TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on August 10, 2005, at the North Tahoe Conference Center located at 8318 North Lake Blvd., Kings Beach, CA. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

August 3, 2005

[Signature]
John Singlaub
Executive Director
AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

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

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

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Scoping of the Tahoe Vista Resort & Affordable Housing Project Joint Environmental Assessment (TRPA) and Environmental Impact Report (Placer County) (20 minutes)

B. Amendment of the boundary between PAS 151, Glenridge and PAS 153, Sugar Pine Point to correct an original mapping boundary error, and other matters properly relating thereto; (15 minutes)

C. Public Hearing to Receive Public Comment on the Adequacy of the Shorezone Draft EIS Alternative #6 Supplement; a Density Based Approach (90 minutes)

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Election of New Advisory Planning Commission Chairman

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director
B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Called to order at 9:30 am

Members Present: Mr. Cole, Mr. Combs, Mr. Romsos for Ms. Davidson, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Mr. Harper for Ms. Krause, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Lohman, Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Bovat for Ms. Moss, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Riley, Ms. Schmidt, Mr. Tolhurst

Members Absent: Mr. Harris, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Porta

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Cole moved to approve the agenda.
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Jamin moved to approve the minutes.
Motion carried.
Mr. Jepson and Mr. Harper abstained.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Amendment to Plan Area Statements: 100, Truckee Marsh; 126, Pope Beach; 127, Camp Richardson; and 128, Baldwin Beach to add "Transmission and Receiving Facilities" under permissible public service uses, and other matters properly relating thereto

Staff member Peter Eichar presented the plan area statement amendment.
No Public Comment

Mr. Jepsen moved to approve the amendment to Plan Area Statements: 100, 126, 127 and 128 to add Transmission and Receiving Facilities under permissible public service uses.
Motion carried unanimously.

B. Certification by Resolution of the City of South Lake Tahoe’s Local Government Moderate Income Housing Plan

Staff member Peter Eichar presented the resolution certifying the City of South Lake Tahoe’s Local Government Moderate Income Housing Plan.

No Public Comment

Mr. Cole moved to certify the resolution.

Motion carried.

Mr. Combs abstained.

C. Certification by Resolution of the Placer County’s Local Government Moderate Income Housing Plan

Staff member Peter Eichar presented the resolution certifying Placer County’s Local Government Moderate Income Housing Plan.

Public Comment:

Sue Abrams, representing Abrams Realty, stated that is the scale that is used to determine what happens to the value of the property reviewed once every 10 years?

Rae James, Deputy Director Redevelopment Placer County, stated that the agency has a restricted covenant in place and restricted it to 45 years. Now the property will be reviewed every year.

Ms. Moss moved to certify the resolution.

Motion carried unanimously.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

Notice of Circulation (NOC) and Overview of Shorezone Draft EIS Alternative #6 Supplement; a Density Based Approach

Staff member Coleen Shade presented an overview of the Shorezone Draft EIS Alternative 6.

Public Comment:

Mr. Yount commented on Alternative 6.
Mr. Midkiff commented on Alternative 6.
VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

John Singlaub, Executive Director, gave the Executive Director’s Report.

B. Legal Counsel

Jordan Kahn, Assistant Agency Counsel, stated that the new Agency Counsel, Joanne Marchetta will be starting on July 18.

C. APC Members

Mr. Tolhurst asked for a copy of the Agency organizational chart to be mailed to the APC members.

Mr. Harper stated that he will be sitting in for Mr. Galloway at the Governing Board.

Ms. Schmidt stated that NRCS has received $500,000 from the Southern Nevada funding and they are anticipating another $1.2M and will go toward the BMP Retrofit program, single family residential. They are going to try to focus on more toward getting installations done on the ground.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Lohman adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Nikkel
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

August 2, 2005

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Brenda Hunt, Associate Planner II, Environmental Review Services
       Melissa Shaw, Senior Planner, Environmental Review Services

Subject: Scoping of Environmental Assessment, Tahoe Vista Interval Ownership and Affordable Housing Project, Placer County, APN: 117-071-29, TRPA File No. 20041266

Proposed Action: No formal action is proposed for this item at this time. Staff is requesting comments from the members of the Advisory Planning Commission and the public at large on the scope and content of a joint TRPA Environmental Assessment (EA) / Placer County Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a proposed project that includes 45 timeshare/Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs) and 10 affordable housing units for employees.

Project Description: The project proposes 55 total units on 6.19 acres located adjacent to State Route 28 (North Lake Boulevard), across from a public beach (Sandy Beach) on Lake Tahoe. The site currently contains a mix of commercial and recreational facilities including a 27 unit Recreational Vehicle Park, and historical tent camping facilities. The applicant’s are proposing to remove the campground/recreational vehicle park and to redevelop this site to contain 45-timeshare units/TAUs and 10 affordable/employee housing units. A clubhouse with a pool and deck will also be added to serve the new facilities. Community Plan improvements, a bike trail easement, interpretive signage for historic buildings and water quality improvements are proposed to be completed with the project. The project originally proposed to remove 409 of the 486 trees over 6 inches in diameter. All trees over 30 inches in diameter were proposed to be protected. During the processing of this application, the applicant applied and received a TRPA tree removal permit dated December 16, 2004 which allowed the removal of 198 trees for forest health and tree hazard reasons. See Exhibit A for existing and proposed site plans and elevations.

Site Description: The 6.19 acre project area is owned by Tahoe Vista Partner’s, Inc. and is located along State Route 28 in the Tahoe Vista Community Plan area. The project area has 275 linear feet of frontage on SR 28 and is visible from both the Scenic Roadway Unit 20A-Tahoe Vista and Scenic Shoreline Unit 21-Agate Bay. The project is across from the public beach known as “Sandy Beach”. The surrounding uses are predominately tourist accommodation and commercial. At the time the initial application was received, the site contained 486 trees over 6 inches in diameter. The site currently
contains commercial buildings (including Spindleshanks Restaurant), associated driveways and parking facilities and a camping resort called, “Sandy Beach” that historically has provided approximately 35 camping/tent sites and 27 RV hook-up facilities. These numbers will be confirmed and analyzed during the EA/EIR process. TRPA has verified 174,324 square feet of land coverage. No water quality best management practices have been installed to date.

Scope of Environmental Assessment: The proposed scope of the joint TRPA EA/Placer County EIR is included within the original Request for Proposal (RFP) attached as Exhibit B. The Executive Director, in accordance with Section 5.3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Section 6.5 of the Rules of Procedure, has established that the Initial Environmental Checklist completed for this project did not contain sufficient information to determine whether the project will have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, an EA shall be prepared and processed according to the above rules. Exhibit C provides the relevant Code and Rules of Procedure sections that outline the requirements for the preparation, processing and analysis of an Environmental Assessment.

An RFP (Exhibit B) was prepared and EDAW, Inc. was chosen through the interview process. A four-way contract agreement between the TRPA, Placer County, EDAW, and the applicant is in the process of being finalized. The applicant will be covering the expenses for the preparation of the EA/EIR.

TRPA will be the lead agency for the EA. Staff has chosen to bring this item before the Advisory Planning Commission to obtain substantive comments on the scope of work for the project from both the APC and the general public. Comments received from the APC and the general public will be thoughtfully considered for incorporation into the scope of the document.

If you have any questions or comment regarding this agenda item, please contact Brenda Hunt and/or Melissa Shaw at (775) 588-4547. You may also wish to contact Allen Breuch at Placer County to discuss the EIR component of this project. If you wish to comment in writing, please send comments to:

Brenda Hunt  
Melissa Shaw  
Environmental Review Services  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

To Prepare an Environmental Assessment For the Proposed Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC – Interval Ownership Resort and Affordable Housing Project

Background

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and Placer County, California are seeking proposals from qualified professionals to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) under the TRPA Code of Ordinances and an EIR under Placer County/California Environmental Quality Act for the proposed Tahoe Vista Partners project. The proposed 10-unit affordable housing multi-family and 45-unit tourist accommodation/interval ownership project is located at 6673 North Lake Boulevard in Placer County, California and lies within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The environmental document is proposed to be an EA for TRPA, that will also address Placer County issues as noted in the Initial Study. The document must meet the substantive and procedural requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact as set forth in TRPA’s Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedure as well as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Potential candidates will be individuals with experience and knowledge in applying an interdisciplinary approach to preparation of an environmental assessment that meets the requirements consisting of environmental planning, environmental impact assessment, the TRPA Regional Plan, applicable Community Plans, the Environmental Impact Reports for these plans and the Placer County zoning ordinance.

The task of the consultant will be to provide a complete and objective assessment of the environmental issues identified in the outline prepared for the Tahoe Vista Partners project EA (see attached Exhibit A). TRPA staff will administer the contract and pay all consultant fees via a four-party contract with TRPA, Placer County, the project proponent and the selected consultant. The project proponent will ultimately be responsible for EA preparation costs.

The focus of this environmental assessment is to analyze impacts and develop potential alternatives for the proposed tourist accommodation and multi-family development project. Potential alternatives to be encompassed by this EA include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. No Action.
2. Proposed 10 unit employee and affordable housing units and 45 tourist accommodation unit (TAU) project.
3. Mixed use project emphasizing commercial and recreational with the TAU use.
4. Full tourist accommodation build-out density with no affordable (employee) housing.
5. Reduced tourist accommodation build-out density.

Potential candidates will be firms comprised of professional individuals with experience and knowledge in applying an interdisciplinary approach to preparation of an environmental assessment that meets the requirements as identified above.
Date of Announcement: April 25, 2005

Deadline for Submittal of Complete Proposal: May 25, 2005

Address All Letters and Proposals as follows:

Sue Dehnan
Executive Assistant
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
Telephone: 775-588-4547
Facsimile: 775-588-4527

Scope of the Project

See Exhibit A for a proposed outline. Substantial information has already been developed and will be available to the consultant for their use. The final scope will be developed in concert with TRPA and Placer County staff, and the project proponent. The consultant will be responsible for all aspects of EA preparation, including but not limited to:

- Developing conceptual site plans for proposed alternatives
- Evaluating prepared studies and determining need for additional studies
- Conducting additional studies
- Researching best available Best Management Practice technology
- Identifying and evaluating mitigations to reduce impacts to less than significant levels
- Identifying indirect and cumulative impacts
- Developing a mitigation monitoring plan
- Preparing the administrative draft, draft and final EA
- Responding to comments received on administrative and draft EA
- Participating in public hearings and community meetings.

Proposal Contents

1. **Definition of the Project**: Indicate your understanding of the project objectives.

2. **Project Approach**: Provide a general description of the approach you would take to achieve of the project objectives, and the content and format of Draft and Final Documents. This description should also include some discussion regarding how response to comments will be handled.

3. **Work Program**: Describe each major task to be performed, including key methodologies and techniques to be used.

4. **Project Management and Key Personnel**: Indicate the proposed management structure and organization, including the qualifications and relevant experience of all key persons, including subcontractors, who will be working on the project.

5. **Schedule and Costs**: Include a specific schedule for each major task. Include an overall budget for the entire project which is broken down by task. The consultant will be
required to attend and make presentations at a number of public meetings, meet with the various agency staff to remain current on relevant issues associated with the project, and to evaluate progress on and adequacy of the document.

6. **Qualifications:** State your firm’s qualifications, including those of any subconsultant. List relevant and recent prior projects and clients. Emphasis should be placed on experience preparing environmental documents.

7. **Number of Proposals:** Provide ten (10) copies of your proposal.

**Notification and Selection Process**

The selection process will be completed within thirty (30) days of the proposal deadline.

The process for selecting the consultant is as follows:

1. All proposals will be initially screened to determine level of knowledge, experience and qualifications. Qualified consultants and/or consultant teams will have educational backgrounds and experience in the following disciplines: hydrology and water quality; scenic quality; soils; wildlife; fisheries; cultural, historic and ethnographic resources; land use planning; urban design; housing; vegetation and forestry; transportation and traffic circulation; recreation issues; and air quality.

2. Evaluation of the applicants determined to have the desired qualifications and experience will be completed utilizing the following criteria:

   A. Experience in the evaluation of water quality impacts and the development of mitigations involving proposed TAU and affordable housing project.

   B. Knowledge and experience of watershed and wetland functions including hydrology, soils, and biology.

   C. Knowledge and understanding of nutrient cycling, soil microbiology, and soil structure characteristics, in relation to nutrient and water holding capacity of soils.

   D. Knowledge of best available Best Management Practice technology application and effectiveness.

   E. Current involvement in related programs which would compliment and/or augment the outcome of this project.

   F. Demonstrated ability to identify and evaluate indirect effects and cumulative impacts resulting from proposed development projects.

   G. Experience with and understanding of the TRPA Regional Plan, the North Tahoe Regional Plan, the Tahoe Vista Community Plan, the Environmental Impact Reports for these plans, the applicable Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design and the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.
H. Knowledge of the Housing Element of the Placer County General Plan and experience in the evaluation and analysis of multi-unit affordable housing projects.

I. Knowledge of Placer County and TRPA Recreational Element of the Regional Plan and the Code of Ordinances allocation system.

J. Demonstrated ability to complete work tasks within time and budget limitations.

K. Demonstrated ability to prepare a required report in a timely manner.

3. On the basis of the evaluation, TRPA and Placer County may invite up to three qualified applicants for a presentation/interview. The interview, if required, would take place during the week of June 1, 2005. The interview would include, but not be limited to, presentation of the applicants' previous related experience, questions relating to qualifications and related experience, understanding of the project, and background/experience of the people who will be performing the work.

4. The consultant selected will be notified and asked to submit a draft contract to TRPA and Placer County based on the RFP, and the consultant's proposal for services. TRPA and Placer County reserve the right to reduce the scope of the study relative to costs or other pertinent circumstances. Should the applicant, TRPA and Placer County be unable to come to agreeable terms, TRPA and Placer County reserve the right to disqualify an applicant and to make a new selection or reissue this RFP.

General Provisions

1. **Nondiscrimination by the Consultant.** The Consultant represents and agrees that the Consultant, its affiliates, subsidiaries, or holding companies do not and will not discriminate against any subcontractor, consultant, employee, or applicant for employment because of race, color, sex, handicap, or national origin. Such nondiscrimination shall include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion, transfers, recruitment, recruitment advertising, layoff, termination, rates of pay, or other forms of compensation, and selection for training, including apprenticeship.

2. **Right to Employ Other Consultants.** TRPA and Placer County reserve the right to employ other consultants.

3. **Conflicts of Interest.**

   A. The Consultant may be subject to the provisions of Article III(a)(5) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, Cal Gov't code Section 66801, N.R. S. 277.200), which requires disclosure of any defined economic interest and prohibits such persons from attempting to influence Agency decisions affecting certain economic interests.

   B. The Consultant may be subject to the provisions of the California Political Reform Act of 1974 (The "Act"), that (1) requires such persons to disclose financial interests that may be material affected by the work performed under
this Agreement, and (2) prohibits such persons from making or participating in making decisions that will financially affect such interests.

C. If subject to the Compact or the Act, the Consultant shall conform to all requirements of the Compact or the Act, as required. Failure to do so constitutes a material breach and is grounds for termination by the Agreement by TRPA and Placer County.

4. **Consultant Agreement.** A sample Consultant Services Agreement (contract) is available upon request. The agreement is subject to change or negotiation.
Outline for Tahoe Vista Partners, LLC Interval Ownership Resort and Affordable Housing
Environmental Assessment

I. SUMMARY (Including Brief Project Description, Project History, Alternatives, Impact and Mitigation Summary Tables)

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS
Contents
List of Tables
List of Figures

III. CHAPTER ONE – PURPOSE AND NEED
1.1 Introduction
1.2 Project Description and Background
1.3 Purpose, Need and Scope of EA
1.4 Environmental Setting/Project Area Description
1.5 Organization of the EA
1.6 Required Permits and Approval Process

IV. CHAPTER TWO – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES
2.1 Summary: Proposed Project and Alternatives
2.2 Alternatives Considered but Rejected from Further Consideration
2.3 Alternative One: No Action
2.4 Alternative Two: Proposed 10 unit affordable housing units and 45 tourist accommodation unit (TAU) project
2.5 Alternative Three: Mixed use project emphasizing commercial, recreational/bike trail/camping using PAOTs (Persons At One Time) and TAU (Tourists Accommodation Units) uses.
2.6 Alternative Four: Full Density Tourist Accommodation Alternative with no affordable housing
2.7 Alternative Five: Reduced Tourist Accommodation Density Alternative

V. CHAPTER THREE – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
3.1 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

VI. CHAPTER FOUR – THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (BY ALTERNATIVE)
4.1 Recreation Impacts
4.1.1 Affected Environment
4.1.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
4.1.2.1 Loss of Campground
4.1.2.2 Incorporation of Regional Bike Trail Connection
4.1.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
4.1.3.1 Impact Description
4.1.3.2 Analysis
4.1.3.3 Mitigation

4.2 Land Coverage, Soils, Geology, Vegetation Protection & Grading
4.2.1 Affected Environment
4.2.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
4.2.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
4.2.3.1 Impact Description
4.2.3.2 Analysis
4.2.3.3 Mitigation

4.3 Hydrology, Water Quality, Soil Contamination (Previous Gas Station Use), Irrigation & Fertilizer Management
   4.3.1 Affected Environment
   4.3.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
   4.3.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
      4.2.3.1 Impact Description
      4.2.3.2 Analysis
      4.2.3.3 Mitigation

4.3 Biological (Wildlife, Vegetation, Tree Removal, Habitat Loss and Forest Health)
   4.3.1 Affected Environment
   4.3.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
   4.3.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
      4.3.3.1 Impact Description
      4.3.3.2 Analysis
      4.3.3.3 Mitigation

4.4 Transportation and Circulation (Motorized, Pedestrian & Bicycle)
   4.4.1 Affected Environment
   4.4.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
   4.4.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
      4.4.3.1 Impact Description
      4.4.3.2 Analysis
      4.4.3.3 Mitigation

4.5 Public Services, Utilities, Health and Emergency Hazards
   4.5.1 Affected Environment
   4.5.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
   4.5.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
      4.5.3.1 Impact Description
      4.5.3.2 Analysis
      4.5.3.3 Mitigation

4.6 Cultural and Historic Resources
   4.6.1 Affected Environment
   4.6.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
   4.6.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
      4.6.3.1 Impact Description
      4.6.3.2 Analysis
      4.6.3.3 Mitigation

4.7 Scenic Quality
   4.7.1 Affected Environment
   4.7.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
   4.7.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
      4.7.3.1 Impact Description
4.7.3.2 Analysis
4.7.3.3 Mitigation

4.8 Land Use, Population and Housing, and Allocation of Development including Project Funding, Monitoring and Compliance
4.8.1 Affected Environment
4.8.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria (including mixed-use density evaluation)
4.8.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
   4.8.3.1 Impact Description
   4.8.3.2 Analysis
   4.8.3.3 Mitigation

4.9 Natural Resources (Mineral & Energy)
4.9.1 Affected Environment
4.9.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
4.9.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
   4.9.3.1 Impact Description
   4.9.3.2 Analysis
   4.9.3.3 Mitigation

4.10 Air Quality (Including Dust Control) and Noise Impacts
4.10.1 Affected Environment
4.10.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
4.10.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
   4.10.3.1 Impact Description
   4.10.3.2 Analysis
   4.10.3.3 Mitigation

4.11 Community Plan Consistency and Improvements
4.11.1 Affected Environment
4.11.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
4.11.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
   4.11.3.1 Impact Description
   4.11.3.2 Analysis
   4.11.3.3 Mitigation

4.10 Project Design Issues (Fire Safety, Aesthetics, Lighting, Landscaping)
4.10.1 Affected Environment
4.10.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
4.10.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
   4.10.3.1 Impact Description
   4.10.3.2 Analysis
   4.10.3.3 Mitigation

4.11 Effectiveness of Proposed Mitigation Measures

4.12 Mitigation Monitoring Plan

4.14 Short Term Uses and Long Term Productivity
4.15 Significant Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

4.16 Other Potential Impacts Identified During Scoping of EA
   4.16.1 Affected Environment
   4.16.2 Impact Evaluation Criteria
   4.16.3 Environmental Consequences and Recommended Mitigation
      4.16.3.1 Impact Description
      4.16.3.2 Analysis
      4.16.3.3 Mitigation

VII. CHAPTER FIVE - Cumulative Impacts, Indirect Effects and Growth – Inducing Impacts.
   5.1 Cumulative Impacts of Chapter IV Issues.
   5.2 The cumulative impact analysis of multiple external development projects within the region as anticipated/not anticipated by the Tahoe Vista Community Plan and the North Tahoe Community Plans EIS/EIR, the Regional Bike Path, including traffic impacts of Tonopolo, Cedar Grove, Tahoe Sands and other proposed projects.

VII. CHAPTER SIX – SUMMARY
   6.1 Less Than Significant Impacts
   6.2 Avoidable Significant Impacts
   6.3 Unavoidable Impacts that can be Mitigated
   6.4 Unavoidable Impacts that cannot be Mitigated
   6.5 Comparison of the Alternatives (in Table and Discussion Format)
   6.6 Compliance with TRPA Environmental Thresholds, Regional Plan and Lake Tahoe Water Quality Management Plan (208 Plan)
   6.7 Required Findings

VIII. CHAPTER SEVEN – DOCUMENT PREPARATION
    7.1 References Cited
    7.2 Agencies and Individuals Consulted
    7.3 List of Contributors

IX. TECHNICAL APPENDICES
    Supporting Documents
    Comments Received During Circulation of Draft EA
(2) The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

(3) The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this Chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

5.3 Environmental Assessments: If TRPA determines the IEC will not provide sufficient information to make the findings in Subsection 5.2.B, TRPA shall require the preparation of an environmental assessment in lieu of an initial environmental checklist.

5.3.A Environmental Assessments: Environmental assessments shall contain the following elements:

(1) A brief discussion of the need for the project;

(2) Alternatives to the proposed project;

(3) A discussion of the environmental impacts of proposed project and the alternatives; and

(4) A list of agencies and persons consulted.

5.3.B Findings: Based on the information contained in the environmental assessment, and other information known to TRPA, TRPA shall make one of the findings listed under Subsection 5.2.B and take the action prescribed in the applicable finding.

5.4 Availability Of Environmental Assessments: TRPA shall make environmental assessments available for public review not less than five working days before TRPA intends to take action on the project.

5.5 Activities And Projects Exempt From Preparation Of Environmental Impact Statement: Article VII(f) of the Compact, requires TRPA to adopt by ordinance a list of classes of projects which TRPA has determined will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore will be exempt from the requirement for the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

5.5.A Projects Exempt From Preparation Of Environmental Impact Statement: The following projects are exempt from preparation of an EIS and other environmental documents:

(1) Construction of single family houses and additions and accessory structures thereto, in compliance with the provisions of the Code.

(2) Changes in use consisting of minor increases in vehicle trips (See Chapter 93).
(b) IECs shall be completed for projects and matters in accordance with Subsection 5.2.A of the Code.

(c) When completed, the IEC shall be reviewed by TRPA to determine the adequacy and objectivity of the responses. When appropriate, TRPA shall consult informally with federal, state, or local agencies with jurisdiction over the project or with special expertise on applicable environmental impacts.

6.5 Environmental Assessment (EA): The Executive Director may determine that the IEC will not provide sufficient information to determine whether a project or matter will have a significant effect and shall then require preparation of an environmental assessment (EA) or an EIS. The Executive Director also may require an EA in accordance with specific provisions of the Code. See Section 5.3 of the Code.

(a) EAs shall be prepared and processed in accordance with Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the Code and as set forth in these Rules.

(b) The Executive Director shall determine the scope of EAs, in conjunction with Subsection 5.3.A of the Code and, when appropriate, in consultation with federal, state, or local agencies with jurisdiction or special expertise with respect to the project or matter under consideration. The scope of an EA shall include, but not be limited to:

(1) Range of alternatives to be considered;
(2) Effects to be analyzed;
(3) Agencies and persons to be consulted; and
(4) Mitigation measures to be considered.

(c) Adequacy of an EA shall be determined based on the following factors:

(1) Compliance with Chapter 5 of the Code;
(2) Sufficiency of analysis; and
(3) Reasonableness of evaluation.

(d) The Executive Director may determine, based on the scope or complexity of the EA, that it is appropriate to present the EA to the APC and request a recommendation from APC as to the adequacy of the EA.

(e) Based on the EA, and other information known to TRPA, TRPA shall make one of the findings, as appropriate, set forth in Subsection 5.2.B of the Code.
August 3, 2005

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of the boundary between PAS 151 Glenridge, and PAS 153 Sugar Pine Point, to correct an original mapping boundary error, and other matters properly relating thereto.

Proposed Action: Staff initiated Map Amendment, to amend the boundary of Plan Area Statements (PAS) 151 and 153, to incorporate two outlying single-family residential parcels with existing residences, into PAS 151 Glenridge, a residential PAS. Refer to Attachment A for the location map.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the Advisory Planning Commission recommend to the Governing Board, to approve the proposed boundary amendment of PAS 151 and 153, to incorporate two privately owned residential parcels into PAS 151.

Background: During the drafting of the PAS Maps, for reasons unknown, the base maps did not identify two outlying single-family residential parcels (APNs 016-531-15 and 016-531-16) adjacent to the northwestern boundary of the Glenridge Park Unit No. 1 Subdivision (See Attachment A). Both parcels are located outside of the Glenridge Subdivision boundary, at the end of Northridge Drive. Consequently, when the PAS maps were adopted as part of the 1987 Regional Plan, these two parcels were not included as part of PAS 151 Glenridge, a residential PAS. Both parcels are currently located in PAS 153 Sugar Pine Point, a recreation PAS, which allows employee housing as the only residential permissible use. Therefore, the single-family residential use of these parcels is considered non-conforming.

Plan Designation information pertaining to PAS 151 Glenridge, includes residential as the land use designation, mitigation as the management strategy, and scenic restoration as the special designation. PAS 151 allows single-family dwellings as an allowed use, at a density of one unit per parcel. See Attachment B for PAS 151.

Both parcels are included on the Amended Map for the Glenridge Park Unit No. 1 Subdivision, with an El Dorado County Recorder’s Certificate date of November 2, 1967. Parcel 15 is 10,018 square feet, and has a two story, 1,800 square foot single-family residence that was constructed in 1978. Parcel 16 is 10,454 square feet, and has a two story, 1,536 square foot single-family residence that was constructed in 1979. Both parcels have been issued additional County development permits for the dwellings, which qualifies the parcels as being legally created in accordance with El Dorado County and Subdivision Map Act standards.
The parcels are located at the top of a ridgeline, overlooking Sugar Pine Point State Park to the north, and U.S. Forest Service land to the south. The dominant overstory vegetation within the parcels is White fir, Incense cedar, and Jeffrey pine, and the dominant understory vegetation is manzanita. The parcels are surrounded by tall mature conifer trees, and due to the topographic location are not visible from a scenic corridor, recreation area, or bikeway. The land capability of the parcels is mapped as Class 1a, with steep slopes on the north and south sides of the parcels. See Attachment A for surrounding land uses.

Discussion: During the original drafting of the PAS maps as explained above, the parcels were unintentionally excluded from PAS 151 as a mapping error. The proposed map amendment serves to amend the boundary of PAS 151 and 153, to incorporate the two residential parcels into PAS 151 Glenridge, a residential PAS. The project serves to bring into conformance the residential use of these parcels as a permissible use within PAS 151. Other than the described PAS boundary amendment, the project does not require any other amendments to PAS 151 and 153.

Expanding the boundary of PAS 151 to incorporate the two residential parcels will result in expansion of the urban boundary. However, the dwellings of both parcels already receive water, sewer, electrical, and telephone services, including propane tank installation. Therefore, no additional utility services are expected as a result of the project.

The project serves to correct a PAS mapping error, which occurred at the time of adoption of the TRPA PAS Maps. As explained in the Background Section, the original PAS base maps erroneously did not identify the two residential parcels, which were known to exist at the time of adoption of the PAS maps, which satisfies provision (a) of the required Chapter 13 Findings to expand the urban boundary. The amendment will achieve consistency with the permissible uses of PAS 151 and 153.

Effect on TRPA Staff Work Program:

The project is not expected to generate an additional amount of staff work, beyond the potential and reasonable residential use of the parcels.

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

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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

   Rationale: The residential use of the parcels is considered non-conforming in PAS 153, and is therefore inconsistent with the Regional Plan. Both parcels already have existing residential uses, and the project is not expected to result in a greater intensification of use within the parcels. Incorporating the parcels into PAS 151 will bring the residential use of these
parcels into conformance as an allowed use. Therefore, the proposed boundary amendment is expected to achieve consistency with PAS 151, the environmental thresholds, and all provisions of the Regional Plan. The proposed map amendment will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan.

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

Rationale: The residential use of the parcels is currently non-conforming within PAS 153. The project is intended to achieve consistency with the permissible uses of PAS 151 and 153, which will therefore achieve consistency with all provisions of the Regional Plan, including the achievement and maintenance of the environmental thresholds. Therefore, the project is not expected to have potential to exceed the environmental thresholds. See Finding 1 for further discussion.

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

Rationale: The project is not expected to generate air or water quality impacts, or have potential to exceed applicable standards for the region. Further, any future projects within PAS 151 and 153 subsequent to this action, must comply with all applicable water and air quality standards. See Finding 1 for further explanation.

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

Rationale: See Findings 1 and 2.

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

Rationale: See Finding 1 and 2.

B. Chapter 13 Findings:

1. Finding: Prior to adopting any plan area amendment, TRPA must find the amendment is substantially consistent with the plan area designation criteria in Subsection 13.5.B and 13.5.C.
Rationale: The land use classification of PAS 151 Glenridge, is residential, and the management strategy is mitigation. The residential uses of the two outlying parcels are consistent with these Plan Designations and the existing residential uses of PAS 151. Further, the proposed map amendment will ensure the appropriate management of these parcels in accordance with the provisions of PAS 151.

The special designation for PAS 151 is scenic restoration, which indicates that highway or shoreline units in the plan area are not in compliance with the Scenic Threshold rating. The two residential parcels proposed to be incorporated into PAS 151 are not located within close proximity to Highway 89 or the shoreline.

The proposed map amendment is expected to be substantially consistent with the plan area designation criteria of PAS 151, and Subsections 13.5.B. and 13.5.C. of TRPA Code.

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

(a) The amendment is to correct an error, which occurred at the time of adoption, including but not limited to a mapping error, an editing error, or an error based on erroneous information; or

(b) The amendment is to enable TRPA to make progress toward one or more environmental thresholds without degradation to other thresholds as measured by the Chapter 32 indicators; or

(c) The amendment is needed to protect public health and safety and there is no reasonable alternative.

Rationale: The project satisfies provision (a) above by correcting a PAS mapping error, which occurred at the time of adoption of the TRPA PAS Maps. As explained in the Background Section, the original PAS base maps erroneously did not identify the two residential parcels, which were known to exist at the time of adoption of the PAS maps.

Since the residential uses of the parcels are non-conforming in PAS 153, the proposed map amendment will rectify the non-conforming uses by incorporating the parcels into PAS 151, which authorizes single-family residential uses as an allowed permissible use. The project serves to achieve consistency with the provisions of PAS 151 and 153.
Environmental Documentation: An Initial Environmental Checklist was prepared for the project, which did not identify any significant impacts.

Please contact Jason Ramos at (775) 588-4547, if you have any questions regarding this agenda item.

Attachments: Attachment A Map of Proposed PAS Boundary Amendment
Attachment B PAS 151 Glenridge
151
GLENRIDGE

PLAN DESIGNATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Strategy</td>
<td>MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Designation</td>
<td>SCENIC RESTORATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION:

Location: The Glenridge area is a small area on the lake's west shore bounded on the north by Sugar Pine Point State Park and on the south by USFS land at Meeks Bay. This area is located on TRPA map D-13.

Existing Uses: The Glenridge Plan Area is a residential subdivision with a density of one single family dwelling per parcel. A church also exists in the unit. The Plan Area is currently 50 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The Glenridge is comprised of approximately 70 percent high hazard lands with remainder being moderate hazard. All the remaining undeveloped parcels within this area are located in the high hazard areas. As suggested by the amount of high hazard lands, the roads are characterized by numerous high and steep-cut and fill slopes. Impervious coverage totals about ten percent plus an additional 20 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: Glenridge should remain residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Subdivision improvements do not meet minimal BMP standards.
2. The county contracts its services in this area.
3. Scenic Roadway Units 7 and 8 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 10 are within this Plan Area.
4. There is a current litigation settlement that affects the Glenridge Subdivision.

SPECIAL POLICIES: No special policies.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td>Single family dwelling (A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Service</strong></td>
<td>Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (A), and local post offices (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation</strong></td>
<td>Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), and beach recreation (A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Management</strong></td>
<td>Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment/management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shorezone:** Within the specified shorezone tolerance district, the following primary uses may be permitted in the backshore, nearshore, and foreshore. Accessory structures shall be regulated pursuant to the regulations applicable to the primary use upon which they are dependent in accordance with Chapter 18. The following structures may be permitted in the shorezone as an allowed (A) or special (S) use only if they are accessory to an existing, allowed use located on the same or adjoining littoral parcel.

**Tolerance District 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Uses</th>
<th>Beach recreation (A), recreational boating (A), safety and navigational devices (A), and salvage operations (A).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Structures</td>
<td>Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tolerance District 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Uses</th>
<th>Safety and navigational facilities (A), and salvage operation (A).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Structures</td>
<td>Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MAXIMUM DENSITIES:** Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 89 corridor is 55 CNEL.

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

- **SUMMER DAY USES** 0 PAOT
- **WINTER DAY USES** 0 PAOT
- **OVERNIGHT USES** 0 PAOT

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS:** The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan and Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) for this area shall be implemented.⁶

---

⁶ Amended 5/22/02
MEMORANDUM

August 3, 2005

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Public Hearing to Receive Comment on the Adequacy of the Shorezone Draft EIS Alternative #6 Supplement; a Density Based Approach

Proposed Action: Staff is not proposing an action item, but is requesting that the Advisory Planning Commission open this item for public comment on the adequacy of the Draft Shorezone EIS Alternative #6 Supplement; A Density Based Approach.

Background: TRPA began commencing a 60-day circulation and comment period on the Draft Shorezone EIS Alternative #6 Supplement on July 5, 2005. The comment period ends September 2, 2005. This is a draft supplemental document to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Lake Tahoe Shorezone Ordinance Amendments issued July 2004. This supplemental document analyzes an additional strategy for Shorezone Ordinances for Lake Tahoe, and other lakes and lagoons of the Lake Tahoe Region and evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed ordinance amendments. Alternative #6, a density approach to shorezone development, is substantially different from the original Alternative #5 in the DEIS released July 2004, therefore additional analysis, public review, and comment are required.

During the comment period staff has presented Alternative #6 in a number of public forums. Two of those included the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) on July 13th, 2005 and to the Governing Board on July 27th, 2005.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Coleen Shade at 775•588•4547, or via email at cshade@trpa.org, if you have any comments regarding this item.