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 13, 2010 at the TRPA Offices, located at 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

October 6, 2010

Joanne S. Marchetta
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


B. Recommendation on the Placer County Preliminary Redevelopment Plan

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Closed Session to Discuss Pending or Potential Litigation

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. General Counsel

C. APC Members

VII. ADJOURNMENT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Advisory Commission Vice-Chair Mr. Donahue called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Donohue, Mr. Greene, Ms. Huggins, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Krause, Mr. Loftis, Ms. McMahon, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Riley, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Upton, Ms. Garcia for Mr. Walker

Members Absent: Mr. Angelocci, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Maurer, Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Sertic, Mr. Tolhurst

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Upton moved approval. Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Dave McClure commented on the proposed bio-mass plant in Kings Beach.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Jepsen moved approval as amended. Motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Recommendation on the Placer County Preliminary Redevelopment Plan

Staff member John Hitchcock presented the proposed Placer County Preliminary Redevelopment Plan.

Ray James, Placer County, presented the history behind the redevelopment plan.

Advisory Planning Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Greene said that the environmental assessment is missing from his packet.
Mr. Hitchcock stated that it was inadvertently left out of the packet, but he will make sure the Commission members receive this as soon as possible.

Ms. James said the environmental assessment was completed by PMC Consultants which is on the TRPA approved list of qualified consultants. They found that there was no significant impact in the proposed boundaries.

Ms. Marchetta said the reason an Environmental Assessment was prepared was because TRPA's Code pre-determined that an EA was always required for this kind of preliminary redevelopment plan. It is a particularly difficult concept on which to prepare an EA, because it doesn't establish zoning or any certainty of land-use on the ground. It only authorizes preliminary baseline studies. She is not sure that we would have required Placer County to prepare this EA, but for the fact that our Code dictated it.

Mr. Thompson asked if the APC has to consider that environmental document at this point.

Mr. Hitchcock said what staff needs from the APC is a recommendation to the Board.

Ms. Rinke said that Code requires that the APC shall review preliminary redevelopment plans and make recommendations to the Governing Board. You could potentially make a recommendation based on the preliminary plan assuming that the Environmental Assessment doesn't show any significant impacts.

Ms. Marchetta said there is no requirement for APC to review the EA and make a recommendation on the adequacy of that EA.

Mr. Upton said they received a letter from the North Tahoe Business Association that looked at Tahoe Vista and suggested a line down both sides of Highway 28 down to Highway 267 and asked for a response regarding that request.

Ms. James said they met and made a presentation to the North Tahoe Business Association and the staff members that conducted the blight study did not find what they call the prevalence of blight on both sides of Highway 28. 60% of the area is what they consider blight. The association asked if this could be included in the study. We recommended that they submit a letter to this Commission making their request.

Mr. Upton said in order to be included in the study, would it need to be included in the action that we or the Governing Board would take.
Mr. Hitchcock said we would be looking for a recommendation from the APC and then the Board would need to make that adjustment to the boundary line in order to have it included as part of the study.

Mr. Donohue said we would need to make that recommendation to the Governing Board.

Mr. Hitchcock said yes.

Mr. Thompson asked about the letter that was submitted from the Friends of Tahoe Vista relating to density and height not being vague. Is there a requirement at this point to have this defined?

Mr. Hitchcock said no.

Ms. Merchant said regarding the letter that Mr. Thompson just referenced, she had not received this prior to today. She can’t read a letter at this late date and consider it as we are sitting here. She would request that these letters be available sooner, so it can be considered.

Ms. Krause said that the attachment was dated May 18 and she found it difficult to understand why they couldn’t have sent their comments earlier.

Ms. Garcia asked if staff recommends the boundary change that is suggested by the North Tahoe Business Association.

Mr. Hitchcock said from TRPA’s perspective, it does make sense to include this as it is part of the existing community plan today. In most cases, we try to align our community plan boundaries with our redevelopment plan boundaries.

Ms. James said that this is an opportunity to look at these preliminary plans to see what areas we are going to study. Since it is adjoining and adjacent to the two areas that we feel meet the criteria now for blight, she doesn’t think this would be a problem.

Public Comment:

Dave McClure said there were focus groups and quite a few meetings on the redevelopment boundaries, especially in the Tahoe Vista and Kings Beach area. Extensive letters were written at that time and submitted to Placer County for review and they assumed that those comments would have received feedback and submitted to this body. He said that the intent of Chapter 15 was to allow and accommodate South Shore’s redevelopment. Now we are taking that same base model and saying Placer County has a redevelopment area and we are just going to apply this same situation to the North Shore just like South Lake Tahoe. There are a lot of concerns that the South Shore model could easily be applied to the North Shore.
Advisory Planning Commission Comments & Questions:

Ms. Merchant said that it is important to understand that Placer County Redevelopment is a separate agency and things that they may do, other Placer County staff may not be privy to.

Mr. Greene agrees and said we are interested in the public's comments and would request they be sent well in advance of these meetings.

Mr. Thompson said we are just in the preliminary stages in the process that is defined in the Code and there will be opportunities later on when we are doing more public review for more input on this item. It seems to be the right thing to study for this area.

Ms. Krause said since Mr. McClure brought up the subject, the idea that we are increasing densities and square footage in the area, her understanding is that Boulder Bay has purchased TAUs and CFA. They are not increasing densities and square footage, only relocating them. This is part of the Regional Plan consideration.

Mr. Wells said that to address some of the issues that Mr. McClure represented, he was here at the time Chapter 15 was being drafted and the intent was for redevelopment to apply potentially basin-wide in the urban core areas. What was done at South Shore was strictly a demonstration project and if you look at the table of contents in Chapter 15, the very last section deals with that, but the other sections apply to redevelopment proposals, such as the one Placer County is presenting. This is the first one that has come forward in the last 20 years other than the demonstration project. The primary difference is that all of the incentives and required improvements for the South Shore demonstration project are significantly greater than those available for other redevelopment plans, such as the plans being proposed by Placer County.

Mr. Hitchcock said that for areas located outside of community plans, there are provisions on the books today to allow the Board to consider designating these areas as eligible for redevelopment purposes. We have special policies in some of these plan areas that actually encourages redevelopment, that is why some of these areas, like the grid streets were included. We have existing conditions that are blighted and you can make the findings so that these areas can be considered.

Ms. James said the focus groups that were referred to earlier by Mr. McClure were created by Placer County in an effort to create forums for various issues in the Basin it had to deal with as a local government. The map that we currently show does reflect the comments from this focus group. The area we had initially proposed was larger and it included both sides of National Avenue all the way to Highway 28 and went further toward Highway 267. The comments received was that we don’t want you to pick up those properties owned by public land holders and constrain
going down Highway 28 on the lake side. This does reflect those comments.

Mr. Donohue suggested that these comments should be made to the Governing Board.

Mr. Greene said that the grid area of Kings Beach is very sad. These areas really need help. The notion that we are enabling things to increase density and height is up for discussion. This is about what kind of concept we are going to use for the next 20 years to try to make the community characters different from what is here today. There are good reasons to look at all these proposed redevelopments projects. It is not simply a matter of making the North Shore like the South Shore which he believes will never happen because of the number of residents in the area.

Ms. Marchetta said staff agrees with this sentiment and has tried to community that. We bump up against the fear that we are turning the North Shore into the South Shore and that is absolutely not where we are headed.

Mr. Upton said he supports the other comments made by members of the Commission and particular at the attempt of the point that this is never intended to be for the rest of the Basin. It was certainly never intended that South Shore would be the only redevelopment area at the time that Chapter 15 was written. This is really a notice of study only and action to study will not predispose any particular outcome.

Mr. Donohue said that the blight analysis shows that in two areas you are around 66%-68% and two other areas you are down around 24%-33%, what is the criteria target?

Ms. James said the staff prepared the blight study and in redevelopment you will find on a block by block basis, which is what the percentages refer to. There will be some houses or some structures that look nice and maybe some curb and not a gutter which are visually apparent and some things that are part of the infrastructure that are not apparent. When we did the physical study of these areas, there were total blocks that were clearly blighted, but then there were some blocks that had some redeeming qualities. You can't draw a line block by block, but need to take a neighborhood or a series of blocks as a hole and that is why we went down to that level of detail.

Mr. Donohue asked when you say redevelopment policy, is there a redevelopment policy that says anything over 12% meets your criteria for blight.

Ms. James said that you have the professional staff that is actually doing the blight study working with the consultant and the consultant also helps make the determination.
Mr. Hitchcock said that blight for TRPA is somewhat a subjective analysis and you need to look at the lay of the land. TRPA Code states blighted area is characterized by properties which suffer from economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse because of three or more of the following factors:

1. The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size for proper usefulness and development.
2. The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions.
3. The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment.
4. A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment.
5. The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carrying capacities.

Mr. Donohue said as you are discussing this at the Governing Board look at a number summary. He thinks it would be important to engage with the Board on this and let them know it is subjective, but at the same time there is a big disparity between 68% and 24%. It is ironic that Kings Beach, because of how big you drew the area, is 24%, which is the lowest.

Ms. Garcia clarified that most of these areas have been designated redevelopment areas under California law, so they have already met some kind of standard.

Ms. James said that scrutiny under California law is very strict and we had to meet legal, as well as environmental review boundary requirements.

Mr. Upton said he liked the way this was presented that in each one of those areas there was noted what the applicable environmental improvement projects were. He thinks that gets into the area of wider boundaries, because you have a lot of EIP projects that maybe couldn’t get any financing through redevelopment, unless they ended up being inside the redevelopment area.

Mr. Donohue said he is struggling with the fact that staff wants the APC to make a motion prior to the Governing Board making their findings that this could be a redevelopment area, because it doesn’t meet the first criteria of being in a community plan. We need to at least change the recommended motion so that it is clear to the Board that they need to make that finding.
Ms. Merchant recommended that the APC motion include the component to the Governing Board that they also take under consideration the expansion beyond the community plan boundary, and that staff prepare that information for the Board so they can make those findings.

Mr. Donohue said he feels uncomfortable that the APC is being asked to make a recommendation to the Governing Board and we don't have the Environmental Assessment as part of our packet.

Mr. Hitchcock said the findings to add the areas outside of community plans are made by the Board at the time we actually adopt the final redevelopment plan, because it will require an amendment to the community plan and the plan area statements that will be designated as eligible. These findings do not need to be made now, however we need the APC’s recommendation to the Board to recommend adding additional areas that currently are not in the study area.

Ms. Merchant said that APC would just recommend that the analysis be done to include this in the study, so that at the Board meeting, they could choose to make this finding.

Mr. Donohue recommended that in the future a change to Chapter 15.1 be made to remove the word “shall.”

Mr. Hitchcock said we would need the Board to agree with staff’s recommendation with amendments from the APC. If they agree, then we would move forward with the study areas as currently amended.

Mr. Donohue said he is concerned that if the Board doesn’t agree, we could have spent tens of thousands of dollars if the findings could not be made down the road.

Ms. Marchetta stated that staff would like a clear record on this before we bring this forward to the Board. They would like to work on the issues raised today. We would like to continue this item to a date uncertain and bring it back with those improvements on our record.

Ms. Krause moved to continue this item.

Ms. Merchant asked if we bring this back in October, could this be held at a November Governing Board meeting on the North Shore.

Ms. Marchetta said rather than designating a month, she would like to ask for discretion as to when this would be best to bring this back.

Ms. Merchant would be concerned about having this at a Governing Board meeting on the South Shore.

Ms. Marchetta said we are actually planning to split our October Board meeting days because of the way that agenda items are lining up, so we
are having one day on the South Shore and one day on the North Shore for the next couple of months.

Motion carried.
Mr. Riley abstained.

VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Ms. Marchetta said that the Boulder Bay final EIS and project will be coming to the APC and Governing Board in October and asked Jerry Wells to present what information you will be receiving related to this item.

Mr. Wells said on Boulder Bay the final EIS will be presented for certification. This will be out for public review for 30 days prior to your October meeting and is posted on our website. We will be providing a hard copy for each of you, as well as a CD if you would like one. The draft EIS is also on our website for review if anyone needs that to review.

Ms. Marchetta said that the other item that will be coming to the APC in October is the Draft EIS for the Upper Truckee River Restoration project, which includes the realignment of the golf course.

Mr. Wells said we anticipate the Homewood Draft EIS will be released around October 18th for the 60 day circulation period.

Ms. Marchetta also updated the APC on what decisions were made at the last Governing Board meeting.

Mr. Donohue suggested that Commission members sit down with their respective Board members to help them understand issues a little better.

B. General Counsel

No report.

C. APC Members

Ms. Marchetta said that Chairman Tolhurst is still in the hospital and he would appreciate an email from any Commission member who would like to contact him, to wish him well.
VII. ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair Mr. Donohue adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Nikkel
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) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 6, 2010

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/DEIS/DEIS) for the Upper Truckee River Restoration and Golf Course Reconfiguration Project, Lake Valley State Recreation Area and Washoe Meadows State Park, Meyers, California

Requested Action: No formal action is proposed for this item at this time. Staff is requesting that the Advisory Planning Commission provide comments and solicit additional comments from the public on the environmental document for the Upper Truckee River Restoration and Golf Course Reconfiguration Project. This will be the first of two public hearings on the Draft environmental document.

Project Description/Background: The California Department of Parks and Recreation is pursuing a restoration project along the reach of the Upper Truckee River that extends from the vicinity of its upstream entry point near the southern boundary of Washoe Meadows State Park (SP) to the point just west of U.S. Highway 50 where the river exits Lake Valley State Recreation Area. The “study area” for the project is approximately 520 acres, including 13,430 linear feet of the Upper Truckee River, and includes the southern portion of Washoe Meadows SP, Lake Valley SRA, and small portions of US Forest Service and California Tahoe Conservancy lands (Attachment A). The primary purpose of the project is to restore natural geomorphic and ecological processes along this reach of river and to reduce the river’s suspended sediment discharge to Lake Tahoe. The proposed restoration project may include reconfiguration of the Lake Tahoe Golf Course to allow for restoration of the river, to reduce the area of Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) occupied by the golf course, and to allow for establishment of a buffer area between the golf course and the river.

The DEIR/DEIS/DEIS analyzes five alternatives: no project/no action, and four unique alternatives. A preferred or proposed alternative has not yet been defined. Following receipt and evaluation of public comments on the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS, TRPA, California Parks and Recreation, and the Bureau of Reclamation will determine which alternative or combinations of features from multiple alternatives will become the proposed project.

Comment Period: In accordance with Article 6.13(b) of the TRPA Rules of Procedure, the comment period for the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS commenced on August 26, 2010 and will conclude on November 8, 2010. The purpose of the comment period is to gather input from the public regarding the adequacy of the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS in terms of identified
impacts and proposed mitigation measures that are addressed in the environmental
document. Copies of the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS have been mailed or delivered to APC and
Governing Board members, the California and Nevada state clearinghouses, and other
interested parties. At the conclusion of the comment period a final EIR/EIS/EIS will be
prepared that will include responses to all written comments received during the
comment period, and may include responses to oral or late comments per Article 6.14,
Rules of Procedure.

Representatives from California Department of Parks and Recreation, the applicant, and
AECOM, the consulting firm contracted to prepare the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS, will be present
at the Advisory Planning Commission hearing to answer any questions.

The DEIR/DEIS/DEIS may be viewed electronically at www.restoreuppertruckee.net, or
in hard copy in South Lake Tahoe at either the TRPA office (128 Market Street,
Stateline, NV) or at the South Lake Tahoe Library (1000 Rufus Allen Blvd.). Additional
hard copy locations are listed at the Restore Upper Truckee website.

Should you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact
Mike Elam, Associate Planner, at 775-588-4547 ext. 308, or melam@trpa.org.

If you wish to comment in writing on the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS, please send comments to:

CA State Parks and Rec., Sierra District
Attn: Cyndie Walck
PO Box 16
Tahoe City, CA 96145

If comments on the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS are provided via email, please utilize the following
format:

Email to: utproject@parks.ca.gov
Subject Line: River-Golf Course
Instructions:
• Attach comments in an Microsoft Word document
• Include commenter’s U.S. Postal Service mailing address in
Microsoft Word.

Attachments:

A. Map of Study Area and Property Boundaries

AGENDA ITEM V.A.
Study Area and Property Boundaries
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 6, 2010

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Recommendation on the Placer County Preliminary Redevelopment Plan

Requested Action: This item was presented to the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) at their regularly scheduled meeting on September 8, 2010 and was continued to the October meeting. Staff is requesting the APC make a recommendation to the Governing Board on the attached Placer County Preliminary Redevelopment Plans (Preliminary Redevelopment Plan).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC review the attached Preliminary Redevelopment Plan and Blight Study and the Environmental Assessment, hold a public hearing on this item and make a recommendation to the TRPA Governing Board for approval of the Preliminary Redevelopment Plan.

Required Motion: In order to recommend approval of the Preliminary Redevelopment Plan the APC must make a motion recommending approval of the Preliminary Redevelopment Plan to the Governing Board. In order for the motion to pass, an affirmative vote of the majority of the APC is required.

Project Description/Background: Placer County has requested TRPA to consider processing and adopting a TRPA approved Redevelopment Plan for a portion of Placer County located within the Tahoe Basin. Chapter 15 of the Code of Ordinances (Code) sets forth the provisions for development and adoption of a Redevelopment Plan.

The Code authorizes the preparation of redevelopment plans in areas that are predominantly urbanized, blighted, and designated in the applicable plan area statement as eligible for redevelopment. Only public entities empowered by applicable state law to engage in redevelopment may propose redevelopment plans. Following adoption of a redevelopment plan, projects within the redevelopment plan boundaries shall be consistent with the provisions of the redevelopment plan.

A predominantly urbanized area is defined as an urbanized area in which not less than 80 percent of the privately-owned property in the redevelopment plan area has been or is currently developed for urban uses. Blighted area is defined as an area that is characterized by properties which suffer from economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse as a result of three or more of the following factors listed below that causes a reduction or lack of proper utilization of the area to such an extent that the blight
constitutes a serious physical, social, environmental or economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise acting alone. The factors are:

1. The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size for proper usefulness and development.

2. The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions.

3. The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment.

4. A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment.

5. The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carrying capacities.

Prior to the commencement of the redevelopment plan process, the Code requires the development of a Preliminary Redevelopment Plan (Preliminary Plan) that must be approved by the TRPA Governing Board. The Preliminary Plan requires the following information:

1. An environmental assessment (EA) prepared in accordance with Subsection 5.3.A, including sufficient information, as may be required by TRPA, to allow TRPA to evaluate the proposed changes in land use and the environmental impacts that may result.

2. A description of the proposed redevelopment plan area boundaries and project area boundaries including a preliminary determination of which areas are blighted and urbanized.

3. A general statement of the proposed land uses, anticipated development, proposed targets and objectives related to attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds, layout of the principal streets and transportation patterns, and a general description of the standards to be used for redevelopment of the area.

4. A general statement of how the proposed redevelopment plan conforms to the provisions of the Goals and Policies, the applicable plan area statements, the Code, and the environmental thresholds.

5. A general description of the provisions for existing and new affordable housing and the expected impact of the proposed redevelopment plan on the residents of the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods.

6. A statement of how the preliminary plan differs from and conforms to the adopted community plan, including a re-evaluation of items required by Subparagraphs 14.6.C (1) through (7), inclusive, and other items prescribed by TRPA as
appropriate to deal with new or changed circumstances arising subsequent to the adoption of the community plan.

7. An economic feasibility and needs assessment.

8. Such other information as TRPA may reasonably require to evaluate the proposed redevelopment plan.

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

The Advisory Planning Commission is requested to review the Preliminary Plan and make recommendations to the Governing Board. The Governing Board will review and either approve, deny or modify the preliminary redevelopment plan. Approval of a preliminary plan allows a public entity to proceed and analyze a final redevelopment plan but does not obligate TRPA to any future approval of a final plan. The public entity has up to five years to submit a Final Redevelopment Plan and environmental documentation for Governing Board approval.

The purpose of the Preliminary Plan is to serve as a checkpoint for all agencies and other parties who may be affected by it. No project approval is considered as part of the Preliminary Plan, however goals, policies and incentives will be further refined as part of the Draft Redevelopment Plan. Additional environmental documentation will be required as part of the Final Redevelopment Plan, therefore only an environmental assessment is needed at his time pursuant to Chapter 15 provisions.

In cooperation with Placer County, TRPA staff is recommending approval of the Preliminary Plan submitted by the County for consideration by the APC and the Governing Board. Placer County has submitted four Preliminary Redevelopment Plans and the associated environmental assessment for consideration by the TRPA APC and Governing Board. The four Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are as follows:

1. Tahoe City Gateway
2. Lake Forest
3. Tahoe Vista
4. Kings Beach/Stateline

Each Preliminary Plan includes the required elements described above, including an economic feasibility assessment and required blight study. The Preliminary Plans and the associated EA is attached to this staff summary (See Attachments A-E). The four plans are conceptual policy and program documents and do not identify specific project locations nor propose specific projects at this time. They do include a discussion on the intent to study and explore certain targeted redevelopment activities that will focus on enhancing the goals of the Regional Plan and environmental improvement. A brief description of each area is provided below.

**Tahoe City Gateway Preliminary Plan**
The Tahoe City/Gateway redevelopment area is defined as that area roughly beginning at the western edge of Rocky Ridge Road plan area on the east to roughly the entrance to Tahoe City o the West, Olympic drive on the south. The area includes the inclusion of the Tahoe City Gold Course, and the old dumpsite located northeast of Tahoe City (See Attachment A, page 6 for a location map).
While Tahoe City does not suffer from the same type of blight conditions as some other communities in North Lake Tahoe. The greatest concern in Tahoe City is retail stagnation. Generally, a more subtle and growing problem is economic malaise associated with the loss of its longtime resident base and the economic fluctuations that are brought about by increasing seasonality. Economically, like other communities in North Lake Tahoe, the commercial district in Tahoe City reflects neglected properties in prime locations along Highway 28, including dilapidated structures and outdated facilities.

The existing streetscape improvements have been successful in promoting increased pedestrian activity in the commercial core. However, forced to compete with Squaw Valley and Northstar resorts, local businesses have struggled for survival. Some have abandoned their properties leaving them vacant and blighted, while others have tried to upgrade their properties in hopes of attracting customers and tenants. The result is that dedicated land owners are forced to survive adjacent to properties that are either abandoned or in disrepair. These conditions environmentally threaten Lake Tahoe’s clarity and beauty, which is compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution.

**Lake Forest Preliminary Plan**
The Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan consists of approximately 28 acres, and centers along Lake Forest Road. The area includes Lupin Lane / Rose Avenue on the north to Sierra Vista on the South; and Manzanita on the east to Bristlecone on the west (See Attachment B, page 6 for a location map)

In 1994, the Lake Forest Commercial area was considered as a candidate for community plan area status. However, it was determined that due to the limited size of the community, the limitations on new development, and the nature of environmental improvements needed in the community, that the Plan Area Statement process was more appropriate and would attract private dollars. This investment has not occurred.

The Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan is targeted on renovating and developing commercial property in Special Areas 1 and 2. In the years since 1994, this area has deteriorated further and without intervention will require costly resources in the future to remedy.

This area was chosen because of the blighted economic and social conditions of its commercial district, as well as the critical physical conditions leading to a lack of water quality BMPs, storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, haphazard parking, and scenic blight.

Increasingly the commercial area of Lake Forest is showing signs of an aging community facing the result of extended deferred maintenance. These conditions environmentally threaten Lake Tahoe’s primary assets, its clarity and beauty which are compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution. Economically, like other communities in North Lake Tahoe, the commercial district in Lake Forest reflects neglected properties, dilapidated structures and outdated infrastructure that exacerbate the community’s decline.

**Tahoe Vista Preliminary Plan**
The Tahoe Vista Preliminary Plan is defined as an area beginning at Donner Road south to Lake Tahoe and generally those privately owned parcels adjacent to National Avenue on the east, including parcels north of Highway 28 to Yaho Avenue, to Estates Drive on the West. The proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area centers on National
Avenue which is predominately tourist accommodation, commercial and industrial uses in nature (See Attachment C, page 6 for a location map).

Land use patterns vary widely, commercial activity fronts along State Route 28 and there are areas which may provide opportunities for open space or environmental preserves. Additionally, there is a trailer park which may pose an opportunity for residential improvements.

The proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plan consists of approximately 85 acres of land, located in Placer County at the north shore of Lake Tahoe.

The mixed residential and commercial uses in the Tahoe Vista community are showing signs of the effects of extended deferred maintenance. These conditions threaten Lake Tahoe’s primary assets, its clarity and beauty, which are compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution. While many neighborhoods located in Tahoe Vista are stable and reflect current market values, there are others which exhibit neglected properties, dilapidated structures, outdated infrastructure and a lack of public improvements that will exacerbate the community’s decline.

Similar to other communities in North Lake Tahoe, Tahoe Vista was originally developed in the 1950’s as an area of vacation cabins and motels, and has since become a year-round residential community with limited supporting commercial and public services. However, the infrastructure and environmental improvements have not been upgraded to adequately meet the increased needs of the Tahoe Vista community.

Kings Beach/Stateline Preliminary Plan
The proposed boundary extends generally from Stateline to Highway 267 and from Speckled Avenue to Lake Tahoe (See Attachment D, page 11 for a location map). In a section known as the “Grid”, an area that extends from behind the commercial corridor to Speckled Avenue, there is a haphazard mix of residential, schools, motels, public uses, and private industrial uses. This area was chosen because of the blighted economic and social conditions as well as the critical physical conditions leading to storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, inadequate infrastructure, substandard housing, haphazard parking, scenic blight and a lack of water quality BMPs. The Grid is currently not included in a TRPA community plan area.

The commercial core, an area that fronts along State Highway Route 28, is marked with abandoned buildings, vacant lots, inadequate and irregular shaped parcels, and substandard public and private physical improvements, all of which contribute to the degradation of the water quality of Lake Tahoe.

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

Increasingly, the areas of Kings Beach/Stateline are showing signs of an aging community facing the result of extended deferred maintenance. Lake Tahoe’s primary assets, its clarity and beauty, have been compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution. Economically, many of the communities in North Lake Tahoe reflect the neglected properties, dilapidated structures and outdated infrastructure that exacerbate the area’s
decline. Improper land uses, limited public transportation and a lack of quality affordable housing and neighborhood services contribute to the dwindling population of full-time residents who have a stake in implementing and seeing environmental and land use improvements.

What was originally developed in the 1950s as an area of vacation cabins, trailers and motels, has become a year-round residential community with limited supporting commercial and public services. However, the housing stock, commercial buildings, infrastructure and environmental improvements have not been upgraded to adequately meet the increased needs of the Kings Beach/Stateline communities.

Issues/Concerns: The Preliminary Redevelopment Plans proposes the inclusion of plan areas that are not designated as redevelopment areas and do not have adopted community plans in place. Of these areas only one plan area (Lake Forest) was once originally targeted as a preliminary community plan area. In the previous staff summary prepared for the September APC hearing, staff stated that Section 15.1 of the TRPA Code limits Redevelopment Plans to plan areas that are designated as eligible for Redevelopment Plans and located within adopted community plans, which are predominately urbanized and blighted.

The areas that are proposed for inclusion in the Preliminary Redevelopment Plans that are located outside adopted community plans and in non-designated plan areas include the Highway 89 scenic corridor and the Tahoe City Golf Course, the Lake Forest plan area which was formerly designated a Preliminary Community Plan area, a portion of a residential plan area located to the North of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan, and a portion of the Kings Beach residential plan area that is commonly referred to as the “Grid Street”. The total acreage of lands that are proposed for inclusion in the Preliminary Redevelopment Plans that exist outside adopted community plans is approximately 324 acres.

During the public presentation to APC, staff highlighted another provisions of Chapter 15 that was not discussed in the original staff summary that staff interpreted to allow for the inclusion of non-designated plan areas that do not meet the applicability provisions of Section 15.1. Section 15.4 states that the Governing Board can designate plans areas as eligible for redevelopment plans if the Board makes the following findings prior to amending the plan area statement to make it eligible for redevelopment plans:

1. **Goals and Policies:** A redevelopment plan in the plan area would be consistent with the Goals and Policies.

2. **Community Plan Designation:** An adopted community plan designates a predominantly urbanized and blighted area within the plan area for redevelopment.

3. **Elimination of Blight:** Redevelopment is the most effective way to eliminate blight in the designated area and has been demonstrated by professionally prepared economic studies to be financially feasible.

4. **Conditions of Dislocation and Maladjustment:** Redevelopment will relieve conditions of economic, social, or environmental dislocation or maladjustment and should not create new unmitigatable economic, social, or environmental impacts.
At the APC hearing staff believed and stated that this provision would allow the inclusion of non-designated plan areas in the boundaries of the Preliminary Plans and would not require an amendment to the TRPA Code of Ordinances or be inconsistent with Section 15.1. APC Chairman Donahue questioned staff on the findings and asked if the APC should make a recommendation to the Board to make the findings prior to approving the Preliminary Plans. Staff responded that it was not necessary to make the findings at this time and that the findings would be made at the time of EIS certification and Redevelopment Plan adoption. Chairman Donahue questioned staff’s interpretation of the Code provision and felt that it was important to have an answer before proceeding and suggested a recess in order for staff to confer with legal counsel. It was agreed among staff and legal counsel that more time was needed to research the Code provisions prior to providing an interpretation. It was suggested by Executive Director Joanne Marchetta and supported by the APC that action on the Preliminary Plan be continued to some future date in order to provide staff adequate time to render the correct interpretation.

Staff has met with legal counsel to discuss the interpretation of Section 15.4. The discussion has resulted in two important determinations. First, only areas within a community plan are eligible for redevelopment. Non-designated plan areas would need to adopt a community plan that designates the plan area as urbanized and blighted in order to qualify for redevelopment. Second, section 15.4 requires the Board to make the appropriate findings to add the designation prior to developing a Preliminary Plan.

Since it is not staff’s or Placer County’s intent to propose adoption of community plans for these non-designated plan areas or expand existing adopted community plan boundaries (e.g., Kings Beach Community Plan) the inclusion of these areas is inconsistent with the existing provisions of Chapter 15. Staff is proposing amendments to Chapter 15 that would allow the consideration of Redevelopment Plans within plan areas without adopted community plans. TRPA and County staff believe there is a compelling rationale to permit Redevelopment Plans outside community plans areas. Certain plan areas outside the adopted community plans also exhibit deteriorating conditions, economic stagnation, and lack of environmental improvement that make these areas potentially ideal for infusion of public funding and future incentives to improve the environmental, economic, and social conditions. Allowing Redevelopment Plans outside community plan areas is consistent with existing Land Use Goal #2, Policy #13 which states that “Redevelopment shall be encouraged in areas designated for redirection to improve environmental quality and community character.” This policy does not restrict Redevelopment Plans to community plans but rather supports redevelopment planning in areas that are designated for redirection. Many plan areas outside community plans also carry this designation because they exhibit urbanized conditions and blight that can be improved through relocation and redevelopment of existing structures. The proposed amendment would be analyzed in the required Environmental Impact Statement for the Final Redevelopment Plan.

It should also be noted that the Draft Preliminary Redevelopment Plans make mention of specific incentives that may be approved as part of the final redevelopment plans as well as references to focusing and enhancing the goals and objectives of the yet to be adopted TRPA Regional Plan update. By approving the preliminary redevelopment plans, APC and the Board are not determining the incentives that the final redevelopment plans will afford, that is a determination that will be made in the final plan, nor are they endorsing statements about the yet to be adopted Regional Plan update. The Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are only conceptual policy documents that
discuss the intent to study and explore certain targeted areas for redevelopment activities and do not identify specific project, project locations, or approve any project or any specific incentives. Approval of the Preliminary Plans does not in any way commit TRPA or the Governing Board to project approval, approval of the Final Redevelopment Plan or any requested incentives or predispose the Regional Plan Update. Any subsequent approval of a Redevelopment Plan by the Governing Board will be required to be consistent with the Regional Plan in place at that time. If the Preliminary Plans are approved by the TRPA Governing Board, the County can begin the redevelopment planning process to identify specific projects, incentives and amendments, which will be analyzed by the required Environmental Impact Statement and brought before the Board for review and potential approval.

**Environmental Documentation:** Placer County has prepared an Environmental Assessment pursuant to Chapter 15 provisions and staff has reviewed and determined that the approval of the Placer County Preliminary Redevelopment Plans will not have a significant effect on the environment and a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA’s Rules of Procedures.

Please contact John Hitchcock, at (775) 589-5220 or jhitchcock@trpa.org if your have any questions.

Attachments:

- Attachment A  Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for Tahoe City Gateway
- Attachment B  Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for Lake Forest
- Attachment C  Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for Tahoe Vista
- Attachment D  Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for Kings Beach/Stateline
- Attachment E  Environmental Assessment for North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans: Kings Beach/State, Tahoe Vista, Lake Forest, Tahoe City/Gateway
- Attachment F  Public Comment Letters
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PRELIMINARY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
TAHOE CITY/GATEWAY

General Overview

Proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) pursuant to Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (§15.10) (“Chapter 15”).

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency intends to submit final Redevelopment Plans for future TRPA approval after the new Regional Plan is adopted sometime over the next three to five years. These plan areas are: Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe Vista, Lake Forest, and, Tahoe City/Gateway. Plans for these areas will be submitted separately in accordance with TRPA’s Code of Ordinances-Chapter 15 (Chapter 15). Chapter 15 provides the opportunity for Placer County to undertake redevelopment programs within TRPA defined redevelopment areas that are found to be urbanized, blighted, and environmentally threatened.

These Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are conceptual policy and program documents; they do not identify specific project locations nor propose specific activities. They do present a discussion on the intent to study and explore certain targeted redevelopment activities that will focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the updated Regional Plan.

It is our understanding that under the new Regional Plan TRPA may provide land use incentives in TRPA redevelopment areas in order to promote the construction of environmental improvement projects. If so, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency submits these Preliminary Plans with the intent to qualify for such land use considerations.

Background

While Tahoe City does not suffer from the same type of blight conditions as some other communities in North Lake Tahoe, of greatest concern in Tahoe City is the retail stagnation. Generally, a more subtle and growing problem is economic malaise associated with the loss of its longtime resident base and the economic fluctuations that are brought about by increasing seasonality. Economically, like other communities in North Lake Tahoe, the commercial district in Tahoe City reflects neglected properties in prime locations along Hwy 28, including dilapidated structures and outdated facilities.

The new streetscape improvements have been successful in promoting increased pedestrian activity in the commercial core. However, forced to compete with Squaw Valley and Northstar resorts local businesses have struggled for survival. Some have abandoned their properties leaving them vacant and blighted, while others have tried to upgrade their properties in hopes of attracting customers and tenants. The result is that dedicated land owners are forced to survive adjacent to properties that are either abandoned or in disrepair. These conditions also environmentally threaten Lake Tahoe’s clarity and beauty, which is compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution.
Preliminary Redevelopment Plan:

TAHOE CITY/GATEWAY
Section I - (15.10.B (2))

A description of the proposed redevelopment plan area boundaries and project area boundaries including a preliminary determination of which areas are blighted and urbanized

Tahoe City/Gateway - Project Area Boundaries (See Exhibit J)

Introduction

The redevelopment area boundary proposed in this report is consistent, and within the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors, under California Law on July 16, 1996. However, the proposed Preliminary Tahoe City/Gateway Redevelopment Plan area is smaller than the current California redevelopment area.

Community Description

For purposes of this Tahoe City/Gateway Redevelopment Plan area, the community is defined as that area roughly beginning at the western edge of Rocky Ridge Road Plan Area Statement on the east to roughly the entrance to Tahoe City on the west; Olympic drive on the south; on Highway 28 to just south of the Wye along Highway 89 and the Tahoe City Golf Course to Lake Tahoe. The Area also includes that land identified at 001B – Commercial / Public Service northeast of the Tahoe City Golf Course. The Gateway section runs along State Route 89 as an off highway turn in, north of Twin Crags Road. State Route 28 runs through the center of the community and is the focus of commercial, residential and recreational activity.

The Tahoe City/Gateway Area consists of approximately 335 acres. The Gateway portion includes the small commercial strip between Alpine Meadows and Tahoe City along the north side of Highway 89 consisting of approximately 41 acres.

The proposed redevelopment plan in Placer County will incorporate the land use guides promoted in the updated Regional Plan. Due to the blighted condition of the properties in the proposed plan, planned land uses will align with Regional Plan goals. Land uses will exemplify development that promotes mixed-use development with a focus on creating uses that will be concentrated and encourage the use of public transportation, bicycles and walking. Live-work environments will be promoted and incentivized.

These areas were chosen because of the blighted economic and social conditions as well as the critical physical conditions leading to a lack of water quality BMPs, untreated storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, substandard housing, haphazard parking, and scenic blight. (See Adverse Conditions Study – Appendix).
Section II - (15.10.B (3))

A general statement of the proposed land uses, anticipated development, proposed targets and objectives related to attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds, layout of the principal streets and transportation patterns, and a general description of the standards to be used for redevelopment of the area.

Land Use Plan

This section provides an overview of the proposed vision planned for the Preliminary Tahoe City/Gateway Redevelopment Plan. Additional descriptions of the environmental settings and land use elements will be discussed in detail at the time of project submittal.

Tahoe City / Tahoe City Gateway Area

This area is non-contiguous and includes parcels along Highway 28 and Highway 89 (Gateway). The community overall lacks strong organizational and land use principles resulting in social and economic maladjustment on certain parcels, a highly visible example of this is the Tahoe City Golf Course. While this could be a major community contribution, it is currently isolated, located behind a series of underutilized buildings and service areas.

Anticipated Development (See Exhibit K)

Open Space Preserve

There are large parcels of land located at the Tahoe City Golf Course that are in a Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) or have soil capability that renders them undevelopable. This Plan will examine the possibility of a land/nature preserve that includes upgraded BMPs and ensures ongoing maintenance.

See also Commercial Development, below.

Commercial Development

In addition to the parcels identified at the Tahoe City Golf Course as SEZ (see above), the location also contains large parcels which lend themselves to compact, mixed-use development. It is planned that under the Regional Plan update, land use designations would allow for resort or hotel development that meet the goals of the applicable transect.

The designated Tahoe City redevelopment area parcels suffer from under utilized commercial structures located in the urban center. Additionally, the Tahoe City Golf Course, a major land holding, suffers from the inability to incentivize private dollars to invest in renovating the environmental and economical infrastructure. Its current condition continues to worsen its environmental downward spiral.
In targeted areas located in the Town Center, the “Wye”, and the land adjacent to the dam and Fanny Bridge, there are opportunities for recreation and support retail. Acquisition of land and easements to create an open space link from the Tahoe City Marina to the Fanny Bridge State Recreation Area would open up opportunities for private development and the installation of modern BMPs.

The Tahoe City Gateway has restrictive commercial land uses due to the current local regulatory codes.

**Workforce Housing**

Explore opportunities for infill new construction and rehabilitated housing. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency will promote its affordable housing rehabilitation loan program where appropriate in Tahoe City, as well as examine the feasibility to construct new affordable workforce housing in Tahoe City Industrial Plan Area Statement 001B.

**Attainment & Maintenance of Environmental Thresholds - Targets and Objectives**

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

The proposed redevelopment plan is targeted to the highest and most critical environmental improvement projects that will lead to the greatest benefit over the shortest period of time for the overall community. It is determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the environmental improvement program as the standard for Plan evaluation.

As projects come forward for development approval they will be measured against the approved five–year environmental improvement project list. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency will provide assistance to private property owners in achieving pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area.
Transportation Patterns

SR 28 is the link between central Tahoe City and the Tahoe City Gateway. It has a terminus at the Wye where it meets SR 89. SR 89 is the major link between Tahoe City and South Lake Tahoe along the west shore of the Lake.

General Description of Redevelopment Standards

The pristine nature and fragility of the environment of North Lake Tahoe require tight controls on development. The standards that will be used for the implementation of the Preliminary Tahoe City/Gateway Redevelopment Plan area are:

1. The project must result in the upgrading and renovation of the communities’ existing building stock, and where possible, reduce the dilapidated building stock contributing to the degradation of Lake Tahoe.

2. Provisions must be made for providing affordable workforce housing in the immediate vicinity of projects, or provisions made to expand alternative public transportation to link housing with jobs and community services.

3. Redevelopment activities must result in development that is both economically attractive to private developers and will achieve and sustain correction of environmental damage to Lake Tahoe through the Achievement Activities of environmental thresholds.

4. Consideration of any substantial redevelopment undertaking must have input from the community affected by the proposed activity.
Section III - (15.10.B (4))

A general statement of how the proposed redevelopment plan conforms to the provisions of the Goals and Policies, the transects, the applicable plan area statements, the Code, and the environmental thresholds.

Conformity with Placer County and TRPA Goals, Policies, Code and Thresholds

The Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Tahoe City/Gateway community will be consistent with the Placer County General Plan, the Tahoe City General Plan, transects for areas outside community plan areas, and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of final Redevelopment Plan approval.

Goals & Policies

The Redevelopment Agency agrees to support and promote Placer County and TRPA’s goals to maintain the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by the Region, through its development projects.

Balancing sustainable development with the above will encourage the wise use of Lake Tahoe and the resources of the area, preserve public and private investments in the community, and preserve the social and economic health of the region.

Placer County Zoning Ordinance & TRPA Code of Ordinances

The TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code) is a compilation of land use and environmental regulations for the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Redevelopment Agency’s Tahoe City/Gateway Preliminary Redevelopment Plan is in conformity with the Code.

All projects are subject to TRPA (in accordance with Chapter Four of the Code) and Placer County review. To ensure effective and efficient coordination, the Code and the Placer County Zoning Ordinance shall apply to building modifications, expansions and repairs. When a conflict presents itself, the most restrictive ordinance shall apply.

Environmental Improvement Program

The TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) encompasses hundreds of capital improvement, research, program support, and maintenance projects designed to restore and protect Lake Tahoe’s clarity.

Placer County is partner with TRPA in constructing and maintaining EIP projects of mutual benefit. Over a twenty-year period Placer County is committed to develop and construct public improvements
Thresholds

Thresholds are environmental standards adopted by TRPA to help protect Lake Tahoe. These thresholds are designed to reflect the inter-connected nature of the environment, the economy and the community’s social well-being.

The environmental threshold carrying capacities and standards for the Lake Tahoe Basin essentially define the capacity of the Region to accommodate additional land development. Threshold indicators are used as the measures of success of attaining environmental health in the region.

Placer County has identified a list of environmental improvement projects in the Tahoe City/Gateway community that address the thresholds and move forward the EIP.

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

Threshold Achievement Criteria:

1. Projects seeking consideration under the provisions of the Plan, must contribute to the implementation of one, or more, of the Environmental Improvement Program projects above.

2. All contribution determinations and calculations shall be made by the Placer County Department of Public Works.

3. Improvement of public or private facilities, provisions of added open spaces, construction of BMPs in conformance with environmental carrying capacities established by TRPA.

4. Use of rehabilitation and façade improvement loans and grants to leverage private investment and improve commercial building conditions.
5. Implementation of a public improvement program including road grading, patching and paving; curb, gutter and sidewalk construction; and storm drain installation.

6. Potential participation in operation and maintenance of public improvements related to air and water quality through funding contribution and / or providing those services for Public Works determined projects.
Section IV - (15.10.B (5))

A general description of the provisions for existing and new affordable housing and the expected impact of the proposed redevelopment plan on the residents of the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods

Description of Provisions for Workforce Housing and Community Impacts

Lake Tahoe is a unique and complex regulatory environment where development of affordable housing is a challenge on a number of levels. Housing affordability pressures are particularly visible on the North Shore where the lack of current decent housing supply available for area workers appears to have provided the opportunity for property owners to rent their units to workers willing to live in substandard and overcrowded conditions.

Clearly, the need for affordable housing outpaces the available land and local state and federal dollars necessary for development. The Agency will continue on its path as defined under California Law with the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area to expand and improve the supply of affordable housing. The impact on the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods will be positive in nature as the Agency will continue to promote affordable housing and workforce housing opportunities for the residents and workforce of the North Lake Tahoe Area.

The TRPA Code of Ordinances establishes specific regulations and thresholds for, among other things, land use, density, rate of growth, and land coverage. TRPA has adopted programs to address the need for workforce housing units in which certain housing developments may obtain special consideration from TRPA’s allocation requirements.

In addition to a unique land use regulatory environment, Lake Tahoe has additional challenges to the creation and maintenance of affordable housing including a large seasonal tourist population and a substantial second-residence population that limits access to permanent affordable housing units. Dean Runyan Associates prepared The Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area, 1997-2002 Detailed Visitor Impact Estimates in December 2003, which noted that nearly 6 in 10 housing units in the Lake Tahoe Basin are vacation homes classified for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use.

In 2001, Placer County adopted an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which requires residential developers in the Area to set aside 15% of the units built as affordable to very low and moderate-income households. Redevelopment inclusionary housing units require a 45 year or 55 year long-term affordability covenant be recorded against the property for either for – sale or rental units respectively.
Program Description

The Agency plans to continue to work with developers by providing gap financing to construct new affordable rental or ownership units, rehabilitating or reconstructing existing developments, and preserving existing affordable units that are otherwise threatened. The Agency will assist in the development of mixed-use complexes to create affordable housing opportunities. The Agency will also participate in land acquisition, land-cost write-down, developer recruitment, and credit enhancements or other financing mechanisms.

The Agency’s housing rehabilitation program provides low interest loans of up to $150,000 to correct health and safety hazards, increase energy conservation, and extend the useful life of an affordable owner-occupied or rental home. Examples include correcting plumbing, electrical, or roof problems, room additions, insulation, and replacing inefficient appliances. This program extends the useful life of the affordable units occupied by low and moderate-income households and improves the quality of the neighborhoods. The Agency will continue to actively pursue State and federal grant funds to leverage the housing set aside from tax increment.

The homeownership program currently makes loans available to qualified homebuyers up to $150,000 in order to purchase a home. These loans act as assistance financing to make mortgage payments more affordable. Single family detached homes, town homes, and condominiums are eligible purchases under this program.

### Breakdown of Affordability Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability Category</th>
<th>Percent of Median</th>
<th>Maximum earnings for a family of four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>31% - 50%</td>
<td>$36,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>51% - 80%</td>
<td>$58,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>81% - 110%</td>
<td>$80,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State of California, Housing and Community Development 2009 income limits.
Section V - (15.10.B (6))

A statement of how the preliminary plan differs from and conforms to the adopted community plan, including a re-evaluation of items required by Subparagraphs 14.6.C (1) through (7), inclusive, and other items prescribed by TRPA as appropriate to deal with new or changed circumstances arising subsequent to the adoption of the community plan.

Conformity with Community Plan

The Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the proposed Tahoe City/Gateway community will be consistent with: the community plans for areas within the boundaries of the plan; transects for areas outside community plan areas; and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of final Redevelopment Plan approval.

The Tahoe City/Gateway Community Plan, under the updated Regional Plan, may include affordable housing as an allowed (and encouraged) use. This Preliminary Redevelopment Plan proposes special height, density and coverage considerations be given to projects that provide affordable housing, if eligible.

There are redevelopment opportunities on properties outside of the current Community Plan boundaries. This Plan proposes that those projects within an approved TRPA redevelopment area that meet the provisions specified in the adopted new Regional Plan, be exempt from the requirement to be located within a Community Plan area.

Consideration to Include Areas Outside a Community Plan Area (See Exhibit L)

The area within the Preliminary Tahoe City/Gateway Redevelopment Plan consists of approximately 625 acres of which the Gateway section and the Tahoe City Golf Course are outside the community plan Area.

In 1994, it was determined as part of the Tahoe City Area General Plan, that the current commercial uses were not desirable and that incentives through transfers of development rights be provided to encourage commercial uses in the Gateway to relocate. That has not occurred, primarily because incentives were inadequate and receivable areas for transfers were not identified.

The Tahoe City Golf Course consists of nine holes on approximately five acres and is located outside a community plan area. Numerous studies and financial assessments have identified the need for a feasibility evaluation to determine if golf course operations or environmental mitigation, or possibly other uses is appropriate. Currently the site lacks updated BMPs and public improvements which would make it more of a contributory site to the community.

Public intervention in the above sections, would underscore the environmental, social and economic public policy direction of the new Regional Plan, and allow discretionary actions consistent with community goals.
Section VI - (15.10.B (7))

Prepare an economic feasibility and needs assessment.

Economic Feasibility Assessment

The national economy has suffered significant financial and economic setbacks over the last eighteen months, and the real estate market on the North Shore has also been affected. Real estate sales were strong in 2005 and 2006, dropped by 34% in 2007 and 15% in 2008. In 2007 the average number of days a property was for sale improved slightly from 2006 but increased by 26% in 2008 to 121 days. During the first quarter of 2009 the number of home sales is below historical numbers however the number of marketing days is comparable at 95 days.

The highest percentages of home sales have been between $300,000 and $900,000, that includes both primary and secondary housing sales. An informal analysis indicates a greater number of homes sold are at the high range which would indicate homes sold were for secondary use.

Below is a table which reflects the historical property tax increment received in the overall California North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Tax Year</th>
<th>Tax Increment Received*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$6,281,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$5,549,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$4,763,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$3,965,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$2,931,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Neither historical nor projected tax increment reflects charges for property tax administration fees, pass through payments, housing set-aside, or debt service

The economy of the North Tahoe area is heavily dependant upon the tourist industry; more so than other similar resort locations. The economic conditions required for a diversified economy, cost of living chief among them, are not present at this time. Redevelopment projects, supported by the County’s investment in infrastructure, which attract a greater share of the tourist market such as high quality accommodations and event facilities or meet a community need, such as workforce housing, will have the greatest immediate impact on the redevelopment area.

To the extent projects encourage year-round occupancy the retail economy will be better supported. Accommodation projects (e.g., entertainment, event/conference centers), and enhanced transit connections to ski resorts will all serve to improve the non-summer draw of those commercial centers. These facilities will also offer viable alternatives to ski-area lodging, to the benefit of the region. The existing stock of visitor accommodations in Tahoe City is non-competitive with neighboring resorts.
Developing beneficial uses will require a concerted public/private effort to reduce project risk and, potentially, to offset onerous costs associated with certain high-benefit projects. Well-conceived hotel developments and associated work force housing may be a good public-private investment opportunity. The community of Tahoe City lacks high quality tourist accommodations or facilities with marketable conference or meeting facilities. For the most part the motels which line Highway 28 are in various states of outdatedness. The buildings that house the available tourist accommodations are well past their effective building life and do not inspire the increasingly sought-after and demanding tourist.

While much of Tahoe City retail reflects the successes of Placer County investment in recent years, an ongoing goal of a redevelopment strategy would be to replace outdated, under-performing retail uses with better performing ones, resulting in increased volumes in sales in key niches. There are some buildings currently housing retail uses that were not originally constructed for that purpose and lack the space and amenities required such as display windows, restrooms, appropriate ceiling heights and so on. Building locations are not conducive to shopping and lack pedestrian connectivity.

Through inclusion in the TRPA Chapter 15 redevelopment designation the Placer County Redevelopment Agency hopes to improve its ability to impact the Lake Tahoe environmental conditions, increase the viability of tourism and retail in the community, and support development of affordable workforce housing.
Section VII - (15.10.B (9))

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

Public Participation Provisions

To support an emphasis on more sustainable environmental preservation and community building, concentrated communications and feedback opportunities are needed for all those who play a role including residents, business operators, developers, environmental interest groups, visitors and other stakeholders within the redevelopment plan areas. Additionally, public feedback will be sought from community business associations and Spanish speaking interest groups.

In addition to general program and project description outreach, prior to Governing Board action, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency will initiate one or more public outreach meetings with the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council in order to receive feedback and recommendation regarding a program and/or project, including vision, processes and benefits.

This comprehensive public outreach will assist to clarify the intentions, refine an implementation plan, and ensure an informed public.
APPENDIX

ADVERSE CONDITIONS STUDY:

TAHOE CITY/GATEWAY
ADVERSE CONDITIONS STUDY:
Tahoe City/Gateway

I. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Chapter 15 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances sets forth the process for adoption of redevelopment plans pursuant to the Goals and Policies of TRPA and as provided for in the plan area statements. Section 15.1 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances dictates that the applicability of Chapter 15 shall apply only to redevelopment plans which are in eligible areas; are predominantly urbanized, blighted; and designated in the applicable plan area statement as eligible for redevelopment plan, etc. This Adverse Conditions Study provides the background and data to evidence the blighted nature of the proposed Tahoe City/Gateway Preliminary Redevelopment Plan (Plan Area).

II. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was formed in April 1991 pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 33300 et seq. A five-member board, which also serves as the Placer County Board of Supervisors, governs the Agency. The purpose of the Agency is to eliminate blight and support environmental improvements within the Project Area, by strengthening its economic base through building public infrastructure, supporting facility improvements, commercial/industrial development and rehabilitation, as well as providing affordable housing development and rehabilitation.

The gateway area suffers from a physical constraint to growth and generally lacks any BMPs the meet environmental threshold carrying capacities. The boundaries have been set to maximize the effectiveness of redevelopment as a tool for the revitalization of the area. The boundaries have been structured to include remaining substandard and deteriorated commercial and industrial buildings as well as residential buildings that are substandard and in need of rehabilitation.

Agency staff surveyed a sampling of the parcels within the Plan Area. Agency staff utilized this information to further refine the area boundaries to what is proposed within this report.

Agency staff reviewed several existing reports to support its conclusions noted within this report including The Preliminary North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area report dated March 1993 prepared by John B, Dykstra & Associates which was prepared for the adoption of the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area; the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Area Report of Recommended Policy, Code and Regulation Changes to Facilitate Redevelopment Opportunities, dated December 15, 2005 and prepared by Design Workshop, Inc.; and the Final Report of the Implementation Strategy for the Redevelopment of Kings Beach and Tahoe City dated May 14, 2007 and prepared by Economic and Planning Systems for the Agency.
Agency staff focused its primary review on public infrastructure conditions or lack thereof, exterior conditions of each parcel surveyed as well as the usefulness of each parcel in comparison to current market standards for the respective type of use. Agency staff did not perform interior inspections of each property.

Agency staff used the information to compile a database of general observations which is summarized in the Building and Site Conditions Survey Results (Attachment A). This blight summary delineates by street, the total number of parcels, the number of blighted parcels and the percentage of blighted parcels. Following the survey results are photos taken around the proposed redevelopment area that exemplify the blight present (Attachment B).

### III. EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY RESULTS

From June to August 2009, Agency staff performed a windshield survey of parcels within the proposed areas to determine if those parcels meet TRPA’s definition of blight. The survey is a more informal survey and does not include interior property inspection. It is a visual assessment of conditions based upon a certain set of criteria whereby Agency staff photographed properties and recorded general observations of the properties surveyed.

Section 15.2.B of TRPA’s Code of Ordinances sets forth TRPA’s definition of blight, which is as follows:

**Blighted Area:** A blighted area is characterized by properties which suffer from economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse because three or more of the following factors cause a reduction or lack of proper utilization of the area to such an extent that the blight constitutes a serious physical, social, environmental or economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise acting alone:

1. The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development.
2. The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions.
3. The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment.
4. A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment.
Section 15.2.B. of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth several criteria for a blighted area by TRPA. The following provides a description of TRPA’s criteria and supporting data concluded by Agency staff during its most recent survey of parcels within the proposed Tahoe City/Gateway area to indicate that these factors still exist within the proposed boundaries.

**General**

Several buildings and public facilities were poorly constructed and / or constructed before the adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and do not comply with updated BMPs or the environmental threshold carrying capacities. This is particularly evident in one large commercial property fronting Highway 28 in the gateway area. In addition, Agency staff observed in the proposed area, a general lack of infrastructure, missing storm drain improvements, and odd shaped parcels which pose challenges to private development. While there are several properties that are improved and upgraded from a bricks and mortar perspective, most properties in the proposed area, were found to lack the private sector investment needed to mitigate deterioration and extend the useful life of the property.

Section 15.2.B. of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth several criteria for a blighted area by TRPA. The following provides a description of TRPA’s criteria and supporting data concluded by Agency staff during its most recent survey of parcels within the Plan Area to indicate that these factors still exist within the proposed Plan Area.
The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development

The proposed Tahoe City Plan Area is a linear development area with nearly all of the primary amenities and services located along the highway frontage. Tahoe City Gateway area caters to light industrial uses and is located on the outskirts of town. The area is constrained by its position at the bottom of a hill and across from the Truckee River.

The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions

Survey results noted that industrial used fronting along the Truckee River may not be in the most suitable locations. River frontages should be encouraged for development of more public and/or recreational uses. The Tahoe City Gateway is located in a hazardous area where shale falling from the adjacent hill poses a threat. The lakefront area is largely built out with tourist serving uses.

The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment

The residential areas lack storm drain improvements; however the commercial frontages have sidewalks in place. The harsh weather conditions in the winter pose a problem with maintenance as curbs have been torn up from repeated snow plowing. Several of the tourist accommodation buildings are old and appear to be constructed prior to TRPA Code of Ordinances and are assumed to lack adequate environmental improvements to meet carrying capacities.

A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment

Adverse economic conditions are evidenced by depreciated values, impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The Tahoe Basin is known for its high construction costs. High construction costs make it difficult for private sector investment.

A report prepared by Economic & Planning Systems noted that demand for local retail services has decreased and many Tahoe City businesses are struggling for survival. Some properties have been abandoned, leaving them vacant and blighted, while others have continued operations in facilities in need of rehabilitation or replacement. Still other owners have continually upgraded their properties in hopes of drawing both desirable retail tenants, and increasing their customer base. The result is that dedicated land owners are forced to survive adjacent to properties that are either abandoned or in disrepair.

One large retail development located in Tahoe City’s town center stands out as blighted, visually unappealing and negatively impacts the character of the commercial core. Additionally, several substandard commercial buildings and tourist accommodation units were noted. These tourist
accommodation buildings were older and outdated and operated at a competitive disadvantage to meet the current consumer’s demands.

The small industrial area, commonly known as the “Gateway” is outside the commercial core along Highway 89. This area currently occupies land that is adjacent to environmentally sensitive zone (Truckee River). There are several non-conforming uses present with few BMPs.

**The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carry capacities.**

As mentioned above, the proposed back-street areas lack storm drain improvements; however the commercial frontages have sidewalks in place. The harsh weather conditions in the winter pose a problem with maintenance, as some curbs have been torn up from repeated snow plowing. A few of the tourist accommodation buildings are old and appear to be constructed prior to TRPA Code of Ordinances and are assumed to lack adequate environmental improvements to meet carrying capacities.

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

Building Conditions Survey Results
## Tahoe City Building/Site Conditions Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name/Location</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Number of Blighted Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Blighted Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 28 - North Side</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 28 - South Side</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Street - West Side</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Drive - East</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake Boulevard - West Side</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macinaw Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City Industrial Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City Golf Course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B

Tahoe City/Gateway Community Photos
Tahoe City Community Pictures

Non-conforming recreational use
North of Highway 28

Non-conforming motel conversion along
Highway 28 near Wye

Along Highway 89 near Tahoe City
Gateway

Along Highway 89 near Tahoe City
Gateway
West of Fairway Drive along Highway 89

East of Fairway Drive along Highway 89

West end of Tahoe City along Highway 28; depicting non-conforming land use

East end of Tahoe City along Highway 28; depicting typical tourist accommodation units
PRELIMINARY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

LAKE FOREST

Prepared for:  Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Prepared by:  Placer County Redevelopment Agency

May 2010
# Preliminary Redevelopment Plan

## Lake Forest

## Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Overview and Background</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area Boundaries</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Proposed Land Uses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity with TRPA Goals, Code &amp; Thresholds</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Provisions for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan Conformity or Differences</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Feasibility Assessment</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Provisions</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix: Adverse Conditions Study</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Overview

Proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) pursuant to Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (§15.10) (“Chapter 15”).

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency intends to submit final Redevelopment Plans for future TRPA approval after the new Regional Plan is adopted sometime over the next three to five years. These plan areas are: Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe Vista, Lake Forest, and, Tahoe City/Gateway. Plans for these communities will be submitted separately in accordance with TRPA’s Code of Ordinances-Chapter 15 (Chapter 15). Chapter 15 provides the opportunity for Placer County to undertake redevelopment programs within TRPA defined redevelopment areas that are found to be urbanized, blighted, and environmentally threatened.

These Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are conceptual policy and program documents; they do not identify specific project locations nor propose specific activities. They do present a discussion on the intent to study and explore certain targeted redevelopment activities that will focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the updated Regional Plan.

It is our understanding that under the new Regional Plan TRPA may provide land use incentives in TRPA redevelopment areas in order to promote the construction of environmental improvement projects. If so, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency submits these Preliminary Plans with the intent to qualify for such land use considerations.

Background

Increasingly the commercial area of Lake Forest is showing signs of an aging community facing the result of extended deferred maintenance. These conditions environmentally threaten Lake Tahoe’s primary assets, its clarity and beauty which are compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution. Economically, like other communities in North Lake Tahoe, the commercial district in Lake Forest reflects neglected properties, dilapidated structures and outdated infrastructure that exacerbate the community’s decline.

What was originally developed as an area of vacation cabins and motels, has become a year-round residential community with limited supporting commercial and public services. However, the commercial buildings, infrastructure and environmental improvements have not been upgraded to adequately meet the increased needs of the Lake Forest community.
Preliminary Redevelopment Plan:

LAKE FOREST
Section I - (15.10.B (2))

A description of the proposed redevelopment plan area boundaries and project area boundaries including a preliminary determination of which areas are blighted and urbanized

Lake Forest - Project Area Boundaries (See Exhibit G)

Introduction

The redevelopment area boundaries proposed in this report are consistent with boundaries shown under the current Lake Forest Commercial Plan Area Statement – 009A, Special Areas #1 and #2. As noted in the Tahoe City Area General Plan, this Preliminary Redevelopment Plan recognizes that the development pattern of Lake Forest continues to result in a mixture of uses that have deteriorated over the years to the point of meeting TRPA’s definition of blight.

Area Description

The Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area consists of approximately 28 acres, and centers along Lake Forest Road. The area includes roughly Lupin Lane / Rose Avenue on the north to Sierra Vista on the South; and Manzanita on the east to Bristlecone on the west.

In 1994, the Lake Forest Commercial area was considered as a candidate for community plan area status. However, it was determined that due to the limited size of the community, the limitations on new development, and the nature of environmental improvements needed in the community, that the Plan Area Statement process was more appropriate and would attract private dollars. This investment has not occurred.

The Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan is targeted to renovating and developing commercial property in Special Areas 1 and 2. In the years since 1994, the area has deteriorated further and without intervention will create significant issues, and require costly resources. (See Adverse Conditions Study – Appendix).
EXHIBIT G

Legend

Proposed Lake Forest Area Under Chapter 15

LAKE FOREST AREA - PROPOSED UNDER CHAPTER 15
Section II – (15.10.B (3))

A general statement of the proposed land uses, anticipated development, proposed targets and objectives related to attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds, layout of the principal streets and transportation patterns, and a general description of the standards to be used for redevelopment of the area.

Statement of Proposed Land Uses

The commercial center of Lake Forest fronting Lake Forest Road (specifically PAS 009A) lacks BMPs and is in a general state of deferred maintenance and dilapidation. Redevelopment efforts would include installation of BMPs, façade updates, curb, gutters, sidewalk improvements, defined parking and landscaped areas, and screened outdoor storage areas.

This area was chosen because of the blighted economic and social conditions of its commercial district, as well as the critical physical conditions leading to a lack of water quality BMPs, storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, haphazard parking, and scenic blight.

Anticipated Development (See Exhibit H)

Commercial Renovation

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

Attainment & Maintenance of Environmental Thresholds - Targets and Objectives

It is the goal of this plan to implement orderly growth and development consistent with the threshold carrying capacities identified through the adoption of the new Regional Plan. Infrastructure improvements will cover a variety of public works projects ranging from correcting and installing utilities, traffic capacity projects, accommodations for transit options, storm drainage, sewers, soil stabilization, etc.
The proposed redevelopment plan is targeted to attract the highest and most critical environmental improvement projects that will lead to the greatest benefit over the shortest period of time for the overall community. It is determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the environmental improvement program as the standard for plan evaluation.

As projects come forward for development approval they will be measured against the approved five-year environmental improvement project list. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency will provide assistance to private property owners in achieving pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area.

**General Description of Redevelopment Standards**

The pristine nature and fragility of the environment of North Lake Tahoe require tight controls on development. The standards that will be used for the implementation of the Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan are:

1. The project must result in the upgrading and renovation of the communities’ existing stock, and where possible, reduce the dilapidated building stock contributing to the degradation of Lake Tahoe.

2. Redevelopment activities must result in development that is both economically attractive to private developers and will achieve and sustain correction, of environmental damage to Lake Tahoe through the achievement of environmental thresholds.

3. Consideration of any substantial redevelopment undertaking must have input from the community affected by the proposed activity.
Section III – (15.10.B (4))

A general statement of how the proposed redevelopment plan conforms to the provisions of the Goals and Policies, the transects, the applicable plan area statements, the Code, and the environmental thresholds.

Conformity with TRPA Goals, Policies, Code and Thresholds

The Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Lake Forest commercial community will be consistent with the Placer County General Plan, and the Tahoe City Area General Plan, the TRPA Code of Ordinances, transects for areas outside community plan areas, and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of final Redevelopment Plan approval.

Goals & Policies

The Redevelopment Agency agrees to support and promote Placer County and TRPA’s goals to maintain the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by the Region, through its development projects.

Balancing sustainable development with the above will encourage the wise use of Lake Tahoe and the resources of the area, preserve public and private investments in the community, and preserve the social and economic health of the region.

Placer County Zoning Ordinances & TRPA Code of Ordinances

The TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code) is a compilation of land use and environmental regulations for Lake Tahoe Basin. The Redevelopment Agency’s North Lake Tahoe preliminary redevelopment plan is in conformity with the Code in effect at the time of plan adoption.

All projects are subject to TRPA (in accordance with Chapter Four of the Code) and Placer County review. To ensure effective and efficient coordination, the Code and the Placer County Zoning Ordinance shall apply to building modifications, expansions and repairs. When a conflict presents itself, the most restrictive ordinance shall apply.

Environmental Improvement Program

The TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) encompasses hundreds of capital improvement, research, program support, and maintenance projects designed to restore and protect Lake Tahoe’s clarity.
Placer County is partner with TRPA in constructing and maintaining EIP projects of mutual benefit. Over a twenty-year period Placer County is committed to develop and construct public improvements.

Thresholds

Thresholds are environmental standards adopted by TRPA to help protect Lake Tahoe. They are designed to reflect the inter-connected nature of the environment, the economy and the community’s social well-being.

The environmental threshold carrying capacities and standards for the Lake Tahoe Basin essentially define the capacity of the Region to accommodate additional land development. Threshold indicators are used as the measures of success of attaining environmental health in the region.

Placer County has identified a list of environmental improvement projects in the Lake Forest community that address the thresholds and move forward the EIP.

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

1. Projects seeking consideration under the provisions of the Plan, must contribute to the implementation of one, or more, of the Environmental Improvement Program projects above.

2. All contribution determinations and calculations shall be made by the Placer County Department of Public Works.

3. Improvement of public or private facilities, provisions of added open spaces, construction of BMPs in conformance with environmental carrying capacities established by TRPA.

4. Use of rehabilitation and façade improvement loans and grants to leverage private investment and improve commercial building conditions.

5. Implementation of a public improvement program including road grading, patching and paving; curb, gutter and sidewalk construction; and storm drain installation.

6. Potential participation in operation and maintenance of public improvements related to air and water quality through funding contribution and / or providing those services for County Department of Public Works determined projects.
Section IV - (15.10.B (5))

A general description of the provisions for existing and new affordable housing and the expected impact of the proposed redevelopment plan on the residents of the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods

Description of Provisions for Workforce Housing and Community Impacts

The area in the Lake Forest community that is identified for redevelopment activity is commercial in nature with limited opportunity for workforce housing. Where appropriate, the Agency will assist in the development of commercial/mixed-use complexes to create affordable housing opportunities.

Regarding the surrounding residential area, the Agency currently has a housing rehabilitation program that provides low interest loans of up to $150,000 to correct health and safety hazards, increase energy conservation, install BMPs and extend the useful life of an owner-occupied or affordable rental home. Examples include correcting plumbing, electrical, or roof problems, room additions, insulation, and replacing inefficient appliances. This program extends the useful life of the affordable units occupied by low and moderate-income households and improves the quality of the neighborhoods. The Agency will continue to actively pursue State and federal grant funds to leverage the housing set aside from tax increment.

The homeownership program currently makes loans available to qualified low and moderate homebuyers up to $150,000 in order to purchase a home. These loans act as assistance financing to make mortgage payments more affordable. Single family detached homes, town homes, and condominiums are eligible purchases under this program.
Section V – (15.10.B (6))

A statement of how the preliminary plan differs from and conforms to the adopted community plan, including a re-evaluation of items required by Subparagraphs 14.6.C (1) through (7), inclusive, and other items prescribed by TRPA as appropriate to deal with new or changed circumstances arising subsequent to the adoption of the community plan.

Conformity with Community Plan

The proposed Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan is outside a community plan area. In 1994, the Lake Forest Commercial area was considered as a candidate for community plan area status. However, it was determined that the Plan Area Statement process was more appropriate.

The Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Lake Forest community will be consistent with the Lake Forest Commercial Plan Area Statement and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of the final Redevelopment Plan approval.

There are redevelopment opportunities on blighted property within the Lake Forest commercial district. This Plan proposes that those projects within an approved TRPA redevelopment area that meet the provisions specified in this Plan be considered for any land use incentives and special considerations under a new updated TRPA Regional Plan.

Consideration to An Area Outside a Community Plan Area (See Exhibit I)

The proposed Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Area consists of approximately 28 acres, all of which are outside a community plan area.

Fifteen years ago it was determined that the goals for the commercial community would be to encourage remodeling and rehabilitation of structures to make properties and uses more congruous. In the years since 1994, the area has deteriorated further and without intervention will continue to decline.

The lack of updated BMPs and owner/developer incentives to upgrade properties require public intervention to forestall further degradation. Adding the commercial district of the Lake Forest community which currently exists outside of a community plan area, but would reside within a TRPA redevelopment area, would underscore the environmental, social and economic public policy direction of the new Regional Plan, and allow for discretionary actions consistent with community goals.
This community resides totally outside a Community Plan Area

LAKE FOREST AREA -- PROPOSED UNDER CHAPTER 15
Section VI – (15.10.B (7))

Prepare an economic feasibility and needs assessment.

Economic Feasibility Assessment

Retail opportunities in the Basin are dwindling and to increase the supply of retail in the redevelopment areas would require a strategy geared to increase demand through greater capture of the visitor market and increasing the number of year round residents in the community. The immediate goal of a redevelopment strategy would be to seek state and federal funds to provide public financial resources to assist in the renovation of out-dated, under-performing retail uses with better performing ones, resulting in increased volumes in sales in key niches. Many buildings currently housing retail uses and lack the space and amenities required such as display windows, restrooms, appropriate ceiling heights and so on. Additionally, current non-conforming uses tend to be obtrusive, and should be screened and buffered to the extent practical, to minimize obtrusiveness.

The economy of the North Tahoe area is heavily dependant upon the tourist industry; more so than other similar resort locations. The economic conditions required for a diversified economy, cost of living chief among them, are not present at this time and are unlikely to change. Redevelopment projects, supported by the County’s investment in infrastructure, which attract a greater share of the tourist market such as high quality accommodations or meet a community need, such as pedestrian customers, will have the greatest immediate impact on the redevelopment area.

To the extent projects encourage year-round occupancy the retail economy will be better supported. The proposed Preliminary Lake Forest Redevelopment Plan area lacks modern commercial facilities. Accommodation projects (e.g., entertainment, food services), and enhanced transit connections will all serve to improve the non-summer draw of those commercial centers. These activities, will be restricted to the Lake Forest Road corridor, and will also offer viable alternatives to ski-area lodging, to the benefit of the region.

Through the inclusion of the Lake Forest commercial community in TRPA’s Chapter 15, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency hopes to improve its ability to impact Lake Tahoe environmental conditions, increase the viability of tourism and support the enhancement of retail in the community.
Section VII - (15.10.B (9))

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

**Public Participation Provisions**

To support an emphasis on more sustainable environmental preservation and community building, concentrated communications and feedback opportunities are needed for all those who play a role including residents, business operators, developers, environmental interest groups, visitors and other stakeholders within the redevelopment plan areas. Additionally, public feedback will be sought from community business associations and Spanish speaking interest groups.

In addition to general program and project description outreach, prior to Governing Board action, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency will initiate one or more public outreach meetings with the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council in order to receive feedback and recommendation regarding a program and/or project, including vision, processes and benefits.

This comprehensive public outreach will assist to clarify the intentions, refine an implementation plan, and ensure an informed public.
APPENDIX

ADVERSE CONDITIONS STUDY:

LAKE FOREST
I. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Chapter 15 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances sets forth the process for adoption of redevelopment plans pursuant to the Goals and Policies of TRPA and as provided for in the plan area statements. Section 15.1 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances dictates that the applicability of Chapter 15 shall apply only to redevelopment plans which are in eligible areas; are predominantly urbanized, blighted; and designated in the applicable plan area statement as eligible for redevelopment plan, etc. This Adverse Conditions Study provides the background and data to support the blighted nature of the proposed Lake Forest Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area (Plan Area).

II. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was formed in April 1991 pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 33300 et seq. A five-member board, which also serves as the Placer County Board of Supervisors, governs the Agency. The purpose of the Agency is to eliminate blight and support environmental improvements within the project area, by strengthening its economic base through building public infrastructure, supporting facility improvements, commercial/industrial development and rehabilitation.

The proposed Lake Forest community includes an aging and run-down commercial and industrial strip that centers along Lake Forest Road that provides evidence of impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The boundaries have been set to maximize the effectiveness of redevelopment as a tool for the revitalization of the area. The boundaries have been limited to include a targeted number of substandard and deteriorated commercial and industrial buildings.

The proposed Plan Area contains approximately 51 parcels. Agency staff surveyed a sampling of the parcels within the Project Area. Agency staff utilized this information to define the area boundaries proposed within this report.

Agency staff focused its primary review on public infrastructure conditions or lack thereof, exterior conditions of each parcel surveyed, as well as the usefulness of each parcel in comparison to current market standards for respective type of use. Staff did not perform interior property inspections. Agency staff used the information to compile a database of general observations which is summarized in the Building and Site Conditions Survey Results (Attachment A). This blight summary delineates by street, the total number of parcels, the number of blighted parcels and the percentage of blighted
parcels. Following the survey results are photos taken around the proposed redevelopment area that exemplify the blight present (Attachment B).

III. EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY RESULTS

From June to August 2009, Agency staff performed a windshield survey of parcels within the proposed area to determine those parcels meeting TRPA’s definition of blight. The survey did not include interior property inspection. It was a visual assessment of conditions based upon a certain set of criteria whereby Agency staff photographed properties and recorded general observations of the properties surveyed.

Section 15.2.B of TRPA’s Code of Ordinances sets forth TRPA’s definition of blight, which is as follows:

Blighted Area: A blighted area is characterized by properties which suffer from economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse because three or more of the following factors cause a reduction or lack of proper utilization of the area to such an extent that the blight constitutes a serious physical, social, environmental or economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise acting alone:

(1) The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development.

(2) The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions.

(3) The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment.

(4) A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment.

(5) The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carrying capacities.
Section 15.2.B. of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth several criteria for a blighted area by TRPA. The following provides a description of TRPA’s criteria and supporting data concluded by Agency staff during its most recent survey of parcels within the proposed Lake Forest area to indicate that these factors still exist within the proposed boundaries.

**General**

A large number of buildings and public facilities were poorly constructed and / or constructed before the adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and do not comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. In addition, Agency staff observed a general lack of infrastructure, storm drain improvements and undergrounding of utilities, and odd shaped parcels which posed challenges development. The majority of the blighted parcels were noted along the commercial and industrial portion of Lake Forest Road, which had run down properties, boarded up properties and buildings that have outlived their useful life. While Agency staff saw several properties that were improved and upgraded from a bricks and mortar perspective, most properties were found to lack private sector investment to mitigate deterioration and extend the useful life of the buildings.

The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development

Agency staff primarily focused its windshield survey to the commercial and industrial sections of Lake Forest fronting along Lake Forest Road. There were several long, narrow rectangular parcels which precipitated the linear development in the area.

The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions

The development pattern of Lake Forest, historically, has resulted in a mosaic of mixed uses that would generally be discouraged under present planning theory. The majority of construction is older, with newer construction dispersed intermittently throughout the study area. The industrial uses were abutting residential development with lakeside development catered toward recreational and large single family structures.
The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment

Runoff from the Lake Forest commercial district deposits sediment into roadside ditches and drainage ways, causing localized flooding, and contributes fine sediment and nutrient loading to Lake Tahoe. Staff noted a general lack of sidewalks in the area. The problem of a lack of sidewalks is exacerbated in the winter time, when snow accumulation forces pedestrians to walk in the street and share the roadway with vehicles. The majority of both private and public facilities was constructed prior to the adoption of TRPA Code of Ordinances and do not indicate updated BMPs and was assumed not to comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities.

Lake Forest is served by a private water company. There is a building moratorium in place due to the fact that the water line diameter, which draws water directly from Lake Tahoe, is insufficient to provide adequate water pressure for development.

A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment

Adverse economic conditions are evidenced by depreciated values, impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The Tahoe Basin has a higher construction cost. High construction and land costs make it difficult for private sector investment.

The area’s structures have had limited renovation on individual parcels, which were largely developed around the 1960’s. There was little economic investment observed in a majority of parcels fronting along Lake Forest Road. Buildings were boarded up and there was a mix of non-conforming uses concentrated in the area. The commercial/industrial district borders on residential developments which constrain growth and uses for the area. Recreational uses are across the street. Homes located along the shoreline tend to be larger, single-family units. A large parcel owned by a utility provider is vacant.

The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carry capacities

As noted earlier, runoff from the Lake Forest community deposits sediment into roadside ditches and drainage ways, causing localized flooding, and contributes fine sediment and nutrient loading to Lake Tahoe. There is a general lack of sidewalks in the area. The problem of a lack of sidewalks is exacerbated in the winter time, when snow accumulation forces pedestrians to walk in the street and share the roadway with vehicles. It appeared that the majority of both private and public facilities were constructed prior to
the adoption of TRPA Code of Ordinances and therefore were assumed not to comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities.

The area is served by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) system which operates in the Basin by Placer County.
Attachment A

Building Conditions Survey Results
## Lake Forest Building/Site Conditions Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name/Location</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Number of Blighted Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Blighted Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Road - North</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Road - South</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest Avenue - South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Avenue - North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Avenue - South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.60%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B

Lake Forest
Community Photos
Lake Forest Community Pictures

Lake Forest Road near Bristlecone Street

Lake Forest Road near Aspen Street

Examples of substandard improvements along Lake Forest Road within commercial area
Property along Lake Forest Road with depreciated value and disrepair

Residential property reuse for commercial
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PRELIMINARY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

TAHOE VISTA

General Overview

Proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) pursuant to Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (§15.10) (“Chapter 15”).

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency intends to submit final Redevelopment Plans for future TRPA approval after the new Regional Plan is adopted sometime over the next three to five years. These plan areas are: Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe Vista, Lake Forest, and, Tahoe City/Gateway. Plans for these areas will be submitted separately in accordance with TRPA’s Code of Ordinances-Chapter 15 (Chapter 15). Chapter 15 provides the opportunity for Placer County to undertake redevelopment programs within TRPA defined redevelopment areas that are found to be urbanized, blighted, and environmentally threatened.

These Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are conceptual policy and program documents; they do not identify specific project locations nor propose specific activities. They do present a discussion on the intent to study and explore certain targeted redevelopment activities that will focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the updated Regional Plan.

It is our understanding that under the new Regional Plan TRPA may provide land use incentives in TRPA redevelopment areas in order to promote the construction of environmental improvement projects. If so, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency submits these Preliminary Plans with the intent to qualify for such land use considerations.

Background

The mixed residential and commercial uses in the Tahoe Vista community are showing signs of the effects of extended deferred maintenance. These conditions environmentally threaten Lake Tahoe’s primary assets, its clarity and beauty, which are compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution. While many neighborhoods located in Tahoe Vista are stable and reflect current market values, there are others which exhibit neglected properties, dilapidated structures, outdated infrastructure and a lack of public improvements that will exacerbate the community’s decline.

Similar to other communities in North Lake Tahoe, Tahoe Vista was originally developed in the 1950’s as an area of vacation cabins and motels, and has since become a year-round residential community with limited supporting commercial and public services. However, the infrastructure and environmental improvements have not been upgraded to adequately meet the increased needs of the Tahoe Vista community.
Preliminary Redevelopment Plan:

TAHOE VISTA
Section I – (15.10.B (2))

A description of the proposed redevelopment plan area boundaries and project area boundaries including a preliminary determination of which areas are blighted and urbanize

Tahoe Vista Community - Project Area Boundaries (See Exhibit D)

Introduction

The redevelopment area boundaries proposed in this report are consistent, and within those for the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors under California Law on July 16, 1996. However, the proposed Preliminary Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Plan area is smaller than the current applicable California redevelopment area.

Community Description

For purposes of this Preliminary Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Plan, the community is defined as that area roughly beginning at Donner Road south to Lake Tahoe and generally those privately owned parcels adjacent to National Avenue on the east, including parcels north of Highway 28 to Yaho Avenue, to Estates Drive on the West. The proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area centers on National Avenue which is predominately commercial/industrial in nature.

Land use patterns vary widely, commercial activity fronts along State Route 28 and there are areas which may provide opportunities for open space or environmental preserves. Additionally, there is a trailer park which may pose an opportunity for residential improvements.

The proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area consists of approximately 85 acres of land, located in Placer County at the north shore of Lake Tahoe.
Section II – (15.10.B (3))

A general statement of the proposed land uses, anticipated development, proposed targets and objectives related to attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds, layout of the principal streets and transportation patterns, and a general description of the standards to be used for redevelopment of the area.

Statement of Proposed Land Uses

The proposed Redevelopment Plan in Placer County will incorporate the land use guides promoted in the updated Regional Plan. With attention to blighted conditions of the properties in this proposed plan, and all planned land uses will align with the updated Regional Plan goals. (See Adverse Conditions Study – Appendix). Land uses will exemplify development in urbanized areas that promote environmentally sensitive open space, low intensity recreational uses with a focus on creating uses that will encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. Live-work environments will be encouraged and incentivized.

In conformance with current community plan goals, for redevelopment purposes this section of the community is proposed to continue primarily as a regional tourist and recreation area with some industrial and commercial uses.

Anticipated Development (See Exhibit E)

This area includes parcels on the north at Donner Rd to Lake Tahoe on the south; and Anderson/Idlewood Roads on west and those privately owned parcels immediately adjacent to National Avenue on the east.

This section provides an overview of the proposed vision planned for the Tahoe Vista Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area. Additional descriptions of the environmental settings and land use elements will be discussed in detail at the time of project submittal.

Roadway / Pedestrian Improvements

Tahoe Vista Preliminary Redevelopment Plan incorporates streets that are inadequately served by pedestrian improvements. While over the years, many efforts have been made to upgrade these roads and drainage facilities, many remain substandard when viewed in terms of modern engineering and construction.

Commercial Renovation

There are a variety of privately owned commercial and industrial structures and properties in various states of disrepair and outdatedness. The Agency plans to encourage use of its commercial loan rehabilitation program and to incentivize new development where feasible.
Recreational Open Space

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

Workforce Housing

Continue to study and explore opportunities for infill new construction and rehabilitated affordable workforce housing. It is proposed to examine the opportunities for improving the community’s trailer park facilities. For purposes of this Plan workforce housing includes very low, low and moderate income levels as defined by California law.
Attainment & Maintenance of Environmental Thresholds - Targets and Objectives

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

The proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plan is targeted to the highest and most critical environmental improvement projects that will lead to the greatest benefit over the shortest period of time for the overall community. It is determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the environmental improvement program as the standard for plan evaluation.

As projects come forward for development approval they will be measured against the approved five–year environmental improvement project list. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency will provide assistance to private property owners in achieving pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area.

Transportation Patterns

State Route 28 is the primary highway and transportation link between Kings Beach and Tahoe City. Within the Tahoe Vista proposed Redevelopment Area it consists of four travel lanes, two through lanes in each direction except for a distance after National Avenue when it narrows to three lanes: two westbound and one eastbound.

The other major roadway is National Avenue. This County road is a two lane street connecting SR 28 with the North Tahoe Regional Park and the industrial area.

The private automobile is the primary mode of transportation. Parking within the community is composed of a mixture of public parking and private parking. The Tahoe Vista community is currently serviced by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit system.

General Description of Redevelopment Standards

The standards proposed for the implementation of the Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Plan area are:

1. The project must result in the upgrading and renovation of the communities’ existing industrial, commercial, and residential building stock, and where possible, reduce the dilapidated building stock contributing to the degradation of Lake Tahoe.
2. Redevelopment activities must result in development that is both economically attractive to private developers and will achieve and sustain correction of environmental damage to Lake Tahoe through the Achievement Activities of environmental thresholds.

3. Consideration of any substantial redevelopment undertaking must have input from the community affected by the proposed activity.

4. The project should aid in the construction of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan improvements including sidewalks, lighting, undergrounding of utilities and other pedestrian improvements.

In order to achieve environmental and land use goals, any development project should focus on activities which in the short run bring about public awareness that positive change is occurring, and in the long term bring about the actual construction of environmental improvement projects.
Section III - (15.10.B (4))

A general statement of how the proposed redevelopment plan conforms to the provisions of the Goals and Policies, the Transects, the applicable plan area statements, the Code, and the environmental thresholds.

Conformity with TRPA Goals, Policies, Code and Thresholds

The Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Tahoe Vista community will be consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Placer County General Plan, community plans for areas within the boundaries of the plan, Transects for areas outside community plan areas, and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of Redevelopment Plan approval.

Goals & Policies

The Redevelopment Agency agrees to support and promote TRPA’s goals to maintain the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by the Region, through its development projects.

Balancing sustainable development with the above will encourage the wise use of Lake Tahoe and the resources of the area, preserve public and private investments in the community, and preserve the social and economic health of the region.

Code of Ordinances

The Code of Ordinances (Code) is a compilation of land use and environmental regulations regarding Lake Tahoe. The Redevelopment Agency’s proposed Preliminary Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Plan is in conformity with the Code.

All projects are subject to TRPA (in accordance with Chapter Four of the Code) and Placer County review. To ensure effective and efficient coordination, the Code and the Placer County Zoning Ordinances shall apply to building modifications, expansions and repairs. When a conflict presents itself, the most restrictive ordinance shall apply.
Environmental Improvement Program

The TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) encompasses hundreds of capital improvement, research, program support, and maintenance projects designed to restore and protect Lake Tahoe’s clarity.

Placer County is partner with TRPA in constructing and maintaining EIP projects of mutual benefit. Over a twenty-year period Placer County is committed to develop and construct public improvements

Thresholds

Thresholds are environmental standards adopted by TRPA to help protect Lake Tahoe. Designed to reflect the inter-connected nature of the environment, the economy and the community’s social well-being, the environmental threshold carrying capacities and standards for the Lake Tahoe Basin essentially define the capacity of the Region to accommodate additional land development. Threshold indicators are used as the measures of success of attaining environmental health in the region.

In order to ensure that any public improvement undertaken in Placer County – North Lake Tahoe region, is targeted to the highest and most critical priority activities, and will lead to the greatest benefit over the shortest period of time for the overall community, Placer County Department of Public Works will determine the projects and activities from the approved EIP projects list.

Table A below is a listing of currently approved EIP projects for the Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Plan area:

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

1. Projects seeking consideration under the provisions of the Plan, must contribute to the implementation of one, or more, of the Environmental Improvement Program projects above.

2. All contribution determinations and calculations shall be made by the Placer County Department of Public Works.

3. Improvement of public or private facilities, provisions of added open spaces, construction of BMPs in conformance with environmental carrying capacities established by TRPA.

4. Use of rehabilitation and façade improvement loans and grants to leverage private investment and improve commercial building conditions.

5. Implementation of a public improvement program including road grading, patching and paving; curb, gutter and sidewalk construction; and storm drain installation.

6. Potential participation in operation and maintenance of public improvements related to air and water quality through funding contribution and / or providing those services for County Department of Public Works determined projects.
Section IV - (15.10.B (5))

A general description of the provisions for existing and new affordable housing and the expected impact of the proposed redevelopment plan on the residents of the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods

Description of Provisions for Workforce Housing and Community Impacts

Lake Tahoe is a unique and complex regulatory environment where development of affordable housing is a challenge on a number of levels. Housing affordability pressures are particularly visible on the North Shore where the lack of current decent housing supply available for area workers appears to have provided the opportunity for property owners to rent their units to workers willing to live in substandard and overcrowded conditions, while paying unaffordable rents.

Clearly, the need for affordable housing outpaces the available land and local state and federal dollars necessary for development. The Agency will continue on its path as defined under its TRPA redevelopment plans to expand, improve and preserve the supply of affordable housing. The impact on the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods will be positive in nature as the Agency will continue to promote affordable workforce housing opportunities for the residents and workforce in the North Lake Tahoe Area, as well as provide opportunities for workers commuting into the Basin, to live closer to work.

The TRPA Code of Ordinances establishes specific regulations and thresholds for, among other things, land use, density, rate of growth, and land coverage. TRPA’s Code of Ordinances also sets maximum annual housing unit allocations, as well as density and coverage limitations on multi-family development. These ordinances are meant to ensure that environmental thresholds are adhered to and that Lake Tahoe’s water quality is protected. TRPA has adopted programs to address the need for workforce housing units in which certain housing developments may obtain special consideration from TRPA’s allocation requirements.

In addition to a unique land use regulatory environment, Lake Tahoe has additional challenges to the creation and maintenance of affordable housing including a large seasonal tourist population and a substantial second-residence population, which limits access to permanent affordable housing units. Dean Runyan Associates prepared The Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area, 1997-2002 Detailed Visitor Impact Estimates in December 2003, which noted that nearly 6 in 10 housing units in the Lake Tahoe Basin are vacation homes classified for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use. Other studies such as the Housing Demand Review, for the then Cedar Grove project, have also addressed the lack of affordable housing within the region and concluded that there is a shortage of several hundred affordable housing units in the Lake Tahoe region. Although developing long-term affordable units is difficult in Lake Tahoe, the Agency has made progress in several areas.
In 2001, Placer County adopted an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which requires residential developers in the Area to set aside 15% of the units built as affordable to very low and moderate-income households. Redevelopment inclusionary housing units require a 45 year or 55 year long-term affordability covenant be recorded against the property for either for – sale or rental units respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability Category</th>
<th>Percent of Median Income</th>
<th>Maximum earnings for a family of four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>31% - 50%</td>
<td>$36,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>51% - 80%</td>
<td>$58,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>81% - 110%</td>
<td>$80,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State of California, Housing and Community Development 2009 income limits.

Program Description

The Agency will assist in the development of mixed-use complexes to create affordable housing opportunities. Additionally, due to the high demand for lower paying service and tourism related jobs in the Lake Tahoe region, the Agency plans to continue to promote new affordable workforce housing construction.

The Agency will continue to work with developers by providing gap financing to construct new affordable rental or ownership units, rehabilitating or reconstructing existing developments, and preserving existing affordable units that are otherwise threatened. The Agency has made major financial contributions to assist in the development of potential housing sites.

The Agency’s housing rehabilitation program provides low interest loans of up to $150,000 to correct health and safety hazards, increase energy conservation, and extend the useful life of an affordable owner-occupied or rental home. Examples include correcting plumbing, electrical, or roof problems, room additions, insulation, and replacing inefficient appliances. This program extends the useful life of the affordable units occupied by low and moderate-income households and improves the quality of the neighborhoods. The Agency will continue to actively pursue State and federal grant funds to leverage the housing set aside from tax increment.

The homeownership program currently makes loans available to qualified homebuyers up to $150,000 in order to purchase a home. These loans act as assistance financing to make mortgage payments more affordable. Single family detached homes, town homes, and condominiums are eligible purchases under this program.
Section V – (15.10.B (6))

A statement of how the preliminary plan differs from and conforms to the adopted community plan, including a re-evaluation of items required by Subparagraphs 14.6.C (1) through (7), inclusive, and other items prescribed by TRPA as appropriate to deal with new or changed circumstances arising subsequent to the adoption of the community plan.

Conformity with Community Plan

The Preliminary Redevelopment Plan for the Tahoe Vista community will be consistent with: the community plans for areas within the boundaries of the plan; transects for areas outside community plan areas; and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of Redevelopment Plan approval.

The Tahoe Vista Community Plan, under the updated Regional Plan, will include affordable housing as an allowed (and encouraged) use. This redevelopment plan proposes special height, density and coverage considerations be given to projects that provide affordable housing.

There are redevelopment opportunities on property outside of the current community plan boundaries. This Plan proposes that for those projects within an approved TRPA redevelopment area, that meet the provisions specified in the new Regional Plan, be exempt from the requirement to be located within a community plan area, if eligible.

Consideration to Include Areas Outside a Community Plan Area (See Exhibit F)

The bulk of the proposed Tahoe Vista Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area consists of approximately 85 acres of which a portion is outside the Community plan Area.

In 1996, the Tahoe Vista Community Plan envisioned a commercial/industrial village concept for the industrial and public service parcels along the eastern border of National Avenue, but left this area outside of the Community Plan. The Redevelopment Agency concurs with this assessment; however, nothing has been done toward those ends because there are no incentives to do so. The Agency would like to explore with community stakeholders, the possibilities of incorporating a broader village concept with an open space preserve.

Adding the areas which currently exist outside of a community plan area, but within a TRPA redevelopment area, would underscore the environmental, social and economic public policy direction of the new Regional Plan Update, and may allow discretionary actions consistent with community goals.
Prepare an economic feasibility and needs assessment.

Assessment of Economic Feasibility

The economy of the North Tahoe area is heavily dependant upon the tourist industry; more so than other similar resort locations. The economic conditions required for a diversified economy, cost of living chief among them, are not present at this time and are unlikely to change. Redevelopment projects, supported by the County’s investment in infrastructure, which attract a greater share of the tourist market such as high quality accommodations and event facilities or meet a community need, such as workforce housing, will have the greatest immediate impact on the redevelopment areas.

To the extent projects encourage year-round occupancy the retail economy will be better supported. Accommodation projects (e.g., entertainment, event/conference centers), and enhanced transit connections to ski resorts will all serve to improve the non-summer draw of those commercial centers. These facilities will also offer viable alternatives to ski-area lodging, to the benefit of the region.

While the national economy has suffered significant financial and economic setbacks over the last eighteen months, the real estate market on the North Shore has also been affected. Real estate sales were strong in 2005 and 2006, dropped by 34% in 2007 and 15% in 2008. In 2007 the average number of days a property was for sale improved slightly from 2006 but increased by 26% in 2008 to 121 days. During the first quarter of 2009 the number of home sales is below historical numbers however the number of marketing days is comparable at 95 days.

The highest percentages of home sales have been between $300,000 and $900,000 that includes both primary and secondary housing sales. An informal analysis indicates a greater number of homes sold are at the high range which would indicate homes sold were for secondary use.

Below is a table which reflects the historical property tax increment received in the overall California North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Tax Year</th>
<th>Tax Increment Received*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$6,281,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$5,549,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$4,763,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$3,965,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$2,931,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Historical tax increment does not reflect charges for property tax administration fees, pass through payments, housing set-aside, or debt service
Developing beneficial uses will require a concerted public/private effort to reduce project risk and, potentially, to offset onerous costs associated with certain high-benefit projects. Well-conceived hotel developments and associated work force housing may be a good public-private investment opportunity. The community of Tahoe Vista has few high quality tourist accommodations or facilities. Many of the buildings that house the available tourist accommodations are well past their effective building life and do not inspire the increasingly sought-after and demanding tourist.

Retail markets in the Basin are dwindling and to increase the supply of retail in the redevelopment areas would require a strategy geared to increase demand through greater capture of the visitor market and increasing the number of year round residents in the community. The immediate goal of a redevelopment strategy would be to replace outdated, under-performing retail uses with better performing ones, resulting in increased volumes in sales in key niches. Many buildings currently housing retail uses were not originally constructed for that purpose and lack the space and amenities required such as display windows, restrooms, appropriate ceiling heights and so on. Building locations are not conducive to shopping and lack pedestrian connectivity. Another key issue is traffic management and pedestrian safety.

Through inclusion of the Tahoe Vista Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area in TRPA’s Chapter 15, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency hopes to improve its ability to impact Lake Tahoe’s environmental conditions, increase the viability of tourism and retail in the community, improve public infrastructure, and produce sustainable affordable workforce housing.
Section VII (15.10.B (9))

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

Public Participation Provisions

To support an emphasis on more sustainable environmental preservation and community building, concentrated communications and feedback opportunities are needed for all those who play a role including residents, business operators, developers, environmental interest groups, visitors and other stakeholders within the redevelopment plan areas. Additionally, public feedback will be sought from community business associations and Spanish speaking interest groups.

In addition to general program and project description outreach, prior to Governing Board action, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency will initiate one or more public outreach meetings with the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council in order to receive feedback and recommendation regarding a program and/or project, including vision, processes and benefits.

This comprehensive public outreach will assist to clarify the intentions, refine an implementation plan, and ensure an informed public.
APPENDIX

ADVERSE CONDITIONS STUDY:
TAHOE VISTA
I. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Chapter 15 in the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances sets forth the process for adoption of redevelopment plans pursuant to the Goals and Policies of TRPA and as provided for in the plan area statements. Section 15.1 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances dictates that the applicability of Chapter 15 shall apply only to redevelopment plans which are in eligible areas; are predominantly urbanized, blighted; and designated in the applicable plan area statement as eligible for redevelopment plan, etc. This Adverse Conditions Study provides the background and data to evidence the blighted nature of the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area (Project Area). Specifically, this report focuses on the Tahoe Vista community in the North Lake Tahoe Basin.

II. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was formed in April 1991 pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 33300 et seq. A five-member board, which also serves as the Placer County Board of Supervisors, governs the Agency. The purpose of the Agency is to eliminate blight and support environmental improvements within the project area, by strengthening its economic base through building public infrastructure, supporting facility improvements, commercial/industrial development and rehabilitation, as well as providing affordable housing development and rehabilitation.

The Tahoe Vista area community under study includes an aging and run-down commercial and industrial strip adjacent to National Avenue that provides evidence of impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The boundaries have been set to maximize the effectiveness of redevelopment as a tool for the revitalization of the area. The boundaries have been structured to include a targeted number of substandard and deteriorated commercial and industrial buildings as well as residential structures that are substandard and in need of rehabilitation.

The Tahoe Vista Redevelopment Project Area contains approximately 1,909 parcels. Agency staff surveyed a sampling of the parcels within the Project Area. Agency staff utilized this information to further refine the area boundaries to what is proposed within this report.

Agency staff reviewed several existing reports to support its conclusions noted within this report including The Preliminary North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area report.

Agency staff focused its review on public infrastructure conditions or lack thereof, exterior conditions of each parcel surveyed as well as the usefulness of each parcel in comparison to current market standards for the respective type of use. Agency staff did not perform interior inspections of each property.

Agency staff used the information to compile a database of general observations which is summarized in the Building and Site Conditions Survey Results (Attachment A). This blight summary delineates by street, the total number of parcels, the number of blighted parcels and the percentage of blighted parcels. Following the survey results are photos taken around the proposed redevelopment area that exemplify the blight present (Attachment B).

III. EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY RESULTS

From June to August 2009, Agency staff performed a windshield survey of parcels within the proposed areas to determine if those parcels meeting TRPA’s definition of blight. The survey did not include interior property inspection. It was a visual assessment of conditions based upon a certain set of criteria whereby Agency staff photographed properties and recorded general observations of the properties surveyed.

Section 15.2.B of TRPA’s Code of Ordinances sets forth TRPA’s definition of blight, which is as follows:

**Blighted Area:** A blighted area is characterized by properties which suffer from economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse because three or more of the following factors cause a reduction or lack of proper utilization of the area to such an extent that the blight constitutes a serious physical, social, environmental or economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise acting alone:

1. The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development.

2. The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions.
The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment.

A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment.

The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carrying capacities.

Section 15.2.B. of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth several criteria for a blighted area. The following provides an analysis of TRPA’s criteria and area supporting data determined by Agency staff during a recent survey of parcels within the proposed Tahoe Vista area, to indicate that these factors still exist within the proposed boundaries.

**General**

Several buildings and public facilities were poorly constructed and/or constructed before the adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and do not comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. In addition, Agency staff observed a general lack of infrastructure, storm drain improvements, and odd shaped parcels which posed challenges development particularly along National Avenue. There was a general lack of sidewalks. A common notation by Agency staff, was that there were several hotels and motels surveyed which were constructed in the around the 1960’s that front along Highway 28. However, these properties have outlasted their useful life as the consumer demands have increased for a more comprehensive hotel/motel experience. While Agency staff saw several properties that were improved and upgraded from a bricks and mortar perspective, most properties were found to lack private sector investment to mitigate deterioration and extend the useful life of the buildings. National Avenue has a mix of dwelling types, from older cottage style wood frame residences to newer homes along Toyon, to a trailer park in disrepair. Adjacent to these residential uses are the former batch plant now owned by Placer County, recreation uses, and industrial uses.

Section 15.2.B. of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth several criteria for a designated blighted area. The following provides a description of TRPA’s criteria:
The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development

Land use patterns in the proposed area vary widely, although, the predominant theme of businesses is tourist-related, with a sizeable number of motels and restaurants along State Route 28. The area along National Avenue is industrial in nature, but abuts residential uses. Staff noted several areas in which parcels were narrow and oddly shaped and not conducive to feasible development.

The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions

The industrial area along the eastern side of National Avenue is adjacent to preserved areas owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy and designated for recreational uses. On the other side of National Avenue, residential areas abut the industrial uses. Lakeside parcels fronting Highway 28 are largely built out with aged tourist accommodation units and large vacation homes.

The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment

Staff observed a general lack of infrastructure and storm drain improvements. There is a lack of sidewalks which in the winter months, when snow accumulation forces pedestrians into the roadways with vehicles, can pose a safety hazard. Several developments along National Avenue and adjacent to the lake appear older in nature, and likely developed before the TRPA Code of Ordinances took effect and are assumed not to have updated BMPs and meet environmental threshold carrying capacities.

A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment

Adverse economic conditions are evidenced by depreciated values, impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The Tahoe Basin has a high construction cost. High construction and land costs make it difficult for private sector investment.

Homes located along the shoreline tend to be larger, newer single-family or multi-family units which cater to the vacation rental market. To the north, residences vary from newer multi-million dollar homes, to condos and timeshares to an old, run-down trailer park, to cottage style wood-frame structures. The majority of tourist accommodation units, in the proposed area, is relatively old and suffers from age and operates at a competitive disadvantage. Several of the residential developments in the area lack adequate drainage facilities.
The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carry capacities.

Staff noted a general lack of sidewalks in the area. The lack of sidewalks is exacerbated in the winter time when snow accumulation forces pedestrians to walk in the street and share the roadway with vehicles. It appeared that the majority of both private and public facilities were constructed prior to the adoption of TRPA Code of Ordinances and therefore lacked updated BMPs and were assumed not to comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. Many of the private parcels fronting the lake are built out. Scenic views are obstructed. The area is served by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART).
Attachment A

Building Conditions Survey Results
## Tahoe Vista Building/Site Conditions Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name/Location</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Number of Blighted Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Blighted Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Road - West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Road - East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donner Road - South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Lane - North</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Lane - South</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyon Road - North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyon Road - South</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Avenue - East</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaho Avenue - North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaho Avenue - South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Club Road - West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Club Road - East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 28-North Lake Boulevard</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tahoe Vista
Community Photos
Tahoe Vista Community Pictures

Trailer park along National Avenue

Along National Avenue near junction with Gun Club Road

Commercial property along Gun Club Road
Example of tourist accommodation units along Highway 28 near National Avenue

Example of residence along Anderson Road and Highway 28
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KINGS BEACH/STATELINE REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN

General Overview

Proposed Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) pursuant to Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (§15.10) (“Chapter 15”).

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency intends to submit final Redevelopment Plans for future TRPA approval after the new Regional Plan is adopted sometime over the next three to five years. These plan areas are: Kings Beach/Stateline, Tahoe Vista, Lake Forest, and, Tahoe City/Gateway. Plans for these areas will be submitted separately in accordance with TRPA’s Code of Ordinances–Chapter 15 (Chapter 15). Chapter 15 provides the opportunity for Placer County to undertake redevelopment programs within TRPA defined redevelopment areas that are found to be urbanized, blighted, and environmentally threatened.

These Preliminary Redevelopment Plans are conceptual policy and program documents; they do not identify specific project locations nor propose specific activities. They do present a discussion on the intent to study and explore certain targeted redevelopment activities that will focus and enhance the goals and objectives of the updated Regional Plan.

It is our understanding that under the new Regional Plan TRPA may provide land use incentives for TRPA redevelopment areas in order to promote the construction of environmental improvement projects. If so, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency submits these Preliminary Plans with the intent to qualify for such land use considerations.

Background

Increasingly the areas of Kings Beach/Stateline are showing signs of an aging community facing the result of extended deferred maintenance. Environmentally, Lake Tahoe’s primary assets, its clarity and beauty, have been compromised due to storm water run-off and pollution. Economically, many of the communities in North Lake Tahoe reflect the neglected properties, dilapidated structures and outdated infrastructure that exacerbate the area’s decline. Poor land uses, limited public transportation and a lack of good quality permanent affordable housing and neighborhood services contribute to the dwindling population of full-time residents who have a stake in implementing and seeing environmental and land use improvements.

What was originally developed in the 1950’s as an area of vacation cabins, trailers and motels, has become a year-round residential community with limited supporting commercial and public services. However, the housing stock, commercial buildings, infrastructure and environmental improvements have not been upgraded to adequately meet the increased needs of the Kings Beach/Stateline communities.
Preliminary Redevelopment Plan:

KINGS BEACH / STATELINE
Section I – (15.10.B (2))

A description of the proposed redevelopment plan area boundaries and project area boundaries including a preliminary determination of which areas are blighted and urbanized

Kings Beach/Stateline - Project Area Boundaries (See Exhibit A)

Introduction

The redevelopment area boundaries proposed for Kings Beach/Stateline are consistent with the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors, under California Health and Safety Code Law on July 16, 1996. However, the proposed Preliminary Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan area is smaller than the current California redevelopment area.

Community Description

The proposed boundary extends generally from Stateline to Highway 267 and from Speckled Avenue to Lake Tahoe. In a section known as the “Grid”, an area that extends from behind the commercial corridor to Speckled Avenue, there is a haphazard mix of residential, schools, motels, public uses, and private industrial uses. This community was chosen because of the blighted economic and social conditions as well as the critical physical conditions leading to storm water runoff, contaminated soils, over-covered land patterns, inadequate infrastructure, substandard housing, haphazard parking, scenic blight and a lack of water quality BMPs (see Appendix: Adverse Conditions Study). The Grid is currently not included in a TRPA community plan area.

The commercial core, an area that fronts along State Highway Route 28, is marked with abandoned buildings, vacant lots, inadequate and irregular shaped parcels, and substandard public and private physical improvements, all of which contribute to the degradation of the water quality of Lake Tahoe.

Additionally, the lack of affordable housing has led to a proliferation of housing which is dilapidated, substandard, and potentially hazardous. The latest federal census estimates that 20% of all households in Kings Beach suffer from overcrowding. More recent local surveys and studies suggest that this percentage may be significantly higher.
Section II – (15.10.B (3))

A general statement of the proposed land uses, anticipated development, proposed targets and objectives related to attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds, layout of the principal streets and transportation patterns, and a general description of the standards to be used for redevelopment of the area.

Statement of Proposed Land Uses

The proposed redevelopment plan in Placer County will incorporate the land use guides promoted in the updated Regional Plan. The blighted condition of properties in this proposed plan, and all planned land uses will comply with the updated Regional Plan definitions and goals. Land uses will exemplify development in urbanized areas that promote mixed-use development with a focus on creating uses that will be concentrated, and encourage the use of public transit, bicycles and walking. Live-work environments will be promoted and incentivized.

Currently the vast majority of the Kings Beach residential area is outside of a community plan area. This exclusion has caused the need for code amendments and has affected the ability to attract the private funding needed to construct and maintain environmental improvement projects and site specific BMPs. This Preliminary Redevelopment Plan proposes that any property located inside of an adopted TRPA redevelopment plan area be exempt from a requirement to be located within a community plan area.

The proposed Kings Beach/Stateline Preliminary Redevelopment Plan area consists of approximately 484 acres in Placer County located at the north shore of Lake Tahoe. Most, if not all of Kings Beach, is laid out in a grid system of rectangular lots designed for summer cabins, most with dimensions of 25 feet in width and 125 feet in length. As a result, much of the development has been constrained by this inefficient lot size.

There are two main drainage courses affecting land capability (Griff Creek and an unnamed tributary) that run through the community, with surrounding Stream Environment Zones (SEZ) along those courses. Areas along the shoreline tend to also have sensitive land capability classifications, while most of the “Grid” is Class 5 (high capability). The final plan will present strategies for land coverage reductions, where necessary and environmentally desirable.

Recent public and private investment, under consideration, include Placer County’s Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project, a major highway safety and environmental effort and the activities of a private developer working in partnership with the Placer County Redevelopment Agency, to construct over 75 units of affordable workforce housing in Kings Beach.
In response to the blighted conditions described above, the proposed Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan calls for focusing on the following anticipated development programs:

**Anticipated Development (See Exhibit B)**

This section provides an overview of the proposed vision planned for the Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan area. Additional descriptions of the environmental settings and land use elements will be discussed in detail at the time of project submittal.

**The Eastern Gateway**

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

The Redevelopment Agency has purchased abandoned contaminated gas station sites and certain nearby properties. The potential for a mixed-use / commercial retail development is supported. Development projects would compliment the mixed-use commercial and retail development planned for the town center.

The Eastern Gateway to California is known to have varying levels of blight. As one enters California and approaches Kings Beach from Nevada, the dilapidation and deterioration of land uses is quickly apparent. Near Stateline single family homes mark stable and possibly historic neighborhoods and the Agency desires to retain that character, however storm water runoff and other drainage concerns indicate an immediate need for environmental improvements. The Agency may work with other County departments to ensure public improvements are constructed and maintained.

Additionally, consolidation of land uses and construction of infrastructure improvements can be accomplished by acquisition of properties to provide and improve commercial uses in combination with low scale retail, office, multi-residential, renovated commercial development and pedestrian focused activities. While many Agency dollars have already been committed to the Eastern Gateway, a Chapter 15 plan is needed to incentivize private investment, as the need exceeds available public monies.

**The Western Gateway**

The Western Gateway centers on Secline Avenue and a 500’ radius extending from Highway 267, to Lake Tahoe and midway from Brockway Vista/Highway 28 to Rainbow Avenue.

The area serves as the western entrance to Kings Beach. It is evidenced by a gas station, local retail, visitor services, and other land use mixes which range widely in deteriorating physical condition. There is a large outdated government pumping station on the lakefront. Limited BMPs are present in the area.
The focus of any development activity will be the preservation of Kings Beach and public access to Lake Tahoe. Reducing the coverage on parcels along the lake front in exchange for resort or hotel building height, not only opens up the lake’s scenic views to the general public, but ensures that dilapidated sewer and water treatment infrastructure is replaced or updated.

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

The Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan will provide that neighborhood improvements, in conjunction with private, mixed-use development projects; be integrated with the goals and objectives of the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project.

**Town Center**

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

The Plan design includes a pedestrian village serving both tourists and residents. Using an “Old Tahoe” theme oriented toward Highway 28 and Lake Tahoe, the scale will be pedestrian in nature and rely on off-street parking, public transportation, and small public plaza areas and visual corridors.

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

**Housing**

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

This Plan would create opportunities for the infill of vacant lots with new housing units as well as an enhanced rehabilitation program for existing housing units. These efforts will not only improve the public infrastructure and the visual quality of the neighborhood as well as
stabilize the area from further deterioration, but will assist in the construction of community-wide environmental improvement projects.

The Plan envisions upgrading the residential sections containing outdated cabins, trailers, old motels, apartments and houses. The goal would be to increase the net number of sustainable permanent affordable housing.
KINGS BEACH/STATE LINE AREA -- PROPOSED UNDER CHAPTER 15
CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT
Attainment & Maintenance of Environmental Thresholds - Targets and Objectives

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

The proposed redevelopment plan is targeted to the highest and most critical environmental improvement projects that will lead to the greatest benefit over the shortest period of time for the overall community. It is determined that the most efficient and effective use of public and private dollars is to focus on the objectives of the Environmental Improvement Program as the standard for plan evaluation.

As projects come forward for development approval they will be measured against the Placer County approved five–year environmental improvement project list. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency will provide assistance to private property owners who can achieve pertinent thresholds within the proposed redevelopment area.

Transportation Patterns

Kings Beach/Stateline neighborhood streets consist of a series of north-south streets and east-west streets that result in an interconnected grid roughly eight blocks (east-west) by ten blocks (north-south) north of SR 28 and east of SR 267. In addition Brockway Vista Avenue parallels SR 28 one block to the south, between Coon and Chipmunk streets; and between Secline and Bear Streets.

These streets largely serve single-family residential land uses. The preponderance of commercial land uses is located along SR 28, or within one block of the state highway. Other important traffic and pedestrian trip generators consist of:

- The Kings Beach Elementary School, along the west side of Deer Street between Steelhead and Dolly Varden Avenue
- Light industrial land uses along Speckled Avenue and Cutthroat Avenue
- North Tahoe Event Center
- The State Recreation Area at the south end of Coon Street
- Restaurants along State Route 28
- US Post Office and County Health Clinic
- Several small churches.

The other major roadway in the proposed area is State Route 267. This road is a two lane highway connecting State Route 28 with Truckee and Interstate 80.

The Kings Beach Redevelopment Area is currently serviced by the Tahoe Area Regional Transit System (TART).
General Description of Redevelopment Standards

The standards proposed for the implementation of the Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan area are:

1. The project must result in the construction of threshold improvement projects, and where possible, upgrade and renovate the communities’ existing dilapidated building stock on sites contributing to the degradation of Lake Tahoe.

2. Provisions must be made for providing affordable workforce housing in the immediate vicinity of development projects, or provisions made to expand alternative public transportation to link housing with jobs and community services.

3. Redevelopment activities must result in development that is both economically attractive to private developers and will achieve and sustain correction of environmental damage to Lake Tahoe through construction of environmental improvement projects (see Section III).

4. Consideration of any substantial redevelopment undertaking must have input from the community affected by the proposed activity.

In order to achieve environmental and land use goals, any development project should be focused on activities which in the short run bring about public awareness that positive change is occurring, and in the long term bring about the actual construction of environmental improvement projects.
Section III – (15.10.B (4))

A general statement of how the proposed redevelopment plan conforms to the provisions of the Goals and Policies, the transects, the applicable plan area statements, the Code, and the environmental thresholds.

Conformity with TRPA Goals, Policies, Code and Thresholds

The final Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Kings Beach /Stateline community will be consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Placer County General Plan, community plans for areas within the boundaries of the plan, transects for areas outside community plan areas, and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of final Redevelopment Plan approval.

Goals & Policies

The Redevelopment Agency agrees to support and promote TRPA’s goals to maintain the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by the Region, through its development projects.

Balancing sustainable development with the above will encourage the prudent use of Lake Tahoe and the resources of the area, preserve public and private investments in the community, and preserve the social and economic health of the region.

Code of Ordinances

The Code of Ordinances (“Code”) is a compilation of land use and environmental regulations regarding Lake Tahoe. The Redevelopment Agency’s North Lake Tahoe preliminary redevelopment plan is in conformity with the Code.

All projects are subject to TRPA (in accordance with Chapter Four of the Code) and Placer County review. To ensure effective and efficient coordination, the Code and the Placer County Zoning Ordnances shall apply to building modifications, expansions and repairs. When a conflict presents itself, the most restrictive ordinance shall apply.

Environmental Improvement Program

The TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) encompasses hundreds of capital improvement, research, program support, and maintenance projects designed to restore and protect Lake Tahoe’s clarity.

Placer County is a partner with TRPA in constructing and maintaining EIP projects of mutual benefit. Over a twenty-year period Placer County is committed to develop and construct public improvements.
Thresholds

Thresholds are environmental standards adopted by TRPA to help protect Lake Tahoe. Designed to reflect the inter-connected nature of the environment, the economy and the community’s social well-being, the environmental threshold carrying capacities and standards for the Lake Tahoe Basin essentially define the capacity of the Region to accommodate additional land development. Threshold indicators are used as the measures of success of attaining environmental health in the region.

In order to ensure that any public improvement undertaken in Placer County – North Lake Tahoe region, is targeted to the highest and most critical priority activities, and will lead to the greatest benefit over the shortest period of time for the overall community, Placer County Department of Public Works will determine the projects and activities from the approved EIP projects list.

Table A below is a listing of currently approved EIP projects for Kings Beach/Stateline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP PROJECT No.</th>
<th>EIP THRESHOLD</th>
<th>EIP PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach - Residential</td>
<td>Drainage improvements for residential area above SR 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Stateline Area</td>
<td>Includes conveyance, stabilization, re-vegetation and road runoff treatment for sediment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach - Industrial</td>
<td>Drainage conveyance stabilization, re-vegetation, road runoff treatment for sediment in industrial developed area (mainly Speckled Ave).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach Commercial Core: Source Controls</td>
<td>Erosion source controls associated with the county and state roadways. Improvements include re-vegetation of disturbed soils, drainage stabilization and infiltration, and sediment ponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach Commercial Core: Treatment controls</td>
<td>Erosion storm water treatment facilities associated with the county and state roadway. Improvements include re-vegetation of disturbed soils, drainage stabilization and infiltration and sediment ponds, as well as potential use of filtration media for treatment of fine sediment. (See below for delineation of Kings Beach watersheds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified Areas to Complete Storm Water Outfall Treatment Facilities</td>
<td>Griff Watershed</td>
<td>Deer Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bear Watershed</td>
<td>Coon Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fox/Chipmunk Watershed</td>
<td>Chipmunk Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Scenic Resources</td>
<td>Scenic Road (SR 28) –Tahoe Vista (Kings Beach) Improv</td>
<td>Multi-phase project with landscape frontage improvement, access controls, walkways, architectural upgrades. Screen or relocate satellite dishes / sign conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>Griff Creek-Stream Habitat restoration</td>
<td>Improve culverts for fish passage, stabilize banks with vegetation and improve substrate through urban area for spawning, for morphology and facilitate water diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>KB Recreation Area Public Pier</td>
<td>Public partners (CTC, etc.) will relocate and improve existing pier may serve water borne transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>CTC Sceline Beach Improvements</td>
<td>CTC will construct additional site improvements-day use recreation improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>KB Curb, Gutters, Sidewalks &amp; Bike Trails</td>
<td>Concurrent with Water Quality Improvements (#10060) - Class II Bike Trails and Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>North Shore Trolley Service</td>
<td>Service expanded by reducing headways and adding service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>Passenger Facilities</td>
<td>Region wide construction of transit shelters at existing or future transit stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10018</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>TART Replacement Vehicles</td>
<td>Purchase and replace TART vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10019</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>Transit Operating Assistance</td>
<td>Provide operating funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10020</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)</td>
<td>Acquire equipment and technology to support ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10027</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>Water based landside facilities</td>
<td>Construct parking, transit and other related facilities to support water borne transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10140</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Lake Access Acquisition: Phase I</td>
<td>CTC to purchase lake front property (KB) for dispersed recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10149</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Lake Access Acquisition: Phase II</td>
<td>CTC to purchase and improve lake front property (KB) for dispersed recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Threshold Achievement Criteria**

1. Projects seeking consideration under the provisions of the Plan, must contribute to the implementation of one, or more, of the Environmental Improvement Program projects above.

2. All contribution determinations and calculations shall be made by the Placer County Department of Public Works.

3. Improvement of public or private facilities, provisions of added open spaces, construction of BMPs in conformance with environmental carrying capacities established by TRPA.

4. Use of rehabilitation and façade improvement loans and grants to leverage private investment and improve commercial building conditions.

5. Implementation of a public improvement program including road grading, patching and paving; curb, gutter and sidewalk construction; and storm drain installation.

6. Potential participation in operation and maintenance of public improvements related to air and water quality through funding contribution and/or providing those services for County Department of Public Works determined projects.
A general description of the provisions for existing and new affordable housing and the expected impact of the proposed redevelopment plan on the residents of the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods

Description of Provisions for Existing and New Affordable Housing

Lake Tahoe is a unique and complex regulatory environment where development of affordable housing is a challenge on a number of levels. Housing affordability pressures are particularly visible on the North Shore where the lack of current decent housing supply available for area workers appears to have provided the opportunity for property owners to rent their units to workers willing to live in substandard and overcrowded conditions.

Clearly, the need for affordable housing outpaces the available land and local state and federal dollars necessary for development. The County, through its Redevelopment Agency will continue on its path with its Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan to expand and improve the supply of affordable housing. The impact on the redevelopment plan area and surrounding neighborhoods will be positive in nature as the Redevelopment Agency will continue to promote affordable housing and workforce housing opportunities for the residents and workforce of the North Lake Tahoe Area.

The TRPA Code of Ordinances establishes specific regulations and thresholds for, among other things, land use, density, rate of growth, and land coverage. TRPA’s Code of Ordinances also sets maximum annual housing unit allocations, as well as density and coverage limitations on multi-family development. These ordinances are being re-evaluated to ensure that environmental thresholds do not prohibit or unduly restrict, the production of workforce housing while ensuring the water quality of Lake Tahoe is protected. TRPA has adopted programs to address the need for workforce housing units in which certain housing developments may obtain special consideration from TRPA’s allocation requirements.

California law requires that local governments have housing need allocation plans based on the following distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD TYPE</th>
<th>MINIMUM PERCENTAGE OF EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to a unique land use regulatory environment, the Lake Tahoe Basin has additional challenges to the creation and maintenance of affordable housing including a large seasonal tourist population and a substantial second-residence population that limits access to permanent affordable housing units. Dean Runyan Associates prepared *The Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area, 1997-2002 Detailed Visitor Impact Estimates* in December 2003, which noted that nearly 6 in 10 housing units in the Lake Tahoe Basin are vacation homes classified for seasonal, recreational, or occasional
use. Other studies such as a Housing Demand Review, have also addressed the lack of affordable housing within the region and concluded that there is a shortage of several hundred affordable housing units in the Lake Tahoe region. Although developing long-term affordable units is difficult in Lake Tahoe, the Redevelopment Agency has made progress in several areas.

In 2001, Placer County adopted an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which requires residential developers in the Area to set aside 15% of the units built as affordable to very low and moderate-income households. Redevelopment inclusionary housing units require a 45 year or 55 year long-term affordability covenant be recorded against the property for either for – sale or rental units respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability Category</th>
<th>Percent of Median Income</th>
<th>Maximum earnings for a family of four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>31% - 50%</td>
<td>$36,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>51% - 80%</td>
<td>$58,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>81% - 110%</td>
<td>$80,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: State of California, Housing and Community Development 2009 income limits.*

Program Description

The Agency plans to continue to promote new, very low, low and moderate income housing construction, and to work with developers by providing gap financing to construct new affordable rental or ownership units, rehabilitating or reconstructing existing developments, and preserving existing affordable units that are otherwise threatened. Due to the high demand for lower paying service and tourism related jobs in the Lake Tahoe region, the Agency’s goal is to use this program to address the substantial need for employee housing. Supporting affordable senior housing is also needed. The Agency will also participate in land acquisition, land-cost write-down, developer recruitment, and credit enhancements or other financing mechanisms. Projects under this category include the construction of those projects mentioned in the previous section and other opportunities that may arise.

The Agency’s housing rehabilitation program provides low interest loans of up to $150,000 to correct health and safety hazards, increase energy conservation, and extend the useful life of an affordable owner-occupied or affordable rental home. Examples include correcting plumbing, electrical, or roof problems, room additions, insulation, and replacing inefficient appliances. This program extends the useful life of the affordable units occupied by low and moderate-income households and improves the quality of the neighborhoods. The Agency will continue to actively pursue State and federal grant funds to leverage the housing set aside from tax increment.

The Agency will assist in the development of mixed-use complexes to create affordable housing opportunities. The Agency will continue to assist the County’s Planning Department with housing expertise and drafting of the employee housing ordinance as well as implementation of employee housing requirements established on new developments by
the County’s General Plan requirements. The Agency will contribute resources toward administration and monitoring of the employee-housing program as well as to other affordable housing units located within the County. However, the Agency is currently budgeted to expend the majority of available housing funds for existing sites under Agency ownership.

The homeownership program currently makes loans available to qualified very low, low and moderate income homebuyers up to $150,000 in order to purchase a home. These loans act as assistance financing to make mortgage payments more affordable. Single family detached homes, town homes, and condominiums are eligible purchases under this program.
Section V - (15.10.B (6))

A statement of how the preliminary plan differs from and conforms to the adopted community plan, including a re-evaluation of items required by Subparagraphs 14.6.C (1) through (7), inclusive, and other items prescribed by TRPA as appropriate to deal with new or changed circumstances arising subsequent to the adoption of the community plan.

Conformity with Adopted Community Plans

The Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Kings Beach /Stateline community will be consistent with: the community plans for areas within the boundaries of the plan; transects for areas outside community plan areas; and the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin in effect at the time of Redevelopment Plan approval.

The Kings Beach/Stateline Community Plan currently does not have provisions for construction of affordable housing to be part of new development. It is understood that a new community plan under the updated Regional Plan, will include affordable housing as an allowed (and encouraged) use. As proposed in the new Regional Plan, this redevelopment plan requests special height, density and coverage considerations be given to projects that provide affordable housing.

There are redevelopment opportunities on property outside of the current community plan boundaries. This Plan proposes that those projects within an approved TRPA redevelopment area, meeting the provisions specified in this Plan, be exempt from the requirement to be located within a community plan area.

Consideration to Include Areas Outside a Community Plan Area  (See Exhibit C)

The Kings Beach/Stateline redevelopment area consists of approximately 500 acres, of which the vast majority is outside the community plan Area. The bulk of that excluded area is locally called “the Grid”, and consists largely of residences, trailer parks and outdated motels.

Twenty years ago when the TRPA Regional Plan was adopted and Placer County updated its community plan areas, affordable housing was not included as an allowable use. It is clear that the lack of safe and affordable workforce housing is a major contribution to the deteriorating state of the Kings Beach community (North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Area, etc., Design Workshop, 2005).

The proposed Preliminary Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan includes the Grid and would supplement the direction of the new TRPA Regional Plan, providing development incentives for height, density and coverage. It is intended that future focus would be to identify infill sites which are close to transit and services for the employee population, and where appropriate, develop mixed-use housing. The development of rental housing to serve the households who now reside in trailer parks or makeshift motel rooms, not meant to serve
as permanent housing, is critical to revitalization efforts in the Kings Beach/Stateline area (Economic & Redevelopment Strategies for Kings Beach and Tahoe City, Economic & Planning Systems, 2007).

Adding the areas which currently exist outside of a community plan area, but within a redevelopment area as defined by TRPA, would underscore the environmental, social and economic public policy direction of the new Regional Plan, and allow discretionary actions consistent with community goals.
EXHIBIT C

U. S. Forest Area

KINGS BEACH/STATELINE AREA -- PROPOSED UNDER CHAPTER 15
Section VI – (15.10.B (7))

Prepare an economic feasibility and needs assessment.

Assessment of Economic Feasibility

While the national economy has suffered significant financial and economic setbacks over the last eighteen months, the real estate market on the North Shore has also been affected. Real estate sales were strong in 2005 and 2006, dropped by 34% in 2007 and 15% in 2008. In 2007 the average number of days a property was for sale improved slightly from 2006 but increased by 26% in 2008 to 121 days. During the first quarter of 2009 the number of home sales is below historical numbers however the number of marketing days is comparable at 95 days.

The highest percentages of home sales have been between $300,000 and $900,000 that includes both primary and secondary housing sales. An informal analysis indicates a greater number of homes sold are at the high range which would indicate homes sold were for secondary use.

Below is a table which reflects the historical property tax increment received in the overall California North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Tax Year</th>
<th>Tax Increment Received*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$6,281,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$5,549,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$4,763,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$3,965,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$2,931,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Historical tax increment does not reflect charges for property tax administration fees, pass through payments, housing set-aside, or debt service

The economy of the North Tahoe area is heavily dependant upon the tourist industry; more so than other similar resort locations. The economic conditions required for a diversified economy, moderate cost of living chief among them, are not present at this time and are unlikely to change without intervention. Redevelopment projects, supported by the County’s investment in infrastructure, which attract a greater share of the tourist market such as high quality accommodations and event facilities or meet a community need, such as workforce housing, will have the greatest immediate impact on the proposed redevelopment areas.

To the extent projects encourage year-round occupancy the retail economy will be better supported. Accommodation projects (e.g., entertainment, event/conference centers), and enhanced transit connections to ski resorts will all serve to improve the non-summer draw of those commercial centers. These facilities will also offer viable alternatives to ski-area lodging, to the benefit of the region.
Developing beneficial uses will require a concerted public/private effort to reduce project risk and, potentially, to offset onerous costs associated with certain high-benefit projects. Well-conceived hotel developments and associated work force housing may be a good public-private investment opportunity. The community of Kings Beach/Stateline lacks high quality tourist accommodations or facilities with marketable conference or meeting facilities. While there has been some effort to upgrade select facilities, for the most part the motels line Highway 28 are in various states of disrepair, some illegally converted to full-time residential use, some simply closed, and others are still hanging on. Most of the buildings that house the available tourist accommodations are well past their effective building life and do not inspire the increasingly sought-after and demanding tourist.

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

Retail markets in the Basin are dwindling and to increase the supply of retail in the redevelopment areas would require a strategy geared to increase demand through greater capture of the visitor market and increasing the number of year round residents in the community. The immediate goal of a redevelopment strategy would be to replace out-dated, under-performing retail uses with better performing ones, resulting in increased volumes in sales in key niches. Many buildings currently housing retail uses were not originally constructed for that purpose and lack the space and amenities required such as display windows, restrooms, appropriate ceiling heights and so on. Building locations are not conducive to shopping and lack pedestrian connectivity. Another key issue is traffic management and pedestrian safety.

Through inclusion in the TRPA Chapter 15 redevelopment designation, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency hopes to improve its ability to impact the Lake Tahoe environmental conditions, increase the viability of tourism and retail in the community, and support development of affordable workforce housing.
SECTION VII – (15.10.B (9))

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

Public Participation

To support an emphasis on more sustainable environmental preservation and community building, concentrated communications and feedback opportunities are needed for all those who play a role including residents, business operators, developers, environmental interest groups, visitors and other stakeholders within the redevelopment plan areas. Additionally, public feedback will be sought from community business associations and Spanish speaking interest groups.

In addition to general program and project description outreach, prior to Governing Board action, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency will initiate one or more public outreach meetings with the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council in order to receive feedback and recommendation regarding a program and/or project, including vision, processes and benefits.

This comprehensive public outreach will assist to clarify the intentions, refine an implementation plan, and ensure an informed public.
APPENDIX

ADVERSE CONDITIONS STUDY:

KINGS BEACH/STATETELINE
ADVERSE CONDITIONS STUDY:
Kings Beach/Stateline

I. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Chapter 15 in the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances sets forth the process for adoption of redevelopment plans pursuant to the Goals and Policies of TRPA and as provided for in the plan area statements. Section 15.1 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances dictates that the applicability of Chapter 15 shall apply only to redevelopment plans which are in eligible areas; are predominantly urbanized, blighted; and designated in the applicable plan area statement as eligible for redevelopment plan, etc. This Adverse Conditions Study provides the background and data to support the blighted nature of the proposed Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Project Area (Project Area).

II. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was formed in April 1991 pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 33300 et seq. A five-member board, which also serves as the Placer County Board of Supervisors, governs the Agency. The purpose of the Agency is to eliminate blight and support environmental improvements within the project area, by strengthening its economic base through building public infrastructure, supporting facility improvements, commercial/industrial development and rehabilitation, as well as providing affordable housing development and rehabilitation.

The Kings Beach area includes aging and run down commercial strips that provide evidence of impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The identified boundaries have been chosen to maximize the effectiveness of redevelopment as a tool for the revitalization of the area. The boundaries have been structured to include a relatively large number of substandard and deteriorated commercial and industrial buildings as well as residential buildings that are substandard and in need of rehabilitation.

The Kings Beach/Stateline Redevelopment Plan area contains approximately 2,563 parcels. Agency staff surveyed a sampling of the parcels within the Project Area. Agency staff utilized this information to further refine the area boundaries to what is proposed within this report.

Agency staff reviewed several existing reports to support its conclusions noted within this report including The Preliminary North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area report dated March 1993 prepared by John B. Dykstra & Associates which was prepared for the adoption of the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area; the North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Area Report of Recommended Policy, Code and Regulation Changes to

Agency staff focused its primary review on public infrastructure conditions, or lack thereof, exterior conditions of each parcel surveyed as well as the usefulness of each parcel in comparison to current market standards for the respective type of use. Agency staff did not perform interior property inspections.

Agency staff used the survey information to compile a database of general observations which is summarized in the Building and Site Conditions Survey Results (Attachment A). This blight summary delineates by street, the total number of parcels, the number of blighted parcels and the percentage of blighted parcels. Following the survey results, are photos taken around the proposed redevelopment area that exemplify the blight present (Attachment B).

III. EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY RESULTS

From June to August 2009, Agency staff performed a windshield survey of parcels within the proposed areas to determine if those parcels meet TRPA’s definition of blight. The survey did not include interior property inspections. It was a visual assessment of conditions based upon a certain set of criteria whereby Agency staff photographed properties and recorded general observations of the properties surveyed.

Section 15.2.B of TRPA’s Code of Ordinances sets forth TRPA’s definition of blight, which is as follows:

Blighted Area: A blighted area is characterized by properties which suffer from economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse because three or more of the following factors cause a reduction or lack of proper utilization of the area to such an extent that the blight constitutes a serious physical, social, environmental or economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise acting alone:

(1) The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development.

(2) The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions.
The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment.

A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment.

The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carrying capacities.

Section 15.2.B. of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth several criteria for a blighted area by TRPA. The following provides a description of TRPA’s criteria and supporting data concluded by Agency staff during its most recent survey of parcels within the proposed Kings Beach/Stateline area to indicate that these factors still exist within the proposed boundaries.

**General**

A large number of buildings and public facilities were poorly constructed and/or constructed before the adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and do not have updated BMPs or comply with environmental threshold carrying capacities. In addition, Agency staff observed a general lack of infrastructure, storm drain improvements and undergrounding of utilities, as well as odd shaped parcels which posed challenges to development. There were several hotel and motels surveyed which were constructed in the 1950’s and 1960’s. However, these properties have outlasted their useful life as the consumer demands have increased for a more comprehensive hotel/motel experience. While Agency staff saw several properties that were improved and upgraded from a bricks and mortar perspective, most properties were found to lack private sector investment to mitigate deterioration and extend the useful life of the buildings. There were several properties in foreclosure.

Staff noted a high concentration of blighted properties along Highway 28 and in the Kings Beach industrial area. For instance, staff noted that approximately 51% of the properties surveyed in the industrial area along Speckled Avenue and Cutthroat Avenue were blighted.

**The existence of parcels of irregular form and shape and inadequate size proper usefulness and development**

Kings Beach as a whole was found to have a prevalence of parcels of irregular form simply by nature of its original subdivision. Most, if not all, of the town was subdivided under the
recorded Final Map of “Brockway Vista”, which recorded in 1926. That subdivision laid out a grid system of rectangular lots, with most of small dimensions of 25 feet in width and 125 feet in depth, a formation which results in blocks approximately 700 feet in length and 250 feet deep. As a result, much of the development has been constrained by this small lot pattern, with a large number of small structures, confined within their property size. Kings Beach is largely built-out. The size of parcels in Kings Beach constrains setbacks and permeable spaces. Parcels tend to have high concentrations of coverage.

The commercial core, fronting along State Highway 28, contains abandoned buildings, vacant lots, inadequate and irregular shaped parcels, and substandard public and private physical improvements, all of which contribute to the degradation of the water quality of Lake Tahoe.

**The layout of parcels in disregard of the contours and other topographical or physical characteristics of the ground and surrounding conditions**

Kings Beach is approximately 80% built-out. Much of the downtown area has a fairly high percentage of impervious land coverage, in excess of what would normally be permitted under the Bailey Land Capability System, although the Community Plan rules do allow coverage “bonuses” under certain circumstances.

There are two main drainage corridors in Kings Beach: Griff Creek and an unnamed tributary. These drainage corridors run through the community, with surrounding Stream Environment Zones along those courses. Due to the constrained nature of development in Kings Beach dictated by small lot patterns, development has occurred in or near the Stream Environment Zones. Most development occurred prior to the adoption of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and therefore is assumed not to meet environmental threshold carrying capacities.

**The existence of inadequate public improvements, public facilities, open space, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment**

On some properties, there is evidence of physical improvements, including water management improvements or BMPs; however, most of the properties are in various states of disrepair. There is an overall lack of water quality BMPs, there is storm water runoff, contaminated soils and properties, over-covered land patterns, substandard housing, and scenic blight. A wide range of private facilities also do not comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities set forth in the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Examples such noncompliance includes motels, restaurants, businesses, residential lots, and parking facilities with excessive density and / or land coverage.
A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments, and social and economic maladjustment

Adverse economic conditions are evidenced by depreciated values, impaired investments and economic maladjustment. The Tahoe Basin has a higher construction cost. High construction costs and land costs make it difficult for private sector investment.

The 2000 Census indicates the Kings Beach Census Designated Place population at 4,307. The median household income is $35,507, which is lower than the median household income for Placer County and the State. Approximately, 32% of the homes in the 2000 Kings Beach Census were constructed prior to 1960 with approximately 873 of the 2,259 housing units noted in the Census as being vacant. This is in large part due to the vacation rental aspect of the Tahoe economy.

The housing stock ranges from old camp cottages or Quonset huts, with no kitchens, to overcrowded trailer parks, converted motels, small cottage style single-family homes, and newer, large single-family residences. A mix of this housing stock can be found on a number of streets. Single-family homes are dispersed throughout the area. Homes located along the shoreline tend to be larger, newer single-family or multi-family units. In the Kings Beach residential grid, homes vary from newer multi-million dollar homes, to older trailer parks and modest wood-frame structures. Overcrowding was slightly more prevalent in households in the Tahoe Basin according to census figures. Seasonal and lower-income wage earners are crowding into homes, particularly in Kings Beach where overcrowding is a year round issue.

The primary tourist area is along Highway 28 near the beach. Tourist accommodations are largely one and two story motels that have surface parking lots. Nearly all of the hotel/motel stock need significant renovation or replacement to meet current market standards. The majority of tourist accommodation units is relatively old and suffers from age and physical deterioration and operates at a competitive disadvantage. There are several motels, some in the residential grid and some along Highway 28, which have been converted to full time apartments and are leased primarily to low income families and entry level workers on both a short and longer term basis. A fraction of the current tourist accommodation units are on lakefront properties and have direct views of the lake. Nearly all of the retail and commercial space in Kings Beach is housed in buildings that originally served other uses and are in critical need of upgrading or replacement. Most buildings are stand alone that have little potential for mixed-use. The industrial portion of Kings Beach supports a variety of uses including residential, light industrial and storage. There is little growth in the industrial uses as most industrial business owners can find less constrained options outside of the Lake Tahoe basin. The industrial area is also constrained by its close proximity to residential housing which is interspersed throughout the industrial area and more concentrated directly adjacent in the Kings Beach Residential grid.
In Spring 2009, the Housing Conditions in Kings Beach Survey was conducted (see Attachment C). The survey was done primarily to supplement future federal Community Development Block Grant applications. A secondary goal of the survey was to develop a database of potential housing rehabilitation opportunities for both owner occupied and owner investor households. Motels, hotels and apartment buildings were considered residential for purposes of the Housing Conditions Survey. The survey determined that the overall housing rehabilitation need in kings Beach was 42.52% of the housing units.
The existence of substandard public or private facilities or improvements, insufficient open space, poor scenic quality, insufficient transportation systems, air quality problems, or insufficient water quality protection systems, such that there is non-compliance with the applicable environmental threshold carry capacities.

Kings Beach/Stateline has public improvements that are deficient, deteriorated, or damaged, including roads, storm drainage facilities and sidewalks. It appears that the majority of both private and public facilities was constructed prior to the adoption of TRPA Code of Ordinances and therefore was assumed not to comply with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. It has been noted in several studies that most development in Kings Beach occurred before drainage issues were commonly considered from an area wide perspective. As a result, the storm water conveyance system is not sized to accommodate flows generated up-gradient and does not meet current standards.

Public transportation may be found by way of the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART), which operates year round. Sidewalks in Kings Beach are limited and not contiguous to each other. The problem with the lack of sidewalks is exacerbated in the winter time when snow accumulation forces pedestrians to walk in the street and share the roadway with vehicles.

There are two abandoned gasoline stations located on the eastern end of Kings Beach fronting along State Highway 28 which are in Agency ownership and are undergoing active remediation efforts. Another gasoline station in town is also undergoing remediation efforts as well.
Attachment A

Building Conditions Survey Results
### Kings Beach Building/Site Conditions Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name/Location</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Number of Blighted Parcels</th>
<th>Percentage of Blighted Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 28 - North</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 28 - South</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockway Vista Avenue - North</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockway Vista Avenue - South</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speckled Street - North</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speckled Street - South</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutthroat Avenue - North</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutthroat Avenue - South</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Varden Avenue - North</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Varden Avenue - South</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Levon Avenue - North</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Levon Avenue - South</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steelhead Avenue - North</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steelhead Avenue - South</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Avenue - North</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Avenue - South</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Avenue - North</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Avenue - South</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Avenue - North</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Avenue - South</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Avenue - North</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Avenue - South</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Avenue - North</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Avenue - South</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnow Avenue - North</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnow Avenue - South</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 28 - North</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 28 - South</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1879</strong></td>
<td><strong>461</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B

Kings Beach/Stateline
Community Photos
Kings Beach Community Pictures

Highway 28 Eastern Gateway

Chipmunk Street and Highway 28

Highway 28 Stateline

Bank Foreclosure near Coon and Highway 28
Along Highway 28 at Eastern end of commercial area

Near corner of Coon Street and Speckled Avenue

Along Speckled Avenue and near Bear Street
Trailer Park near Salmon Avenue and Fox Street

Area near Secline Street

Along Beaver Street

Along Bear Street
Dilapidated commercial use near Stateline

Poorly maintained and outdated improvements near Stateline
Attachment C

Kings Beach Housing Conditions
Survey Results
Kings Beach Housing Condition Survey – 2008-09

Survey Purpose
The Kings Beach Housing Condition Survey was conducted primarily to support future Community Development Block Grant applications. A secondary goal of this survey was to develop a database of potential housing rehabilitations for both owner occupied and owner investor households. For this survey, motels, hotels and apartment buildings were considered to be residential. The survey was conducted on all residential structures within the Census Tract 201.07, Block Groups 1, 2, 3 & 4. The special parameters and instructions for this survey were:

Rate all residential structures in the following five categories:
1. Foundations 0-25
2. Roofing 0-25
3. Siding 1-10
4. Windows 0-10
5. Electrical 0-10

The following items were also noted on the survey form:
1. Street Address
2. Structure Type
3. Number of units
4. Presence of curbs, gutters, sidewalks, paved streets adequate drainage

A photographic record was made of each unit surveyed. All units with old fashion single pane windows were scored for a complete window replacement.

Census Data
The total number of housing units was derived from the 2000 Census. The Block Group figures were for Census Tract 201.07, Block Groups 1-4.

Items not considered fully during the windshield survey (taken from a car) were the electrical, foundations and drainage. For the electrical part, since it was not practical to take the time to make individual inspections of wiring conditions, this determination was interpolated from the other factors that were visible. These factors included wiring on outside of building, size of electric lines, siding and foundations. Also the foundation was often assessed on the basis of the condition of the porch, sagging or straight. The roof was assessed on it being level, and/or showing signs of leaks in the eaves, soffits or fascias. All flat roofs were scored as needing replacements because of the heavy snow conditions in the Tahoe area. Shake roofs were scored as needing replacement due to new fire prevention standards. Masonry block buildings, most which were build in the 1950s, were assumed to be unrebired, therefore in need of some foundation work.
Overall Rating

Sound  9 or less  Structurally sound – no need for repair or signs of deferred maintenance. The foundation appears structurally undamaged and there is a straight roof line. Minor problems such as small areas of peeling paint and/or maintenance items are allowed under this category.

Minor  10 – 15  Appears structurally sound, but shows signs of deferred Maintenance i.e. roof replacement or repair needs.

Moderate  16 – 39  Repairs needed for at least one major component and other repairs, i.e. roof replacement, painting and new windows.

Substantial  40 – 55  Replacement needed for several major systems and possibly other repairs i.e. complete foundation work and roof replacement along with painting and windows.

Dilapidated  56 and Over  Structurally unsound, all systems need repair, may need demolition if not major rehabilitation. These units have suffered excessive neglect and some are not fit for human habitation.

Survey Methodology

The survey was conducted starting in October 2008 and continuing until April of 2009. The majority of the survey was done by a two-person team, one driving and one recording. Some survey observation was done by walking the streets. Mobile home parks were all assumed to be in need of substantial rehabilitation or replacement. However, only homes in need of repairs were written up and photographed. The numbers of total units were taken from the 2000 Census. These numbers were adjusted by adding the number of new building permits filed, and subtracting the number of demolitions permits filed reported by the Annual California State Housing & Community Development Department Reports since 2001.

Age of Housing Stock

There were 481 total units in Kings Beach that needed some type of rehabilitation. The 2000 Census summary file 3 (SF 3) was used to determine the age of housing stock. Below is a chart of these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Track 201.7, Block Groups 1-4</th>
<th>Older than 30 Yrs.</th>
<th>Newer than 30 Yrs.</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, the percent of housing units over 30 years old = Number of units built before 1970 ÷ Total number of units ~ 1,182 ÷ 1,872 = 63%
Overcrowding
The percentage of overcrowding in Kings Beach is taken from the 2000 Census Summary File 3 (SF3) and is summarized as follows:

Census Track 201.7, Block Group 1
Number with more than 1 occupant per room – 114

Census Track 201.7, Block Group 2
Number with more than 1 occupant per room – 107

Census Track 201.7, Block Group 3
Number with more than 1 occupant per room – 119

Census Track 201.7, Block Group 4
Number with more than 1 occupant per room – 9

Census Track 201.7, Block Groups 1-4 total number with more than 1 occupant per room – 349.

The total number of housing units in Kings Beach is 1,296.

The federal calculation to get the percentage of overcrowded units is: divide the number of housing units with more than one person per room by the total number of housing units.

\[
\frac{349}{1,296} = 27\%
\]

Housing Condition Survey Results

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Housing Condition} & \text{No. of Units Needing Rehab} & \text{Total Units} & \text{Percentage} \\
\hline
\text{Dilapidated} & 109 & \text{NA} & 8.41\% \\
\text{Needs Substantial Rehabilitation} & 140 & \text{NA} & 10.80\% \\
\text{Needs Moderate Rehabilitation} & 225 & \text{NA} & 17.36\% \\
\text{Needs Minor Rehabilitation} & 77 & \text{NA} & 5.94\% \\
\hline
\text{Totals} & 551 & 1,296 & 42.52\% \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The Overall Housing Rehab Need is determined to be 9.43%.
Note: 1,296 total units were used because it is the Census figure from the 100% Data Survey for QT-0HS Household Population.
### Housing Condition Survey Results  Census Tract 201.7, Block Group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Condition</th>
<th>No. of Units Needing Rehab</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Substantial Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Moderate Rehabilitation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Minor Rehabilitation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>366</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.96%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Condition Survey Results  Census Tract 201.7, Block Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Condition</th>
<th>No. of Units Needing Rehab</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Substantial Rehabilitation</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Moderate Rehabilitation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Minor Rehabilitation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>272</strong></td>
<td><strong>457</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.52%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Condition Survey Results  Census Tract 201.7, Block Group 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Condition</th>
<th>No. of Units Needing Rehab</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Substantial Rehabilitation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Moderate Rehabilitation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Minor Rehabilitation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>299</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.12%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Condition Survey Results  Census Tract 201.7, Block Group 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Condition</th>
<th>No. of Units Needing Rehab</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Substantial Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Moderate Rehabilitation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Minor Rehabilitation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.63%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The **Age of Housing Stock** calculation indicated that 63% of housing units in Kings Beach are over 30 years old. The source of the data was the 2000 Census Summary File 3, for Census Tract 201.7.

The **Overcrowding** calculations indicated that 27% of the housing units in Kings Beach have more than 1 person per room. The source of the data was the 2000 Census Summary File 3, for Census Tract 201.7.

The overall **Housing Rehab Need** in Kings Beach was determined to be 42.52%. The source of the data was an in-house Housing Condition Survey, using CDBG Survey Forms, conducted during October 2008 – April 2009.
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SECTION 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

ESTABLISHING PRELIMINARY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AREAS

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

Selection of Redevelopment Plan Area

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

Preparation of Preliminary Redevelopment Plans

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

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

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

- An economic feasibility and needs assessment.

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

**Action on Preliminary Redevelopment Plans**

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

**Preparation of Final Redevelopment Plans**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Process for Final Redevelopment Plans

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

- The Advisory Planning Commission shall review and make recommendation to the Governing Board prior to adoption of a final redevelopment plan.
- The final redevelopment plan shall be considered as a regional plan amendment and the Governing Board shall approve, deny or modify the final redevelopment plan.

Findings for Adoption

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

- The plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies;
- The plan is consistent with the Code;
- The plan is consistent with the applicable plan area statement and adopted community plan;
- The plan is consistent with the adjacent Plan Area Statements or any inconsistencies are identified and evaluated and measures specified to correct the inconsistencies.
- The plan does not propose the development of residential units, tourist accommodation units, commercial floor area, recreational Persons at One Time or other projects, in excess of applicable limits set forth in the Regional Plan;
- The plan is substantially more likely to result in progress toward the attainment and maintenance of environmental threshold carrying capacities than the adopted community plan;
- Affordable housing is provided as part of a redevelopment plan to the extent required by applicable state law;
- The redevelopment plan shall not result in a net increase in the amount of land coverage existing within the redevelopment plan area prior to adoption of the redevelopment plan; and
• The redevelopment plan in conjunction with other adopted plans and programs of TRPA shall attain and maintain thresholds.
SECTION 3 - NEED FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

KINGS BEACH/STATELINE REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN

Existing Conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Proposed Land Uses

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

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

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

Anticipated Development

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

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

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

**The Eastern Gateway**

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

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

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

**The Western Gateway**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Housing

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

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

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

Thresholds

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP PROJECT No.</th>
<th>EIP THRESHOLD</th>
<th>EIP PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach - Residential</td>
<td>Drainage improvements for residential area north of SR 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Stateline Area</td>
<td>Includes conveyance, stabilization, re-vegetation and road runoff treatment for sediment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach - Industrial</td>
<td>Drainage conveyance stabilization, re-vegetation, road runoff treatment for sediment in industrial developed area (mainly Speckled Ave).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach Commercial Core: Source Controls</td>
<td>Erosion source controls associated with the county and state roadways. Improvements include re-vegetation of disturbed soils, drainage stabilization and infiltration, and sediment ponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Kings Beach Commercial Core: Treatment controls</td>
<td>Erosion storm water treatment facilities associated with the county and state roadway. Improvements include re-vegetation of disturbed soils, drainage stabilization and infiltration and sediment ponds, as well as potential use of filtration media for treatment of fine sediment. (See below for delineation of Kings Beach watersheds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIP PROJECT No.</td>
<td>EIP THRESHOLD</td>
<td>EIP PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Identified Areas to Complete Storm Water Outfall Treatment Facilities</td>
<td>Griff Watershed, Deer Watershed, Bear Watershed, Coon Watershed, Fox/Chipmunk Watershed, Chipmunk Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Scenic Resources</td>
<td>Scenic Road (SR 28) –Tahoe Vista (Kings Beach) Improv</td>
<td>Multi-phase project with landscape frontage improvement, access controls, walkways, architectural upgrades. Screen or relocate satellite dishes / sign conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>Griff Creek-Stream Habitat restoration</td>
<td>Improve culverts for fish passage, stabilize banks with vegetation and improve substrate through urban area for spawning, for morphology and facilitate water diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>KB Recreation Area Public Pier</td>
<td>Public partners (CTC, etc.) will relocate and improve existing pier may serve water borne transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>CTC Secline Beach Improvements</td>
<td>CTC will construct additional site improvements-day use recreation improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>KB Curb, Gutters, Sidewalks &amp; Bike Trails</td>
<td>Concurrent with Water Quality Improvements (#10060) - Class II Bike Trails and Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>North Shore Trolley Service</td>
<td>Service expanded by reducing headways and adding service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>Air Quality/Transp</td>
<td>Passenger Facilities</td>
<td>Region wide construction of transit shelters at existing or future transit stops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EIP PROJECT No. | EIP THRESHOLD | EIP PROJECT NAME | DESCRIPTION
--- | --- | --- | ---
10018 | Air Quality/Transp | TART Replacement Vehicles | Purchase and replace TART vehicles
10019 | Air Quality/Transp | Transit Operating Assistance | Provide operating funds
10020 | Air Quality/Transp | Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) | Acquire equipment and technology to support ITS
10027 | Air Quality/Transp | Water based landside facilities | Construct parking, transit and other related facilities to support water borne transit.
10140 | Recreation | Lake Access Acquisition: Phase I | CTC to purchase lake front property (KB) for dispersed recreational opportunities
10149 | Recreation | Lake Access Acquisition: Phase II | CTC to purchase and improve lake front property (KB) for dispersed recreational opportunities

### TAHOE VISTA REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN

#### Existing Conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Proposed Land Uses**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Roadway / Pedestrian Improvements

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

Commercial Renovation

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

Recreational Open Space

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

Workforce Housing

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

Thresholds

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

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

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

**Lake Forest Redevelopment Area Plan**

**Existing Conditions**

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

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

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

Proposed Land Uses

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

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

Anticipated Development

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

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

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

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

### TABLE 3
**SUMMARY OF EIP PROJECTS IN LAKE FOREST AREA**

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

**TAHOE CITY/GATEWAY REDEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN**

**Existing Conditions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Proposed Land Uses**

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

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

**Anticipated Development**

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

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

**Open Space Preserve**

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

**Commercial Development**

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

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

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

Thresholds

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIP PROJECT NO. &amp;EIP THRESHOLD</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>254.231 &amp; 796.1 Water Quality</td>
<td>Tahoe City Residential ECP</td>
<td>Water quality improvements and treatment of public ROW runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.3 Water Quality</td>
<td>Lower Ward Valley</td>
<td>Water quality improvements and treatment of public ROW runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856 Air Quality</td>
<td>Tahoe City Transit Center</td>
<td>Participation in ongoing O&amp;M of built facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALTERNATIVES

No Action Alternative

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

**Modified Project Alternative**

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

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANALYSIS APPROACH

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

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

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

IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

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

1. Land

Land Coverage Impacts

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

Topography and Ground/Soil Stability Impacts

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

2. Air Quality

Substantial Air Pollutant Emissions and Deterioration of Ambient Air Quality Impacts

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

Vehicle Miles of Travel

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

**Stationary Emissions**

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

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

**Objectionable Odor Impacts**

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

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

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

3. Water Quality

Alteration in Drainage Patterns and Rate of Runoff Impacts

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

Water Quality Impacts

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

Groundwater Flow and Quality Impacts

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

Water Supply Impacts

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

4. Vegetation

Alteration of Native Vegetation and Habitat/Rare Plant Species Impacts

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

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

5. Wildlife

Wildlife Species (Including Rare Species) Impacts

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

Fishery Impacts

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

Community Noise Equivalent Level Conflict Impacts

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

Traffic Noise Impacts

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

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

Stationary Noise Impacts

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

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

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

7. Light and Glare

New or Modified Exterior Lighting and Glare Impacts

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

8. Land Use

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

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

9. Natural Resource

Substantial Increase in Use of Natural Resources or Nonrenewable Resource Impacts

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

10. Risk of Upset

Exposure to Hazardous Material Impacts

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

Emergency Evacuation Plan Conflict Impacts

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

11. and 12. Population and Housing

Alteration of Population and Growth Rate Impacts

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

Displacement of Residents and Housing Impacts

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

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

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

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

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

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

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Public Services Impacts

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

15. Energy

Substantial Use or Increase in Energy Demand Impacts

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

16. Utilities

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Utilities Impacts

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

17. Human Health

Exposure or Creation of Health Hazard Impacts

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

18. Scenic Resources

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

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

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

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

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

19. Recreation

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

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

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

20. Archaeological/Historical

Adverse Impacts to Archaeological or Historic Sites or Their Use

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

21. Findings of Significance

Natural Resource and Archaeological/Historical Impacts

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

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

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

**Cumulative Impacts**

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

**Environmental Impacts That Result in Adverse Effects on Human Beings**

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

**IMPACTS OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

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

1. Land

Land Coverage Impacts

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

Topography and Ground/Soil Stability Impacts

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

2. Air Quality

Substantial Air Pollutant Emissions and Deterioration of Ambient Air Quality Impacts

Mobile Emissions

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

Stationary Emissions

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

Objectionable Odor Impacts

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

Alteration of Air Movement or Change in Climate Impacts

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

3. Water Quality

Alteration in Drainage Patterns and Rate of Runoff Impacts

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

Water Quality Impacts

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

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

Water Supply Impacts

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

4. Vegetation

Alteration of Native Vegetation and Habitat/Rare Plant Species Impacts

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

Removal of Native Trees Impacts/Impacts to Old Ecosystems

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

5. Wildlife

Wildlife Species (Including Rare Species) Impacts

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

Fishery Impacts

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

6. Noise

Community Noise Equivalent Level Conflict Impacts

Traffic Noise Impacts

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

Stationary Noise Impacts

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

Single Event Noise Impacts

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

7. Light and Glare

New or Modified Exterior Lighting and Glare Impacts

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

8. Land Use

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

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

9. Natural Resource

Substantial Increase in Use of Natural Resources or Nonrenewable Resource Impacts

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

10. Risk of Upset

Exposure to Hazardous Material Impacts

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

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

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

11. and 12. Population and Housing

Alteration of Population and Growth Rate Impacts

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

Displacement of Residents and Housing Impacts

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

13. Transportation/Circulation

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

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

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

14. Public Services

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Public Services Impacts

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

15. Energy

Substantial Use or Increase in Energy Demand Impacts

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

16. Utilities

Altered and/or Increased Demand for Utilities Impacts

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

17. Human Health

Exposure or Creation of Health Hazard Impacts

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

18. Scenic Resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

20. Archaeological/Historical

Adverse Impacts to Archaeological or Historic Sites or Their Use

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

21. Findings of Significance

Natural Resource and Archaeological/Historical Impacts

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

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

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

Cumulative Impacts

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

Environmental Impacts That Result in Adverse Effects on Human Beings

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

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

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

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

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

- This alternative would not include roadway improvements in the Tahoe Vista and Lake Forest areas and would not provide further assistance in the implementation of TRPA EIP projects 649/436 (Snow Creek Wetlands Restoration), 748 (Four Corners Bikeway Summit to Tahoe Vista Recreation Trail), and 10038 (National Avenue Tahoe Vista Connection Trail).
TRPA INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following Checklist documents the potential environmental impacts of the proposed North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Area Plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will the proposal result in:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</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>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet deep?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</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>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</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>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</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>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Air Quality

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

## 3. Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposal result in:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
<td>Data Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Is the project located within 600 feet of a drinking water source?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Vegetation

**Will the proposal result in:**

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

## 5. Wildlife

**Will the proposal result in:**

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

**6. Noise**

**Will the proposal result in:**

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

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels? |    | X  |                     |                   |

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

**7. Light and Glare**

**Will the proposal:**

a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting? | X  |    |                     |                   |

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

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

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

**8. Land Use**

**Will the proposal:**

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Housing</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?</td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Transportation/Circulation

**Will the proposal result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Generation of 100 or more new daily vehicle trip ends (DVTE)?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14. Public Services

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

| a. Fire protection? | X |
| b. Police protection? | X |
| c. Schools? | X |
| d. Parks or other recreational facilities? | X |
### Environmental Assessment

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

#### 15. Energy

**Will the proposal result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</th>
<th>Data Insufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### 17. Human Health

**Will the proposal result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, with Mitigation</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Scenic Resources/Community Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Be visible from any state or</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federal highway, Pioneer Trail or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Lake Tahoe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Be visible from any public</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation area or TRPA designated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle trail?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Block or modify an existing view</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seen from a public road or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be inconsistent with the height</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and design standards required by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the applicable ordinance or Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Quality Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Create additional demand for</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create additional recreation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have the potential to create</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflicts between recreation uses,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either existing or proposed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in a decrease or loss of</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public access to any lake, waterway,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or public lands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Archaeological/Historical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. Findings of Significance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, with Mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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September 7, 2010

TRPA – APC and TRPA Governing Board

Re: Placer County RDA proposal to amend Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code

Dear Board Members,

During the past few months a contingent of community members have reviewed the North Lake Tahoe Preliminary Redevelopment Plan dated April 2010, attended a presentation in front of NTRAC on April 8th, and also participated in one of the Placer County focus group meetings on April 7th with other community members and agency staff. Additionally, a presentation was given on May 18, 2010 at the BOS meeting held at NorthStar (presentation Attachment A).

There is no question that many of the components of the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) goals are joint goals with the community and include:

1. Reducing blight;
2. Improving substandard housing conditions;
3. Upgrading deficient infrastructure;
4. Revitalizing the local economy;
5. Improving the quality of life for local residents, workers and visitors.

Due to economic conditions and the cost of redevelopment, many developers, small business owners, etc simply can not afford to make the improvements to their properties without some type of public or other assistance. Additionally, the RDA maps that supplement the report are also based on areas with future needs of Affordable Housing, Best Management Practices (BMP’s), and Environmental Improvement Projects which affect large areas of North Stateline, Brockway, Kings Beach, Tahoe Vista, Lake Forest and Tahoe City. The County intention is to amend the plan concurrently with the proposed but yet unapproved TRPA Regional Plan Update in order to piggy back on the Regional plan environmental analysis.

In this plan, Placer County along with TRPA is promoting “special” or increased allowed height, increased density, and coverage for those projects proposing affordable housing. Additionally projects “seeking consideration under the provisions of the Plan, must contribute to the implementation of one, or more, of the EIP projects identified for each of the proposed community areas.

The RDA is asking to amend TRPA Chapter 15 to allow parcels currently not contained within the Community Plan boundaries to also receive incentives for increased density, height and land coverage. The report states “There are redevelopment opportunities on property outside of the current Community Plan boundaries. This Plan proposes that those projects within an approved TRPA Redevelopment area, meeting the provisions specified in this Plan, be exempt from the requirements to be located within a Community Plan Area.”

However this proposal is in direct conflict with Chapter 15 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances which states:

“Eligible redevelopment plan areas shall be in adopted Community Plans which are predominantly urbanized ( Subsection 15. 2 A. Community Plans- “Except for the demonstration plan provided for in the chapter, no redevelopment plan shall be adopted unless it is within an adopted community plan.” Section 15.6 B.

Placer County is proposing to include thousands of acres of land to be added into the Redevelopment Area defined by Chapter 15. We are unsure of how much area is located outside the CP boundaries and what the impacts of including this land into a Redevelopment Area will be.

Simply requesting more height, density, and coverage without very specific parameters, and guidelines for such is of particular concern to the communities.

We feel that the community must have a chance to weigh in during the community plan process before TRPA amends their codes to allow redevelopment areas outside community plans and give special incentives to those areas.
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Creative communities have realized that their best assets are what drew them to the place originally. Preservation based revitalization based on maintaining diverse neighborhoods, scenic vistas, open space, preservation of vegetation, managed traffic, quality of life, facade improvements, green development and meaningful mitigation with nexus. Rules must be specific to character, massing, scale, height, and scope.

We would also like to know if the RDA is going to update the 1997-2002 Runyan report? Is there really a shortage of several hundreds of affordable units at the Lake? What are the boundaries delineated in the Runyan report for the Lake Region? Does this just include the Placer County portion of the North Shore or the entire south and north shore? Currently, housing prices are down over 30% and falling making many homes now affordable that were not in the past.

Vacancy rates for rentals are also high. We would like to see a current demand study based on a current need. (Redeveloping what is existing affordable and blighted should always continue to be a high priority in every plan area such as the Domus projects on the back streets of Kings Beach and hopefully the trailer park on National Ave).

The RDA report is vague regarding the level of contribution an individual project must make to identified EIP’s but requires that they contribute. Is the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan to help the private sector with projects or for the private sector to help the County with EIP’s?

We question why the RDA has not made their desire to amend Chapter 15 to include the Placer County RDA more public? The County is advocating a plan that places height, density and coverage increases throughout thousands of acres on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe and proposes these changes outside of Community Plan boundaries.

Having one or two focus group meetings, and an “informational only” NTRAC meeting is not adequate public comment. It is also difficult to add meaningful input if we don’t know what the specific projects will be. RDA has five years in which to develop a more specific plan. The County as well as the TRPA must analyze the impacts of the population increase due to increased density, neighborhood compatibility as a result of including non CP parcels, threshold attainment as a result of additional vehicle trips and possible worsening of LOS, change to a communities character as a result of increased project massing, increased height and coverage, analysis of cumulative impacts, demand for infrastructure, removal of vegetation, and diminished open space, and conformance with thresholds for all of the proposed projects. Reliable explicit criteria must be established as to the benefit of each project proposed with input from the communities affected by the proposed projects.

The bigger picture is that planning is being done piece meal with significant amendments to Chapter 15, CEP’s, changes to PAS, Community Plans, and the TRPA Code of Ordinances that preview the Regional Plan Update. By the time we actually get an approved Regional Plan, most of the increased density/height/coverage decisions will have been made. Last year the County advocated for 100% affordable housing density increases at the jurisdiction of the Planning Director. Unsure is the sphere of influence of this proposed density increase. CEP and other special projects have requested increases in height and density which may be appropriate in some instances but not appropriate in others.

Carrying Capacity: Can the Lake handle what may turn out to be substantial (re)development? Shouldn’t we first have an idea of where we stand as to the Lake’s carrying capacity? Maybe, after first figuring this out, we may find the Lake doesn’t have the ability to accept any more development.

What is the acreage of area outside CP boundaries for each of the plans proposed for the extra incentives? What criteria was used to justify this inclusion? What project are envisioned by the RDA on land not included within CP boundaries?

Tahoe Vista has a current CP that has never had a conformance check as required by TRPA Chapter 14 Code. All of the entitlements have been handed out such as Commercial Floor Area (CFA) and most of the residential allocations, however, very few of the required mitigations measures have been implemented. Our current CP required projects to be implemented such as sidewalks, bike trails, parking management plan, under grounding of utilities, reduction of traffic trips, etc. How can we advocate for more projects when the existing requirements have simply not been met?
How can the report say that the RDA Plan meets or will meet the goals of the TRPA community plan and thresholds when Chapter 15 says the opposite? The code does not allow parcels outside CP boundaries to be part of a TRPA RDA. This is a major inconsistency.

Additionally, the redevelopment plan must meet certain findings for adoption as stated in Section 15.10 F. Does RDA have the data showing how the RDA plan is consistent with Chapter 15.10F? This section says that the RDA plan must conform to applicable plan areas statements and adopted community plans. The County proposes to annex in parcels that are outside of the CP boundaries which is specifically not allowed under Chapter 15. Has the RDA identified the existing coverage within the individual plan areas?

What is specifically meant by “Consideration of any substantial redevelopment undertaking must have input from the community affected by the proposed activity ?.” Does this mean that public input will be considered or that it is just a requirement of the RDA Plan? Therefore, when is the appropriate time for these concerns to be addressed and how will these concerns be translated into code?

In conclusion,

- The Community and the RDA have common goals as identified previously. The community understands redevelopment’s desire to implement BMP’s and EIP projects but this goal is not clearly defined.
- The Language proposed in the RDA Plan advocating for extra density, height, and coverage is too vague and must be much more specific.
- The County looks to TRPA for the Plan to be in conformance with policy and goals. Who is ultimately responsible for the goals and the policies? What agency has the ultimate jurisdiction?
- TRPA Chapter 15 code does not allow parcels outside the CP boundaries to be eligible for Redevelopment status. Why is the County proposing something that is not allowed?
- Redevelopment projects require reduction in coverage yet the RDA Plan and the TRPA transect zoning advocates an increase in coverage for commercial and mixed use sites? How is this resolved?
- What level of public input will the RDA seek as part of amending Chapter 15? It is our understanding that the RDA is seeking TRPA approval of its plan and modified boundaries, request for extra height, density and coverage etc. How can the TRPA approve a plan that advocates including areas outside CP boundaries as part of the plan when TRPA currently does not allow this and the public specifically has no knowledge of the Counties proposals?

Please be assured that the communities would like to see redevelopment. The Community also would like to see funding for EIP and BMP projects. The concerns being expressed are based on the public’s first review of this plan. We would urge the APC to take a hard look at what is being proposed by Placer County and require additional public input. We would also caution allowing incentives outside community plan boundaries.

Sincerely,
Ellie Waller, Friends of Tahoe Vista
Placer County is asking TRPA to adopt Chapter 15 before the Regional Plan update- The proposed boundaries encompass hundreds of acres of land- both inside as well as outside community plans. The RDA proposes assistance with BMP’s as well as increased height, density and coverage incentives yet the public is unaware of what areas are scheduled merely for BMP’s and what areas are scheduled for the increased height, and density.

Does Placer County know how the proposed redevelopment plan is going to interact or affect the Regional Plan? If the RDA plan is based on Alternative 2- transect zoning, why is the RDA including areas outside community plans to concentrate development?

Is staff, the Planning Commission as well as yourselves knowledgeable regarding TRPA’s proposed RDA boundaries in relation to transect zoning? Does the County agree that transect zoning is the best choice for our limited infrastructure environment? Do you fully understand the transect zoning concepts and overlays proposed? Have you read the 118 Page RPU Fact Sheet # 3 compiled by the TRPA staff? If not, how can you possibly make any decisions related to the land use element????

What public input is the County garnering regarding these issues? Several community members attended one focus group meeting. A list of questions was given to the RDA. Not all the questions have been answered. Some of the suggestions were taken into consideration yet others were not?

Admittedly we can learn from other resort destinations but we are not apples to apples. What other alternatives were evaluated or considered and why weren’t public hearings conducted explaining the different approaches and why transect was selected?

How much capital has been spent to date on transect application to Lake Tahoe by Placer County?

When will you begin environmental impact studies to determine if the transect designations selected for each community are correct based on your findings of those impacts? As well as evaluation to threshold attainment?

How does Placer County intend to involve the community when updating community plans?

The North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan was certified on July 16, 1996 as was the Environmental Impact Report. The current Implementation Plan is April 4, 2006 to April 2, 2011.

Is a new five plan being prepared and when will there be a public comment period for that new plan? Will the community be able to submit requests for funds associated with the new plan?

In November 2005 the Agency commissioned a consultant to conduct a land use and market study for the Project area to help guide the Agency investment in development projects. Is that study still valid or will a new study been commissioned?

As a result of the Market Land Use Demand Study, the Agency anticipates entering into Owner Participation Agreements that are structured to meet redevelopment goals and stimulate local redevelopment efforts in Kings Beach, Tahoe Vista and Tahoe City. Can you tell me what projects have been promoted in Tahoe Vista besides the $500,000 for the Tahoe Vista Rec Area Phase Two parking lot project?

Where have the funds that were allocated for the Highlands Village Senior Housing project and the Tahoe City Marina parking garage, that will not been built, been allocated to?
The plan states “supporting affordable senior housing is also a priority”- is there another project planned at this time? On the same Page (page 19) of the North Lake Tahoe Redev Project Area “As part of the process, the Agency anticipates allocating funds toward new mixed use development, which will support affordable housing opportunities in Kings Beach and Tahoe City” I assume the Kings Beach project is Domus, what is proposed in Tahoe City and where will it be located?

Is $6 Million still allocated for investment in a multi-family workforce housing development in Tahoe Vista?

How much of the $50,000 that was allocated to the Regional Plan Update been spent to date?

It was stated in the 2006-2009 Redevelopment Plan that $500,000 was allocated to the Tahoe City Transit Center how much has been spent to date? $500,000 was allocated to BB LLC for a predevelopment loan- the status is on-going- how much has been spent to date? Have any additional funds been allocated for the Ferrari Family project?

The community has had limited opportunity to comment on the Placer County proposal to amend TRPA Chapter 15. Chapter 15 on the South Shore was for a very specific area- the Casino corridor. We feel the Placer County proposal for the North Shore is too broad a scope. If infrastructure improvements, BMP’s etc are the goal then these should be identified. If others are for obtaining more density, height and coverage then these areas should also be identified along with the projects proposed that are seeking the additional height, density and coverage. Chapter 15 outside the community plan boundary should also be very carefully examined and publically vetted. Going outside the CP boundary is contrary to TRPA’s current goal of concentrating development within the community plans. We do not know what will actually be adopted in the Regional Plan Update. Is the Environmental Assessment you propose to submit available for public consumption?

Respectfully,
Ellie Waller
Tahoe Vista Resident