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, October 8, 2008 at the Chateau, located at 955 Fairway Blvd., Incline Village, NV. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

October 1, 2008

John Singlaub
Executive Director
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. PLANNING MATTER

A. Status Report on the Truckee River Operating Agreement
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VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 111 (Tahoe Island), City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, CA, to increase the maximum permissible density for multiple family dwellings in the portion of Special Area #2 located on TRPA Plan Area Map G18, from 8 units per acre to 15 units per acre.
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B. Recommendation to the Governing Board on Certification of the Final Lake Tahoe Shorezone Ordinance Amendments EIS and on the Proposed Amendments to the Shorezone Code of Ordinances, Plan Area Statements, Community Plans and other Amendments Related Thereto

Separate Attachment*

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

*Updated Shorezone Documents – Available on TRPA’s website @ www.trpa.org
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Meeting called to order at 9:35.

Members Present: Mr. Breuch, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Goldberg, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Harris, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Kemper, Ms. Krause, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Maurer, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Riley, Mr. Kuchnicki, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Upton, Ms. Garcia for Mr. Walker, Mr. Zuckerman

Members Absent: Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Szczurek

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Krause moved approval.
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Ann Nichols, representing Friends of Crystal Bay/Brockway, stated they have concerns related to TAUs and the policy with more density and less parking. Sandra Thrillfall has concerns related to TAUs and suggested that with each new project that comes forward, that an hourly parking permit be considered. Judy Tournes suggested that the Regional Plan needs to be complete before Community Enhancement Projects are approved. Allie Vancy suggested that the Commission read their mission statement.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Upton moved approval with amendment.
Motion carried.
Mr. Kuchnicki abstained.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Sierra Colina project off Highway 50 and Lake Village Drive in Douglas County, NV, Sierra Colina, LLC, APN 1318-23-301-001

Staff member Theresa Avance introduced the public comment on the Sierra Colina Environmental Impact Statement and introduced Sydney Coatsworth who gave the Commission specifics on the environmental document.

In response to an APC questions, Brent Wolfe, Northwest Hydraulic Consultants, wrote the storm water management plan for Alternative 1 and
he has worked on the TMDL stated that the advance technology is detention filtration vaults size to meet the peak flow from a 20 year, 1 hour storm for all surfaces associated with cars. The public road and all the driveways would have storm water filtration before detention.

APC Discussion and Comments:

Jason Kuchnicki stated that it is imperative to demonstrate, if this development were to be approved that there would be no loading. Monitoring he believes would be an essential part of this project and encourages this to be part of the project.

Laurie Kemper stated that the goal should be “zero” sediments going into the Lake for new projects. These projects should do better than average and we can’t accept a new load. The environmental document should look at storm water not only in a low impact way but in a no impact way.

Charlie Donohue asked as part of the storm water management plan, how will the run off from the area, including the Middle School be handled.

Jason Drew, Nicholas Consulting, stated that the Lake Village Phase II EIP project and as a part of this project the culvert on this property will be removed and it will be treated as part of the proposed design for this EIP project for the road.

Martin Goldberg stated regarding fire and defensible space, that this project consider an ongoing defensible space program for either the homeowners association or individual owners.

Public Comment:

Melissa Thaw, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that the preferred alternatives impacts on traffic, noise, water quality and wildlife are significant with inadequate evidence to support them. They believe that an additional conservation alternative needs to be prepared.

Jennifer Quashnick stated there is a process issue in regards to the ability of the public to review these large environmental documents.

Michael Donohoe, representing the Sierra Club, stated that this draft EIS is huge, but it is quality not volume that he is interested in. This draft EIS falls short. Where is the context and the history and why is it not stated that this sensitive 18 acre parcel on raw land which has protected the lake and kept it clear for many centuries?

APC Discussion and Comments:

Commission members suggest that the EIS look at other alternatives, including a conservation alternative and a more compact development.

This is a no action item.

B. Draft Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Determination of Scope Homewood
Staff member David Landry presented the process for the scoping of the Homewood Mountain Resort community enhancement program project.

Art Chapman, the applicant, presented the proposed project.

Michael Hogan presented some of the restoration projects that are happening on the Homewood site.

Rob Breuck, consultant, preparing the environmental document presented the range of alternatives.

APC Discussion and Comments:

Mr. Maurer suggested that the EIS/EIR fully addresses the affects of all the new residential and transit housing and full need of employees, including part-time and where they are commuting from.

Mr. Tolhurst stated that he is all for a water taxi system, but as a mitigation measure, it is not realistic that this would be operating seven days a week with an hourly frequency. He wants to make sure that the music theater be analyzed for traffic and impacts to the community.

Mr. Zuckerman stated that he would like to see the scope include VMT reduction with onsite workforce housing as a strategy.

Ms. Kemper stated that they have been under a permit for a long time to retrofit their parking lot and their road system. They are making great headway. This project is a new opportunity to do some additional benefits and she supports an alternative that includes restoring the SEZ that is the gravel parking lot and to expand and that should be part of another alternative that includes this restoration opportunity. She would support an alternative that looks at increased height to reduce the overall coverage to accommodate some of the development. The EIS/SIR should also look at an alternative that encourages the pumping of storm water from CalTrans, Placer County roads and their own project to separate storage ponds and reservoirs.

Mr. Goldberg stated that in the scoping process they should look at evacuation in place, which the project could be a viable evacuation center and a shelter in place and working closely with the community because in a wildfire situation the community may look to that area for their shelter, and it should also include fuels reduction.

Mr. Donahue stated that he would support the scoping of a conservation alternative that should be addressed in the EIS. He believes it is critical to quantify the water quality benefits with the pumping and treat option that is being proposed.

Public Comment:
Flavia Sorelet, League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that they recommend that the following issues and concerns are included: 1) cumulative Basin-wide impacts to the plan area statement amendments for height and allowed uses; 2) the transfer and/or trading of tourist accommodations units including the bedroom ratio of transferred TAUs, 3) the construction and year-round operation and maintenance of the resort and transportation, including VMTs, level of service and emissions per person per mile, 4) all environment impact and benefits should be disclosed, including the substantial environmental improvements and mitigations in excess that are being asserted for the projects classification as a CEP special project, 5) all benefits and impacts relating to all nine environmental thresholds needs to be quantified and compared, 6) environmental and community impacts that are associated with additional land coverage.

Ron Grasse, representing the Sierra Club, stated their concerns are: 1) water – where will the water come from, 2) fire and traffic – how will resident and visitors evacuated if there is a fire in the summertime, 3) community character – there is no community plan for this community at this time, 4) parking – there should be at least one parking space per bedroom and 5) cumulative impacts – this should be looked at in relation to the other projects that are being proposed on a lake-wide basis.

Judy Tournes stated that many people on the West Shore are concerned with the size and scale of this project. They are in favor of revitalizing the resort, but feel it needs to be substantially reduced in size and scope.

Susan Gearhart stated that there are three watersheds that are on this property and she doesn’t feel that they should be allowed to build up the slope on the Bailey’s 1A or 1B SEZ areas.

Allie Vancy stated she would like to bring the two sides of this issue together and have TRPA should create a citizens advisory committee to work through this project.

Mr. Zuckerman moved to recommend approval of the determination of the scope of the joint EIS/EIR for the Homewood Mountain Resort Master Plan and Community Enhancement Program.

Motion carried unanimously.

C. Recommendation to the Governing Board on Certification of the Final Lake Tahoe Shorezone Ordinance Amendments EIS and on the Proposed Amendments to the Shorezone Code of Ordinances, Plan Area Statements, Community Plans and other Amendments Related Thereto

Richard Harris and Bob Jepsen recused themselves from the discussion.

General Counsel Joanne Marchetta presented the motions that are being requested by the Advisory Planning Commission for this item.

Executive Director John Singlaub presented the proposed program for the ordinance amendments to the Shorezone Code, Plan Area Statements and Community Plans.
Debra Lilly, EDAW, stated that they are the environmental consultants that have been working on the project since 2004 and they have prepared the supplement to the draft, the final EIS and the addendum. She walked the APC through the findings that are in the addendum and that discuss the environmental impacts of the preferred alternative as they compare with impacts of previous alternatives.

Public Comment:

Judy Tournes stated that it appears that illegal buoys are included in the existing total buoys, which seems inappropriate.

Nicole Gergens, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that the APC needs to require that all Shorezone development utilizes a go slow approach, where structures will be phased in depending on attainment and maintenance of any associated environmental thresholds.

Jennifer Quashnick, representing the Sierra Club, stated that most of their concerns remain. They will still like another 60 days comment period as the recently released document has made significant changes. They also feel that the Regional Plan should be adopted before the Shorezone Ordinances.

Gregg Lien stated that the ordinances are very hard to understand. He feels that it should be simple and concise, but after a lot of work it is still too complex. He also feels that we do not have a social consensus. Public access and limitation on new facilities where there is access to a multiple use facility are still a concern.

Jan Brisco stated she is concerned that they have had only a couple of days to go through the document. This is a very complex document. One of their key issues are you don’t have to do anything as long as you comply with design standards. About 90% of the current piers do not comply with the new design standards. Most of the time you will have to file for qualified exempt and do an entire BMP plan as well as other things that is very onerous. She also feels that they should have 60 days to review the final, final document.

Executive Director John Singlaub stated that staff will provide a workshop for all APC and Governing Board members during the next Governing Board meeting.

After considerable APC discussion, Mr. Maurer moved to continue this item until next month’s meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Executive Director Mr. Singlaub gave the Executive Director’s Report.
B. Legal Counsel

General Counsel Ms. Marchetta had no report this month.

C. APC Members

Jason Kuchnicki stated that the State of Nevada and California have issued their 319 request for proposals for implementation project.

Lauri Kemper stated that their Board will be considering a MOU with TRPA to facilitate fuel reduction projects in the Basin on October 7.

Mike Lefevre stated that they will be holding public meetings on the Forest Land Management Plan on October 29 & 30.

Teri Jamin stated there is a sustainability city workshop tonight at 6 p.m. at the middle school and the public is invited to attend.

Allen Breuch stated that there was a request from the Governing Board about permitted structures in Placer County and he will report to the Board at this month’s meeting.

Charlie Donohue stated that the NTRPA is soliciting applications for their At-Large Member for the Governing Board and the deadline is September 30th. Also the Lake Tahoe License Plate will be soliciting for a request for proposals from public agencies next week.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Tolhurst adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Nikkel
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 589-5277. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

September 30, 2008

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Status Report on the Truckee River Operating Agreement

September 6, 2007, the Truckee River Operating Agreement was signed. This document has significant impacts on water allocations in the Region. Representatives from the participating agencies will provide a status report. Staff has attached the preliminary Power Point presentation.
Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA)

TRPA Briefing – Sept. 2008
100 Years of Conflict on the Truckee

• Interstate allocation

• Water for Pyramid Lake and its T & E fish

• Newlands Project water rights

• Increasing M&I demands

• Extensive judicial oversight of river operations (decrees, settlements, etc.)
Public Law 101-618 (Nov 1990)

**TROA Elements**

- Directs Secretary to negotiate TROA
- Allows storage of water in Truckee River reservoirs (including Lake Tahoe) for new purposes
- Permanent allocation between California and Nevada (TROA dependent)
- Protects Orr Ditch Decree water rights
What is TROA?

- Culmination of 18 years of negotiations

- An agreement among the 16 parties (United States, California, Nevada, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and Truckee Meadows Water Authority) to improve the operational flexibility of Truckee River reservoirs

- Core of TROA - provides opportunities for storing and managing additional water in federal and non-federal reservoirs
How Does TROA Work?

• Allows the storage of “credit water” in Truckee River reservoirs by:
  – Capturing or retaining in storage water a party has a right to use, but does not need for current demand
  – Exchanging a party’s existing right or storage for that of another party

• Allows comprehensive coordination of water storage, release, and exchange among TROA water managers
Lake Tahoe under TROA as to No Action

- Slight change in Tahoe storage, but maximum elevation would not be exceeded
- Shoreline erosion would not increase
- Water quality would not change
- No effect on bald eagles or Tahoe yellow cress
Average Monthly Tahoe Storage
(Thousands of acre-feet)

- Oct: 370
- Dec: 390
- Feb: 410
- Apr: 430
- Jun: 450
- Aug: 470

- No Action
- TROA
Tahoe Monthly Elevations

During period of analysis:

- 1900: 6220
- 1905: 6222
- 1910: 6224
- 1915: 6226
- 1920: 6228

Graph: Tahoe Elevation 1900-1920

- Red line: No action
- Green line: Troa
Tahoe Elevation 1920-1940

Year

Feet
Tahoe Elevation 1940-1960

Year | feet
--- | ---
1940 | 6220
1945 | 6221
1950 | 6223
1955 | 6224
1960 | 6225
Tahoe Elevation 1960-1980

feet

year

Tahoe Monthly Elevations
During period of analysis
Tahoe Elevation 1980-2000

feet

year

Interstate Allocation

• **Lake Tahoe Basin**
  
  Annual Diversion (surface and ground water)
  
  CA - 23,000 acre-feet
  
  NV - 11,000 acre-feet

  Annual Depletion - Max. 34,000 acre-feet

• **Truckee River Basin**
  
  Annual Diversion
  
  CA - 32,000 acre-feet
  
  Up to 10,000 acre-feet of surface water
  
  NV - Remainder of river flow

  Annual Depletion – Max. 17,600 acre-feet
Pumping/Siphoning Lake Tahoe to the Truckee River

• **Current Condition**
  – According to Truckee River Agreement
    • For hydroelectric power or irrigation if agreed to by Sec.
    • For “sanitary or domestic use” if agreed to by CA & NV
  – Complies with Federal and CA laws

• **TROA**
  – For M&I use only when following met:
    • TMWA’s water supply less than 1928-1935 period
    • Tahoe below rim
    • Action complies with Federal and CA laws
    • Sec., CA, and NV concur
The TROA “Package”

- Comprehensive management to meet 21st century needs – agriculture, municipal, & environmental

- Interstate allocation to end conflict over waters of Lake Tahoe, Truckee River, and Carson River

- Resolves litigation among parties
Who Supports TROA?

TROA signatories – 16 parties

Business community

Environmental community

Recreational community
When Will TROA Be “Done”?

• **Executed**
  – September 6, 2008

• **Effectiveness**
  – No later than December 2014
    (or later date agreed to by Mandatory Parties)
Actions Required To Implement TROA

Prior To Effectiveness

- Promulgate as Reclamation Rule
  - “Exclusive Federal Regulation” governing operation of Truckee River reservoirs

- Modify Orr Ditch and Truckee River General Electric Decrees

- Modify water rights and storage licenses and permit
Purpose of Water Stored Under TROA

• Pyramid Lake – cui-ui and LCT
• Municipal drought relief (NV and CA)
• Water quality and stream flows
• Incidental benefits for recreation
• Newlands Project irrigation
Stampede Reservoir

CURRENT

- Newlands Project Credit Storage (OCAP)
- TMWA Water (Interim Storage Agreement)
- Fish Water (Washoe Project Water)

TROA

- Additional Ca Env Credit Water
- Other Credit Water
- NPCW (TROA)/NPCS (OCAP)
- Water Qual Credit Water
- Fernley M&I Credit Water
- Ca Env Credit Water
- Ca M&I Credit Water
- Fish Credit Water
- Non-Firm M&I Credit Water
- Fish Water (Washoe Project Water)
- Firm M&I Credit Water
- M&I Emergency Drought Supply
Average Monthly Tahoe Releases
(thousands of acre-feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>TROA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lake Tahoe under TROA as to No Action

• Storage
  – Slightly less (1 taf) - wet hydrologic condition
  – Slightly more (2 taf) - median hydrologic condition
  – Less (7 taf) - dry hydrologic condition

• Release
  – Generally greater - April through July
  – Generally less - August through January
  – Similar - February and March
Challenges Ahead

- Protests
- Litigation
- Appeals
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 1, 2008

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Recommendation to Governing Board on Amendment to Plan Area Statement 111, Tahoe Island, to Increase Maximum Density for Multiple Family Dwellings in Special Area #2 East from 8 to 15 Units per Acre, and Providing for other Matters Properly Related Thereto

Requested Action: The applicant, McDivitt Development, with the property owner Claudia Wright, is requesting that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) make a recommendation to the Governing Board to amend Plan Area Statement (PAS) 111, Tahoe Island, to increase the maximum allowed density for multiple family dwellings in Special Area #2 East only, from 8 to 15 units per acre.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission concur with the required findings and recommend approval of the proposed PAS amendment and finding of no significant environmental effect.

Project Description/Background: McDivitt Development submitted an application to increase the maximum density for multi-family residential development in the amendment area (Special Area #2 East within PAS 111) from 8 units/acre to 15 units/acre. McDivitt Development has indicated their intent to acquire the Little Truckee Mobile Home Park (APN 023-221-39) and apply to redevelop the parcel with multi-family residential uses at 15 units/acre following approval of this amendment.

The proposed maximum density is common for multi-family residential uses in the Tahoe Basin and is the maximum permitted by Chapter 21 of the Code of Ordinances. The existing 8 units/acre maximum density in PAS 111 was carried over from the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (CTRPA) high density residential zoning and incorporated into the TRPA's Regional Plan in 1987, which included the PAS system. The proposed project would amend the Plan Area Statement 111 text to establish 15 units/acre as the maximum allowed density for multi-family residential uses in Special Area #2 East only (that portion of Special Area #2 on TRPA PAS Map G-18). Another portion of Special Area #2, now to be known as Special Area #2 West (that portion of Special Area #2 shown on TRPA PAS Map F-18) will continue to have a maximum density of 8 units/acre for multi-family residential uses. The PAS text would also be amended to clearly identify the two components of Special Area #2, the East and West portions.

PAS 111 has an overall land use classification of Residential which means that it is an area with the potential to provide housing for residents of the Region. The existing development within the plan area is predominantly residential. An existing special policy for the affected portion of Special Area #2 provides that it “should be primarily a multi-residential area and professional offices and health care services shall be limited to parcels fronting on the east side of Tahoe Keys Blvd.” The proposed amendment is consistent with the existing predominant residential use and special area policy.
The management strategy for PAS 111 is mitigation. This designation is the predominate strategy in the Basin and allows for additional development if the impacts are fully mitigated. The proposed amendment is consistent with the PAS's management strategy, and would provide the opportunity to replace an existing non-conforming use (mobile homes) on a dilapidated site with a redeveloped multi-family residential project that would adhere to current environmental and design standards. This would result in scenic, water quality, and other environmental improvements consistent with the mitigation strategy.

Although the proposed project is a PAS amendment which would take effect throughout Special Area #2 East, the specific characteristics of the parcel for which the amendment has been initiated are also relevant. The parcel, located at 2333 Eloise Avenue in the City of South Lake Tahoe, is currently the site of the Little Truckee Mobile Home Park and contains 34 verified existing residential units of use (30 mobile homes, 3 apartment units in one building, and 1 single family dwelling). The site is located at the eastern end of Eloise Avenue which dead ends into the Upper Truckee Marsh which extends along the western edge of the amendment area. The western edge of the potential project site has been verified as SEZ and survey data indicates a portion of the site is also within the 100-year floodplain.

If the proposed amendment is approved, the maximum permissible density for multiple family dwellings on the 1.64-acre site would be 24 units. Thus, even though an increase in permissible density is proposed, any multiple family dwelling project constructed on the site as a result of the amendment would reduce the density from that which exists today. Further, since mobile home dwellings are not a permissible use in Plan Area 111, a multiple family project would bring the Property into compliance with TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe zoning.

Issues:
- Consistency with City of South Lake Tahoe Zoning
- Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) and Floodplain
- Existing Density in Amendment Area
- Community Character
- Scenic Impact
- Affordable Housing
- Population and Housing
- Traffic
- Public Services/Utilities

If you have any questions, please contact Melissa Shaw, AICP, Senior Planner at mshaw@trpa.org or 775-589-5242.

Attachments:
- Required Findings/Rationale (Attachment A)
- Draft Implementing Ordinance (Attachment B)
- Exhibit 1 Amendment to Plan Area Statement 111 – Tahoe Island
- Issues/Concerns Discussion (Attachment C)
- Tahoe Island Plan Area Statement Map (Attachment D)
- Tahoe Island Special Area 2 East Detail Map (Attachment E)
- Tahoe Island Special Area 2 Existing Density Analysis Map (Attachment F)
Required Findings/Rationale

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

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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

   Rationale: There is no evidence showing that the amendment to PAS 111 will adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan. The proposed amendment is consistent with all current designations for PAS 111 as a whole and Special Area #2 East specifically. The current PAS designations and Special Policy #6 clearly identify the amendment area as a preferred area for multi-residential development. The amendment encourages such development by increasing the maximum allowed density for such development consistent with most areas of the Basin where multi-residential uses area allowed. The amendment encourages the development of multi-family residential uses in area which has been previously identified as an appropriate area for such uses. As such, it is consistent with and supports the implementation of the Regional Plan and other TRPA plans and programs.

   As discussed in the staff summary, the amendment is consistent with the PAS 111 purpose and intent and does not result in any increase development potential beyond that established in the Regional Plan. The amendment may result in the development of multifamily residential uses at an increased density within a limited area within PAS 111, but such development must meet all other requirements of the applicable PAS and other Regional Plan components.

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

   Rationale: Any projects that are proposed due to this amendment will be required to comply with all aspects of the Regional Plan package, including applicable Thresholds. The amendment does not result in any additional development potential beyond that established by the Regional Plan, but rather provides an additional incentive to develop multifamily residential uses in area appropriate for such uses. In addition, any project resulting from the density limit increase will need to adhere to the TRPA Code, Goals and Policies, and the applicable plan area policies for achieving and maintaining the Thresholds.
3. Finding: Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: This PAS amendment does not directly affect any air or water quality standards. Any new or expansion of development due to this amendment will continue to be subject to federal, state, and local air and water quality standards.

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

Rationale: For reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Regional Plan will continue to achieve and maintain the thresholds.

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

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.

B. Chapter 13 Findings:

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

Rationale: Pursuant to Code of Ordinances subsection 13.5.B(1), each plan area statement shall be assigned a plan designation consisting of a land use classification and a management strategy. The land use classification for PAS 111 is Residential. The planning statement for the plan area provides that this area should continue to be residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood. Special Policy 6 further provides that Special Area #2 East, the amendment area, should be primarily a multi-residential area with office commercial uses limited to parcels on Tahoe Keys Blvd. The proposed amendment is consistent with the planning statement and special policy as it provides a further incentive to develop multi-residential use in this preferred area. The amendment would not affect non-residential uses in the amendment area.

Subsection 13.5.8(2) defines Management Strategies. PAS 111 has a Management Strategy of Mitigation which is also consistent with the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment is consistent with the PAS’s management strategy, as it provides an incentive to construct new multi-family residential development that would adhere to current...
environmental and design standards. This would result in scenic, water quality, and other environmental improvements within the amendment area consistent with the mitigation strategy.

Pursuant to Code of Ordinances subsection 13.5.C, eligibility for a specific planning program shall be limited to those plan area statements with the applicable special designations. Special designations for PAS 111 include: TDR Receiving Area for Existing Development (Special Areas #1 and #2) and Multi-Residential Units (Special Area #2 only); Scenic Restoration Area; Preferred Affordable Housing Area; and, Multi-Residential Incentive Program. The proposed amendment within Special Area #2 East supports the special designations which encourage multi-residential development by providing an increased maximum density which can increase the feasibility of multi-residential projects. The designation as a Scenic Restoration Area indicates that projects are subject to the scenic quality provisions of Chapter 30. The amendment will potentially improve the scenic restoration designation. Although the majority of the amendment area is not visible from a TRPA designated scenic corridor or resource, a portion of the future project site is visible from a bicycle trail and redevelopment would analyze potential impacts and improvements to that site.

**Environmental Documentation**: An Initial Environmental Checklist was prepared by the applicant for the project and revised on two occasions in response to TRPA staff requests for additional information. No significant environmental impacts were identified for the proposed project. Staff will recommend that a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) be made for the Plan Area Statement amendment based on the IEC, Chapter 6 and 13 findings and information contained in this Staff Summary and the project file.
## Implementing Ordinance

**DRAFT**  
**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**  
**ORDINANCE 2008-**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, TO AMEND PLAN AREA STATEMENT 111 – TAHOE ISLAND TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM DENSITY FOR MULTIPLE FAMILY DWELLINGS IN SPECIAL AREA #2 EAST FROM 8 UNITS PER ACRE TO 15 UNITS PER ACRE, AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING 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 increasing the maximum density allowed for multiple family residential dwellings within Special Area #2 East of Plan Area Statement 111- Tahoe Island from 8 units per acre to 15 units per acre, in order to further implement the Regional Plan pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.20 This amendment has been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment, and is 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 amendment and recommended adoption. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendment. 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, Chapter 13 of the Code and Article V(g) of the Compact.

1.50 The Governing Board finds that the amendment 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 Amendment of Plan Area Statement 111

Subsection _____, subparagraph ___ of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended as set forth in Exhibit 1, dated September __, 2008, which attachments are attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 3.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this Ordinance and the amendment of Plan Area Statement 111 – Tahoe Island 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 amendment to Plan Area Statement 111 – Tahoe Island shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this Ordinance and its amendments are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.00 Effective Date

The provisions of this Ordinance amending Plan Area Statement 111 – Tahoe Island shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held October 22, 2008 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

___________________________
Mara Bresnick, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
111
TAHOE ISLAND

PLAN DESIGNATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Strategy</td>
<td>MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Designation</td>
<td>TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR: §</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Existing Development (Special Areas #1 & #2 Only) (Refer to Special Policy #7)
2. Multi-Residential Units (Special Area #2 Only)

SCENIC RESTORATION

PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA

MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This Plan Area is located north of the South Tahoe "Y" and south of the Tahoe Keys and is depicted on TRPA maps G-18 and F-18. Non-contiguous portions of Special Area #2 are on each map. That portion on map G-18 is identified as Special Area #2 East while that on F-18 is Special Area #2 West.

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

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

§ Amended 09/23/98, Special Designations.

MS/sb
PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to be residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. There is an excess of land coverage and disturbance within the SEZ.
2. Portions of the area are subject to flooding.
3. This area contains a site reserved for possible affordable housing.
4. Additional fire hydrants and water system improvements are needed in this area.
5. This area is the location of Tahoe Valley ball field and Tallac Park (20 acres).
6. Thresholds require the scenic restoration of the Highway 89 corridor.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Drainage problems on developed parcels should be remedied.
2. Restoration of disturbed SEZ and reduction of soft coverage have high priority.
3. Redevelopment is encouraged along Highway 89 consistent with a City of South Lake Tahoe redevelopment plan. Noncommercial and tourist accommodation uses permitted in this area should be located on Highway 89.
4. Expansion of the Tahoe Valley ball field and Tallac Park may be permitted, consistent with a TRPA-approved master plan, which specifies the PAOT capacity of the improvements.
5. Extensions of commercial development should be limited to Special Area #1 along Highway 89 to help facilitate concentration of commercial development, except for parcels within Special Area #2 adjacent to Highway 89, which had previously legally existing commercial uses and have existing commercial floor area as verified by TRPA.

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

6. Special Area #2 in the Eloise area (Special Area #2 East) should be primarily a multi-residential area and professional offices and health care services shall be limited to parcels fronting the east side of Tahoe Keys Blvd. Projects utilizing the increased multiple family residential density of 15 units per acre in Special Area #2 East shall adhere to the following design requirements:

- Any new residential structures must be attached style buildings containing two or more units per structure, and must be consistent with TRPA Design Review Guidelines.
• **Parcels being redeveloped and which contain structures located within designated 100-year floodplain limits and/or verified stream environment zone (SEZ) limits shall relocate all development outside of the designated 100-year floodplain and/or the verified SEZ limits.** The SEZ and/or floodplain shall be restored.

• **Projects requiring affordable/moderate housing mitigation shall provide replacement affordable/moderate housing that meets the Transit Oriented Development standards set forth in Subparagraph 13.7.D(3)(a)-(e) or the functional equivalent as defined in Subsection 13.7.D(4) and shall be located within the City of South Lake Tahoe.**

7. Special Area #1 fronting on Highway 89 shall be permitted to receive transferred commercial floor area only on parcels with legally existing commercial development. Those properties that transfer commercial floor area shall be required to bring all existing and future parking into compliance with the City of South Lake Tahoe’s Parking Standards.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Single family dwelling (A).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), schools-kindergarten through secondary (A), and day care centers/pre-schools (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), Management special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Special Area #1:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Multiple family dwellings (A).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td>Hotel, motel and other transient dwelling units accommodations (S) and bed and breakfast facilities (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (S), nursery (S), and outdoor retail sales (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Outdoor recreation concessions (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Multiple family dwellings (A), nursing and personal care (S), and residential care (S).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Professional offices (S), health care services (S), nursery (S), and general merchandise stores (S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td>Bed and breakfast facilities (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAXIMUM DENSITIES:** Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings (Special Area #2 East only)</td>
<td>Up to 15 units per acre for projects in compliance with Special Policy #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel and Other Transient Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• with less than 10% of units with kitchens</td>
<td>40 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• with 10% or more units with kitchens</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area, including the Highway 89 corridor is 55 CNEL.

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

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

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

---

§ Amended 5/22/02
**Issues / Concerns Discussion**

◊ *Consistency with City of South Lake Tahoe Zoning:* Within the Tahoe Basin, the City of South Lake Tahoe has adopted the TRPA Plan Area Statements, Community Plans and associated maps as its zoning. The proposed Plan Area Statement amendment requires public hearings and the adoption by the TRPA Governing Board and the City Council. The City’s Planning Commission will hear the proposed amendment in October, and the City Council in November, 2008.

◊ *Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) and Floodplain:* Planning Considerations 1 and 2 for PAS 111 identify that there is considerable SEZ disturbance and some areas of flooding within PAS 111 as a whole and Special Area #2 East in particular (see Tahoe Island Special Area #2 East Detail Map in Exhibit E). These environmental development constraints also affect the potential project site. Such constraints should be considered in conjunction with the proposed density change because such limitations effectively reduce the site on which the allowed density may be placed.

With respect to the potential project site, the overall parcel is 1.64 acres (71,506 square feet) in size with an area of SEZ and the 100-year flood plain mapped along the eastern edge of the parcel. Some of the existing on-site improvements are within each of the identified environmentally constrained areas. Based on currently available mapping, the 100-year flood plain comprises a larger portion of the site and generally contains the SEZ area. TRPA Code Section 28.3.B prohibits additional development, grading and filling of lands within the 100-year floodplain except for certain uses or facilities. Residential development is not one of the allowed uses, hence future residential construction is limited to site area outside of the 100-year flood plain, but the floodplain portion of the site would be counted for density purposes. The area of 100-year floodplain is approximately 13,451 square feet (19% of the project site) according to survey data provided by the applicant. Subtracting this area from the overall site leaves 58,055 square feet (1.33 ac) to accommodate new construction. At 15 units per acre, the 1.64 acre site could have 24 units on the remaining area.

◊ *Existing Density in Amendment Area:* The density of existing residential properties in the amendment area (Special Area #2 East) ranges from 2 units per acre to over 24 units per acre (see Existing Density Map in Attachment F). The lowest density parcel is a single family home on a one-half acre parcel (2301 Eloise Avenue) while the highest density occurs with a four unit apartment building on a parcel approximately one-sixth of an acre in size (2300 Eloise Avenue). Within the amendment area there are four existing single family residences with calculated densities ranging from 2 to slightly over 4 units per acre and one with a density just over 7 units per acre due to a very small lot size. There are six parcels with existing 4-unit apartment buildings with calculated densities of 19 to 24 units per acre. The newer duplex developments in the area are at the current maximum density of 8 units per acre. The density of the Sky Meadows #1 PUD is calculated at 8.1 units per acre while Sky Meadows #2 is calculated at 4.4 units per acre. It should be noted that the buildings in both PUDs are essentially identical small detached residences yet the calculated density is very different due to the much larger amount of common area in #2. The architectural character of the two PUDs is nearly identical yet one has approximately half the calculated density.
Community Character: Evaluation of any future project will include consideration of numerous site and building design issues. The Planning Statement outlines that “this area should continue to be residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood”. Generally, TRPA restrictions on land coverage and building height determine the size of structures. Approval of additional building height is only allowed when certain findings can be made per TRPA Code Section 22.3.A. For heights greater than those allowed for a 5:12 roof pitch by Table A in Chapter 22, a finding that the “additional height is consistent with the surrounding uses” would be required. Consideration would also be given to PAS 111 Special Policy 6 which states the amendment area “should be primarily a multi-residential area”. Existing uses throughout the amendment area are mixed in terms of size and bulk. Parcels immediately adjacent to the potential project site are typically older one and two story structures. Several new single family condominiums just down the street are at or are nearly at the maximum TRPA allowed height. In contrast, the Sky Meadow developments contain small, single story detached residential style structures.

An analysis of impacts the change in density from 8 units to 15 units per acre would have on community character would be more readily assessed if projects were immediately adjacent to each other allowing direct comparison. However, the wide range of existing building designs and density suggest building or neighborhood character is somewhat independent of density. The highest density units are in relatively small structures and appear set back from the street while the new duplexes are in large buildings with cantilevers extending towards the street. The older buildings with densities which range from 2 to over 24 units per acre convey a relatively small scale neighborhood character while the newer structures with a calculated density of only 8 units per acre, have a much larger scale and character, even compared to those parcels developed at over three times the density. Hence, although neighborhood compatibility/character issues may arise with an increase in allowed density, building size and project design will have a greater impact on character and compatibility than the changed density standard. Staff has proposed adding new policy language to the existing special policy for the amendment area to require new residential projects utilizing the increased density to be attached style structures that are consistent with the TRPA Design Guidelines. With this added special policy language and the existing Planning Statement, the proposed density amendment is not anticipated to create density or community character conflict issues.

Scenic Impact: The future project area of the Little Truckee Mobile Home Park will be partially visible from the existing Class 1 Bicycle Trail paralleling Highway 50. Future scenic impacts will also be evaluated during the project review phase.

Affordable Housing: The existing mobile home park is assumed to provide affordable housing options for South Lake Tahoe residents. The applicant has indicated that the proposed project, if approved, will likely result in the closure of the park and removal of the manufactured homes. TRPA regulations regarding analysis and mitigation of moderate (and affordable) housing is described in Section 43.2.B of the subdivision standards. Prior to subdivision of existing structures mitigation of moderate and affordable housing is required on a unit for unit basis. State of California requirements will guide the City of South Lake Tahoe’s project review. Those requirements are not applicable until the actual closure of the park and would be evaluated in the project review process for any new development proposal for the trailer park site. Additionally, the Tahoe Valley Community Plan is currently being prepared by TRPA and the City for the area immediately south of the project area, along US Hwy 50. The Community Plan, currently under an environmental impact statement review, has not been adopted as official
policy. The four alternatives being evaluated for the community plan include one which would provide an option to expand the community plan boundary to include two sites for affordable workforce housing to support the employment within the community plan area. Per the proposed Community Plan provisions, inclusion in the community plan and development of affordable housing would be the landowner’s choice; there would be no requirement that the option be implemented. One of the potential residential sites is the Little Truckee Mobile Home Park which the applicant intends to acquire and redevelop following approval of the proposed PAS amendment. The proposed amendment does not conflict with the potential community plan provisions as it does not preclude the landowner’s choice to remain in PAS 111 or be included community plan, if that option is available in the future. It is the current landowner’s choice to sell to the project proponent or wait for the outcome of the community plan process. If the site is not added to the community plan area, an increased density limit per the proposed amendment would make affordable/moderate housing more feasible on the site independent of the community plan.

To further emphasize mitigation of affordable housing that may be removed with future projects in this Special Area, and in keeping with the Community Plan alternative that encouraged affordable housing for this parcel, a special policy is recommended requiring that mitigated affordable/moderate housing meet the Transit Oriented Development standards set forth in Subparagraph 13.7.D(3)(a)-(e) or the functional equivalent as defined in Subsection 13.7.D(4).

◊ **Population & Housing:** A parcel-by-parcel analysis has been conducted to determine the maximum potential change in number of housing units which could reasonably be expected to occur if the amendment was adopted due to additional development or redevelopment at the new maximum density. The analysis considered public v. private land ownership, private ownership patterns (more owners equates to less likely to redevelop), existing density (only parcels currently less than 15 units/ac would redevelop), and apparent value of existing development (higher value equates to less likely to redevelop). The analysis concluded that the proposed amendment could result in an additional 34 units if all of the privately-owned vacant parcels were developed and all of the developed parcels with the potential for increased density, excluding the mobile home park, were redeveloped with multi-family residential at the new maximum density. This is the “worst case” scenario for potential increase in residential units within the amendment area. However, the potential redevelopment of the mobile home park is the impetus for the proposed density amendment. As noted above, this would actually result in a decrease of 10 units from the existing verified units on-site, for a potential net increase of only 24 residential units within the amendment area. Currently, there are 188 residential units either existing or permitted at the current density on vacant parcels. An increase of 34 units would equate to an 18% increase in the number of residential units within the amendment area, while a 24 unit increase would equate to a 13% increase.

Although the “worst case” scenario is unlikely due to the number of properties involved, an increase of 34 residential units would not be expected to create adverse impacts unless they were in the following areas:

- **Traffic:** Although the proposed amendment in and of itself will not generate any traffic impacts, it could result in additional residential units being constructed in the amendment area which would generate additional traffic. A limited traffic analysis was prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants for the proposed project based on the additional 34 residential units identified above. The analysis indicated that the potential dwelling unit increase would
result in 228 additional daily vehicle trips. These additional trips were determined to not significantly affect the level of service (LOS) at the critical Tahoe Keys Blvd./US Hwy 50 intersection. Traffic analyses conducted for larger commercial projects such as Staples and Blockbuster Video indicated that improvements would be needed at the Tahoe Keys intersection. The traffic analysis conducted for this proposal assumed that the LOS at the US 50/Tahoe Keys Blvd. is now LOS C due to a decline of traffic counts. LOS C is forecast to remain "with no change in intersection configuration". The proposed change in density to PAS 111 would "increase existing peak-hour traffic volumes by 0.6 percent." Additional trips generated by individual future projects would be assessed for any environmental impacts and mitigation requirements on a case-by-case basis as those projects are reviewed.

- **Public Services/Utilities**: Most public services in the amendment area are provided by the City of South Lake Tahoe. The City is concurrently processing the identical PAS amendment and prepared an Initial Study consistent with its responsibilities under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Initial Study indicates that all potential public service impacts due to the proposed project, including the potential increase in residential units, are less than significant or nonexistent. Similarly, the South Tahoe Public Utility District (the water and sewer provider for the vast majority of the amendment area, including the potential project site) has provided written confirmation that the proposed project would not affect their ability to serve their service area.
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