NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 14, 2007, at the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, located at 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on Thursday, November 15, 2007, commencing at 10:30 a.m., at the TRPA Offices, located at 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV, the TRPA Governing Board Catastrophic Wildfire Prevention Committee will meet. The agenda will be as follows: 1) Public Interest Comments; 2) Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Defensible Space and BMPs; 3) Discussion on Stream Environment Zone Treatments; 4) Discussion and Possible Action on Funding for Prevention of Catastrophic Wildfire; 5) Member Comments; (Committee: Chair – Swobe, Vice Chair - Kranz, Galloway, McDermid, Santiago, Ruthe, Weber, Merrill)

John Singlaub
Executive Director
All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item not listed on the agenda may do so at this time. Public comment on Public Hearing 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. Amendment to Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal to increase the diameter limit on trees requiring a permit for removal from 6 inches dbh to 14 inches dbh and other related amendments.  Page 1-10


VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Presentation on TMDL Results  Page 45

B. Status Report on Scope of Work Plan Alternatives for Regional Plan Update EIS  Page 47-48

C. Community Enhancement Program Update on Pre-application Proposals and Public Meetings  Page 49-50

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER
Called to order at 9:35 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Breuch, Mr. Harris, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Kuchnicki for Ms. Sertic Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Mauer, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Riley, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Upton, Mr. Zuckerman

Members Absent: Ms. Krause, Mr. McIntyre

Mr. Morhouse for Ms. Schmidt arrived 9:45

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Agenda Approved as Submitted

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS
No Public Comment

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES – May
Ms. Kemper moved approval as amended
Motion carried.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS
A. Public Hearing to amend the Stateline/Ski Run community Plan, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, California, modifying District 5b boundary to include Assessors Parcel Number 027-313-09.

Staff Member Neil Crescenti presented the proposed boundary change of Assessors Parcel Number 027-313-09 from District 3b to District 5b to accommodate a future residential design time-share project currently allowed in District 5b. The staff requests the APC recommend to the Governing Board the approval of the amendment.

Discussion regarding concern over the opinion of the neighbors followed. The amendment was noticed as required and the applicant of the future project has
approached the surrounding businesses and neighbors; none expressed opposition to the proposed boundary change.

Mr. Tolhurst Opens Public Comment

None Heard

Mr. Tolhurst Closed Public Comment

Mr. Upton makes motion as recommended in the Staff Report
Mr. Rieley seconds
Motion Carries

VI. PLANNING MATTER

A. Staff member Brenda Hunt presented an update on the progression of the Community Enhancement Program, previously known as the Demonstration Program. Focusing on mixed use projects not including Industrial Community Plan Areas, building on Chapter 33 in the Code of Ordinances for Special Projects. The program is set to launch next Thursday accompanied by a press release. The developer will have ninety days to submit an application after the project launch date then the selection process will begin.

Discussion on CFA limits, length of application and approval process, developer incentives, areas where interested developers are located, cost sharing and quantifiable benefits of proposed projects. General support for the RFP coming out on Thursday was expressed.

Mr. Tolhurst Opens Public Comment

None Heard

Mr. Tolhurst Closed Public Comment

VIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Angora Fire Update

Mr. Singlaub: TRPA has been extremely active in the forest fuels reduction area and are proud of the work we have done over the years. I was surprised at the hits TRPA has been taken in the press. I would like to provide you an update on the efforts being made in light of this tragedy.

Staff member Steve Chilton summarized the fire origins, fire movement, fire suppression efforts, rehabilitation response, and suppression effects team focusing on treatment and rehabilitation of the burn area.

Staff member Lyn Barnett summarized the efforts of TRPA and El Dorado County to streamline the permit process for private property owners’ efforts to rebuild, the TRPA
disaster code allowing property owners’ to rebuild, and the efforts to find and share plans and property information to determine what existed before the fire.

Forest Service representative Terri Maceron provided information on the fire status, ongoing fire suppression efforts, forest land closures for safety and resource protection, there three phases of rehabilitation (fire suppression rehabilitation, emergency burn area rehabilitation, and long term rehabilitation). The final report will be available on the Forest Service Website.

NRCS representative Jane Schmidt summarized the potential risk for flash flooding, continued safety of residence still living in area, other water shed dangers, erosion rates and recovery efforts.

Nevada Firesafe Counsel representative John Pickett discussed the risk of another fire, vegetation for home protection, fire resistant building materials and defensible space.

Lahoton representative Lori Kemper summarized agency coordination, defensible space, forest practice rules, timber waiver and the contents of the timber waiver, and debris removal.

B. Legal Counsel

No Report

C. APC Members

Mr. Upton: We need to focus on the lessons learned from the fire and use these lessons for future planning and what can we do to protect what we have left.

Mr. Zuckerman and Mr. Jepson: Thank you for the through report on the fire.

Ms. Jamin: I know this is a difficult time, thank you John for your professionalism.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Adjourned at 1:15p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Sandoval
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tape of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 589-5243. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
I. CALL TO ORDER

Called to order at 9:35 a.m.

Members Present: Members Present: Mr. Breuch, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Lafere, Mr. Mauer, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Riley, Mr. Kuchnicki for Ms. Sertic, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Upton, Mr. Zuckerman

Members Absent: Mr. Harris, Ms. Krause,

Ms. Schmidt arrives 9:45
Ms. Kemper arrives 10:08

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda Approved as Submitted

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No Public Comment

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

To be presented at the next regularly scheduled APC meeting

V. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Notice of preparation and scoping hearing for the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the Tahoe Sands Time Share Project, 6610 North Lake Blvd., Placer County, California, assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 117-071-05, TRPA File Number 20070389STD

Staff member David Landry presented introduction to the Tahoe Sands Time Share project replacing existing hotel units with 103 new time share units with 6 employee housing units totaling 107 units on 5 parcels totaling 7.5 acres located on the north and south side of Highway 28. Areas needing further study are outlined in Attachment “A” which includes areas that have either a possible impact or insufficient data. No alternatives were presented at the time of the staff summary however the proponent is will to discuss alternatives at the time of their presentation.
Mr. Tolhurst expressed concerns over the affordable housing component.

Mr. Zuckerman expressed concerns over the lack of mitigation measures in the report.

Mr. Landry: Mitigation measures will be part of the final report.

Jim Porter of Porter Simon, the project attorney, introduced the project representatives. Representing Tahoe Sands: Tom Williams, Teri Martin, Robert Wordhaur, and Jeff Rose. The Design Team: Matt Hansen and Lydia Altech. The project’s Civil Engineer Tim Ferrell. On behalf of the projects representatives we endorse the Staff Report and contents of the EIR/EIS.

Matt Hansen presented a brief video showing the conceptual design of the project.

Lydia Altech addressing the alternative requirement. Three alternatives will be included in the final report. The alternatives will include a no touch alternative leaving the property as it exists today, the project as submitted and an alternative with fewer units.

Mr. Tolhurst: How many units will the third alternative will have.

Ms. Altech: The final number of the units in that alternative has not been determined.

Mr. Upton: Has the existing motel been converted into a timeshare?

Ms. Altech: Yes the current units are used as a timeshare with 2500 owners.

Mr. Landry: In order for the NOP to move forward we would need to have a definitive answer on density.

Mr. Hansen: We have an ownership that needs x number of units to survive. We can propose another project with 18 less units. We have purchased 18 TAU’s, we need those 18 TAU’s to meet the minimum number of units to keep the project alive. We will remove these 18 TAU’s as the third alternative. With out those units the project is at a dead end.

Mr. Tolhurst: If the project can not go forward with out those units that is something we need to understand. These are the issues that need to be reflected in the report. These are the things we need to understand.

Mr. Hansen: This is where our inexperience in the process is showing. We will comply with the requirement to show an alternative with fewer units.

Mr. Upton: Mr. Chairman is there any rule that states the third alternative needs to have fewer units?

Mr. Tolhurst: We are used to seeing one with more and one with less. In any case we need to see more than just the proposed alternative.
Ms. Joann: Based on scoping comments the best project can be chosen based on all the facts. There is not hard and fast rule you need to present one larger and one smaller.

Mr. McIntyre: Placer County has lost around 3000 permanent fulltime residence. Based on this, I would ask for more units rather than less. Placer County has lost workforce, I would like to see more employee housing and am surprised to see only 6 workforce housing units. I know Placer County has not finalized workforce housing requirements and is negotiating this on a per project basis.

Mr. Breuch: Placer County has in the general plan that projects of this size provide fifty percent of employee housing for new employees.

Mr. McIntyre: I have no problem increasing the size of this project to provide for additional workforce housing. We have 2500 people who come up to use this property and Lake Tahoe as their playground and no one to serve them. I would like to see this project and future projects meet the workforce housing requirements. I’m not asking only this project to provide workforce housing however we need to stick to our gun in regards to workforce housing.

Mr. Maurer: Are any of these units currently occupied by full time residence? Is there an increase in units or does the number of units remain the same?

Mr. Hansen: The property currently has two workforce housing units. The number of units as well as the size of the units increases with the project. The size of the two bedroom unit will increase from 550 square feet to about 900 square feet in keeping with current industry standards.

Mr. Singlaub: Please clarify the number of units. There are currently 47 lake side units and 19 mountain side units which equal 66 however it states here there are currently 67 units. The proposed project is 76 lakeside unites and 33 mountain units which comes to the 109 is that correct?

Ms. Altech: We are proposing 76 lake side and 33 mountain side units including the workforce housing units. Currently there are 46 plus one residential lakeside units and 18 plus one residential unit mountain side.

Mr. Hansen: There are 64 existing TAU’s the two residential units were not included in the count.

Mr. Singlaub: You have secured the additional TAU’s needed for the project.

Mr. Hansen: We have entered into a purchase for all but 18 of the TAU’s needed.

Mr. Tolhurst: You are thinking you will be offering the employee housing units as low income units?

Ms. Altech: Two will be low income and two will be moderate income. These will be deed restricted through the County.
Mr. Zuckerman: I don’t think you need a lower impact or lower unit project. I would like to corroborate with what Mr. McIntyre stated. I would like to add you will have a mitigation vehicle by reducing the number of vehicle trips with the affordable housing units.

Mr. Breuch: You have done an outstanding job with community outreach it is important to continue that through out this process. I would like to ask about the public access easement issues. There is an easement to the south of the proposed project.

Mr. Hansen: All 2500 owners would have to change there deed to allow/accept public access. We don’t see that happening. There are parcels across the street that do have existing easement access through our property. We will not be nor can we remove those. I really can’t speak to this since this is a legal issue.

Mr. Landry: You will find some material in front of you addressing the easement issue.

Ms. Joann: I was not aware of this letter or easement issue until late yesterday. We can take this as a scoping comment and adjust the project based on the impact the easement issue has on the project.

Ms. Kemper: I don’t know the legal ramification of the time share but could this be part of the package.

Mr. Rose: It is quantified in the property description at the time of sale

Mr. Hansen: This can be written in for new owner however we would still need to get permission from the 2500 existing owners.

Mr. Upton: Is the current project designed reflecting the current easements and legal rights.

Mr. Hansen: From our point of view, yes.

Ms. Jamin: Do the employee housing units meet Placer County’s fifty percent requirement? Were the designation of low income and moderate income units based on employees projected salaries?

Ms. Altech: Yes, they do meet Placer County’s requirement. The designation of low income and moderate income came at the suggestion of Placer County.

Ms. Jamin: Do you anticipate these units will be occupied by employees of the project or will they be open to anyone?

Ms. Altech: We anticipate units will be occupied by employees.

Mr. Hansen: Employees will have first choice and we anticipate they will take it.

Mr. Lawrance: When looking at cumulative traffic impacts will you be looking at all anticipated projects in the area?
Mr. Hansen: As part of this EIR/EIS process we feel that has to happen.

Mr. Kuchnicki: I'm assuming this will result in an increase in coverage.

Mr. Hansen: No, we will not exceed the grandfathered coverage.

Mr. Zuckerman: Can you comment on the large amount of grass coverage.

Mr. Hansen: Currently there is a ball field which is unique to the area. We want it to remain as part of the proposed project although it will be reconfigured. Overall turf will decrease; there will be more evergreens as well as a dune to prevent large amounts of sand blowing off the beach area.

Mr. Zuckerman: If you moved some of the buildings around you could provide covered parking decreasing run off and increasing your ball field area.

Mr. Hansen: The current configuration is a cumulative result of public input from the community and neighbors.

Mr. Tolhurst: Opens Public comment

None Heard

Mr. Tolhurst Closes Public Comment

Mr. Tolhurst: Could you explain how with only one parking space per car you plan on meeting parking demands.

Mr. Hansen: Using historic data and current parking usage determined the calculated number of needed parking space.

Mr. Tolhurst: I would like to see that spelled out in hard numbers in the document.

Mr. Breuch: Placer County's current adopted ordinance for timeshare parking states one parking space per unit not bedrooms.

Mr. Upton: When not full is this used as a hotel?

Mr. Hansen: The property is currently rents unoccupied units as a hotel however we anticipate this continuing.

Mr. Upton: Do we have enough information to go forward?

Ms. Marchetta: I have not had an opportunity to evaluate this project in its entirety however believe there is enough information to go forward. We can incorporate all necessary detail into the draft document and take comments at that time.

Mr. McIntyre: Do you have your own private transportation for your owners to local attraction and the ski resorts.
Mr. Rose: I have teamed up with the local trolley service as a stop as well as a public bus stop. No private bus service is currently planned.

Mr. Maurer: Under the land discussion the proposed mitigation mentions to do a study and should be included in the report not as a future study. High ground water issues should be addressed. Under 4c a mitigation measure is mentioned but not named.

Mr. Kuchnicki: High water and lawn area are a concern for me due to water quality.

Mr. Lawrence: Uncomfortable with lack of specifics

Mr. Zuckerman: I am satisfied staff has identified all the areas of concern and am ready to make a motion to move forward.

Mr. Zuckerman Motion: Recommend to executive director taking into account the comments to move forward with the proposed joint EIR/EIS.
Mr. Riley second
Mr. Lawrence opposed
Motion carries

B. Report on the Proposed Lake Tahoe Management System

Staff member Shane Ramsos introduction of Jeremy Sokulsky representing Environmental Incentives

Mr. Sokulsky presented a model of proposed Adaptive Management System developed through the Pathway 2007 process. Designed to apply continual improvement by utilizing a plan, due, check method and an active adaptive management system by means of human practices to drive the science in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of management decisions and policy changes.

Mr. McIntyre and Ms. Kemper expresses concern over funding and the availability of an independent funding mechanism and the history of funding issues related to past efforts.

Mr. Poppoff and Mr. Upton are concerned the process has the potential to become overly complicated ending in a series of meetings with out much success in an outcome. In order for all this to work this needs to have a defined management system rather then a group of committees.

Mr. Barrett comments on the current system we are using today. We are using a version of this system today we just need to do it better.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Recommendation to Governing Board on a Resolution Issuing the 2006 Threshold Evaluation Report and Adopting the Amended Compliance Forms
(Targets, Indicators, Compliance Measures, Attainment Schedules and Related Items) Pursuant to Chapter 32 of the Code of Ordinances.

Staff member Ted Thayer presented the summary of the process of the origin of the changes, a summary of the proposed changes, and the background summary of the changes. Summary of current attainment status to date was also presented. Staff requests recommendation to the Governing Board for adoption of the Threshold Evaluation Report and Amended Compliance Forms.

Mr. McIntyre expresses concern over the lake clarity in light of the disaster year.

Mr. Poppoff believes improvement indication is premature based on tributary obtainment determination.

Staff member Larry Benoit clarifies the number is based on a monthly average.

Ms. Kemper summarizes Lahoton's stand and future monitoring of the tributaries and streams and questions the comments of a street sweeping program mentioned in the report. Wood smoke and dissolved nitrogen concentration language needs to be stronger in the report.

Staff member Charles Emmett clarifies there is no basin wide street sweeping program and reason for the wording and deletions associated with the wood smoke and nitrogen concentration.

Ms. Kemper requests clarification in the street sweeping statements as well as stronger language for the wood smoke and nitrogen concentration in the report. Would also like more clarification in the SEZ restoration number.

Mr. Breuch would like clarification on air quality monitoring location plans and how each jurisdiction will fund these locations or funding options.

Mr. Emmett summarized the air quality monitoring station plan for entire basin monitoring protocols, appropriate placement and number of stations required to make our findings.

Mr. Bruech would like more clarification on the IPES program and re-evaluations.

Staff member Phil Sholes summarizes the is an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of IPES as the new soil survey is ready to be adopted and bringing the IPES scores in line with the Bailey System.

Ms. Jamin would like clarification on VMT.

Mr. Emmett states the VMT (vehicle miles traveled) is changing based on number of second home ownership. Supplemental measures will be kept in place incase we need them; there is no need to trigger them at this moment however we can clean up the language to reflect this.

Mr. Tolhurst Opens Public comment
Carl Young representing League to Save Lake Tahoe has some issues with language and clarification already discussed by the board. We will provide those in written form to the Board.

Jennifer Merchant Placer County we do stand behind the Report however have a few concerns. We are unsure how a threshold will encourage travel patterns in regards to the VMT Threshold. We are in favor of making improvements to monitoring, we are required to meet the same goals yet remain unclassified. We do have issue with the funding for this monitoring program since we remain unclassified we do not have access to the funds allocated by the state. There are no recommendations to changing the calculations that place our IPES scores higher than they should be. The IPES continues to be a sore spot with us and we will continue to work with staff on this issue.

Mr. Tolhurst Closes Public Comment

Mr. Singlaub: Any additional changes made as a result of the comments made here today will not be a part of this Boards recommendations when this report is presented to the Governing Board.

Ms. Kemper Motion to Recommend the Governing Board Approve the Report Taking into Account all the Comments made Today.
Mr. McIntyre second
Motion carries

B. Recommendation to Governing Board on an Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality Mitigation and Amendment to Chapter 93, Water Quality Mitigation Program. To raise the mitigation fee to reflect increased cost of construction.

Staff Member Rita Whitney presents Mitigation fees summary and justification.

Mr. Tolhurst Opens Public Comment

None Herd

Mr. Tolhurst Closes Public Comment

Ms. Kemper: Motion to Recommend to the Governing Board to Adopt the Cost Increase as Presented in the Staff Summary.
Mr. Riely second
Motion Carries


Staff member John Hitchcock presents the NOP for the Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed changes and implementation outlining the process and timeline for completion. Eight elements of improvement have been identified through the Pathway 2007 and public workshop process finding ways to accelerate threshold attainment, revitalization of urban cores, enhance housing
opportunities, restoration of sensitive areas, transportation, improve forest health, increase recreation opportunities, and improve agency collaboration and project implementation. No action required from the Board on this item, comments from the APC and public are requested to help formation of the final document.

Mr. McIntyre: Pleased regarding discussion of play space in this forum. I’m concerned about a needs assessment regarding workforce and affordable housing. What seems to be missing is an exemption from allocation for a minimum of 120 percent workforce housing. We need to have the ability for people to work and live here. I’m asking for a comprehensive needs assessment to address this issue. I do not believe you currently have the information needed.

Mr. Singlaub: We do know and understand the need we will work with the local jurisdictions to provide incentives for these programs.

Mr. McIntyre: Are you willing to change Allocation system as needed to compensate for proven needs.

Mr. Singlaub: Our biggest problem is the unwillingness of local jurisdictions to allow affordable housing projects. Everyone wants and understands the need however every one says not in my neighborhood. In answer to your question yes we will change the pools as needed.

Mr. Upton: The other piece of this is the incentives are not strong enough. We were unable to meet the housing criteria in the area of moderate housing. We need to see the few multi-family buildable lots built as concentrated as we can. We need to be sure the incentives are strong enough to make something happen.

Mr. Singlaub: Limiting the amount of second homes and vacation rentals is a local jurisdiction will. There is not a shortage of housing in the basin there is a shortage of affordable housing. They have the authority to do something about this we need to find the balance somewhere.

Mr. Breuch: A lot of our TAU’s were outdated Placer County is looking at ways to utilize those TAU’s with the current codes. Maybe as a possibility you need to do a mixed use project in order to get commercial floor area.

Mr. Upton: Just for clarification is there no more CFA available?

Mr. Hitchcock: There are two way to earn CFA under the proposed plan. You can transfer in existing TAU’s or under the special project pool tied to the special project program.

Mr. Tolhurst: In any other city you limit the amount of commercial floor area by zoning a lot as commercial. I don’t understand why we have to have CFA? Why don’t we just allow commercial floor area on a commercial lot? Why don’t we eliminate CFA all together?
Mr. Hitchcock: If that was the route we were going to take it does have economic ramifications due to the amount of people who are sitting on CFA that currently has value.

Mr. Zuckerman: I think it would be interesting for the TRPA and the local jurisdiction looked at alternative ways provide incentives for developers to build some of these affordable housing projects in areas where a developer would loose money. Use actual financial incentive rather then development right incentives. Tourist mixed like the type you see in Las Vegas where some of the floors in the high-rise building have a floor or two of residential or are converted into residential units. Why couldn’t we allow some casino or hotel owners convert some of there units into residential units.

Mr. Singlaub: We can not do everything for housing. This really takes a strong role of the local jurisdictions we are talking about a real estate transfer tax and we have the ability to tax we don’t. I urge you to talk to elected officials who can. We are more than willing to partner up.

Mr. Tolhurst: Are we approaching build out? Is it possible to get Forest Service or Conservancy lands in urban areas in order to get some affordable housing built?

Mr. Barrett: The Conservancy is open to do what you are talking about; the Forest Service has never been that flexible. We have not had much success at to this point.

Mr. Tolhurst: We need to deal with the parking component of this as well. We need to consider adapting to global changes as well.

Mr. Tolhurst Opens Public Comment

Jennifer Merchant, Placer County, we are perplexed by the way some of the report is being approached. I thought we were going to be concerning individual area rather than using such a broad stroke. Transferring commercial floor area would work in overdeveloped area but in Placer County this would be incredibly difficult; I’m concerned we are setting up a scenario we are not going to be able to deal with. You will receive the rest of our comments in written form before the October deadline.

Steve Teshara, Pathway Forum Member, I’m concerned about where the money is going to come from to complete this EIS. There are many thing that still need to be hammered out during this process and I would like to see this a more public process rather than see a consultant take the ball and run with it. I don’t believe it is accurate to say we are nearing build out with more than 4000 lots available to build and would like to see that reference changed. We need more TAU incentives. The EIS need to take a hard look at the sensitive lot issue. All the soil surveys and data are confusing and I look forward to see the new soil survey in its entirety. A real estate transfer tax makes a lot of sense and would like to see someone look into that. We need to look into the climate change and be leaders in adapting to the changes. When does the TMDL get completed and how does it get folded into the regional plan.
Mr. Tolhurst Closed Public Comment

Staff member Shane Ramsos continues presentation, summarizing the Threshold changes and definitions.

Mr. Tolhurst Opens Public Comment

None Heard

Mr. Tolhurst Public Closes Comment

Mr. Maurer: At what level in the process are we?

Mr. Hitchcock: We are looking for scoping comments to help us form alternatives.

Ms. Kemper: I would like to suggest extending the public scoping comment period to the first of November. We have a forum meeting where some issues that may be valuable for this process.

Mr. Singlaub: We have to have a new plan in place by October of next year. We no longer have the option to extend the deadlines.

Ms. Kemper: I think all the other deadlines can stay the same, I'm only speaking of the public comment period.

Mr. Hitchcock: The timeline can be provided to the APC members.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Introduction of Dennis Oliver as the new Communications Representative.

The Blue Ribbon Fire Commission updates will continue throughout the process.

B. Legal Counsel

No Report

C. APC Members

Mr. Breuch: How are fee increases notified? The fees are being updated on our end however we would like to be notified in advance.

Ms. Kemper: The Pollutant Load Reduction Report will be available on our website on Friday. All the information will be discussed on the Forum Meeting on the 27th.

Mr. Zuckerman: Douglas County has been bringing forth some good environmental legislation. We have just passed our first Windmill Ordinance for
parcels over five acres. We may be bringing forth a revision to allow the new quieter windmills on smaller parcels.

Mr. Upton: Fire and fire commission update

Mr. McIntyre: I want to thank John for all the work regarding the Fire Commission.

Mr. Maurer: Arial Hydro mulch started yesterday, public view points are set up at Sawmill Pond, Mt. Rainer and the airport.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Sandoval
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

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) 589-5243. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
I. CALL TO ORDER

Called to order at 9:40 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Breuch, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Mr. Morhouse for Ms. Krause, Mr. Lefevre, Ms. Merchant for Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Teshara for Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Tolhurst

Members Absent: Mr. Harris, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Mauer, Mr. Riley, Ms. Schmidt, Ms. Sertic, Mr. Upton, Mr. Zuckerman

Quorum not present

Mr. Zuckerman arrives 10:00 a.m. to Complete Quorum
Mr. Riley arrives 10:05 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda Acknowledged as Presented (Quorum not present for formal approval)

Quorum Not Present Item VI.A. Status Report on TRPA's Transportation Model Presented First.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No Public Comment

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

July and September Minutes will be presented at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Amendment to Chapter 33, Special Project to Change Eligibility Requirement to Allow Projects in Community Plan or TRPA Master Plan Designated Areas.

Staff Members Brenda Hunt presented an overview on the need to amend Chapter 33.3.D of the TEPA Code of Ordinances regulating the Commercial Floor Area
(CFA) allocation pool for Special Projects. The proposed amendment would amend the eligibility requirement and permit projects located within plan areas that are currently undergoing either a community plan or a ski area master plan planning process. The amended provisions of the Code would only apply to plan areas that have been designated as preliminary community plan areas and to recreation plan areas designated as a downhill ski facility. The Special Project program goals are to promote major projects that result in the construction of Threshold-related environmental improvement, to promote transfer of development that results in substantial environmental benefits, and to rehabilitate substandard development.

Steve Tashara Moved to Recommend to the Governing Board the Proposed Code Amendment Amending Chapter 33.3.D(3) Special Projects
Ms. Merchant Seconds the Motion
Motion Carries

B. Notice of Preparation and Scoping Hearing for the Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Tahoe Valley Community Plan in the City of South Lake Tahoe.

VI. PLANNING MATTER
A. Status Report on TRPA’s Transportation Model.

Staff Member Keith Norberg provided a summary on the new Tahoe TransCAD travel model. Information presented included information on resident, seasonal resident and visitor travel behavior in the Lake Tahoe basin. Mr. Norberg’s summary included a break down of tour based vehicle activity. The travel based model breaks down vehicle activity into seven separate categories; Mandatory Tours, Joint Tours, Non-Mandatory Tours, A-Work Torus, Maintenance Tour Type, Discretionary Tour Type and Escort. The presentation was informational only no action was required by the board.

VIII. REPORTS
A. Executive Director
B. Legal Counsel
No Report
C. APC Members

IX. ADJOURNMENT
Meeting Adjourned at 1:15p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
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) 589-5277. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Date: November 7, 2007

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal to increase the diameter limit on trees requiring a permit for removal from 6 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) to 14 inches dbh and other related amendments.

Requested Action: Staff requests that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) make a recommendation to the Governing Board on the proposed Code amendment changing Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal. The proposed amendment would increase the diameter of trees needing a permit for removal from 6 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) to 14 inches dbh. Diameter at breast height (dbh) is measured 4.5 feet from the base of the uphill side of a tree.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC recommend approval of the proposed amendment. Staff is also requesting that the APC make a recommendation to the Governing Board to make the required findings and approve the proposed Code amendment.

Required Motion(s): To recommend approval of the proposed action, the APC should make the following motions, based on this staff summary and the evidence in the record:

1) A motion to recommend approval by the Governing Board of the required findings (see Attachment A), including a finding of no significant effect; and 2) A motion to recommend approval by the Governing Board of the proposed ordinance. (see Attachment B).

Project Description/Background: The TRPA Compact directs TRPA to regulate tree removal in the Tahoe Basin (See Compact Article VI (a)). The current Code regarding tree removal in the Basin requires a tree removal permit from TRPA, unless permit authority is delegated, for trees larger than 6 inches diameter at breast height (dbh). Many counties, cities and townships throughout California require tree removal permits for a multitude of reasons. Though many entities have set diameter limits from 6 to 9 inches dbh, TRPA knows of no scientific basis for these diameter limits. TRPA's current 6 inch diameter limit is patterned for consistency on the rules of other jurisdictions. In general, the reason behind requiring a tree removal permit is so that professionals knowledgeable about tree health, forestry, or arboriculture make decisions on what trees
should be removed in order to help maintain healthy forests and vegetation by removing
diseased and hazard trees and trees deemed a fire hazard.

Beginning in 2004, TRPA delegated a portion of its tree removal permitting authority to
the Basin Fire Protection Districts. The Districts have been working under Memoranda of
Understandings (MOUs) that delegate to each Fire District tree removal responsibilities
for defensible space and fire hazards. During the implementation of these MOU's, the
Fire Districts have indicated to TRPA what works under the MOU's and what could work
better. One issue that has been identified as a problem is the time consuming
requirement of completing permits for removal of trees greater than 6 inches dbh. To
alleviate the administrative burden on the Fire Districts and speed the implementation of
defensible space treatments on private parcels, the Chiefs made a written request to
increase the minimum diameter limit for tree removal permits.

On October 5th 2007, TRPA met with the Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs to discuss and
develop recommendations for resolving wildfire hazard issues under consideration by
the California-Nevada Tahoe Basin Fire Commission that had been raised by the Basin
Fire Chiefs in the “nine-point letter” to TRPA dated September 18th, 2007. The first point
in the letter asked TRPA to eliminate the need to issue a TRPA tree removal permit for
trees larger than 6 inch diameter at breast height (dbh). During the meeting on October
5th, the Fire Chiefs provided data to TRPA indicating the tree sizes they typically mark for
removal for defensible space. The FPD's data shows that 85% of the trees they mark for
defensible space are 14 inches dbh or less. TRPA is relying on this data as the basis for
the proposed Ordinance change from 6 to 14 inches dbh. The diameter increase will
facilitate less paper work for the Fire Protection District's (FPD's) and speed the
implementation of defensible space treatments on private parcels.

To explain the intent behind and implementation of the proposed changes to TRPA
Code, TRPA staff will produce a new “A Property Owners Guide to Cutting Trees”
pamphlet/brochure. The revised pamphlet will inform homeowners of the tree removal
permit process, and general guidelines to help homeowners understand the benefits and
values of trees as well as potential hazards trees can present in and around structures.

Attachment B shows the specific text changes to the Code of Ordinances as a result of
approval of this requested action.

Issues/Concerns: The following issues or concerns have been identified by staff. The
first issue/concern is the potential for impacts to the Scenic Threshold in the event of
additional tree removal on lakeshore properties or along scenic corridors. There are
instances where lakeshore or other structures have been issued a permit or other
authorization that includes or relies upon vegetative screening to mitigate scenic impacts
or meet TRPA's scenic threshold. Because the proposed Code amendment applies
prospectively only, it does not automatically revoke past permit conditions that have
relied on trees or vegetative screening to mitigate adverse scenic effects. Therefore, to
avoid potential adverse effects on scenic threshold attainment, the proposed new Code
language includes a requirement that lakeshore homes or structures within other scenic
corridors must provide an alternative scenic mitigation if vegetative screening required
by permit conditions is now or later removed to provide defensible space. For lakeshore
or other scenic corridor properties requiring scenic mitigation in the future, Chapter
30.15.D (3) Design Standards, that requires vegetative screening to be in compliance
with local defensible space regulations, applies. Furthermore, there is no additional
potential impact by allowing the FPD’s to mark 14 inch dbh trees without a permit since they already mark those trees if they are deemed a fire hazard. This Code amendment simply allows the FPD to mark those trees without doing any additional paper work in the form of a permit.

These mitigation requirements are expected to be adequate to prevent potential adverse environmental effects on scenic threshold attainment. Nevertheless, at the 5-year Threshold review, the effects of the proposed Code amendment and the effectiveness of the mitigation on scenic attainment will be assessed.

The second issue/ concern involves managing the risk that the diameter limit change will be mis-interpreted to mean that all trees in the Tahoe Basin up to 14 inches dbh should and must be removed for fire safety. Requiring fewer permits necessarily means fewer on-site reviews before trees are removed because neither TRPA nor the Fire Districts will be required to visit sites or identify specific trees for removal if they are below 14 inches dbh. Therefore, the landowner will now be the one most often interpreting whether or not a tree can or should be removed, and these decisions can be made without aid or consultation of professionals trained in either tree or forest health or fire protection. The intent of the Code change was not to give carte blanche to landowners for tree removal; it was more limited – i.e., to alleviate the administrative burden of obtaining a tree removal permit in order to expedite voluntary defensible space fuels reduction treatments by private landowners.

Staff has not, however, proposed limiting the new 14 inch dbh rule to “for defensible space purposes only” because such a limitation is believed to be too confusing for self-interpretation and implementation by the varied landowners around the Region. Although defensible space is generally considered to include 100 feet around a structure, the actual distance varies by property boundaries, terrain and natural conditions and can be identified accurately only by a trained professional. To include such limiting language in the proposed Code amendment, the average landowner would be applying two different rules in an undefined geographic space – i.e., a 6 inch dbh rule outside the defensible space area and a 14 inch dbh rule inside the defensible space area. Staff believes it would be too confusing for landowners to interpret and implement, and too difficult for TRPA to consistently enforce, varying rules within otherwise un-delineated defensible space areas.

Furthermore, other protections are presently in place or are expected to be in place to guard against indiscriminate or excessive tree removal under the proposed Code amendment. As discussed above, the scenic mitigations included address the environmental threshold concerns that could conceivably be implicated by any risk of excessive tree removal as a result of the rule change. Lastly, the permit exemption may be lost and the action treated as a project requiring a permit if TRPA finds that the activity may have or is having a substantial effect on the resources of the Region. See Code Section 4.6.

Regional Plan Compliance: The proposed project complies with all requirements of the TRPA Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements, and Code of Ordinances, including all required findings in Chapters 6 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (see attachment A for details).
If you have any questions please contact Mike Vollmer at (775) 589-5268 or via email at mvollmer@trpa.org.

Attachments/Exhibits:
- Required Findings and Rationale (Attachment A)
- Draft Ordinance (Attachment B)
  - Proposed Language Amendments (Attachment B, Exhibit 1)
6.3 Threshold-Related Findings: The following specific findings shall be made, pursuant to Articles V(c), V(g) and VI(b) of the Compact in addition to any other findings required by law.

6.3.A Findings Necessary To Approve Any Project: To approve any project, TRPA must find, in accordance with Sections 6.1 and 6.2, that:

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

Rationale: The amendment to Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal, will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan. Staff's proposed amendment is consistent with the Regional Plan and TRPA plans and programs. The proposed amendment will promote health and safety concerns with regard to fire safety and defensible space. This amendment will exempt from review removal of trees 14 inches dbh or less unless otherwise stipulated as a condition to a permit.

(2) The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities (thresholds) to be exceeded; and

Rationale: This amendment will not change the way the fire protection districts have been marking trees for defensible space under existing MOUs since 2004; it will only streamline the administrative process (less paperwork) by not requiring a tree removal permit for trees 14 inches dbh or less. This Code change will also allow private homeowners and property owners to remove trees 14 inches dbh or less without a permit or review from TRPA or the fire protection districts. Where these private properties are potentially within scenic corridors, mitigation has been included to prevent adverse effects.

Lakeshore and other scenic corridor properties with vegetative screening as part of permit requirements are required to provide alternative scenic mitigations if vegetation removal relied upon for scenic mitigation is required for defensible space. Chapter 30.15.D (3) Design Standards, prohibits vegetation screening that is inconsistent with local fire protection standards.

In the event of abuses from this Code change, Chapter 4.6 Project Review and Exempt Activities, stipulates that “An exempt activity shall be considered a project if TRPA finds that the
activity may have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space, or any other natural resources in the Region.”

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

Rationale: Any project that may come forth due to this provision will be required to meet air and water quality standards as set forth in the TRPA Compact.

6.5 Findings Necessary To Amend Or Adopt TRPA Ordinances, Rules Or Other TRPA Plans And Programs:

To approve any amendment or adoption of the Code, Rules or other TRPA plans and programs which implement the Regional Plan, TRPA must find, in addition to the findings required pursuant to Section 6.3, and in accordance with Sections 6.1 and 6.2, that 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 and Rationale listed above. The amendment is consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. Although the amendment will result in trees 14 inches dbh and less to be removed without a permit, scenic considerations are addressed in the new Code language.

Environmental Documentation: Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist for the proposed Code of Ordinance changes. Staff will recommend that a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) be made for the Code Amendment based on the IEC, Chapter 6 and 13 findings and information contained in this Staff Summary.
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY; CHAPTER 4.2.A(13) PROJECT REVIEW AND EXEMPT ACTIVITIES AND CHAPTER 71.3 TREE REMOVAL, AMENDING THE REQUIREMENT FOR A TREE REMOVAL PERMIT FOR TREES GREATER THAN 6 INCHES DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT BY INCREASING THE DIAMETER OF TREES REQUIRING A TREE REMOVAL PERMIT TO TREES GREATER THAN 14 INCHES DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT, AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY REALATING THERETO.

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.00 Findings

1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance 87-9, as amended, which ordinance relates to the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) by amending Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal, to further implement the Regional Plan pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.20 These amendments have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment, and are therefore exempt from the requirements of an environmental impact statement pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.

1.30 The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) has conducted a public hearing on the amendments and recommended adoption. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. At those hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.40 The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Chapter 6 of the Code and Article V(g) of the Compact, and the findings required by Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8. As to the Ordinance 87-8 findings, the Board finds that those findings were supported by a preponderance of the evidence in the record.

1.50 The Governing Board finds that the amendments adopted here will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a
manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.00 Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedures

2.10 Subsection 6.60 of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended by amending Chapter 4.2.A(13) and Chapter 71.3 as set forth in Exhibit 1, dated November 1, 2007, which attachment is appended hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 3.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to affect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion thereof is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.00 Effective Date

The provisions of this ordinance amending Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances is authorized by the Compact to become effective immediately, but in the exercise of its discretion, the Governing Board defers the effective date of the ordinance and the amendments until 60 days after adoption in order to produce education and outreach materials for the public.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held November 28, 2007 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent
Julie Motamadi, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Amendment to Chapter 4.2.A(13) and Chapter 71.3
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November 1, 2007

Proposed Language Amendments to Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal

Proposed language is double-underlined and deleted language is struck-through

Chapter 4
PROJECT REVIEW AND EXEMPT ACTIVITIES

4.2 List Of Exempt Activities: The following activities are not subject to review and approval by TRPA provided they do not result in the creation of additional land coverage or relocation of land coverage, comply with Sections 30.6, 30.9 and 30.10 and meet all restrictions set forth below. §

4.2.A General Activities: The following general activities are exempt:

(13)§ Cutting, moving, removing, killing or materially damaging up to 100 live trees between six fourteen inches d.b.h. and 30 inches d.b.h. in westside forest types and 24 inches d.b.h. in eastside forest types, per year within a project area provided all live trees to be removed are marked and a tree removal permit is issued pursuant to a memorandum of understanding between a qualified agency and TRPA, and the tree removal does not constitute substantial tree removal as defined in Subsection 71.4.I. The memorandum of understanding shall be consistent with the standards in Chapter 71. §§

Chapter 71
TREE REMOVAL

71.3 General Standards: The cutting, moving, removing, killing, or materially damaging of live trees, the removal of disease-infested and hazardous trees, and the attachment of appurtenances to trees, shall comply with this chapter. Except as provided in subsections 71.5.B, and 71.5.J, all cutting of trees six fourteen inches dbh and larger shall require approval by TRPA. If vegetative screening is part of permit requirements, and vegetation removal is required for defensible space, alternative scenic mitigation must be approved by TRPA. Permits shall be granted or denied in conformity with the provisions of this chapter. Such tree-related projects and activities also shall conform to the other provisions of the Code. §§§

§ Amended 11/20/02
§ Amended 7/28/04
§§ Amended 5/23/01
§§ Amended 1/28/04; Amended 7/28/04
§§§ Amended 7/22/98
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 14, 2007
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Review of Study Alternatives, Tahoe Sands Time Share Joint Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Placer County, APNs, 117-071-005, 117-071-007, 117-071-012, 117-072-003, and 117-072-004, TRPA File Number 20070389

Requested Action: No formal action is requested other than an APC recommendation to the Executive Director on the revised draft scope and Notice of Preparation. This item was asked to be brought back in front of the APC for further review of the project design alternatives to be included in the EIR/EIS and to update the APC on the revised draft scope document and Initial Checklist. Staff is requesting comments on the revised draft scope and content of the proposed EIS/EIR for the proposed 103-unit time share tourist accommodation development project in Placer County (See Attachment "A" for the revised Initial Environmental Check List (IEC), Attachment "B" for the revised Notice of Preparation (NOP).

APC Comments from September 2007 Meeting: The TRPA Advisory Planning Commission discussed the scope of the proposed EIS/EIR during their monthly meeting of September 2007. The APC suggested that the proposed outline for the environmental document be amended to include public service, air quality, water quality issues, revised noise impact considerations and cumulative effects. The draft EIS/EIR outline and IEC have been amended accordingly. There was also a discussion regarding the need to include additional alternatives to be evaluated at an equal level of detail along with the preferred alternative in the Notice of Preparation. The appropriate changes to the NOP document have been made reflecting the inclusion of additional alternatives.

Other comments pertained to the potential for increased parking and cumulative traffic impacts as a result of the project. No additional changes to the EIS/EIR outline were made as a result of these comments as they have already been incorporated into the outline to be addressed during the formalized environmental study and review process.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC endorse the revised topics for environmental review as identified in the revised IEC and NOP.
**Required Motion(s):** An APC recommendation of endorsement to the Executive Director which requires:

1) A motion to recommend endorsement of the revised Scope of the Joint Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the, Tahoe Sands Time Share Redevelopment project. (see Attachments A and B).

**Project Description/Background:** The applicant is proposing to pursue a redevelopment project for the Tahoe Sands Time Share Homeowners Association which involves the removal of an existing cinder block motel built as a dormitory for the 1960 Winter Olympic Games and several ‘antiquated’ cabins which make up a total of 67 tourist accommodation units (TAUs). The existing development will be replaced by a master planned time share tourist accommodation development of 103 guest units and six employee housing units. The development will be located on both the north (mountain) side and the south (lake) side of State Highway 28. There are currently 63 TRPA verified Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU) which will be used for this new timeshare/hotel redevelopment project. The applicant has also obtained the right for an additional 25 TAUs from the adjacent Tahoe Vistana Inn Resort. The remaining TAUs will be obtained from open market sources.

Under the preferred alternative, development targeted for the lake side of the project will be located on parcels 117-72-004 and 117-072-003 and will accommodate 64 two-bedroom units and twelve one-bedroom units within six, three-story buildings, a 3,350 square foot swimming deck and pool, and a separate one-story Reception Building consisting of an office and lobby area. Development on the mountain side will include 14 two-bedroom and 6 one-bedroom timeshare units, along with a storage building, a maintenance building, and existing swimming pool and deck on Parcel 117-071-005, with 10 two bedroom and 5 one-bedroom timeshare units on Parcel 117-071-012. A separate service/storage building will be located on parcel 11-7-071-007. The project will incorporate other site amenities, gathering places, landscaping, and water quality improvements. The development will also include two low income housing units and four moderate income housing units available for rent to individuals who qualify for affordable housing. The applicant currently has four verified units of use in their possession with the additional two targeted to come from bonus unit allocations; See Attachment C for site plans and elevations.

This Notice of Preparation identifies six study alternatives including: 1) No Touch/No Project, 2) Proposed Redevelopment Project, 3) Reduced Impact Development, 4) Reduced Development, 5) Additional Affordable Housing Option, and 6) Reduced Unit Development. Four of the six alternatives to be analyzed in this EIR/EIS were derived from the preferred alternative.

**Issues/Concerns (Revised):** The revised key impacts are noted below and described in the attached revised IEC. Project alternatives along with the preferred alternative have also been included in the revised Notice of Preparation.

- **Water Quality** – The short term impacts associated with construction activity in terms of sediment load are unknown. In addition the long term affects of fertilizer use on a smaller formalized landscaped area has not been determined.
Air Quality – The short term impacts associated with construction activity are unknown as well as the long term impacts as a result of introducing additional destination vehicle trip ends to the site as well as the region.

Traffic Impacts – The existing tourist units generate approximately 693 destination vehicle trip ends (DVTE) while the proposed project will generate 1019 DVTEs. The total VMT have not been identified which incorporates both the number of vehicle trips and the length of those trips. This would have a direct impact to Level of Service (LOS) along Highway 28 and National Avenue. Further the short term construction related impacts are also unknown.

Noise Impacts – It will be necessary for the EIS/EIR to assess potential short term noise impacts as a result of construction activity relative to sensitive receptors. Long term noise impacts associated with increased vehicle trips sources will need to be assessed especially along the Highway 28 corridor, and has been identified as having a cumulative noise equivalent of 55 CNEL, which is at threshold.

Lighting and Glare – The introduction of a larger scale project from 67 units to 109 units could create a new source of light and glare, which could affect day and night views in the area.

Unit Size Impacts - The increase in unit size from the existing motel units to the larger Tourist Accommodation Units could place increased demands on public services and infrastructure of which the cumulative impacts to fire flows, wastewater treatment, etc., are unknown.

Scenic Impacts: The redevelopment will be visible from State Route 28. The new three-story building massing could have a negative impact on distant views.

Cumulative Effects – The joint EIS/EIR will need to identify the combined affect on recently approved or anticipated development projects within the Tahoe Vista and Kings Beach development corridors.

Environment Document Compliance: A Notice of Preparation has been prepared for the EIS/EIR for Tahoe Sands Redevelopment Project. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and Placer County Community Development Resource Agency are preparing a joint EIR/EIS for the Tahoe Sands Redevelopment Project. The joint document is an EIR prepared by Placer County pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and an EIS prepared by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency pursuant to its Compact and Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Additional public scoping will consist of a hearing before the Placer County Planning Commission at a later date to be announced.

If you have any questions, please contact David L. Landry, Senior Planner at dlandry@trpa.org or 77-588-4547 ext. 214.

Attachments:

Revised Initial Environmental Check List (Attachment A)
Revised Notice of Preparation (Attachment B)
Maps and Other Displays (Attachment C)
I. Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN)/Project Location

117-071-005, 117-071-007, 117-071-012, 117-072-003, and 117-072-004

Project Name: Tahoe Sands Redevelopment Project

County: Placer

Project Description/Background:

a. Background:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Community Plan</th>
<th>Existing Conditions &amp; Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Tahoe Vista Community Plan Special Area #1 (Tourist Area) &quot;Planned Area Statement 022&quot;</td>
<td>Tahoe Vista Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Tahoe Estates Residential &quot;Planned Area Statement 021&quot;</td>
<td>North Tahoe Area General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>same as project site</td>
<td>same as project site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Tahoe Estates Residential &quot;Planned Area Statement 021&quot;</td>
<td>North Tahoe Area General Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Environmental Setting:

c. Environmental Document:

TRPA in conjunction with Placer County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for un-mitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the TRPA Goals and Policies and Code of Ordinances, Community Plan, Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used for this Initial Study.
1. LAND – Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></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></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion - All items**

The project involves extensive on and off-site improvements including; building pads, utilities, driveways, parking areas, retaining walls and street improvements. The following mitigation measures will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Submit a Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:

- Road, pavement and parking area design.
- Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable).
- Grading practices.
- Erosion control/winterization.
- Special problems discovered on-site (i.e., groundwater, expansive or unstable soils, etc.)
- Slope stability.

If the soils report indicates the presence of critically expansive or other soil problems which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects, additional investigations, prior to issuance of a TRPA project permits, may be required.

**Discussion-Item 1 - b:**

Development of this project will involve cuts and fills up to 5 feet in depth and an estimated 3,000 cubic yards of soil to be disturbed.

The project will also involve grading and other earthwork activities specifically for the installation of site improvements. This work could result in increased water and air erosion of soil located in stockpiles and other areas disturbed by construction activities.

**Mitigation Measures-Item 1-b** The following are potential mitigation measures which could aid in reduction of potential erosion impacts to a less than significant level.
Prepare and submit, a drainage report to TRPA for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. “Best Management Practice” (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

**Discussion-Item 1 - c:**
The proposed project will impact the soil during the construction of the various on and off-site improvements. The following mitigation measures will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvements Plans and all work shall conform to all State, County and TRPA regulations that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by TRPA. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope.

**Mitigation Measures-Item 1-c**
The applicant shall re-vegetate all disturbed areas. Re-vegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant’s responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off the pavement, per TRPA Code of Ordinances.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by TRPA or other appropriate Agency indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by TRPA for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approval prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of TRPA to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

**Discussion-Item 1 - f:**
Storm drainage from the project site(s) has the potential to impact Lake Tahoe if not mitigated. The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures-Item 1 – f** Prior to Improvement Plan approval, provide the Engineering and Surveying Department with permits/comments from TRPA and/or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board indicating their approval.

**Discussion-Item 1 - g:**
The preliminary geotechnical study prepared by Pezonella Associates, Inc. (May, 2002) states there are no known fault traces crossing the project sites based on geologic mapping completed by John L. Burnett and Charles W. Jennings (Geologic Map of California, Chico Sheet, California Division of Mines and Geology, Olaf P. Jenkins Edition, 1962). However, fault traces have been identified within the Tahoe Basin, which warrants the inclusion of the sites within Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 3. The project will be constructed in compliance with the applicable Building Codes, which includes seismic standards. Therefore, these potential impacts are considered less than significant.

The preliminary geotechnical study noted above states “Based on the results of our deeper subsurface exploration, detailed laboratory testing and engineering analysis, the underlying materials exist, overall, in a relatively firm and/or compact density state and contains abundant fine grain particles with cohesive
characteristics.” The study concluded that based on this information that the susceptibility of the sites to liquefaction can be considered very low. Additionally, due to the relatively level nature of the overall project sites and the absence of slopes, that the susceptibility for landslide or rockfalls activity at the sites may be considered low. Therefore, these potential impacts are considered less than significant.

Based on an assessment of the soils at the project site, the subsurface soils are defined as having a low expansion potential (expansion index in the 15 to 50 range). Therefore, this is considered to be a less than significant impact.

2. AIR QUALITY – Will the proposal result in:

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

**General Discussion- All Item:**
It is unknown at this time if the project will not conflict with implementation of the regional air quality plan as the cumulative effect on air quality as a result of increased traffic flows is unknown.

**Discussion- items 2-a:**
Only TRPA approved gas/propane fire place appliances are allowed and are to be included in any CC&R’s that may be established.

**Discussion- Items 2-b:**
The proposed project is located in the Mountain Counties Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the State particulate matter standard. The proposed project will contribute to cumulative air quality impacts in the air basin. Any demolition of structures with known asbestos will require approval from the EPA and/or the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

**Mitigation Measures- Items 2-b:**
If it is determined that there is asbestos in the buildings the applicant shall apply to the California Air Resources Board and/or the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9 office or the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for the appropriate permit to remove asbestos prior to demolition.

**Discussion- Items 2-c:**
Based upon the project description, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and would not create objectionable odors.
### 3. WATER QUALITY – Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff so that a 20 yr. 1 hr. storm runoff (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion-Item 3-b:**
The project development will cover approximately 37% of the 7.2 acre sites with impervious surfaces. The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures-Item 3-b:**

Storm water run-off shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of retention/detention facilities. TRPA may, after review of the project drainage report, delete this requirement if it is determined that drainage conditions do not warrant installation of this type of facility. In the event on-site detention requirements are waived, this project may be subject to payment of an in-lieu fees.

**Discussion-Item 3-e:**
Storm water run-off from the project sites has the potential to impact Lake Tahoe if not mitigated. The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures- Items 3-e and f:**
No proposed work shall be conducted between the shore ZONE AS DEFINED BY TRPA. The existing drainage patterns will not be altered with the proposed redevelopment of the project sites. Therefore, no impact will occur.

**Discussion-Items 3-i:**
The project is not located within a FEMA designated 100-year floodplain nor is it within a dam failure inundation area. Therefore, no impacts will occur.

**Discussion-Item 3-j:**
Lake Tahoe is located adjacent to the project site and this project could result in urban stormwater runoff. This project will utilize standard best management practices to control the surface water and stormwater runoff. The impacts to watersheds, water quality standards as well as increases to the rate of surface runoff are unknown. The project includes the construction of street improvements, driveways, utilities, landscape areas, parking areas and building pads. This will result in potentially significant sources of polluted runoff (sediment, oils, greases, fertilizers, etc.) without mitigation. The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures-Items 3-j**
Storm drainage from on-site impervious surfaces shall be collected and routed through specially designed water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) for removal of pollutants of concern (e.g. sediment, oil/grease, etc.) as approved by TRPA. With the Improvement Plans, the applicant shall verify that proposed BMPs are appropriate to treat the pollutants of concern from this project. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

4. **VEGETATION** – Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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, micro flora and aquatic plants)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion- Items 4-a:**
The Tahoe Vista Community Plan Area is located in the Sierra Nevada coniferous ecosystem at the Jeffrey pine belt altitude (North Tahoe Community Plans Final Environmental Impact Report April 1996)
Mitigation Measures-Items 4-a:
The loss of trees will be mitigated through a proposed landscape plan approved by TRPA which may include planting nearby or be planted as part of the street tree community plan improvements for Tahoe Vista.

Discussion- Items 4-c:
The project includes the construction of street improvements, driveways, utilities, landscape areas, parking areas and building pads. This will result in potentially significant temporary sources of polluted runoff (sediment, oils, greases, fertilizers, etc.) without mitigation. The need for specific mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts will need to be further investigated in the environmental document.

Mitigation Measures-Items 4-c
Storm drainage from on-site impervious surfaces shall be collected and routed through specially designed water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) for removal of pollutants of concern (e.g. sediment, oil/grease, etc.) as approved by TRPA.

5. WILDLIFE – Will the proposal result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians or micro-fauna)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the migration or movement of animals?</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. NOISE – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permitted in the applicable Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Threshold?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion- Items 6-a:
The existing pool and new proposed pool deck on the mountainside appears to lie within the 65 dB contour according to the excerpt of the Tonopolo Study included with the project description. The Tonopolo study references an average daily traffic count of roughly 20,000 vehicles per day along this section of Highway 28, which references the 65 dB noise contour of 75 feet from the centerline of Highway 28 and the 60 dB noise contour of 163 feet from the centerline on Highway 28. The pool deck is considered to be an outdoor recreation area and needs to be protected from noise greater than 60 dB. Additionally, several of the cottages on the mountainside and the sales/reception area on the lakeside are within the 60 to 65 dB contours. Both the cottages and the sales/reception area are required to have an interior noise level of no greater than 45 dB. Plus, the Highway 28 corridor has a maximum 55 dB CNEL (cumulative noise equivalent level) per Tahoe Vista Community Plan Special Area #1.
For the sales/reception area, the 20-feet of landscape buffer along Highway 28 does not provide for any acoustical buffering and does not meet the “allowed exterior noise level reduction measures”. The EIR shall include an acoustical analysis which addresses the above stated concerns as follows:

- Include representative noise level measurement with sufficient sampling periods and locations to adequately describe local conditions and the predominant noise sources.
- Estimate existing and project cumulative (20 years) noise levels in terms of Ldn or CNEL and compare noise levels in the TRPA Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, and Tahoe Vista Community Plan.
- Recommend appropriate mitigation to achieve compliance with the policies and standards of the TRPA Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, and Tahoe Vista Community Plan, giving preferences to proper site planning and design over mitigation measures which require the construction of noise barriers or structural modifications to buildings which contain noise-sensitive land uses.
- Estimate noise exposure after the prescribed mitigation measures have been implemented.
- Describe a post-project assessment program, which could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.

Noise from construction activities may noticeably increase noise levels above existing ambient noise levels. This is a potentially significant event.

**Mitigation Measures-Item 6-a:**

In order to mitigate the impacts of construction noise noted above, construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a building permit or grading permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holiday, and shall only occur:

- Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 6:00 pm (during daylight savings)
- Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 6:00 pm (during standard time)
- Saturdays, 8:00 am to 5:00 pm

In addition, a temporary sign shall be located throughout the project (4’ x 4’), as determined by TRPA, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations. This condition shall be included on the Improvement Plans and shown in the development notebook.

Essentially, quiet activities, which do not involve heavy equipment or machinery, may occur at other times. Work occurring within an enclosed building, such as a house under construction with the roof and siding completed, may occur at other times as well.
7. LIGHT AND GLARE – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create new sources of glare through the sighting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Discussion – All Items: The introduction of a larger scale project from 67 units to 109 units could create a new source of light or glare, which could affect day or nighttime views in the area. Exterior lighting is proposed per the community plan guidelines. The parking areas will be lit from light standard type fixtures consistent with light levels as defined in chapter 4 of the North Tahoe Community Plan. The bollard type fixtures will be similar in style as noted in the community as well. Interior walkways will be lit with low light fixtures that will be directed downward with concealed light sources and places so as to prevent glare.

8. LAND USE – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Discussion- All Items: The development will result in the removal of 46 existing Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU’s) and one residential unit of use, known as “Tahoe Sands,” on two “lakeside” parcels and the construction of seven buildings designed to house 76 Tourist Accommodation Units “timeshare units,” in addition to a pool, an owners check in lobby, lounge and staff offices. The three mountainside properties will result in the removal of the existing 18 Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU’s) and one residential unit of use and replaced by twelve buildings designed to accommodate 27 TAU’s along with six (6) employee-housing units in one building. Total number of TAU’s with employee units brings the total number of units to 109. The proposal may have significant impacts and conflict with the Tahoe Vista Community Plan if the project area only included density calculations of the two-lakeside properties. However, included with this project are three properties located immediately to the north of Highway 28 (APN’s 117-071-005, 006 and 013), which are included with the project area total square footage and density calculations.

The increase in unit size from the existing motel units to the larger Tourist Accommodation Units will cause an increased demand for public services; water, fire protection, sanitary sewer in addition to creating increased impacts associated with traffic, parking, and air quality.
9. **NATURAL RESOURCES** – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion- All Items:**
The proposed project will not have significant effects to energy conservation plans, non-renewable natural resources, nor result in the loss of available natural resources.

10. **RISK OF UPSET** – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion- All Items:**
The project as designed will not be involve with explosive devices or the release of hazardous substances

11. **POPULATION** – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion- All Items:**
Applicants shall satisfy the employee housing requirements for the proposed project as required by the Placer County General Plan by submitting a housing mitigation plan, specifying how the minimum work force housing requirement will be provided for the “Tahoe Sands” employees. Workforce housing units required by this article shall be deed restricted to employee rental.

The EIS/EIR must “discuss the ways in which the proposed project could aid in fostering economic growth in addition to potential impact of the additional housing could either directly or indirectly effect the surrounding environment."
12. HOUSING – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td>x</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF EXISTING DWELLING UNITS:** 64  
**NUMBER OF PROPOSED DWELLING UNITS:** 109

**Discussion - All Items:**

The proposed project is not generating additional employees. However, two residential units are proposed to be removed as a result of the project. The applicant is proposing six (6) two bedroom employee housing units that will be used for the Tahoe Sands employees and other employees in the North Lake Tahoe region.

All work force housing units shall comply with the necessary standards to insure the housing stock meets “habitable conditions” as set forth established by federal, state and other local agencies. Applicants shall satisfy the employee housing requirements for the proposed project as required by the Placer County General Plan by submitting a housing mitigation plan, specifying how the minimum work force housing requirement will be provided for the “Tahoe Sands” employees. Workforce housing units required by this article shall be deed restricted to employee rental.

The housing plan shall include a site plan and building floor plans, illustrating the number of units proposed, their location, land ownership and management, and the rental mix of the development. The housing mitigation plan shall also include an on-site managers unit, an analysis of the salary ranges of all new employees, an estimate of the level of housing affordability for the salary ranges, and the income categories to which each unit is proposed to be restricted. The workforce housing proposed be kept at rates affordable to the new employees generated.
13. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generation of 100 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion-Items 13 - a:**
Development of this project will have a cumulative impact on the transportation system. The following mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures-Items 13 – a:**
This project is subject to payment of traffic impact fees as prescribed by TRPA Code for the generation of over 100 dvte daily vehicle trip ends designed to offset impacts from indirect sources of air pollution. This fee is payable prior to permit acknowledgement.

**Discussion-Items 13 - b:**
The project will decrease the amount of uncontrolled traffic access along State Route 28. As part of this project, one defined entrance/exit and one entrance only access will be constructed on the lakeside site. Therefore, no impacts will occur.

**Discussion-Item 13 - c:**
The proposed project provides a total of 112 spaces for parking which meets Lake Tahoe Region of Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Parking and Design (March 7, 1994).

The project shall construct frontage improvements along State Route 28 as established by the North Tahoe Community Plan (April, 1996) – Tahoe Vista Community Plan (Appendix B, Chapter 20). These improvements include a Class II bicycle trail, vertical curb as approved by Caltrans, 6 to 8 foot wide sidewalks, street lighting, public bus stop/shelter and landscaping. The design of these improvements shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and approved by the DRC.
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sheriff protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parks and Recreation facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other governmental services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion - All Items:**
The proposed project will not have significant effects to public services such as fire, sheriff, schools, maintenance other anticipated government services. The applicant will comply with any conditions imposed by the local fire district for the proposed project as a condition of permit approval.

This project will also require review by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board as well as other governmental agencies. It is suggested that the other governmental agencies is considered to be less than significant but will have to be determined through the EIR/EIS.

16. UTILITIES– Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Power or natural gas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communication systems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Storm water drainage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Solid waste and disposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion - All Items:**
The increase in unit size from the existing motel units to the larger Tourist Accommodation Units could cause an increased demand for public services; water, fire protection, sanitary sewer in addition to creating increased impacts associated with traffic, parking, and air quality.

**Discussion-Item 10 - c:**
Although a projected water use study has been conducted additional information will be needed to ascertain the total demand for preferred alternative.
Discussion-Item 10 - d:
Sewer services will be provided by the North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) and are already available to the sites. The sewage generated by the proposed project would be typical of residential developments and is not expected to cause the existing facilities to exceed the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. This impact is considered less than significant.

Discussion-Item 10 - e:
The Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency (TTSA) provides the treatment of the waste water currently generated on the sites. The developer will be required to adhere to all TTSA requirements and will be subject to all relevant fees. No mitigation measures are required. The project will not require or result in construction of new storm water drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion-Items 10 - f:
The project will require solid waste collection services from the North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD). NTPUD provides services to this area and has indicated their requirement to serve the project. These requirements are routine in nature and do not represent significant impacts. Typical project conditions of approval require submission of “will serve” letters from each agency. No mitigation measures are required. The landfill and transfer station which are the final destination of solid waste generated by this project have sufficient capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.

17. HUMAN HEALTH – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Discussion- All Items:
The safety and welfare of persons and property in the surrounding area will be protected at all times during demolition and construction phases with appropriate fencing and signage per OSHA and Placer County regulations.

Discussion-Item 17 - a:
Transportation noise from Highway 28 has the potential to negatively impact the project. The cumulative effect will need to be determined through the EIS/EIR review. The project as proposed does not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project does not emit hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter of an existing or proposed school.

Discussion- Items 17 - b:
The redevelopment of the site will not result in long term safety hazards for people residing or working at the project site. The potential for disastrous wild land fires in the Lake Tahoe region exists although the proposed project will not increase these existing fire hazards. Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on this project site, consisting of a records search and related review. The review did not identify any past uses known to be associated with human health hazards. Therefore the exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards is potentially less than significant.
18. SCENIC RESOURCES/COMMUNITY DESIGN – Will the proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance or Community Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Discussion- All Items:
Tahoe Vista is defined as a highly scenic area with lake vistas and mountain peaks with a low intensity rustic Tahoe style of development (Tahoe Vista Community Plan-1996). The project proposes the removal of the existing nine (9) one story cabins, lobby/office building and the two story timeshare building while introducing seven new (6 three story and 1 one-story) structure on the lakeside of the development resulting in a (35 percent increase in units on the two lake front properties). This could substantially alter existing land use patterns and scenic views that exist in this Plan Area. Specifically, there could be a net loss of vistas, mountain peaks and lake views when viewing the project from Highway (State Route 28) a TRPA designated scenic corridor or from the waters of Lake Tahoe. The introduction of a larger scale project from 67 units to 109 units could create a new source of light or glare, which could affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Visibility of the proposed action from State Route 28, a TRPA-designated scenic travel route, will be determined through the EIS/EIR review. Potential impacts from construction and operation of the proposed action will be evaluated through the use of ground-level site photographs from sensitive viewpoints on or near the project site.

19. RECREATION – Does the proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create additional demand for recreation facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create additional recreation capacity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Discussion- All Items:
The proposed development could increase some demand on existing recreation facilities for the development and could increased utilization of existing recreation facilities in the Tahoe Vista area. While the general effect is unknown there seven public beach access points in the area for public use.
### 20. ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HISTORICAL – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is the property associated with any historically significant event sand/or sites or persons?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion- All Items:**

A search of archeological records indicates potentially significant archeological resources may be present in the southeast portion of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan area outside of the proposed project area. An inventory of historic structures was conducted for the project site to identify and record any resources prior to development projects, which involve structure removal. No significant historic structures or cultural resources were identified as a result of the resources inventory.

### 21. Findings of Significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No with Mitigations</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, 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>No</td>
<td>x</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>No</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 being, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVISED DRAFT NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: California State Clearinghouse
   Nevada State Clearinghouse
   Cooperating Agencies
   Responsible and Trustee Agencies
   Interested Parties and Organizations
   Affected Property Owners (within 300 feet of the proposed Tahoe Sands Redevelopment project

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Tahoe Sands Redevelopment Project, 6610 North Lake Boulevard, Tahoe Vista, Placer County, CA.

Lead Agencies: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89448
Contact: David L. Landry, TRPA Senior Planner
Phone: (775) 588-4547 ext.214
Fax: (775) 588-4527
Email: dlandry@trpa.org

and

Placer County
Community Development Resource Agency
Contact: Christina Snow, Senior Planner
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, CA 95603
Phone: (530) 745-3111
Fax: (530) 745-3080
Email: csnow@placer.ca.gov

Project Title: Tahoe Sands Redevelopment Project

Project Location: The proposed project will be located on five Placer County Parcels which comprise an approximate total of 7.2 acres of land within the Tahoe Vista Community Plan area. Development is to be located on both the north and south sides of State Highway 28. (Exhibit A).
The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and Placer County Community Development Resource Agency are preparing a joint EIR/EIS for the Tahoe Sands Redevelopment Project, 6610 North Lake Boulevard, Tahoe Vista, Placer County, CA. This joint document is an EIR prepared by Placer County pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and an EIS prepared by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency pursuant to its Compact and Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. This notice meets the CEQA and TRPA noticing requirements for a Notice of Preparation (NOP).

We would like to know the views of interested persons, organizations, and agencies as to the scope and content of the information to be included and analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Agencies should comment on the elements of the environmental information that are relevant to their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed action. The project description, location, alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS, and potential environmental effects of the proposed action (to the extent known) are contained in this NOP.

In compliance with the time limits mandated by State law and TRPA, your response should be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than December 31, 2007. Please send your written responses to David L. Landry, Senior Planner, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, at the address shown above. Responses should include the name of a contact person at your agency or organization.

Summary:

The applicant is proposing to pursue a redevelopment project for the Tahoe Sands Time Share Homeowners Association which involves the removal of an existing cinder block motel built as a dormitory for the 1960 Winter Olympic Games and several ‘antiquated’ cabins which make up a total of 67 tourist accommodation units (TAUs). The existing development will be replaced by a master planned time share tourist accommodation development of 103 guest units and six employee housing units. The development will be located on both the north (mountain) side and the south (lake) side of State Highway 28. There are currently 63 TRPA verified Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU) which will be used for this new timeshare/hotel redevelopment project. The applicant has also obtained the right for an additional 25 TAUs from the adjacent Tahoe Vistana Inn Resort while the remaining TAUs will be transferred from open market sources. The applicant currently has four verified units of use in their possession with the additional two targeted to come from bonus unit allocations.

Under the preferred alternative, development targeted for the lake side of the project will be located on parcels 117-72-004 and 117-072-003 and will accommodate 64 two-bedroom units and 12 one-bedroom units within four, three-story buildings, a 3,350 square foot swimming deck and pool, and a separate one-story Reception Building consisting of an office and lobby area. Development on the mountain side will include 14 two-bedroom and 6 one-bedroom timeshare units, along with a storage building, a maintenance building, and a new swimming pool and deck on Parcel 117-071-005. In addition 10 two-bedroom and 5 one-bedroom timeshare units will be located on Parcel 117-071-012. A separate manager’s unit will be located on parcel 11-7-071-007. The project will incorporate other site amenities, gathering places, landscaping, and water quality improvements. The development will also include two low income housing units and four moderate income housing units available for rent or sale at cost to individuals who qualify for affordable housing. See Staff Summary Attachment C for site plans and elevations.
Regional Location
BACKGROUND/EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The Tahoe Sands Resort is a 60-unit timeshare property located on the north shore of Lake Tahoe. The Tahoe Sands project area is made up of a 7.2 acre site which consists of five distinct parcels situated on both the north and south sides of State Highway 28. The resort consists of a combination of guest cabins and motel suites and studios with kitchenettes as well as direct beach access, swimming pools and other amenities. The existing motel consists of two cinder block buildings built in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s as temporary accommodation for the 1960 Winter Olympic Games in Squaw Valley. The proposed Tahoe Sands Redevelopment is located within a Placer County redevelopment area.

This Notice of Preparation identifies six alternatives including: 1) No Touch/No Project, 2) Proposed Redevelopment Project, 3) Reduced Impact Development, 4) Reduced Development, 5) Additional Affordable Housing Option, and 6) Reduced Unit Development. Four of the six alternatives to be analyzed in this EIR/EIS were derived from the original preferred alternative. The effort to prepare the Environmental Assessment Report and range of alternatives therein involves presentations, meetings and consultation with agencies, and the public. In continuing these outreach efforts, TRPA and Placer County will hold noticed public meetings in its ongoing analysis of alternatives to be carried forward for further consideration.

PURPOSE AND NEED:

The purpose of the proposed action is to upgrade the physical appearance and functionality of the 7.2 acre Tahoe Sands Resort site in the attempt of re-establishing the property as the western gateway to Tahoe Vista. The need for the proposed action is to work in tandem with other redevelopment activity within the Placer County Redevelopment area (RDA); to introduce infrastructure and other improvements which include a) Improve aesthetic character of the commercial core area, b) Implement SR28 improvements including sidewalks, landscaping and utility under-grounding, c) Improve water quality, d) Restore shorezone areas, e) Provide for additional housing needs of employees within the area, f) Provide for additional view corridors some of the following improvements in areas experiencing declining economic growth.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

The following goals and objectives were developed for the proposed action to meet the purpose and need:

► Create, a ‘Gateway’ property within Tahoe Vista which is inviting and gives an attractive first impression for visitors approaching from the west.

► Establish a tourist/commercial node as defined in the community plan by encouraging tourist usage of the west end of the resort development.

► Improve tourist accommodations and other facilities located on existing developed sites without encroaching on undisturbed land areas or other residential neighborhoods.

► Create a unified design concept around a common architectural style, reflected in other new and remolded resort properties using a rustic mountain motif.

► Create a high quality destination tourist accommodation as described as a major policy goal in the Strategic Plan.

► Minimize and mitigate short-term water quality and other environmental impacts during construction.

► Improve the layout of building structures and infrastructure to reduce visual impacts to the surrounding neighborhood.

► Provide opportunities for informal, non-vehicular recreation.
Project Site Location
Tahoe Sands Redevelopment

Approximate Scale
**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (PROPOSED ACTION)**

**Alternative 2 – Proposed Redevelopment Project (Preferred Alternative).** This alternative would allow redevelopment to occur as proposed in the Tahoe Sands Redevelopment Application submitted to Placer County and TRPA. New Development would include environmental enhancements some of which are noted in the following description and details.

**Description:**
Redevelop and replace all existing units and buildings with 103 Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs), which consist of ±720 square foot single bedroom and ±900 square foot 2 bedroom timeshare units, and also 6 ±900 square foot Affordable Housing Units for a total of 109 units. A new Reception Building with Accessible Entrances would partially screen the new delineated parking lots further screened and broken up by landscape design. A new swimming pool on the lakeside parcel, (mountainside pool to remain) would be screened from Highway 28 and Lake Tahoe by new architectural and landscape elements. On the lakeside, seven newly constructed multiple unit housing buildings will replace the 30 + unit motel and several small ±400 square foot wood cabins currently on site that have marginal insulation and foundations. Removal of impervious coverage in the backshore would allow restoration of the natural beach.

**Description Detail:**
- New residential style buildings to maintain character of the area (‘Tahoe Elegance’)
- Three new view corridors are unfiltered
- New landscaping with native species define entrance/exit; install 20’ landscape buffer
- Install sidewalks that connect with existing and proposed walkways/bike routes
- Implement underground utilities along Highway 28 in front of project
- Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs)
- Improve runoff from Highway 28
- Implementation of snow storage areas within project site
- Reduce signage following Tahoe Vista Community Plan Guidelines
- Improve existing bus stop to include a shelter
- Place swimming pool and gathering space away from Highway 28
- Implementation of bear proof trash containers
- Lighting and landscaping per the Tahoe Vista Community Plan
- Create a more sustainable, environmentally friendly LEED Certified

**OTHER ALTERNATIVES**

The following alternatives are intended to be evaluated in the EIR/EIS. These alternatives will be evaluated at an equal level of detail as the above preferred alternative.

• **Alternative 1 – No Change/No Project (Existing Development):** Under this alternative, no redevelopment of the existing development would occur. The project site would retain existing conditions with the requirement that BMPs be installed.

**Description:** The 7.2 acre site is situated in the western gateway to Tahoe Vista on California State Highway 28. The existing site includes two cinder block “motel” buildings built in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s to accommodate the 1960 Winter Olympic Games in Squaw Valley, and numerous cabins, outbuildings, a reception building, two swimming pools, play yards and a large lawn situated between the “motels” and cabins. The motel was converted to a timeshare in the 1970’s and was later purchased by the timeshare homeowners (±2,500) who own and operate it currently.
Description Detail:
  Three Residential Units have been verified by TRPA
  64 Tourist Accommodation Units have been verified by TRPA
  Utility wires and poles front both sides of Highway 28 at the Sands site
  Storm water and runoff flow directly under the site to the lake in a Cal Trans maintained pipe
  Water quality measures in accordance with Placer County and TRPA are not in place
  Installation of BMPs
  Entire frontage on the lakeside consists of a continuous blacktop drive to roadway edge
  Parking along Highway 28 is not screened
  Swimming pool and spa on lakeside are bordering Highway 28 obscuring views of Lake Tahoe for passersby
  View corridors are filtered and unfiltered
  Asphalt and structures extend into the TRPA delineated backshore boundary from 1’ – 10’

• **Alternative 3 – Reduced Impact Development:** This alternative would move all lakeside structures more than 70’ from the roadway improving far shore views over the new structures and improving water quality.

Description:
This alternative is similar to Alternative #2 with the lakeside parcel site plan parking to be located closer to Highway 28 and the reception building to be relocated further away from Highway 28. This design was previously submitted in an earlier application in 2002 and rejected by the TRPA staff because the parking lot was thought to be too prominent along the view corridor.

Description Detail:
  Same architecture as Alternative #2 (proposed redevelopment project)
  Same landscaping scheme as Alternative #2
  Water quality is achieved by allowing runoff from Highway 28 and the lakeside parking lot to be treated on site then tied into the Core Project under an Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) at Estates Drive
  Reduced visual impact with all lake buildings more than 70’ from Highway 28
  Removal of impervious coverage in backshore

• **Alternative 4 – Reduced Development.** Per CEQA guidelines and the TRPA APC request, the project designers were asked to present a reduced development scenario. This alternative was originally conceived in 2000, 2001 as redevelopment as opposed to major renovation of the existing half century old motel and cabin units.

The Tahoe Sands Timeshare Development is currently owned by the ±2500 homeowners. They have contracted with a local Tahoe timeshare Development Sales Company to sell existing timeshare inventory as well as share in redevelopment design and costs. The financing plan that has made redevelopment possible is a combination of homeowner’s fees, loans, upgrading revenue and new sales revenues. To accommodate requests from Placer County and TRPA, we propose a reduced development scenario to be analyzed in the EIS/EIR that is similar to the proposed development project, but would involve an overall 15% reduction in unit size of Timeshares and Affordable Housing Units distributed over the proposed parcels that are included in the project site. In order for this project scenario to work financially a total of 103 TAUs is necessary. Given this fact, we propose a reduced development scenario that could be accomplished by the following:

  Reduce 1-bedroom units 15% (±760 sq. ft. to ±650 sq. ft.)
  Reduce 2-bedroom units 15% (±900 sq. ft. to ±760 sq. ft.)
  Reduce the number of 1-bedroom units and create studio units
  Reduce the number of 2-bedroom units; increasing 1 bedroom units
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This could equate to a reduction in the size/footprint of structures by a corresponding 15%, while not decreasing the total number of units.

**Description:**
Redevelop and replace all existing units and buildings to 103 TAUs and 6 Affordable Housing Units with decreased floor area square footage.

**Description Detail:**
- Same architecture as Alternative #2 (proposed redevelopment project)
- Same landscaping scheme as Alternative #2
- Reduce overall density 15%
- Reduced economic feasibility as smaller units may be non-competitive in the marketplace

**Alternative 5 – Additional Affordable Housing Option.** The TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) has requested that the Draft EIR evaluate additional affordable housing opportunities for the Tahoe Sands Redevelopment in an effort to offset housing needs in the North Tahoe region. In response to the APC’s request, an “Additional Affordable Housing Option” alternative has been developed for the project site, which would increase the number of Affordable Housing Units from 6 to 14. This alternative would eliminate the warehouse/storage/laundry building in Alternative #2 and replace it with the additional 8 Affordable Housing Units. This alternative would require an overall density increase, if allowed by Placer County (19 units/acre or 1.25 units/2,000 sq. ft of project area), for multi-residential/affordable housing under Bonus Residential Unit Allocations. This alternative would also require additional land coverage (to 50% of the total Tourist Accommodation project area) for parking and building, to meet Placer County ordinances that would have to be acquired and transferred to the Sands Redevelopment Project area by the developer.

**Description:**
103 TAUs and 14 Affordable Housing Units would be configured similar to Alternative #2 with additional parking (8 spaces) and 8 additional 1 bedroom units (8 + 6 per Alternative #2 = 14 Total).

**Description Detail:**
- 8 Additional Affordable Housing Units
- Additional Units would have beach access/privileges; increasing public use of the beach
- Reduce Traffic/Noise/Public beach impacts would be reduced in the Tahoe Vista area

**Alternative 6 – Reduced Unit Development.** Under this alternative, development would occur similar to the proposed project, but there would be an overall reduction in development distributed over the proposed redevelopment project. The TAUs would be reduced from 103 to 89. This alternative would eliminate the need to obtain additional TAUs using only the previously purchased units from two directly adjacent properties. For example, buildings would be reduced on the steeper mountainside parcel to minimize the overall footprint of development. The 6 units of affordable/employee housing would remain unchanged.

**Description:**
Redevelop and replace all existing units and buildings to 89 TAUs and 6 Affordable Housing Units

**Description Detail:**
- Same architecture as Alternative #2 (proposed redevelopment project)
- Same landscaping scheme as Alternative #2
- Decrease the TAUs by approximately 15% from the proposed project (preferred alternative)
- Reduced economic feasibility due to fewer TAUs
**POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

The following subject areas include potential environmental effects that will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS:

**Land Use**: Land use impacts to be addressed in the EIR/EIS include changes to onsite uses, land use compatibility, and community character, and for the proposed action, changes in character of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan. The EIR/EIS will also address consistency with the Community Plan requirements.

**Soils, Land Capability and Coverage**: The proposed action would involve the clearing and grading for construction of the new building facilities. Relocation of building footprints will change the amount of coverage in land class zones. The EIR/EIS will describe potential environmental effects related to land capability and coverage, soils and geology, topographic alteration, seismic hazards, and erosion potential.

**Water Quality and Hazardous Materials**: Construction of the proposed action would create a risk that short-term increases in sediment load could occur. BMPs and mitigation measures would be developed to address potential short-term impacts to water quality that would be identified in the EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS will also address hazardous materials issues related to the use of fertilizers and pesticides in addition to focusing on potential short- and long-term changes in sediment fate and transport as it relates to altered landscape areas.

**Lighting and Glare**: The introduction of a larger scale project from 67 units to 109 units could create a new source of light and glare, which could affect day and night views in the area. The EIR/EIS will include an assessment of these impacts on visual quality.

**Scenic Resources**: The proposed action would result in the removal of trees and would replace developed land with larger building structures and a reduced meadow open area. Visibility of the proposed action from State Route 28, a TRPA-designated scenic travel route, will be determined through the EIS/EIR review. Potential impacts from construction and operation of the proposed action will be evaluated through the use of ground-level site photographs from sensitive viewpoints on or near the project site. Scenic effects will be evaluated in terms of visibility of the proposed action, alteration of the visual setting, sensitivity of viewpoints, and potential effects on TRPA scenic thresholds.

**Transportation, Parking and Circulation**: The proposed action would generate short-term, construction-related traffic. Long-term traffic generated by the resort development use will also be discussed as the existing tourist units generate approximately 693 destination vehicle trip ends (DVTE) while the proposed project will generate 1019 DVTEs. The transportation analysis will include identification of major roadways that may be affected by the proposed action, traffic volumes on those roadways, overall operating conditions, public transit routes that may be affected by the proposed action, and major pedestrian or bicycle routes that may be affected by the proposed action.

**Air Quality**: The proposed action would involve construction emissions and generation of fugitive dust, as well as generate construction traffic in the area, contributing pollutants to the air basin. The EIR/EIS will include an assessment of short-term (i.e., construction) air quality impacts and long-term (i.e., operational) regional air pollutant emissions, including mobile as a result of introducing additional destination vehicle trip ends to site as well as the region.

**Noise**: The EIR/EIS will assess potential short-term (i.e., construction) noise impacts, relative to sensitive receptors and their potential exposure. Noise levels of specific construction equipment will be determined and resultant noise levels at nearby receptors (at given distances from the source) will be calculated. Long-term (i.e., operational) noise impacts, including increased noise from mobile sources as a result of potential increases in vehicle trips sources, will be assessed especially along the Highway 28 corridor which has been identified as having a cumulative noise equivalent of 55 CNEL, which is at threshold.
**Unit Size Impacts (including Growth-Inducement):** The increase in unit size from the existing motel units to the larger Tourist Accommodation Units could place increased demands on public services and infrastructure of which the cumulative impacts to fire flows, wastewater treatment, etc., are unknown.

**Public Services and Utilities:** The public services and utilities section of the EIR/EIS will evaluate impacts on power, water treatment and distribution, wastewater collection, solid waste collection and disposal, police services, and fire protection services.

**Cumulative Effects:** The joint EIR/EIS will identify and describe recently approved and reasonably anticipated projects in the Tahoe Vista and Kings Beach area being contemplated for local and region-wide planning efforts currently underway. The EIR/EIS will evaluate the combined effects of these activities with the proposed action.

**TRPA Threshold Carrying Capacities:** The EIR/EIS will include assessment of the proposed action’s compliance with and contribution to the attainment of threshold carrying capacities adopted by TRPA.

**INTENDED USES OF THE EIR/EIS**

TRPA and Placer County will use this EIR/EIS to consider the environmental effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives, when reviewing the proposed action for approval. The EIR/EIS will serve as the State’s CEQA compliance document and as TRPA’s compliance document with respect to its Compact and Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. State responsible and trustee agencies and other cooperating agencies may also use this EIR/EIS, as needed, for subsequent discretionary actions.

**PUBLIC SCOPING**

A public scoping meeting was conducted at the September 12, 2007, APC Public Hearing to provide interested parties with the opportunity to learn more about the proposed action and to express oral comments about the content of the EIR/EIS, in addition to an opportunity to submit written comments. An additional scoping meeting will be held for public comment at the following times and locations:

**Wednesday, November 14, 2007**
9:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Please mail written responses to David L. Landry, Environmental Review Services, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, P.O. Box 5310, Stateline, Nevada or email dlandry@trpa.org to be received no later than November 13, 2007.

David L. Landry, Environmental Review Services  Date

Christina Snow, Community Development Resource Agency  Date
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 7, 2007

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Presentation on TMDL results

Requested Action: No action is requested. The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) is invited to provide comments and discussion on the presentation.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC provide comment and discussion related to the presentation.

Required Motion(s): No motion is required.

Project Description/Background: The Clean Water Act establishes water quality standards for water bodies of the United States. The Lake Tahoe Clarity standard is such a standard. When the water quality standards that describe a minimum requirement to maintain a beneficial use are not being met, the water body is listed for those pollutants known to be affecting that standard, and a TMDL is required to determine the capacity of the water body and the limits of those pollutants. The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection are developing a fine sediment, nitrogen and phosphorus TMDL in response to the declining clarity of Lake Tahoe.

Issues/Concerns: Refinement of the TMDL model has resulted in additional information. Staff’s presentation explains rationale for changes to the model, updated information included in the most recent model runs, and pollutant load reduction opportunities being discussed with the Pathway Forum and other stakeholders.

Regional Plan Compliance: Integration of the TMDL results and strategic alternatives will enhance the implementation of the Regional Plan by providing a basis for focused policies and resource management plans.

If you have any questions, please contact Larry Benoit – Water Quality Program Manager at lbenoit@trpa.org or (775)589-5227.
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 7, 2007
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Status Report on Scope of Work Plan Alternatives for Regional Plan Update EIS

Requested Action: Staff is requesting that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) participate in a planning matter discussion on the pathway planning process and the Environmental Impact Statement preparation. Staff is not requesting an action at this time. The following topics will be covered in the presentation:

- Presentation and Overview of Current Situation and Proposed Process for the plan update.
- Presentation and Results of the Environmental Impact Statement Scoping.
- Presentation and Results of Governing Board Pathway Workshop
- Presentation and Discussion of Potential Alternatives.

Project Description/Background: The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to consider the potential effects of updates to the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (ETCC’s / Thresholds) and current Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region. This project will comply with all TRPA EIS requirements in Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Compact), Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Article VI of the TRPA Rules of Procedure.

TRPA issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on September 5, 2007 which closed on October 5, 2007.

As part of the Pathway 2007 planning process, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), together with the three other Pathway agencies, have been receiving input regarding future management of the Tahoe region from federal, state, and local governments; stakeholders of the Tahoe Region; technical and scientific experts; public-interest groups; the general public; and through a consensus-seeking advisory group called the Pathway 2007 Forum (Forum). TRPA is engaged in the Pathway collaborative process to update its existing Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and its Regional Plan.

In developing the proposal, TRPA, as part of Pathway, held five visioning public workshops in and out of the Basin, conducted 1800 individual surveys and 8 focus
groups in and out of the basin, held numerous meetings of 11 technical working groups, held 17 Forum Meetings with numerous subcommittee meetings, and had many meetings among the four Pathway agencies. The APC and Governing Board reviewed the Vision and Desired Conditions in May of 2006. The proposal takes into account the products of 12 Place-Based Workshops and joint APC-Governing Board Workshops that produced the 2007 Tahoe Basin Regional Vision Summary. For more than four years, TRPA has been considering a wide array of information and viewpoints and has been developing a recommendation to update its Thresholds and Regional Plan.

If you have any questions regarding this matter please contact John Hitchcock at jhitchcock@trpa.org or (775) 589-5220.
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 7, 2007

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Community Enhancement Program Update on Pre-application Proposals and Public Meetings

Requested Action: No action is being requested on this item.

Staff Recommendation: This item is for informational purposes only.

Required Motion(s): No motions are required for this item.

Project Description/Background: This item has been placed on this agenda to update the Advisory Planning Commission’s (APC) members on the Community Enhancement Program’s (CEP) progress to date. The CEP was previously presented to the APC in June of this year and was launched on August 1, 2007. Documentation on the program is available at www.trpa.org. The ninety-day public notice period that called for pre-applications to be submitted to compete for various commodities ended on October 31st, 2007. TRPA is pleased to announce that we have received nine pre-applications for project proposals to be reviewed under the CEP. There are seven proposals located on the North Shore and two proposals located on the South Shore. The proposals are summarized in Attachments A-I. Attachment J contains a map of the project proposals locations.

Two public meetings are scheduled to be held, one on November 5 (South Shore) and the other on November 7, 2007 (North Shore). Staff will update members of the APC on the feedback received at these meetings during this item’s presentation. Agendizing this item also provides an opportunity for the public to give feedback directly to the APC members on the pre-application proposals outlined in your packet and to be presented at the November 5 & 7th public meetings.

There will be additional opportunities for the public to comment on the potential CEP projects. This matter will also go before the Governing Board on November 28, 2007. In January 2008, public hearings will be held with the PRC, the APC and the Governing Board on staff’s recommendations for the allocation of commodities based on the analysis of the applications against the CEP criteria. The Governing Board is expected to take action to determine which proposals should be designated CEP projects and/or receive commodities. Those projects that receive commodities will then be required to submit a full application to the TRPA Environmental Review Services (ERS) within one year. TRPA staff, the local jurisdiction staff and their planning working group members
have been working with the majority of the pre-applicants to help shape their projects. In our discussions with the pre-applicants, it is likely that most, if not all, will apply to ERS immediately upon receiving commodities. Therefore, it is hoped that subject to the environmental review process, on-the-ground implementation would be at the start of the grading season, May 2009.

Collaboration between the community, TRPA, local jurisdictions, institutional partners and developers has been a key feature in making the CEP process a success to date. With nine pre-applications received from around the Lake, TRPA staff is pleased that the CEP has generated interest in achieving and implementing the Program’s goals and objectives.

The CEP is an integral part of the TRPA’s Pathway Regional Plan Update. The program is intended to help inform the Regional Plan update and help to better understand how to encourage “net gain” results from proposed community reinvestment and redevelopment activities. The Program provides a framework and a process to identify and facilitate projects that help to demonstrate the success of Regional Vision Summary and planning concepts, accelerate attainment of environmental thresholds, and achieve community revitalization with local and regional benefits. The Special Projects section of the TRPA Code provides the opportunity for TRPA and our local jurisdiction partners to create the CEP (a.k.a. demonstration program) under the existing TRPA Code of Ordinances. The CEP builds upon Special Projects criteria and incorporates elements of the Regional Vision obtained through the Placed Based planning process. These elements further clarify the goals of the Special Projects and are aimed to assist in moving the Lake Tahoe Basin toward attainment of the environmental thresholds. The focus of the CEP is to implement projects that demonstrate considerable environmental, social and economic benefits by achieving mixed-use development on existing disturbed and/or underutilized sites.

Concerns/Issues: TRPA has received one letter from the Ray Perryman Family (Attachment M) in relation to the Homewood Ski Resort CEP pre-application and master plan application review. The Perryman’ are concerned about the plan to include housing at Homewood, will increase the parking congestion already experienced within the area in both winter and summer months. TRPA will also pass this information on to the Homewood owners JMA Ventures, and to the Environmental Review Services Senior Planner, David Landry for inclusion into the Master Plan application file to follow up on the concerns raised in the letter.

If you have any questions, please contact Brenda Hunt, Land Use Planner at bhunt@trpa.org or 775.589.5225.

****NOTE: Please see the back of the packet for the following attachments:
Attachments:
Attachment A  BB LLC
Attachment B  Ferrari Family Resort
Attachment C  Domus
Attachment D  KB Resorts, LLC
Attachment E  PastoreRyan
Attachment F  Boulder Bay, LLC
Attachment G  Homewood
Attachment H  Mikasa Site
Attachment I  South Y
Attachment J  Kings Beach Project
Attachment K  Homewood Project Site
Attachment L  South “Y” Project Sites
Attachment M  Letter from Perryman
Attachment N  Family
EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

PROJECT AREA: 4.30-acres. Eighteen (18) contiguous parcels. The project area encompasses an entire block of downtown Kings Beach.

LAND USE / ZONING: Kings Beach Community Plan – Downtown Commercial Area. This site is located within Placer County’s North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area and within an adopted Community Plan in the Kings Beach urban core area. It is located within Special Area #1, the Downtown Commercial Area. The properties are located directly adjacent to existing transit nodes, with a diverse mix of pedestrian uses.

SUMMARY OF EXISTING USES: A mix of current and historic residential, commercial, and tourist use comprise the proposed project area. The area currently includes standard commercial and residential.
- Former Hands of Fortune Trailer Park
- Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) Restaurant
- Kings Beach Miniature Golf
- Scraps Dog Bakery Building
- Spirits of Tahoe Building
- Lucky 7 Tattoo Shop Building
- Mad About Music Building
- Remax Realty and Thrift Store Building

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS: The site has been extensively disturbed in the past, so the only significant natural features are the remaining specimen trees. An arborist inventory of the project area has been completed to identify the healthy, specimen trees to be retained and incorporated into the project design. There is no viable “open space” currently on the site due to the extent of previous, automobile-oriented development. There are currently no trails or sidewalks connecting this property with adjoining properties. There is a TART stop located along the highway fronting the KFC property. There are minor easements for utilities on the site, all of which can be relocated to facilitate new construction. No deed restrictions exist on the site.

SUMMARY OF EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS OR COMMODITIES: The project area is located entirely within a Class 5 Land Capability District, with significant verified entitlements, including:
- Approximately 150,000 sq. ft. or 3.45 acres of existing land coverage
- Approximately 19,000 sq. ft. of Commercial Floor Area (CFA)
- Fifteen (15) Residential Units of Use
- Ten (10) Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU’s)
- Ten (10) Recreational Vehicle Sites and two (2) Mobile Home Units

EXISTING WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS: Drainage systems on the site are almost non-existent, and where they do exist, they discharge directly to Lake Tahoe. Existing water quality problems on the project site are largely the result of vehicular activity for parking areas, driveways and turnarounds. This is due to the random and unorganized development pattern on the site.

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD / SITE REMEDIATION & SITE CLEANUP:
- Tank Removal and Site Remediation Completed by B.B., LLC in the Spring of 2007
- Seven (7) vacant structures were removed to reduce a “blight”

“Greatest Opportunity: Kings Beach”
- Placer County Vision Summary, August 2006

B.B., LLC
STEVEN KENT BROWN
835 Twelve Bridges Drive, Suite 95
Lincoln, CA 95648

Approximately sixty-percent (60%) of the site is presently subjected to automobile use, with significant expanses of unpaved, compacted soil.
ose Project

SUMMARY: The proposed Kings Beach Town Center is a pedestrian-oriented development comprised of a total of 7 buildings at this 4.30-acre site, including a parking and potential site for the Placer County Government. The project includes 30 market-rate condominium units in a diversity of sizes, 20 condo-tel units and ten (10) fractional ownership units, 9,000 sq. ft. potential Government Center building, 1,100,000 sq. ft. commercial use comprising 31,000 sq. ft. and 33,000 Professional Office space and 7-space parking structure.

The team reflected on the principles and goals set forth in the Placer County Vision Statement. The conceptual design, by providing these benefits: pedestrian-oriented plaza areas with connectivity, flexible parcels and uses, and the use of pedestrian walkways and destinations, is in line with the principles and goals of the Placer County Vision Statement. The design promotes pedestrian walkways and destinations, and provides opportunities for public gatherings and events.

LOCAL JURISDICTION PARTNERSHIP AND SUPPORT: The project team has been working closely with the Placer County departments in development of the conceptual project beginning with a pre-development meeting in February of 2007. Recently, the Placer County Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to endorse the City of Kings Beach development proposal with its Kings Beach partnership projects for submission to the Lake Tahoe Community Enhancement Program.

ENTITLEMENTS REQUESTED FROM OEP FOR PROPOSED PROJECT:
- Ten (10) Multi-Residential Bonus Units for the new employee/workforce housing property
- Approximately 77,900 sq. ft. of Commercial Floor Area (including 24,000 sq. ft. attributable to potential Placer County Government Center site)

CODE AMENDMENTS: To reach regional and community goals stemming from the placed-based planning process, in addition to accelerated attainment of environmental thresholds, we need to re-evaluate the regulatory framework as it presently exists. Mixed-use, in-fill development within urban cores can accelerate attainment of these goals and environmental thresholds.

The proposed project will require amendments to current height, density and parking standards. Through review of form-based codes, the historical and future context of our communities, we can work together to create overlay districts in established Community Plans and enact policies that achieve common goals. In a cohesive effort with the Placer County CEP projects, Placer County and TRPA, we will inform the Regional Plan update with amendments that encourage a revitalization of existing commercial centers in the Basin.

The viability of both Kings Beach and Tahoe City has suffered in large part because of the lack of density at their commercial cores and the urbanization of surrounding residential communities.

- Regional Vision Summary, May 2007

As you approach the Town Center, the prominent corner at Coon Street marks the beginning of the development, and also becomes a beacon for the Town, creating identity for the entrance point to the beach.

The large contiguous land area creates a rare opportunity for the mixed-use concept to work with all aspects: commercial retail, housing, parking, and civic.

Proposed Site Plan

"New mixed use should be within walking distance of transit and utilize green construction methods."

- Regional Vision Summary, May 2007
Distinguishing Characteristics:

The project will incorporate a high quality architecture that takes its cues from the modern construction methods and materials utilized in contemporary sustainable, green alpine architecture with the idea of continuing the evolution of the Kings Beach character from seasonal campsites to mid-century resort and worker enclave, to a viable, environmentally-focused, diverse year-round community. We are designing architecture that celebrates the views of the lake and the surrounding forest, incorporates modern alpine construction methods and fire resistive materials, is filled with light, shadow and texture, and emphasizes the specific structural and aesthetic characteristics of trusses, beamed ceilings, stone walls, deep recesses, and spaces adaptable to both summer and winter seasons. The proposed architecture will respect its relationship to Lake Tahoe by using multiple planes to diminish the presence of walls, and by using colors and materials that recede from view and blend into the background. It will also demonstrate the value and beauty of incorporating many recycled and naturally weathering materials, as well as Green building practices as it attempts to obtain LEED Certification.

Buildings will step up from the highway frontage to no more than 3 stories on the lake side and no more than 4 stories on the North side. The street edge will be 1 and 2 stories in height, with the upper stories stepping back. It should also be noted that the Ferrari property has an existing three-story building located 25 feet from the high water mark that will be removed to reduce coverage.

As a catalyst project for an important mixed-use transit node in Kings Beach, the proposal intends to incorporate the informal, eclectic quality that currently exists, yet develops a high standard for sustainable architectural design and construction as well as a model for reducing coverage, creating environmental enhancements, and promoting a strong public realm. It is a comprehensive project that intends to benefit the entire community.

Environmental, Social and Economic Benefits:

There are three resonating themes that distinguish this proposal. First, this is a proposal that is intended to strengthen and revitalize this struggling community by providing various types of housing, both market rate and affordable, by creating density at an important community transit activity node, and by creating opportunities for jobs with a valuable tourist accommodation attraction, and enhanced and new retail activities. Second, this proposal provides numerous environmental and scenic core improvements including:

- A significant view corridor where none now exists
- Beach public access
- Sidewalk pedestrian access
- Reduced coverage
- Public open space improvements
- Neighborhood water quality management improvements
- Enhanced transit opportunities
- Elimination of asphalt and other paving
- Removal of all parking and vehicles from the beach side of Highway 28

And third, that the Ferrari family has long been stewards of the environment, the lake and community in Kings Beach and that tradition and responsibility continues in this proposal through their desire to create new housing for full time residents; enhance the living conditions of many of the lowest paid members of the community; expand the public's views and access to the lake, develop a high quality resort; and enhance the quality and beauty of the environment they have lived and worked in over the past half century.
Measurable Benefits:

The Ferrari Family Resort proposes, as part of this project proposal, to implement the following measurable benefits:

- Creation of some new public beach access to 300 feet of previously private land.
- Elimination of all vehicles from the lakeside portion of the project except handicap parking, valet drop off and emergency access.
- Improved scenic quality along Highway 28 and as seen from Lake Tahoe with removal of rundown, crowded development along the view corridor, and replacement with new, attractive, quality multi-planed architecture, screened with landscape plantings.
- Full BMPs for all project elements and creation of a neighborhood BMP project to treat runoff from surrounding properties (depending on space/treatment capacity) of the site.
- Creation of a 50' wide view corridor from Highway 28 to Lake Tahoe.
- Remove extensive coverage (over 7,000 s.f.) from 1B area that will then contribute to recreation, scenic and water quality improvements while improving publicly accessible recreational beach use opportunities.
- Reduction in coverage from more than 80% to less than 60% on the lakefront portion of the property.
- Abandonment of Brockway Vista, an unimproved county road, to the extent of the existing Crown Resort and Goldcrest properties, to be replaced with emergency and pedestrian public access to the existing and potentially expanded beach, reducing automobile access in the project area.
- Creation of 44 new family residential units, a new family resort, more than 300 parking spaces, and 35,000 square feet of CFA in existing transit node.
- Creation of new work force residential units through donation of a site and cooperation with DOMUS Development.
- Commercial Core improvements to create a pedestrian friendly streetscape and varied setbacks to create places for people to congregate.
- An elevated pedestrian crossing to facilitate people safely crossing Highway 28 where no signals are proposed.
Ferrari Family Resort

The next 50 years on the lake and in the community

Proponent: Ferrari Family

Location: Kings Beach, CA

Project Description:

More than 50 years ago, the Ferrari Family purchased a little cabin on the shores of Lake Tahoe in Kings Beach. Since that time, the family has lived, worked, and played in the community, creating a much loved family resort, contributed continuously to its environmental, economic, and social vitality, and has taken an active leadership role in shaping its current redevelopment effort. The culmination of this effort is the proposed Ferrari Family Resort: The next 50 years on the Beach and in the Community. This is a complex and comprehensive proposal that will transform the Western gateway of Kings Beach from a collection of time worn underperforming and environmentally damaging motels, cabins, parking areas, and retail spaces into a vibrant community and tourist serving transit oriented mixed-use activity center. This proposal provides 44 new housing opportunities for full-time residents, new workforce housing in collaboration with DOMUS Development, a new Leed certified resort, more than 30,000 square feet of enhanced and new retail opportunities, extensive environmental improvements, significant consolidated parking, an enhanced transit center, and important public views and access to the lake.

Existing Site Context/Conditions:

The existing sites, located on both sides of Highway 28 between Secline Street and Deer Street, contain an eclectic mix of aged residential, resort and commercial buildings. These single and multi-story buildings, built over the past 50 plus years, are dispersed on the sites, creating excessive coverage and uncontrolled site drainage. Some of the residential buildings, originally built as cabins, are under 200 square feet, yet they are homes to families. Additionally, many of the motel units have long been utilized as residences because they represent the only affordable options for many people. The undersized Rite Aid store is housed in a former bank building, one of many improvised uses. The current Ferrari Crown Resort, including the former Gold Crest are a collection of 2 and 3 story buildings that extend to the lake high water line, completely block any views of the lake, and have coverage of more than 80 percent.

The sites on the North of Highway 28 are relatively flat with an over abundance of trees that are often encroaching on building foundations. There are no curbs, gutters or sidewalks, and no water treatment measures. On the lake side of the highway the site slopes slightly to the Brockway Vista Drive, an unimproved County Road, and then slopes down to the lake. Here trees are sparse, but well located. There is little screen planting on the lake side of the buildings.

The existing site conditions include:

- Coverage in excess of 80 percent on most sites
- 27 Residential Units
- 93 Tourist Accommodation Units
- 19,000 square feet of pavement for parking and vehicle circulation on the lake side
- 5,972 square feet of Commercial Floor Area
- Predominantly Class 5 land with a portion of the lake side classified as 1B
- No public access through the sites or open space
- 25 foot wide scenic easement on the Langston property
- No bus shelters
- No sidewalks or bike paths
Proposed Site Context/Conditions:

The Ferrari Family Resort proposal incorporates residential, commercial, resort, parking, and open space in a vertical and horizontal mixed-use project encompassing multiple sites on both sides of Highway 28. On the north side of the highway, three different housing sites on Rainbow Avenue add approximately 38 new flats and live/work townhouses in 3 story buildings. A four mixed-use housing project adds an additional 6 units over retail in a 3 story building facing the highway. A new 16,000 SF commercial space is proposed on the existing Rite Aid site, flanked by new ground floor retail and a pedestrian overpass entrance. At the center of the block a 4 level parking structure is planned, its walls screened by the surrounding retail and residential structures. The new resort spans both sides of the highway, linked at the second floor by a pedestrian overpass that is also open to the public and connects to the parking structure. The lake side of the 3 story resort is planned to provide a streetfront cafe, a waterfront restaurant, and a view corridor to the lake. The buildings are pulled back from the high water line approximately 50 feet. Brockway Vista is closed to vehicles at the current Goldcrest property and dedicated for pedestrian access. On the North side of the highway, the resort wraps around a over the new commercial space creating a stepped back 4 story building with balconies overlooking the street and lake. Neighborhood BMP gardens are sited to control and treat site drainage.

Code Amendments/Commodities:

Code Amendments: The following Code issues will need to be addressed to implement the Ferrari Resort Community Enhancement Proposal.

- Parking: The Ferrari application proposes a parking structure incorporating approximately 320 shared parking spaces which eliminates scattered parking from most sites and consolidates them into one structure.
- Density: TRPA Code, Chapter 21, does not provide for a methodology of calculating the number of uses in a mixed-use project. As conceptual planning and economic analysis continues, the product mix of number and type of units may change to ensure that the proposal is economically viable and can be built.
- Height: Current TRPA Code, Chapter 22, will need to be adjusted to allow for 3 and 4 story building heights that support reduced coverage and transit oriented development.
- Coverage: The Code will need to be adjusted to consider the entire proposal coverage including non-contiguous parcels.
- Land Use: Multiple-family residential and Time Share uses will need to be added to the allowable land uses, and designate the proposal area to receive transfers of existing development.

Commodities: The proposed development has 93 TAUs and will require approximately 87. The project will require 44 RUs. Currently 46 RUs, 19 of which will need to be transferred as bonnet units from a site developed in conjunction with DOMUS's affordable housing initiative. Approximately 29,100 square feet of additional CFA is required to meet the goal of 35,000 square feet.

Environmental Enhancement Improvements:

Several elements will specifically contribute to environmental improvements, recreational access to Lake Tahoe, and scenic improvements within the Kings Beach commercial core.

- Remove approximately 7,000 square feet of coverage from sensitive 1B lake front land, restore an area of beach, and open the beach to some public access.
- Open a 50' wide view corridor from Highway 28 to Lake Tahoe.
- Remove nearly 15,000 square feet of parking from the lake side of Highway 28.
- Reduce lake side coverage from 81% to less than 60%.
- Enhance water quality with roof designs that capture and direct rain and snow to on-site BMPs.
- Participate in the implementation of the Community Core project where it interfaces with the project.
- Contribute substantially to the Scenic Quality Improvement EIP with new, high quality buildings utilizing natural and recycled materials, deep recesses, and multiple planes.
200 CHIPMUNK

Project Area: 63,843 sq. ft.  
Land Capability: Land Class 5, 3 and 1a

The 63,843 or 1.5 acre parcel is developed with 9 one story structures; 6 are residential units, one was previously used as a church but is now vacant, and 2 are derelict.

Natural Features: 44 existing trees, 10 which are 30’th or greater

Surrounding Neighborhood: Surrounding land uses include a mix of single-family and multi-family residences, commercial uses, and motels.

Transit Linkages: Bus stop adjacent at N Lake Blvd and Chipmunk St

The proposed units on this site could potentially house 101 tenants (based on the HUD maximum of 2 tenants per bedroom).

Additional Needs: Height increase, parking reduction, density increase

8797 NORTH LAKE BLVD

Project Area: 14,961 sq. ft.  
Land Capability: Class 5

These 3 parcels make up a project area that contains the Swiss Mart Gas Station. The station has been removed and the site remediated.

Natural Features: none

Surrounding Neighborhood: Surrounding land uses include a mix of single-family and multi-family residences, commercial uses, and motels.

Transit Linkages: Bus stop adjacent at N Lake Blvd and Chipmunk St

The proposed units on this site could potentially house 10 tenants (based on the HUD maximum of 2 tenants per bedroom).

Additional Needs: Height increase, parking reduction, density increase

PROJECT SUMMARY

KINGS BEACH Housing Now will address the urgent need for affordable workforce housing in Kings Beach and help to protect the natural beauty of Lake Tahoe and its surrounding environment. Our CEP proposal consists of a scattered sites project that will demonstrate substantial environmental, social and economic benefits for the region. Our project aims to provide new income restricted housing and environmental improvements that will enhance the quality of life contributing to the long-term economic vitality of the region. Our housing will promote a healthier environment through green buildings, storm water management and “smart growth” practices. By also supporting higher density infill development and increasing transit ridership, the project will counter the environmental ills associated with sprawled development. The project builds on transit nodes and key redevelopment opportunities utilizing existing disturbed, blighted or underutilized properties.

The Project will be constructed in phases to accommodate relocation of existing residents. The new housing types will vary from studios to three bedroom units to address the varied needs for singles as well as large family housing. Domus is currently investigating the possibility of using panzetal or other modular housing construction to deal with the short construction season and to reduce the impact of construction onsite. Domus will explore LEED certification for the Project and is committed to utilizing green building technologies.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Allowable: 3,740 sq. ft. or 25% of total project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Units</td>
<td>Existing: 14,811 sq. ft. or 99% of total project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>0 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA:</td>
<td>1,326 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>no parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Needs: Height increase, parking reduction, density increase

EIP INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear Feet of Pedestrian and bike facilities constructed: 510 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF impassive cover removed: 8,180 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF treated and/or re-vegetated: 8,180 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Feet of underground utility lines installed: 2,005 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear feet of streetscape improvements: 78,199 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of re-vegetation: 78,199 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of structures removed, relocated, or improved: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear feet of highway right-of-way improved: 510 LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF treated with erosion source control and runoff practices: 78,199 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF of roadway storm-water treated: 3,180 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds of Emission Reductions: TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
325, 348, 385 DEER STREET
Project Area: 28,125 sq. ft.
Land Capability: Land Class 5

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS
This project area is made up of three parcels; two are contiguous and one is separated by Dear St.
There are 6 one-story structures which were initially motels and have been converted to long term residential rentals.

Surrounding Neighborhood: primarily residential with a mixture of single family homes, duplexes, and higher density multi-family. There are several converted residential motels near-by.

Natural Features: Disturbed over covered site, 26 existing trees, 9 which are 30'/th or greater.

Transit Linkages: Bus stop 300 ft. away at N Lake Blvd and Deer St

EXISTING
Coverage
Allowable: 7,032 sq. ft. or 25% of total project area
Existing: 19,310 sq. ft. or 70% of total project area

TAUs: 7 units

RIS: 11 units

Density: 28 units per acre

Parking: Approximately 24 spaces

PROPOSED SITE CONDITIONS
This proposal includes 5 structures on three parcels for a total of 16 units comprised of 10 three bedroom, 2 two bedroom, and 4 one bedroom units.
The proposed units on this site could potentially house 80 tenants (based on the HUD maximum of 2 tenants per bedroom).

Placer County parking standards require 45 parking spaces for this project.

Additional Needs: Height increase, parking reduction, potential to use existing density.

PROPOSED
Coverage
Proposed: 15,991 sq. ft. or 54% of the total project area
Change: Reduction of 4,579 sq. ft. or 16%

# of Units: 16 units

Unit types: 10-three bedroom, 2-two bedroom, 4-one bdrm

Density: 25 units per acre

Parking: 32 parking spaces (24 covered, 8 in open lot)

TROUT STREET
Project Area: 13,755 sq. ft.
Land Capability: Verification is pending.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS
The project area consists of 3 parcels; 2 that are vacant and the third has a compacted dirt road which is used for vehicle storage.

A portion of the site is located in Special Area 1, Downtown Commercial of the Kings Beach Commercial Community Plan and the remaining is located within P28 Kings Beach Residential.

Surrounding Neighborhood: primarily residential with a mixture of single family homes, duplexes, and higher density multi-family.

Natural Features: 6 existing trees, 3 which are 30'/th or greater.

Transit Linkages: Bus stop 500 ft. away at N Lake Blvd & Bear St

EXISTING
Coverage
Allowable: Potentially 3,444 sq. ft.
Existing: 2,049 sq. ft. or 15% of total project area

TAUs: 0 units

RIS: 0 units

Density: 0 units per acre

Parking: 0 spaces

PROPOSED SITE CONDITIONS
This proposal is for 6 units comprised of 2 one bedrooms and 4 three bedrooms.
The proposed units on this site could potentially house 28 tenants (based on the HUD maximum of 2 tenants per bedroom).

Placer County parking standards require 16 parking spaces.

Additional Needs: Height increase, parking reduction, density increase

PROPOSED
Coverage
Proposed: 5,893 sq. ft. or 43% of project
Change: Increase of 3,847 sq. ft. or 26%

# of Units: 6 units

Unit types: 4-three bedroom, 2-one bedroom

Density: 19 units per acre

Parking: 12 spaces

265 FOX STREET
Project Area: 16,750 sq. ft.
Land Capability: Land Class 5

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS
This parcel contains 5 one-story motel cottages that have been converted to long term residential rentals.

Surrounding Neighborhood: primarily residential with a mixture of single family homes, duplexes, and higher density multi-family; there are several converted residential motels near-by.

Natural Features: Disturbed over covered site, 36 existing trees, 13 of which are 30'/th or greater.

Transit Linkages: Bus stop about 650 ft. away at N Lake Blvd & Fox St

EXISTING
Coverage
Allowable: 4,688 sq. ft. or 25% of total project area
Existing: 11,538 sq. ft. or 62% of total project area

TAUs: 7 units

RIS: 1 units

Density: 18 units per acre

Parking: in front of the individual structures; undefined

PROPOSED SITE CONDITIONS
This proposal is for 12 units comprised of 4 one bedroom and 8 three bedroom apartments for a total density of 28 units per acre.
The proposed units on this site could potentially house 56 tenants (based on the HUD maximum of 2 tenants per bedroom).

Placer County parking standards require 42 parking spaces for this project.

Additional Needs: Height increase, parking reduction, density increase

PROPOSED
Coverage
Proposed: 11,520 sq. ft. or 61% of the total project area
Change: Reduction of 18 sq. ft. or 1%

# of Units: 12 units

Unit types: 8-three bedroom, 4-one bedroom

Density: 28 units per acre

Parking: 24 covered parking spaces
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KINGS BEACH Housing Now
COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Project Proponent: Kings Beach Resorts LLC - Michael Blakeman, Nancy Frisch, George Bean
Project Team: Kaufman Planning, Ward-Young Architecture, Gary Davis Civil Eng., Randy Facinto-Attorney
Location:
- Project Area - Seven Placer County Assessor parcels located in "The heart" of Kings Beach, California on 2.08 acres of land adjacent to the Community Conference Center to the east and Ferrari Crown Resort to the west.

WHAT IS HERE TODAY?

- (72) Aging and obsolete Tourist Accommodation Units in four motels: “The Sun and Sand Resort, Falcon Lodge, Big Seven Motel, and Motel California.
- (230 seats) worn and dated restaurants scattered throughout project site - high turnover (Steamers), a smaller - coffee shop, (Java Hut) and (Peleusos Pizzal) - to go.
- (6564 sf) of existing Commercial Floor Area - “La Petite Hair Salon, Java Hut & Steamers.”
- (11) Small Residential Units of Use comprised of Managers’ units and non-conforming studio rooms located within the hotels and commercial buildings.
- (81% land coverage) of 2.08 acres. (13,000 sf) contained within Class 1b and Class 5 soils.
- 96 surface parking of cars on the Lakeside of North Lake Blvd;
- Poorly marked and non-advertised Public access to the Lake;
- Conservancy and utility easements.

WHAT IS PLANNED FOR TOMORROW?

A project that addresses the rehabilitation of the deterioration of North Lake Tahoe’s built environment in “THE CENTER” of Kings Beach by providing for a mixed use project designed to:

- Improve water quality to treat the 100 year storm.
- Provide synergy for a walkable community: creating connections at the “keystone” of Kings Beach including pedestrian walkways and promenades to the Lake with direct linkage to the Community Conference Center and State Beach.
- Create Community access to Lake Tahoe and other Public spaces with opportunities for a new cultural center/museum and 7500 sf of additional deeded beach access.
- Open up new 75ft. wide view corridor from North Lake Blvd to public beach at currently Lake view blocked entrance to downtown Kings Beach.
- Encourage a healthy and more vibrant main street by participation in the KBCSCIP.
- Consolidate 8560 sf of one story retail in two locations fronting Highway 28 encouraging pedestrian access to the central plaza, terrace, and beach overlook.
- Update and revitalize existing restaurants - Provide for a new “Steamers” style” restaurant of 3580 sf with approx. 1400 sf of outside deck and 210 seats.
- Redevelop the existing Tourist Accommodations at “The Center of Town” by providing for: 64 new Tourist Units consisting of:
  - 30 fractional units with kitchens (15 one bd., 14 two bd., 1 three bd.).
  - 34 studio hotel rooms with kitchens - "Heads on Beds" direct benefit to Conference Center.
WHY UNIQUE?

- The Kings Beach Lakeside Resort is "The Center" of Kings Beach. The logical tie in and direct nexus to the Community Conference Center-the State Beach to the East and other Tourist Oriented lodging to the west. The resort is organized around public amenities, oriented to take advantage of the southern exposure and views to the Lake. Only private project offering a public plaza to the Lake in the center of Kings Beach.

  Request: Amendment/concession to allow residential timeshare as an allowable use in Special Area #2 of the Kings Beach Community Plan - for both Placer County and TRPA zoning.

  Request: To allow an increase in density per Chapter 21 in the TRPA Code with no penalties for mixed use or for adding kitchens to motel use, or alternatively, for TRPA to adopt Kings Beach as a Redevelopment Area using the existing findings in the Placer County RDA Environmental Document. Placer County and TRPA to adopt consistent zoning.

- The architecture is a contemporary interpretation of regional & "Old Tahoe" influences that respects the scale and character of the surrounding context and Kings Beach as a unique place. Architecture that will step down around the edges to reduce the apparent mass and shading to the sidewalk along Hwy. 28.

  Request: 45 feet of height where 38 feet is allowed under Code Section 22.7. Re-look at TRPA Code Section 22.4 B to allow interpolation of existing codes for increased view corridor, setbacks and shoreline access.

- Only project that proposes removal of 96 on-site surface Lakeside parking places and replacement with two parking structures containing 50 cars that are partially below grade (4.5 feet) to reduce the presence and views of cars within the project and from the highway and Lake.

  Request: TRPA and Placer County to re-examine Appendix B-Standards & Guidelines for signage, parking, and design of the North Tahoe Community Plans to allow concessions for mixed use projects. Proposal for 75 spaces where approx. 120 +/-spaces are required. Project applicant to work with other developers, community partners etc. to explore shared parking, valet and other options.

- LEED certification will be pursued to create high performing, healthy, durable buildings that have minimum impacts to the environment. Roof forms, materials and detailing to respect the climatic and environmental conditions unique to the site.

ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT?

- Treatment of runoff for the 100 year storm.- Standard: 20 year 1 hour storm.
- Reduction of Land Coverage of more than 5%. - Standard: 5% reduction.
- Reduction of 387 Vehicle Miles Traveled and 95 PM peak hour trips over existing conditions. Standard: no mitigation required- Proposed: one on-site bus shelter.
- New 75 linear feet of public view corridor to Lake Tahoe from Highway 28 where badly needed at western entrance to downtown Kings Beach. Standard: replacement of existing view corridor lost by new construction.
- Potential reduction of off-site land coverage in sensitive soils as a result of removal of Motel CA; Standard: Relocation on site.
- Reduction of driveways off Highway 28 from four to one.
- Potential Removal of Tourist Accommodation Units from sensitive class 1b soils.
- Participation in the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project. 450 plus linear feet of sidewalk, street trees, and frontage improvements. Sidewalks to be larger than standard.
- LEED Certified sustainably designed development.

SOCIAL BENEFIT?

- Removal of and rehabilitation of substandard and aging development.
- Tie in with three other non-contiguous parcels whose structures are blighted and economically worn to extend the area of benefit to the community by removal and rehabilitation.
- Revitalization of the Kings Beach Community with "inviting public gathering places" by providing ADA access to the Lake in the heart and center of Kings Beach.
- Lake access and use for potential owners/users of other proposed Kings Beach redevelopment projects that are not on the Lakefront, in addition to current residents and visitors -- helping all projects in the market.
- Opportunities for a new cultural center/museum at the La Petite property modeled after the Watson Cabin; for artifacts, long time photos, public gathering and reminiscing.
- Improvement to the quality of life for the workforce by providing new, upgraded facilities to replace substandard existing housing.

ECONOMIC BENEFIT?

Tourism - $50,000,000 plus dollars spent to construct project will promote tourism and provide for local jobs contributing to the long-term economic vitality of the region. Improved quality of tourist accommodation units, Lake access and attractive public areas will result in higher occupancy and improved economic activity (including increased TOT and sales tax revenue).

Conference - Symbiotic relationship with the existing community conference center by providing upgraded hotel rooms. More use of the conference center will bring in more tourist dollars thus assisting everyone else in the community. Fractional component of the project will provide full-time use of the resort to assist with occupancy in the shoulder seasons.
8931 North Lake Blvd (Foothill Motel) is currently the design and engineering office of Pastore • Ryan. Surrounding land uses within a thousand foot radius include residential and commercial. The Foothill Motel is the last commercial business in eastern Kings Beach. The Foothill Motel is also the first commercial property as one enters Kings Beach from the east (Crystal Bay, Nevada).

Pastore • Ryan is the owner and developer of the 8931 North Lake Blvd project. It is the intent of Pastore • Ryan to conduct a community-based design process and construct the planned project. A proposed mixed-use eco-office park will offer residents and visitors numerous facilities including a demonstration site/resource center for sustainable design. This project intends to offer an ongoing series of training and educational workshops addressing the needs and desires of the community.

Existing: ▲ Pastore • Ryan Office, Former Foothill Motel

Current Site Conditions:
APN: 090-222-012
Parcel Size: 11,373 SF (0.26 Acres)
Coverage: 5,789 SF (51%)
Land Capability: Pending
CFA: 1,059 SF
TUs: 7 Units
Residential: 1 Unit
Building Height: 19'-11"
Surrounding Land Use: Residential and commercial
Parking: Diagonal parking adjacent to State Route 28 - 9 spaces
Structure: 2 CMU constructed buildings
Site Features: Small courtyard, concrete walks, retaining walls, patio and limited landscaping
Linkages: Unimproved shoulder State Route 28, Beaver Street. bus stop at SR 28 and Chipmunk Street, sidewalk begins at Chipmunk Street.

▲ Proposed: Mixed-use Eco-office Park
proposed site
Pastore Ryan’s business and passion is “green building”. 8931 North Lake Blvd will be a clear demonstration of green building integrated with neighborhood design and enhancements. In addition, the site is currently blighted and the project will greatly improve the visual character of the buildings and landscape. The project intends to demonstrate green building concepts and implement renewable energy systems including solar electric, solar thermal, biodiesel, stormwater and greywater re-use, and edible landscaping.

proposed site conditions:
Coverage: 5,526 SF (49%)
Land Capability: Pending
Structure: Pre-Fabricated Units, Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs), Wood Framed
Site Features: Stormwater and Greywater re-use, edible and native landscaping, green roof
Linkages: Sidewalk and bike lane along State Route 28 continuing to Chipmunk, heading West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A</th>
<th>Concept B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFA: 3,623 SF</td>
<td>3,623 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUs: 0 Units</td>
<td>0 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: 2 Unit (1,065 SF)</td>
<td>5 Units (3,219 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office: 1,693 SF</td>
<td>1,693 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height: 28’</td>
<td>37’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking: 9 spaces</td>
<td>9 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commodities/Allowances Needs:
Commercial Floor Area (CFA): 2,564 SF
Building Height: None
Parking Spaces: 4
Residential Units: 1

Urban Beautification:
Improvements to the façade
New landscape design
Green roof garden
Proper scale of building

Environmental Improvements:
Reduction of site coverage
No net runoff of stormwater
Habitat enhancement – bird/bat houses, etc.
Modern BMP & defensible space demonstration
Reduce dependence on automobiles
Pervious concrete

Sustainable Development
Community Non-profit Center for Sustainability
Mixed use: Retail, non-profit/public, educational programs, cafe, residential

8931 North Lake Blvd - Concept A ▼

8931 North Lake Blvd - Concept B ▼

8931 North Lake Blvd - Site Plan ▼
Boulder Bay Preliminary Existing Site Conditions
Depicting Increased Setbacks and Improved Pedestrian Experience along Highway 28

**Objectives:**
- Enhance scenic & pedestrian environment
- Repair grading and erosion issues and reduce sediment
- Reduce coverage, create pedestrian village and community gathering space, hide parking behind buildings and underground
- Increase setbacks, deemphasize gaming, connect to multimodal transportation system, enhance scenic quality

**Boulder Bay Project Goals & Objectives**
1. Establish a unique character for the Crystal Bay community
2. Creation of a true destination resort experience
3. Development of retail and tourist amenities in a village environment
4. Create a pedestrian and multimodal transportation hubs
5. Create a streetscape and improve the scenic quality of Hwy 28
6. Enhance walkability and improve pedestrian safety & traffic flow
7. Create view corridor to the lake and mountains
8. Reduce visibility of parking areas
9. Placement of buildings for better energy conservation
10. Reduce the amount of impervious surface and improve water quality attributes
11. Connect the site to all possible recreation opportunities

**Project Name:**
Boulder Bay Mixed Use Resort

**Proposers:**
Boulder Bay LLC (Majority partners International Supply Companions & Shoreline Tahoe, LLC, Architects: Design Workshop (Master Plan), Hensel & Roberts (Vertical))

**Location:**
Crystal Bay, Nevada: North Shoreline Community Plan (Tahoe Biltmore Resort and former Tahoe Mariner site)

**Project Description:**
BOULDER BAY is envisioned to become a place where both visitors and residents can experience all that Lake Tahoe has to offer within a single destination resort community. Our project will be a reinvention of the North Tahoe resort experience, with an emphasis on year-round outdoor and health and wellness opportunities.

Our project will seek to find a natural balance and transcend its surroundings by taking a ground-up approach to a sustainable LEED-certified design and building. Our environmental program will reduce coverage, develop infrastructure that improves visual and water quality, reduce vehicle trips and relocate the pedestrian pathway away from parking areas and toward the cultivation of the outdoors and the lake.

**Existing Site Context Conditions:**
- Existing on-site & adjacent land uses: Hotel & Casino resort with surface parking; vacant parcels originally housing the Tahoes. Existing uses are in close proximity to Hwy 28 with limited landscaping
- Mariner Hotel and Casino. Adjacent three gaming facilities, Casino office and Blighted Motels
- Current site details including land coverage: Bilmore 262,409 (89%) Lakeview 66,612 (25%)
- Abandoned Roads 25,610 (10%)
- Land capability: Predominantly Class 4 / small amount of Class 1 on the north side of Tahoe Mariner site
- CFA: 78,679 sq. ft. / 29,744 sq. ft. of Gaming CFA
- Units of use: 114 TAU / 6 EAU
- Parking surface: 296 parking spaces
- Linkages: 8-10’ Public sidewalks with no setback from Hwy 28; bike lanes on the road surface
- Open space: Predominantly located on the Tahoe Mariner site. No parks or gathering spaces
- Easements: Wawona Rd, Stanolm Rd, portions of Reserve Dr.
- Deed restrictions: none

**Proposed Site Context Conditions:**
On-site and adjacent land uses: BOULDER BAY is envisioned to be a new full-service resort community located on the crystal clear shores of legendary Lake Tahoe. When completed, the BOULDER BAY resort will apply edge environmental design to create a relaxing mountain village complex with a full-service hotel, spa and gaming facility, fractional and whole ownership condominiums, a pedestrian mountain village with a variety of retail and dining options, a world-class health and wellness center.

**Site Details:**
- Proposed land coverage: 10.15% reduction in land coverage
- Land capability: Development on Class 4 soil
- CFA: 33,775 sq. ft. of dining and retail (10,950 sq. ft. classified as hotel accessory)
- Gaming CFA: 18,000 sq ft (significant reduction from current)
- TAU: 101 hotel / 282 fractional condominium
- Residential units: 2 Whole ownership units / 12,350 sq ft of workforce housing units onsite
- Parking: 821 designed and hidden from Hwy 28 and the lake
- Linkages: Interconnected pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, investment in multimodal public transportation system, recreation: golf, skiing, hiking and lake
- Resort Amenities: Health and Wellness Center as well as a full service spa and health club, 7,500 sq ft of meeting facilities, Family entertainment and kid recreation centers.
- Open space: Green space and trail complex developed on north side of project; village center w/ retail, dining
- Easements: Provided for all necessary utilities
- Deed restrictions: none
CEP COMMUNITY

Multi-Residential: 48 Bonus Units

CFA: n/a

Density: n/a

Height: 75 ft. (existing buildings is 76 ft.)

Parking requirements: 49% reduction based on LSC Transportation Consultants study

EIP PROJECTS

a) Transportation
   1. Enhanced multimodal/short headway transit
   2. Pedestrian pathway system along SR 28 and connecting side streets
   3. Improvements to the following intersections with Hwy 28 to improve traffic flow/safety:
      - Cal Newa Drive (adjacent to the post office)
      - Stetina Road
      - Reservoir Drive

b) Water Quality/Soil Conservation
   1. Washoe County Water Quality Improvement Projects
   2. Placer County Blueways Water Quality Improvement Project
   3. BMPs on public rights-of-way

c) Scenic Resources/Community Design
   1. State Route 28 scenic improvements (EIP Project # 869)
   2. Utility undergrounding (EIP Project # 970 and 972)
   3. North Stateline CP Lake View Mini Park (EIP Project # 110)

CEP PROJECT CRITERIA

Boulder Bay is committed to community improvement on multiple fronts: 1) Improvement of physical structures and properties, 2) Improvement and revitalization of the North Shore economy, 3) Improvement of Environmental conditions and performance:

- Redevelop blighted properties and structures within the targeted North Stateline Community Plan
- Catalyst for re-invigorating the North Shore economy by deemphasizing gaming, driving activity during shoulder seasons and reinforcing tourist activity on a celebration of the outdoors and the lake
- Contribute to environmental improvement initiatives in the areas of water quality, transportation and scenic

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

Built upon developer Roger Wittmer's, lifelong commitment to innovative environmental stewardship and sustainability, Boulder Bay has the SCALE and the LEADERSHIP to provide a REAL catalyst for the revitalization of the Crystal Bay Community and the greater North Shore communities:

- Concentration of development and increase in dining, retail and community gathering spaces
- Job creation and seasonal demand stabilization
- Multimodal transportation and VMT reduction
- Water quality and scenic improvements

MEASURABLE BENEFITS

a) Transit
   1. Public transportation use to access North Stateline
   2. Reduction Vehicle trips (VMT)

b) Environmental
   1. Water quality in Crystal Bay area of Lake Tahoe (reduction in lbs. of sediment)
   2. Scenic quality from Highway 28 and the Lake (increased scenic rating)
   3. Percent green space allocated for public use

c) Tax Revenue
   1. Total tax revenue generated from North Stateline
   2. % tax revenue generated from gaming

CONTACT INFORMATION

Phil Wedinger
Wedinger Public Relations
(775) 588-2412
diego@wedingerpr.com
**Background:** The Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area, originally the Homewood Ski Area and Tahoe Ski Bowl, is a long standing fixture of the Homewood Community, as is the surrounding residential area, Obexer’s Marina, Homewood Hi and Dri Marina, and central Homewood commercial area. The proposed project, including modernization of the ski area, development of new lodges, and addition of small commercial, additional residential and tourist accommodations are all uses that have existed in the area for generations.

The proposed project is intended to fit into the site and step up the lower, gentler slopes at the runout of the ski runs at both the north and south base areas

By enabling the existing ski area to remain open and to be modernized, the project is an important economic enhancement of the west shore and Homewood area, providing jobs, housing, lodging for guests, and general commercial improvements. As already noted, there is the beginning of an economic improvement already, in part due to the anticipation of the revitalization of the Homewood Mountain Resort and additional development of the resort.

The existing conditions at the north and south base areas, including surrounding land uses, ingress and egress points, parking, and storm water improvements are illustrated on the attached maps.
Proposal:
The proposed project includes revitalized ski facilities, a new gondola, base and mid-mountain lodges and skier services, local serving commercial, tourist accommodations (hotel and interval ownership), single family attached and detached residential, and employee housing. The architectural theme will be reminiscent of “Old Tahoe”. Although current building codes will mandate fire resistant and/or non-combustible materials, the architecture will be one of primarily natural, rustic materials such as log timbers, shingles and wood siding, and stone. The North Base area has been accepted into the U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) for Neighborhood Development Pilot Program. Building heights will range from 1 and 2 stories on the outer edges and fronts of buildings, and three-four stories inclusive of the traditional pitched roofs in the center areas away from the street frontage. The architecture will be designed to blend with the surroundings and not appear to be so tall due to the limitations of viewing distances and vantage points and the way the buildings will be gradually stepped up the slopes.

Additional important elements of the proposed project include:

- Upgrades to existing ski facilities
- Replace Madden chair with 8-passenger gondola to new mid-mtn lodge and learn to ski area
- Replace Quail chair with detachable quad chair
- Relocate Quail chair to mid-mtn learn to ski area

North Base Area development will include the following key elements:
- Ski Support Services,
- Hardware store, grocery store, and ice cream parlor (estimated 15,000 – 17,000 s.f.);
- 50-60 traditional hotel room
- 40 two bedroom hotel condo units
- 30 hotel residential units
- 42 residential condominium units, 30 of which are designed to be interval ownership Restaurant, lounge and meeting space
- Ice skating pond
- Spa and fitness facility within the lodge hotel
- 12 employee-housing units
- Substructure and parking garage for all parking.

The project parking structure will serve most day skiers during the ski season, and during summer will provide off-street parking for boat trailers to get them off the street.

**South Base area development is proposed to include:**

- 120 attached residential condominium units
- a small ski area maintenance facility

The South Base area will no longer have public ski access or parking, although skiers may come down the mountain and ride back up on the Quail lift or over to the north base via ground transportation provided by the resort. All parking at the south base will be restricted to use by the residential unit owners and will be located directly under the new residential units eliminating the need for surface parking lots at the south base.

**Preliminary Conceptual Mid-Mountain Facility**

Mid-Mountain development is proposed to include:
The mid-mountain lodge will house upper terminal of gondola, food service, first aid and other services, as well as a pool for community residents in West Shore area. Summer events will include weddings and other activities.

Major environmental elements of the proposed project include:

The North Base has been accepted for the LEED Neighborhood Pilot program and all facilities will incorporate sustainable design principles.

- Development to be setback from highway and stepped back and up away from road
- All parking (except for the retail element) will be in the parking garage or directly beneath the a hotel and other structures
- Micro-hydroelectric elements to provide power to the mountain
- Restoration of over 500,000 s.f. of coverage from existing roads and disturbed areas
- Forest Fuels treatments completed on 400 acres with 1200 acres to be treated
- A watershed management plan will be developed to guide all activities throughout the entire Ski Area and resort
- Relocation of primary maintenance for grooming equipment to mid-mtn
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Mikasa Site

Project Name: Mikasa Site Mixed-Use Gateway Project
Proponent: Garfinkle Family
Location: South Lake Tahoe, California: Tahoe Valley Community Plan (pending adoption) Mikasa Site at the ‘Y’

Project Description:
The Mikasa mixed-use proposal will demonstrate the integration of elements that will have a substantial positive impact on the economy, the environment and the community of the South Shore. This Community Enhancement Program (CEP) project will be the first project at the South Lake Tahoe “Y” that has carefully reviewed, considered and incorporated the Tahoe Valley’s Community Plan Team’s goals as well as the visions developed by the South Shore community-at-large through the Place-Based process. We truly believe that the implementation of our proposed CEP project at the Mikasa site will provide the catalyst for positive change the City, the community and the Tahoe Region is looking for, and, become one of the GATEWAYS to Lake Tahoe we all can be proud of.

Our project aims to provide revitalization of a 3.3 acre site with Transit Oriented Design (TOD), Mixed-use, public gathering spaces, and “Green” building development elements. These elements will provide a healthy balance of commerce, employment, entertainment, and livability. As articulated in the draft vision for the Tahoe Valley Community Plan, our project's architectural style and massing will emphasize characteristics that complement a mountain environment and will be consistent with the scale and context of the south “Y” urban core.

Existing Site
Context/Conditions:
The Mikasa site includes 3.3 acres (145,210 square feet) divided between two parcels (APN 23-421-0110 and APN 23-421-0210) zoned for commercial use. Existing on the two parcels currently is 29,641 square feet of commercial/retail called the Mikasa building which includes Miller’s Outpost. The physical condition and structure of the building is currently being evaluated. The site area contains approx. 99% coverage (143,242 square feet). Ingress/Egress is provided along Highway 50 and Highway 89, and along both James Avenue and Dunlap Drive, which bind the site to the east and north.

- **Project Area Size**: 3.3 acres (145,210 sq. feet total area)
- **APN 23-421-0110 (A)**: 131,481 sq. feet
- **APN 23-421-0210 (B)**: 13,729 sq. feet
- **Impervious Coverage**: 143,242 sq. feet (98.6%)
- **Parcel (A)**: 131,481
- **Parcel (B)**: 13,729
- **Existing CFA**: 29,619 sq. feet
- **Parking**: 108,103 sq. feet
- **Transit Stop**: Unsheltered bench
- **Sidewalks**: 5,520 sq. feet
- **Bike Amenities**: None
- **Gateway Feature**: None
- **Traffic Circulation**: Poorly articulated
- **Landscaping**: None
- **Public Gathering Space**: None

Proposed Site
Context/Conditions:
Two design alternatives have been prepared for the Mikasa Site project. The following are the elements in a bullet format for each.

**Alternative 1**
- **Project Area**: 145,210 sq. feet
- **Building Footprints**: 46,200 sq. feet
- **Parking**: 58,100 sq. feet
- **Paving**: 15,490 sq. feet
- **Total Impervious Cover**: 119,740 sq. feet
- **Impervious Cover Reduction**: 17%
- **Parking Spaces**: 156 spaces
- **Retail/Commercial**: 46,200 cfa
- **Office/Commercial**: 21,300 cfa
- **Residential**: 24 live/work lofts
- **Public Gathering Spaces**: 3000 sq. feet
- **Gateway Art**: Featured at Intersection
- **Context Sensitive Design**: Wood and rock, articulated buildings, pitched roofs
- **Additional Height**: 3 and 4 story on resid. on building at back of lot
- **Bicycle Connections**: Create connection with bike trail on Elizabeth
- **Bicycle Amenities**: Sheltered Bike Parking
- **Sidewalks**: Create pedestrian circulation/connections to site
Alternative 2

- Project Area: 145,210 sq. feet
- Building Footprints: 49,500 sq. feet
- Parking: 55,530 sq. feet
- Paving: 11,830 sq. feet
- Total Impervious Cover: 116,860 sq. feet
- Impervious Cover Reduc. 19%
- Parking Spaces: 144 spaces
- Retail/Commercial: 49,500 cfa
- Office/Commercial: 27,325 cfa
- Residential: 18 live/work lofts
- Public Gathering Spaces: 4250 sq. feet
- Gateway Art: Featured at Intersection
- Context Sensitive Design: Wood and rock, articulated buildings, pitched
- Additional Height: 2 and 4 story for resid. on building at back of
- Bicycle Connections: Create connection with bike trail on Eloise
- Bicycle Amenities: Sheltered Bike Parking
- Sidewalks: Create Pedestrian circulation/connections to

CEP Commodity

Requests:
CFA: Based on the two alternative concept designs the Mikasa Site project will be requi
be the need to request additional CFA as appropriate.
Height: Allow for a 4 story, 50 foot height maximum in the Tahoe Valley CP Gateway C
include stepped back architecture so as not to create a 4 story wall along highway 50 or 8
can policy change would provide for mixed-use that intensifies and densifies the uses of this i
creating TOD that actually supports transit.
Parking: Allow for off-site shared parking as part of a parking plan submitted and a redi
the automobile at this location because of the transit stop and the bike/peDESTrian connecti
design of this project can create community gathering spaces, reduce impervious covering
scaped areas and intensify the mixed-use capabilities of this site.
Mixed-Use: Amend density polices as they pertain to mixed-use and residential allowed
and residential within one project area, TRPA’s current Code creates a disincentive to res
units per acre depending on the proposed amount of CFA. The project proposes to allow
residential within the community plan as long as a parking plan that may include off-site:

Social, Environmental, Economic Benefits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GATHERING SPACES</th>
<th>Plaza designed for different users 3,000 to 5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIXED-USE Commercial</td>
<td>67,500 to 76,800 square feet (provide concentra anchors to provide local and visitor needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>46,200 to 49,500 square feet (approx. 30,000 e:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>21,300 to 27,300 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>18 to 24 Units Moderate Income (for sale, Live/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement of Transit Stop</th>
<th>Sheltered bus/trolley stop (currently a bench)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Amenities</td>
<td>- Connect to Bike Trail on Eloise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Friendly Access</td>
<td>- Sheltered Bike Parking Amenity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage Reduction</th>
<th>17% to 19% (Existing impervious land coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality BMPs</td>
<td>Current site does not meet standards. Opportuni amenity. Opportunities to partner with adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQIP</td>
<td>Redevelopment of site and design solutions will Community Character. (improvements in the re. Intactness should move numerical rating toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingress/Egress Improvements</td>
<td>Incremental improvement to the “Y” intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Trolley Service to South Shore Beaches and Emerald Bay</td>
<td>Sheltered bus/trolley stop, create icon that clea stop as the BEACH stop (EIP#831)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH 'Y' CENTER COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CALIFORNIA

SITE ANALYSIS AND PROJECT CONTEXT ASSESSMENT

EXISTING SITE

The site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of US Highway 50 and State Route 89. The existing site is composed of three parcels. The commercial center is located on one parcel, 513,099 +/- SF in size, with a Kmart and Raley's and several small associated shops. The center was built in 1972 and consists of 147,435 +/- SF of commercial floor area. 272,808 +/- SF of the site is paved parking and driveways and 161,792 +/- SF is landscaped and open space. The second parcel is 74,148 +/- SF and contains an abandoned gas station. The third parcel is owned by the City and contains the bus stop. The parcels are surrounded by existing commercial development on all sides of the intersection and medium to low density residential development on the south and west.

There is currently access to the site from Lake Tahoe Blvd and Highway 50 for the larger parcel, gas station parcel is accessed from Highway 50 and the bus stop is accessed from Highway 50 and Lake Tahoe Blvd. There are several large trees on the site that will be retained and there is a section of treed land behind Raley's where some additional parking will be developed for employee use, no tree removal is proposed. Existing parking spaces number 416. The site is served by sidewalks along Highway 50 and Lake Tahoe Blvd.

The existing buildings were constructed in the early seventies and have been updated once in the mid-eighties. The project has not kept up with some of the adjacent developments in upgrades to meet the current demands and to upgrade the neighborhood character. It was originally developed as a traditional "strip" shopping center.

Please note that no land capacity verification is available from the TRPA website. We are willing to have the property reviewed for its compatibility according to the TRPA requirements as part of the project planning process.

MWA architects
1165 Bridge Way #1
Tahoe City, CA 96148
Voice: 530-567-6257
Fax: 530-567-0781
PROJECT CONCEPT PLAN

The intent of the project is to take a highly visible aging commercial strip center and redevelop it into a vibrant community-oriented mixed-use people place using the most progressive and regionally appropriate planning principles.

The plan specifics include upgrading all the architecture and site planning while using sustainable practices including utilizing as much of the existing infrastructure as possible. The K-Mart will be expanded by a desirably needed 17,000 sq. ft. by displacing the retail stores at the south-east portion of the site. These displaced businesses will then be relocated into new and smaller scaled buildings interspersed along the Highway 50 street front as to obscure the sea of parking, enhance the streetscape, and create the opportunity for vibrant outdoor plazas.

Affordable housing, workforce housing, and market-rate housing are proposed above the 17,000 sq.ft. of the K-Mart, over some of the new retail buildings as well as over the existing retail stores at the north-west end of the project. The applicant would like to work with the interested agencies to decide the quantity and size of said residential units. Cross over peak parking demand will likely be the limiting control. If additional coverage can be justified and mitigated, there are opportunities to expand the parking capabilities and therefore the number of units. Due to the current rental market and current cost of construction, these dwelling units are likely to need some form of creative financing and/or partnership. The applicant is willing to explore options here.

In reworking the streetscape, the existing service gas station will be re-designed to be a fueling station with perhaps a convenience store. The intent is to reverse the plan so that the pumps face the parking lot and not the street.

The applicants are familiar with a number of successful traffic circles and strongly support such a solution at the "Y". Please visit: http://www.roundaboutsusa.com. A traffic circle will create a gateway opportunity as well as better traffic flow. Our intent is to create a public plaza that relates to the circle, and we support either public sculpture or a clock tower within the circle. In order to create such a plaza, the intent is to absorb the transit center/six into the project. This will give an integrated destination for the transit users. The plaza and adjacent covered spaces shall become destinations and might include tourist information, educational and/or cultural displays as well as recreational amenities.

In addition to the plaza, an area within the existing parking lot almost ½ acre in size is proposed to become a combination of family park, picnic areas, landscape area, snow storage area, and storm water retention pond and/or bioswale. Along the western side of the site is a forested area that includes an existing earthen pedestrian path to the neighborhood. We are proposing to improve the path and strongly encourage a partnership with adjoining property owners to create a small park in the vicinity.

Transportation alternatives and connectivity are of importance to the applicant. The proposed project will be a regional node for pedestrian, bicycle, automobile, and bus users. Paths and sidewalks are proposed to be enhanced throughout the site. The improved parking lot will offer intercept parking capabilities.

For any additional impacts to occur, significant upgrades need to be made in the realm of environmental improvements. It is proposed to improve the BMP's throughout the site. There are several areas showing potential to house sizable retention ponds and/or bioswales. We propose to work with professionals to create a leading example of responsible practices. Please also note that this site already has many mature trees that will be protected as well as landscaping to be preserved and enhanced. The natural beauty must dominate.

In general, this highly visible and prominent site at the gateway to South Lake Tahoe has the opportunity to become an outstanding example of responsible planning. With a public-private partnership it is possible to rectify the mistakes or ignorance of the past and embrace the future. We realize that our proposal is lacking some specifics. The design is in the infant stage. We strongly encourage as much cooperation and dialogue as is needed, and we are willing to put in the effort required for success on many levels.
From: Ray & Lois Perryman [raynois@infostations.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2007 11:49 AM  
To: Brenda Hunt  
Subject: HMR TRPA Decision  

Brenda, I would appreciate your providing the following to your Board. Ray

To: TRPA Board Members

You have a number of proposals before you including the proposal by Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR) to be included in CEP. We do not envy you having to make the decisions, which you must render.

On the one hand HMR has done an outstanding job of keeping the community informed and I believe they will build a first rate complex. At the same time, it does not make common sense that HMR can fill the existing North & South existing Parking areas with over 300 new housing units (many of which have multiple bedrooms) with parking for their occupants below, and still have parking for the “necessary” public skiers, music festival attendees, et al that will be coming to Homewood as they have been in the past. I use the word “necessary” because they have stated that these public paying skiers are necessary for the financial solvency of their venture. I simply do not believe all these customer vehicles can possibly fit into the planned small multiple story parking garage located on the current three gravel parking lots south of Fawn Street (Note: these same three lots will also contain their employee housing units facing Sacramento Avenue). Frequently these lots in the winter are already filled with parked skier vehicles. I fear that the public will be parking on our narrow Homewood streets & blocking our residential driveways and paying no attention to the proposed signage that the HMR say they will post near Fanny Bridge stating that their parking/tickets are no longer available.

Approvals have already been given for Westshore Café to only provide an inadequate 38 parking spaces across the Highway from HMR and Approvals were given to the Tahoe Yacht Club Museum with knowledge visitors would need to park on the streets. An Outdoor Lakeside Wedding Facility is about to be opened next door to the Westshore Café with no visible parking. AND we have two very active boat launching facilities between the North & South HMR proposed development with essentially no parking available!

When there is inadequate parking, people not only park where they shouldn’t, but very dangerous situations arise that set the stage for serious accidents on this fast moving state highway. I believe HMR should be required to provide adequate parking or reduce the size of there proposal.

I, also, am concerned about the current highway two-lane inadequacy during the summer and yet hate to see what will result from a multiple lane road being put in.

Frustrating traffic already normally backs up several miles on this two-lane road from Fanny Bridge to Sunnyside and sometimes it backs up as far as Homewood. What will happen if we have a significant fire or add over additional 300 residential units?

We, also, share our neighbor’s questions and concerns related to the adequacy of water, sewer, and hope decisions will be based on factual studies. For example, if fire rages along the West Shore, the use of HMR winter snow making sprinklers will be nice, but what will happen when every other Homewood resident is also attempting to water down their home and property using some of this same water supply. (HMR plans to use three sources; water from Madden Creek Water which is the community water supply and two of their own wells.) to water down their home and property using some of this same water supply.

The Ray Perryman Family  P.O. Box 711, Homewood, Ca. 96141