant species. Subsequent redevelopment activities and projects would be subject to development standards and compliance measures in place that provide protection and mitigation for vegetation, habitat and rare species (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 65 [Vegetation Protection During Construction], 74 [Vegetation Protection and Management], 75 [Sensitive and Uncommon Plant Protection and Fire Hazard Reduction], and 77 [Revegetation]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on vegetation, habitat and rare species. The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to native vegetation, habitats and rare plant species or impair attainment of vegetation thresholds (V-1 through V-3).
Removal of Native Trees Impacts/Impacts to Old Ecosystems

Redevelopment activities under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would primarily involve existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and are not expected to result in substantial tree loss or any impacts to late seral/old growth ecosystems. However, native tree removal of trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height could still occur. Subsequent redevelopment activities and projects would be subject to the native tree protection and removal requirements under TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 65 [Vegetation Protection During Construction], 71 [Tree Removal], 74 [Vegetation Protection and Management], and 77 [Revegetation]]. These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on native tree resources in the Tahoe Basin. The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to native trees or impair attainment of vegetation thresholds (V-1 through V-4).

5. Wildlife

Wildlife Species (Including Rare Species) Impacts

Redevelopment activities under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would primarily involve existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and are not expected to result in significant impacts to wildlife species. Subsequent redevelopment activities and projects would be subject to development standards and compliance measures in place that provide protection and mitigation for wildlife species (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 65 [Vegetation Protection During Construction], 74 [Vegetation Protection and Management], 77 [Revegetation], 78 [Wildlife Resources]). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to wildlife species or impair attainment of wildlife thresholds (W-1 and W-2).

Fishery Impacts

Redevelopment activities under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would primarily involve existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and are not expected to result in new significant impacts to streams and other fishery habitat areas. Subsequent redevelopment activities and projects would be subject to development standards and compliance measures in place that provide protection and mitigation for fisheries and associated habitat conditions species under TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 79 (Fishery Resources). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to fisheries or impair attainment of thresholds (F-1 through F-4).
6. Noise

Community Noise Equivalent Level Conflict Impacts

The Proposed Action would result in subsequent redevelopment activities in the North Lake Tahoe area that could increase traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and an associated increase in traffic noise levels. The development, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of existing commercial, industrial, retail and residential uses could also introduce new stationary noise sources.

Traffic Noise Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but does set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans also propose assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds through the support of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), which would include improvements to bike trails and sidewalks, expansion of North Shore Trolley service, replacement of TART vehicles, transit operating funds and development of facilities to support water borne transit (see Tables 1 through 4). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans and its associated projects would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds, which includes AQ-7 (reduction in VMT) (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F[6]). Thus, implementation of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans is expected to result in a reduction of vehicle trips ends from 2010 levels. Therefore, the increased traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled would be offset by reductions in total trips by increasing the use of non-auto transportation modes and reducing trip length by increasing density in the urban core areas.

Furthermore, according to the Mobility 2030 Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, demographic and economic changes have caused a decline in traffic volumes in the Tahoe Basin, improving air quality in the Basin. Assuming that basin-wide VMT, vehicle trip and traffic volume continue to decline, the site-specific increases in traffic from redevelopment made possible by the Proposed Action would not be considered significant and associated traffic noise impacts would not be considered significant. Please see the Transportation and Circulation discussion for more information about the decline in traffic volumes in the Basin.

Stationary Noise Impacts

Subsequent development projects and activities under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to be in compliance with the noise standards and provisions in the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 23 (Noise Limitations) as well with project review in compliance with Regional Plan CNEL noise standards associated with noise threshold N-3.

Thus, no significant noise impacts are expected.
Single Event Noise Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans are not expected to result in the establishment of a new land use that would be a source of single event noise (e.g., aircraft, helicopters, snowmobiles, personal watercraft, and off-highway vehicles). However, such uses would be regulated by the single event noise standards provided in Section 23.2 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Thus, no significant noise impacts are expected.

7. Light and Glare

New or Modified Exterior Lighting and Glare Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but set forth development concepts that have the potential introduce new sources of nighttime light and glare. However, development would be subject to lighting and architectural design standards provided in the Tahoe City, Tahoe Vista, Kings Beach, and North Stateline community plans as well as the Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design (see Chapter 4 and 5). These standards include provisions that require minimal use of exterior lighting and shielding of light fixtures and provision of non-glare finishes on building equipment. Thus, no significant light and glare impacts are expected.

8. Land Use

Land Use in Conflict with Adopted Plans and Intensification of Non-Conforming Use Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but set forth development concepts that are intended to be consistent with the Regional Plan, community plans, plan area statements, as well as the anticipated future updated Regional Plan. Thus, no significant land use impacts are expected.

9. Natural Resource

Substantial Increase in Use of Natural Resources or Nonrenewable Resource Impacts

Redevelopment activities under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would involve primarily existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and would not involve a substantial increase of natural resources or nonrenewable resources. Redevelopment activities would make efficient use of existing developed conditions in the North Lake Tahoe area. Thus, no significant natural resource impacts are expected.

10. Risk of Upset

Exposure to Hazardous Material Impacts

Existing land uses and parcels in the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area may contain hazardous materials and/or contamination from historic and current land uses that could be a public health hazard. Subsequent individual project review by TRPA and the Redevelopment Agency will assess the potential for existing contamination and necessary measures to remediate the site.
The transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol (CHP), U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act), and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.). The use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials by developers, contractors, business owners, and others are required to be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations during project construction and operation. Facilities that use hazardous materials are required to obtain permits and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards and regulations designed to avoid hazardous material releases. In addition, subsequent projects that meet the definition of a “Possible Contaminating Activity” under Section 83.2B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances would be required to demonstrate compliance with the findings and requirements under Section 83.2D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and demonstrate that adequate protections are in place to avoid soil and groundwater contamination and protect public health of area residents. Thus, no significant hazardous material exposure impacts are expected.

Emergency Evacuation Plan Conflict Impacts

Redevelopment activities under the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would primarily involve existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and is not expected to result in any conflicts with emergency evacuation plans. Thus, no significant impacts are expected.

11. and 12. Population and Housing

Alteration of Population and Growth Rate Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would result in the redevelopment and improvement of existing residential areas containing cabins, trailers, old motels, apartments and houses. While the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans does not identify any specific redevelopment housing projects, they do set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and affordable workforce housing with a focus on creating concentrated uses that would be and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not propose any request for development allocations. Thus, no significant impacts regarding population or growth rate are expected.

Displacement of Residents and Housing Impacts

As noted above, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would result in the redevelopment and improvement of existing residential areas containing cabins, trailers, old motels, apartments and houses and would not displace residents. While the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment housing projects, they do set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and affordable workforce housing with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. Thus, no significant impacts regarding displacement of residents or housing is expected.
13. Transportation/Circulation

Increase in Daily Vehicle Trip Ends and Impacts to Existing Transportation Systems

The Proposed Action would result in subsequent redevelopment activities in the North Lake Tahoe area that could increase traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The development, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of commercial, industrial, and retail districts would also increase traffic volumes and VMT. Construction activities would also impact transportation and circulation temporarily. Under current TRPA regulatory processes, potential transportation-system capacity issues from localized increases can be mitigated through project design that provides access to public transportation, onsite circulation patterns that minimize VMT, and offsite transportation system improvements where warranted.

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking and reduce the use of vehicles and the need for parking facilities (development would still be subject to parking standards provided in Chapter 12 of the Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design). The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans also propose assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds through the support of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), which would include improvements to bike trails and sidewalks, expansion of North Shore Trolley service, replacement of TART vehicles, transit operating funds and development of facilities to support water borne transit (see Tables 1 through 4). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans and associated projects would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds, which includes AQ-7 (reduction in VMT) (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F[6]). Thus, implementation of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans is expected to result in a reduction of vehicle trips ends from 2010 levels. Therefore, the increased traffic volumes and vehicle miles traveled would be offset by reductions in total trips by increasing the use of non-auto transportation modes and reducing trip length by increasing density in the urban core areas.

Furthermore, according to the Mobility 2030 Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, demographic and economic changes have caused a decline in traffic volumes in the Basin, even while redevelopment projects and other development have taken place. In 2005, Peak Month Traffic Volumes within the Tahoe Region fell 14.6 percent from the highest reported levels recorded in 1986. In 2005, the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume decreased 4.1 percent from the highest reported levels recorded in 1991. North Shore August traffic volumes have decreased by 18 percent from the recorded high in 1986 with AADT declining by 12.6 percent from the recorded high in 1990. As a result of the decrease in traffic volumes, VMT has been estimated to have decreased as well.

Basin-wide vehicle trips and VMT are expected to decline as a result of the continued implementation of trip reduction measures included in TRPA Transportation Plans, which are targeted at reducing the number of trips made by the private automobile. Recent reductions in VMT, vehicle trips and traffic volumes are also attributable to changes in home ownership, gaming economics, employment and redevelopment projects. Assuming that basin-wide VMT, vehicle trip and traffic volumes continue to decline, the site-specific increases in traffic from development made possible by the Proposed Action would not be considered significant.
14. Public Services

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Public Services Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would result in the redevelopment and improvement of existing developed urban areas in the North Lake Tahoe area that currently served by public service providers. While the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment projects, they do include improvements to roadway conditions in the Tahoe Vista and Lake Forest areas (e.g., road pavement restoration, gutter and sidewalk construction) that would benefit public service providers (roadway maintenance, fire protection and law enforcement). The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not propose any request for development allocations that would increase the overall demand for public services in the North Lake Tahoe area. Thus, no significant impacts regarding public services are expected.

15. Energy

Substantial Use or Increase in Energy Demand Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities, redevelopment projects or requests for development allocations, but set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans also propose assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds that would reduce vehicle fuel use through the support of the TRPA EIP, which would include improvements to bike trails and sidewalks, expansion of North Shore Trolley service, replacement of TART vehicles, transit operating funds and development of facilities to support water borne transit (see Tables 1 through 4). Redevelopment would also result in the replacement of buildings and structures with more energy efficient structures that could result in a net decrease in greenhouse gas emissions from existing development. Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts related to energy use.

16. Utilities

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Utilities Impacts

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would result in the redevelopment and improvement of existing developed urban areas in the North Lake Tahoe area that are currently served by existing utilities (water, wastewater, drainage, electrical and natural gas). While the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment projects, they do include drainage and roadway water quality control improvements (see Tables 1 through 4 for TRPA EIP projects) that would improve existing drainage facilities as well as identifies opportunities for improvement of existing dilapidated sewer facilities (e.g., as found in portions of the Kings Beach/Stateline area). The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans does not propose any request for development allocations that would increase the overall demand for utilities in the North Lake Tahoe area. TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 27 (Basic Service Requirement) includes requirements that water, wastewater and electric service be adequate to meet...
demands for subsequent redevelopment projects. Thus, no significant impacts regarding utilities are expected.

17. Human Health

Exposure or Creation of Health Hazard Impacts

The reader is referred to the analysis above under 10 (Risk of Upset).

18. Scenic Resources

Adverse Visual Impacts from Views Along State Highways, Lake Tahoe and Recreation Areas

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities, redevelopment projects or proposes development allocations, but set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses. Portions of the redevelopment areas are visible from SR 267, SR 28, SR 89, Lake Tahoe, public recreation areas, and TRPA designated bicycle trails, and would alter the current appearance of these views. However, subsequent redevelopment activities would be subject to the design standards set forth in the Tahoe City, Tahoe Vista, Kings Beach, and North Stateline community plans, Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design, and TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 50 (The Shorezone). These provisions are intended to improve the existing scenic quality of the Tahoe Basin in manner consistent with attainment of the TRPA scenic resource thresholds (SR-1 through SR-4). The proposed development concepts for North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans include improvements to scenic views of Lake Tahoe (specifically in the Kings Beach area) as well as assistance with TRPA EIP projects to improve visual quality (e.g., EIP Project No. 149 – utility undergrounding).

The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F[6]), and individual redevelopment projects would be evaluated for site-specific scenic impacts.

Conflicts with Height and Design Standards or the Scenic Quality Improvement Program

As noted above, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities, redevelopment projects or proposes development allocations, but set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses. These redevelopment activities would be subject to existing design standards that are intended to improve the existing scenic quality of the Tahoe Basin in manner consistent with attainment of the TRPA scenic resource thresholds (SR-1 through SR-4) and Scenic Quality Improvement Program. While the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do request special height considerations in the Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe Vista, and Tahoe City areas for redevelopment projects that provide affordable housing (as part new provisions under consideration as part of the updated Regional Plan), they do not specifically propose any exceptions or amendments to height standards currently set forth in TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 22 (Height Standards).
The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F(6)), and individual redevelopment projects would be evaluated for site-specific scenic and height impacts.

19. Recreation

Create Additional Demand, Capacity, Conflict or Loss of Recreation Facilities and Opportunities

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would result in the redevelopment and improvement of existing developed urban areas in the North Lake Tahoe area that are currently served by existing recreation facilities, including beach areas, boat launches, and bike trails (e.g., Kings Beach State Recreation Area and Lower Truckee River). The Proposed Action could result in the concentration of residents and visitors in close proximity to existing recreation facilities. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do include assistance in implementing TRPA EIP projects involving recreation improvements (EIP Project No. 287 – Lake Forest Beach Public Access Improvements, 619 – Kings Beach Recreation Area Public Pier, 625 – CTC Secline Beach Improvements, and 10038 – National Ave Tahoe Vista Connection Trail). In addition, the Tahoe Vista Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plan includes the potential use of redevelopment programs to develop suitable residential serving recreational and open space preservation opportunities. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not propose any request for development allocations that would increase the overall demand for recreation in the North Lake Tahoe area.

The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F(6)), and individual redevelopment projects would be evaluated for site-specific recreation impacts.

20. Archaeological/Historical

Adverse Impacts to Archaeological or Historic Sites or Their Use

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would result in the redevelopment and improvement of existing developed urban areas in the North Lake Tahoe area. While impacts to archaeological resources are not expected, there is potential that redevelopment activities could impact historic structures. Chapter 29 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances provides protection measures for archaeological, historic and paleontological resources. In addition, Chapter 64 of the Code of Ordinances at 64.8 provides measures to protect historic resources inadvertently discovered during grading activities.

21. Findings of Significance

Natural Resource and Archaeological/Historical Impacts

As identified under sections 4, 5, and 20 above, implementation of proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans are not expected to result in significant impacts on the environmental associated with vegetation, wildlife, rare plant or wildlife species, archaeological/historical resources, or impair attainment/maintenance of TRPA thresholds. The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of...
Ordinances, Section 15.10.F[6]), and individual redevelopment projects would be evaluated for site-specific impacts.

Achievement of Short-Term Environmental Benefits to the Disadvantage of Long-Term Environmental Goals

The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects, but set forth development concepts that would be based in urbanized areas to promote mixed-use development and the renovation of existing commercial and residential uses with a focus on creating uses that would be concentrated and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking and reduce the use of vehicles. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans also propose assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds through the support of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) (see Tables 1 through 4). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans and its associated projects would be required to demonstrate progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, implementation of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans is expected to result in assistance in meeting long-term environmental goals (TRPA thresholds).

Cumulative Impacts

As noted above, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans do not identify any specific redevelopment activities or redevelopment projects. The proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans also propose assistance in meeting TRPA environmental thresholds through the support of the TRPA EIP that would result in environmental benefits under cumulative conditions (see Tables 1 through 4). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans and associated projects would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, implementation of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans is not expected to result in considerable impacts on the environment.

Environmental Impacts That Result in Adverse Effects on Human Beings

As identified under sections 2, 6, 10, and 13 above, implementation of proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans is not expected to result in significant impacts on the environmental that would result in adverse effects on human beings. Thus, no significant environmental impacts are expected.

IMPACTS OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action alternative, the Redevelopment Agency would not establish the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans for the following communities on or near the north shore of Lake Tahoe: Kings Beach/Stateline; Tahoe Vista; Lake Forest; and, Tahoe City/Gateway. There would be no Code of Ordinance amendments to exempt the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans from the requirement to be located within a community plan area. Redevelopment activities by the Redevelopment Agency would continue to occur in the project area under the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan as required by California redevelopment Law. However, this alternative would not be able to utilize
development incentives provided under Section 15.9 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances regarding land coverage, density, grading, relocation of development and other associated provisions.

1. Land

Land Coverage Impacts

The No Action Alternative would not alter land coverage standards set forth in the TRPA Code of Ordinances under Chapter 20 (Land Coverage) and is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of impervious cover (SC-1) threshold.

Topography and Ground/Soil Stability Impacts

Continued development activities under the No Action Alternative would continue to be subject to land coverage, grading and development standards associated with the regulation of topography and land areas including SEZs (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 28 ([Natural Hazard Standards] and 54 [Shorezone Project Findings and Development Standards] and Placer County grading standards). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on topography, land stability, erosion and water quality in the Tahoe Basin. Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of impervious cover (SC-1) or SEZ (SC-2) thresholds. However, the No Action Alternative would not provide development incentives provided under Section 15.9 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances regarding land coverage or additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects as compared to the Proposed Action.

2. Air Quality

Substantial Air Pollutant Emissions and Deterioration of Ambient Air Quality Impacts

Mobile Emissions

According to the Mobility 2030 Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, demographic and economic changes have caused a decline in traffic volumes in the Tahoe Basin, improving air quality in the Basin. Assuming that basin-wide VMT, vehicle trip and traffic volumes continue to decline, continued development activities under the No Action Alternative would not be considered significant and associated air quality impacts would not be considered significant. Nonetheless, air quality mitigation fees for new vehicle trips related with new housing projects would be collected by TRPA to mitigate air quality impacts (see TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 93 [Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program]). However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects related to air quality and VMT as compared to the Proposed Action.

Stationary Emissions

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to current development standards and compliance measures in place (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 91 [Air Quality Control] and 93 [Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on air quality and include such measures as payment of air quality mitigation fees and emission standards for new wood stoves.
Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of air quality thresholds.

**Objectionable Odor Impacts**

All development would be subject to Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rule 205 (Nuisance) that prohibits any discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause to have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts related to odors.

**Alteration of Air Movement or Change in Climate Impacts**

Continue development under the No Action Alternative would result in the replacement of buildings and structures with more energy efficient structures that could result in a net decrease in greenhouse gas emissions from existing development. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts related to climate change.

### 3. Water Quality

**Alteration in Drainage Patterns and Rate of Runoff Impacts**

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to land coverage, grading, best management practice (BMP) and development standards and compliance measures in place (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 28 ([Natural Hazard Standards] and 54 [Shorezone Project Findings and Development Standards]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on watershed processes (drainage) in the Tahoe Basin. This includes the provision of BMPs with development projects that are designed to retain or infiltrate runoff from new impervious surfaces. However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects related to runoff and water quality as compared to the Proposed Action.

**Water Quality Impacts**

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to water quality, land coverage, grading, best management practice (BMP), development standards and compliance measures in place (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 25 [Best Management Practice Requirements], 28 ([Natural Hazard Standards], 54 [Shorezone Project Findings and Development Standards], and 81 [Water Quality Standards]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on water quality. This includes the development and implementation of storm water pollution prevention plans for construction, provision of BMPs with development projects that are designed to treat/capture pollutants and post-project monitoring of the effectiveness of BMPs. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts or impair attainment of water quality thresholds (WQ-4, WQ-5 and WQ-6). However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects related to runoff and water quality as compared to the Proposed Action.
Groundwater Flow and Quality Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 15.9.C and 64.7.B prohibits excavations in excess of five feet in depth unless certain findings are made that demonstrate that no interference or interception of groundwater would occur. In addition, compliance with water quality development standards and compliance measures described above under item “e” would ensure that groundwater quality is protected. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts.

Water Supply Impacts

TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 27.3 includes requirements that water service be adequate to meet both domestic consumption and fire flow requirements for development, while potentially contaminating activity located within a source water protection zone, roughly equivalent to any area within a 600-foot radius of identified water sources such as wells, lake intakes, and springs, would be required to undergo special review and application of specific BMPs as well as a spill control plan under Chapter 82, Section 83.2.D. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts.

4. Vegetation

Alteration of Native Vegetation and Habitat/Rare Plant Species Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to development standards and compliance measures in place that provide protection and mitigation for vegetation, habitat and rare species (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 20 [Land Coverage], 65 [Vegetation Protection During Construction], 74 [Vegetation Protection and Management], 75 [Sensitive and Uncommon Plant Protection and Fire Hazard Reduction], and 77 [Revegetation]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on vegetation, habitat and rare species. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to native vegetation, habitats and rare plant species or impair attainment of vegetation thresholds (V-1 through V-3).

Removal of Native Trees Impacts/Impacts to Old Ecosystems

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to the native tree protection and removal requirements under TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 65 [Vegetation Protection During Construction], 71 [Tree Removal], 74 [Vegetation Protection and Management], and 77 [Revegetation]). These compliance measures are designed to mitigate the adverse effects of development on native tree resources in the Tahoe Basin. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to native trees or impair attainment of vegetation thresholds (V-1 through V-4).

5. Wildlife

Wildlife Species (Including Rare Species) Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to development standards and compliance measures in place that provide protection and mitigation for wildlife species (e.g., TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 65 [Vegetation Protection During
Construction], 74 [Vegetation Protection and Management], 77 [Revegetation], 78 [Wildlife Resources]). Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to wildlife species or impair attainment of wildlife thresholds (W-1 and W-2).

Fishery Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to development standards and compliance measures in place that provide protection and mitigation for fisheries and associated habitat conditions species under TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 79 (Fishery Resources). The North Lake Tahoe Final Redevelopment Area Plans would be required to demonstrate in progress in attainment and maintenance of TRPA environmental thresholds (see TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 15.10.F [6]). Thus, the Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts to fisheries or impair attainment of thresholds (F-1 through F-4).

6. Noise

Community Noise Equivalent Level Conflict Impacts

Traffic Noise Impacts

According to the Mobility 2030 Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, demographic and economic changes have caused a decline in traffic volumes in the Tahoe Basin, improving air quality in the Basin. Assuming that basin-wide VMT, vehicle trip and traffic volumes continue to decline, continued development activities under the No Action Alternative would not be considered significant and associated traffic noise impacts would not be considered significant. Please see the Transportation and Circulation discussion for more information about the decline in traffic volumes in the Basin. However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects related to VMT as compared to the Proposed Action.

Stationary Noise Impacts

Subsequent development projects and activities under the No Action Alternative would be required to be in compliance with the noise standards and provisions in the TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 23 (Noise Limitations) as well as project review in compliance with Regional Plan CNEL noise standards associated with noise threshold N-3. Thus, no significant noise impacts are expected.

Single Event Noise Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be regulated by the single event noise standards provided in Section 23.2 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Thus, no significant noise impacts are expected.

7. Light and Glare

New or Modified Exterior Lighting and Glare Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to lighting and architectural design standards provided in the Tahoe City, Tahoe Vista, Kings Beach, and North Stateline community plans as well as the Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage,
Parking and Design (see Chapter 4 and 5). These standards include the provisions that require minimal use of exterior lighting and shielding of light fixtures and provision of non-glare finishes on building equipment. Thus, no significant light and glare impacts are expected.

8. Land Use

Land Use in Conflict with Adopted Plans and Intensification of Non-Conforming Use Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to the Regional Plan, community plans, plan area statements, as well as the anticipated future updated Regional Plan. Thus, no significant land use impacts are expected.

9. Natural Resource

Substantial Increase in Use of Natural Resources or Nonrenewable Resource Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would involve primarily existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and would not involve substantial increase of natural resources or nonrenewable resources. Redevelopment activities would make efficient use of existing developed conditions in the North Lake Tahoe area. Thus, no significant natural resource impacts are expected.

10. Risk of Upset

Exposure to Hazardous Material Impacts

Existing land uses and parcels in the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area may contain hazardous materials and/or contamination from historic and current land uses that could be a public health hazard. Subsequent individual project review by TRPA and the Redevelopment Agency will assess the potential for existing contamination and necessary measures to remediate the site.

The transportation of hazardous materials on area roadways is regulated by the California Highway Patrol (CHP), U.S. Department of Transportation (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act), and Caltrans. Use of these materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.). The use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials by developers, contractors, business owners, and others are required to be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations during project construction and operation. Facilities that use hazardous materials are required to obtain permits and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards and regulations designed to avoid hazardous material releases. In addition, development projects that meet the definition of a “Possible Contaminating Activity” under Section 83.2B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances would be required to demonstrate compliance with the findings and requirements under Section 83.2D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and demonstrate that adequate protections are in place to avoid soil and groundwater contamination and protect public health of area residents. Thus, no significant hazardous material exposure impacts are expected.
Emergency Evacuation Plan Conflict Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would involve primarily existing developed areas in the North Lake Tahoe area and is not expected to result in any conflicts with emergency evacuation plans. Thus, no significant impacts are expected.

11. and 12. Population and Housing

Alteration of Population and Growth Rate Impacts

The No Action Alternative does not propose any request for development allocations. Thus, no significant impacts regarding population or growth rate are expected.

Displacement of Residents and Housing Impacts

The No Action Alternative does not propose any request for development allocations. Thus, no significant impacts regarding displacement of residents are expected.

13. Transportation/Circulation

Increase in Daily Vehicle Trip Ends and Impacts to Existing Transportation Systems

According to the Mobility 2030 Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, demographic and economic changes have caused a decline in traffic volumes in the Basin, even while redevelopment projects and other development have taken place. In 2005, Peak Month Traffic Volumes within the Tahoe Region fell 14.6 percent from the highest reported levels recorded in 1986. In 2005, the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume decreased 4.1 percent from the highest reported levels recorded in 1991. North Shore August traffic volumes have decreased by 18 percent from the recorded high in 1986 with AADT declining by 12.6 percent from the recorded high in 1990. As a result of the decrease in traffic volumes, VMT has been estimated to have decreased as well.

Basin-wide vehicle trips and VMT are expected to decline as a result of the continued implementation of trip reduction measures included in TRPA Transportation Plans, which are targeted at reducing the number of trips made by the private automobile. Recent reductions in VMT, vehicle trips and traffic volumes are also attributable to changes in home ownership, gaming economics, employment and redevelopment projects. Assuming that basin-wide VMT, vehicle trip and traffic volumes continue to decline, continued development activities under the No Action Alternative would not be considered significant. However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects related to VMT as compared to the Proposed Action.

14. Public Services

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Public Services Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would occur in existing developed urban areas in the North Lake Tahoe area that are currently served by public service providers. The No Action Alternative does not propose any request for development allocations that would increase the overall demand for public services in the North Lake Tahoe area. Thus, no significant impacts regarding public services are expected. However, this alternative includes
no provisions for improvement of roadways and drainage facilities as compared to the Proposed Action.

15. Energy

Substantial Use or Increase in Energy Demand Impacts

Continue development under the No Action Alternative would result in the replacement of buildings and structures with more energy efficient structures that could result in a net decrease in greenhouse gas emissions from existing development. Thus, the No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts related to energy use. However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects related to VMT reductions that would assist in reduced vehicle fuel usage as compared to the Proposed Action.

16. Utilities

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Utilities Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would occur in existing developed urban areas in the North Lake Tahoe area that are currently served by existing utilities (water, wastewater, drainage, electrical and natural gas). TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 27 (Basic Service Requirement) includes requirements that water, wastewater and electric service be adequate to meet demands for subsequent redevelopment projects. Thus, no significant impacts regarding utilities are expected. However, this alternative would not provide assistance in further improvement of existing infrastructure facilities as compared to the Proposed Action.

17. Human Health

Exposure or Creation of Health Hazard Impacts

The reader is referred to the analysis above under 10 (Risk of Upset).

18. Scenic Resources

Adverse Visual Impacts from Views Along State Highways, Lake Tahoe and Recreation Areas

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to the design standards set forth in the Tahoe City, Tahoe Vista, Kings Beach, and North Stateline community plans, Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design, and TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 50 (The Shorezone). These provisions are intended to improve the existing scenic quality of the Tahoe Basin in manner consistent with attainment of the TRPA scenic resource thresholds (SR-1 through SR-4). However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation TRPA EIP projects related to scenic resources as compared to the Proposed Action.

Conflicts with Height and Design Standards or the Scenic Quality Improvement Program

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to existing design standards that are intended to improve the existing scenic quality of the Tahoe Basin in manner consistent with attainment of the TRPA scenic resource thresholds (SR-1 through SR-4).
19. Recreation

Create Additional Demand, Capacity, Conflict or Loss of Recreation Facilities and Opportunities

The No Action Alternative does not propose any request for development allocations that would increase the overall demand for recreation in the North Lake Tahoe area. However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation of TRPA EIP projects related to recreation as compared to the Proposed Action.

20. Archaeological/Historical

Adverse Impacts to Archaeological or Historic Sites or Their Use

Chapter 29 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances provides protection measures for archaeological, historic and paleontological resources. In addition, Chapter 64 of the Code of Ordinances at 64.8 provides measures to protect historic resources inadvertently discovered during grading activities. Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to these requirements.

21. Findings of Significance

Natural Resource and Archaeological/Historical Impacts

As identified under sections 4, 5, and 20 above, implementation of No Action Alternative is not expected to result in significant impacts on the environmental associated with vegetation, wildlife, rare plant or wildlife species, archeological/historical resources, or impair attainment/maintenance of TRPA thresholds.

Achievement of Short-Term Environmental Benefits to the Disadvantage of Long-Term Environmental Goals

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to TRPA requirements and standards that are intended to protect the environment and assist in the attainment of TRPA thresholds. However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation of TRPA EIP projects related to recreation as compared to the Proposed Action.

Cumulative Impacts

Continued development under the No Action Alternative would be subject to TRPA requirements and standards that are intended to protect the environment and assist in the attainment of TRPA thresholds and improve future environment conditions in the Tahoe Basin. However, this alternative would not provide additional assistance in implementation of TRPA EIP projects related to recreation as compared to the Proposed Action.

Environmental Impacts That Result in Adverse Effects on Human Beings

As identified under sections 2, 6, 10, and 13 above, implementation of No Action Alternative are not expected to result in significant impacts on the environmental that would result in adverse effects on human beings. Thus, no significant environmental impacts are expected.
IMPARTS OF THE MODIFIED ALTERNATIVE

Under the Modified Project alternative, the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans would be modified to be consistent with the current TRPA community plan boundaries. As a result, the redevelopment areas for Kings Beach/Stateline would be reduced to 300 acres, Tahoe Vista would be reduced to 15 acres, and Tahoe/City Gateway would be reduced to 130 acres. Under this alternative, the Lake Forest Redevelopment Area Plan would be eliminated.

Under the Modified Project Alternative, approximately 445 acres would receive focused attention and utilize development incentives provided under Section 15.9 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances to reverse deteriorating trends, upgrade public facilities, rehabilitate and add to the housing stock, and contribute to TRPA EIP projects. The impact conclusions for the Proposed Action environmental analysis provided above would be largely similar for the Modified Project Alternative. However, the following conclusions are made for this alternative:

- This alternative would be consistent with the requirements of Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances in regards to the establishment of a redevelopment plans consistent with community plan boundaries and would not require an amendment to this chapter.

- Given that the redevelopment area would be reduced under this alternative, approximately 470 fewer acres would not receive the benefits of this plan and would likely limit the success of redevelopment of these areas as well as the ability to further assist in the implementation of TRPA EIP projects in the Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe Vista, and Tahoe City areas.

- This alternative would not include roadway improvements in the Tahoe Vista and Lake Forest areas and would not provide further assistance in the implementation of TRPA EIP projects 649/436 (Snow Creek Wetlands Restoration), 748 (Four Corners Bikeway Summit to Tahoe Vista Recreation Trail), and 10038 (National Avenue Tahoe Vista Connection Trail).
The following Checklist documents the potential environmental impacts of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Land</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet deep?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion, including natural littoral processes, which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposal result in:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substantial air pollutant</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emissions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Deterioration of ambient</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(existing) air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The creation of objectionable</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Alteration of air movement,</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moisture or temperature, or any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change in climate, either locally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or regionally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Increased use of diesel fuel?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposal result in:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Changes in currents, or the</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course or direction of water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Changes in absorption rates,</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drainage patterns, or the rate and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of surface water runoff so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that a 20 yr. 1 hr. storm runoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(approximately 1 inch per hour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot be contained on the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alterations to the course or</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flow of 100-year flood waters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Change in the amount of surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water in any water body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discharge into surface waters,</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or in any alteration of surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water quality, including but not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited to temperature, dissolved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxygen or turbidity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Alteration of the direction or</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of flow of groundwater?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Vegetation

**Will the proposal result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, microflora and aquatic plants)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Removal of streambank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA’s Conservation or Recreation land use classifications?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Wildlife**

**Will the proposal result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians or microfauna)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Noise
Will the proposal result in:

a. Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan?

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

c. Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?

7. Light and Glare
Will the proposal:

a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?

b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?

c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off-site or onto public lands?

d. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?

8. Land Use
Will the proposal:

a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?

b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Natural Resources</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Risk of Upset</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Population</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Housing</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region historically or currently being rented at rates affordable by lower and very-low-income households?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Transportation/Circulation

Will the proposal result in:

a. Generation of 100 or more new daily vehicle trip ends (DVTE)?          | X   |

b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?     |     | X  |

c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities? |     | X  |

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

e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?                        | X   |

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

14. Public Services

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

a. Fire protection?                                                       | X   |

b. Police protection?                                                     | X   |

c. Schools?                                                               | X   |

d. Parks or other recreational facilities?                                 | X   |
### Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other governmental services?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 15. Energy

**Will the proposal result in:**

| a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy? | X  |                     |                   |
| b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy? | X  |                     |                   |

#### 16. Utilities

**Except for planned improvements,**

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

| a. Power or natural gas? | X  |                     |                   |
| b. Communication systems? | X  |                     |                   |
| c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider? | X  |                     |                   |
| d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider? | X  |                     |                   |
| e. Storm water drainage? | X  |                     |                   |
| f. Solid waste and disposal? | X  |                     |                   |

#### 17. Human Health

**Will the proposal result in:**

<p>| a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)? | X  |                     |                   |
| b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards? | X  |                     |                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Scenic Resources/Community Design</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will the proposal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Be visible from any state or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federal highway, Pioneer Trail or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Lake Tahoe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Be visible from any public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation area or TRPA designated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle trail?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Block or modify an existing view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seen from a public road or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be inconsistent with the height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and design standards required by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicable ordinance or Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Quality Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the proposal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Create additional demand for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create additional recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have the potential to create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflicts between recreation uses,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either existing or proposed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in a decrease or loss of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public access to any lake, waterway,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or public lands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Environmental Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Archaeological/Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure, object or building?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is the proposed project located on a property with any known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or sites or persons?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacred uses within the potential impact area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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