

Chapter 8

SCENIC RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY DESIGN

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The visual landscape of the Tahoe Region presents one of its most impressive qualities. It contains the unusual combination of rugged mountain peaks, the vast, flat lake surface, and thickly forested slopes. This combination of landscape elements makes it one of the truly unique places in the world.

Despite significant development and alteration of the landscape for over a century, the Tahoe Region continues to attract visitors due to its powerful and stunning inherent landscape character, which successfully maintains visual dominance over most of the area. It is the natural features of views offered from the region's scenic corridors and recreation areas and bike trails that the framers of the TRPA Compact intended to preserve when they declared, "Maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic ... values provided by the Lake Tahoe Basin." (TRPA Compact, Public Law 96-551-Dec. 19, 1980, Article I)

8.2 BACKGROUND

The TRPA Compact provided for the development and implementation of environmental threshold carrying capacities or 'thresholds'. In 1982, the threshold study team completed the scenic resource inventory and evaluation necessary to define and establish threshold standards for preservation of scenic quality. At that time numerical standards were established for roadway and shoreline travel route ratings, and roadway and shoreline scenic quality ratings. Additionally, TRPA adopted a management standard policy statement for overall community design elements. In 1993, TRPA adopted numeric standards for designated public recreation areas and bike trails.

The high quality scenic environment of the Tahoe Basin is the result of several factors:

1. The dominant element of the Lake, a water feature visible from many areas of the Basin, that results in a single large feature type.
2. Distinctive mountain landforms that surround the flat plane of the lake and create an enclosed landscape type.
3. Skyline (often ridgelines) that define the earth-sky silhouette.
4. Conspicuous water-land edges.
5. Conspicuous edges between different vegetation types.

6. Numerous feature elements, such as streams and rock formations, and sand and rocky beaches that are less dominant than the lake, but create smaller feature landscape types on a sub-scale.

Although the Tahoe landscape is extensive, varied, and complex, viewers predominantly see the landscape from major roadways or from the lake itself. Privately held lands are generally located around the perimeter of the lake, in most cases along major roadways, and it is on these lands that major development has occurred.

Large areas of the Basin in public ownership (national forests and state parks) offer natural landscapes of exceptionally high quality. These areas are generally not as easily accessible to the average visitor or resident as those lands near major roadways, and for this reason, are seen by most viewers as more distant background or middle ground, rather than foreground landscapes. Publicly owned areas are managed to provide recreational opportunities for the public. Development and operation of recreational use areas can have effects on visual quality and result in visual problems on these public lands, as can be seen with the Heavenly Resort ski runs. These effects are generally limited in extent and minor in comparison with residential and commercial development on private lands.

Most viewers see the landscape either from major roadways or from the Lake waters. Despite their relative importance, the lands immediately surrounding the Lake and, in most cases, along major roadways, are privately owned; and are where most development has taken place. Consequently, these are also the areas where the scenic quality is most threatened. Scenic deterioration results from types of development that: dominate or are incompatible with the natural landscape; are in locations visible from major roadways, block important views and remove vegetation and natural features, and alter the topography. Therefore, the focus of the scenic study was on identifying visual resources components and establishing thresholds for major visual resources that can be seen from major Basin roadways and from the Lake itself, as these are the areas of greatest use by both visitors and residents. Further discussion on the development of the thresholds follows.

The purpose of the 1982 Study Report was to establish threshold standards for the protection of scenic quality and development of a methodology for measuring change in scenic quality over time. The team began by developing a draft value statement focusing the scope of their work on protection of the natural landscape while also emphasizing the identification and protection of existing visual resources as envisioned and outlined in the 1980 Compact. This three-part value statement was derived from existing goal statements contained in various TRPA, local, state and federal documents relating to the Tahoe Basin. They are as follows:

1. Maintain and enhance the dominant natural-appearing landscape for the vast majority of views and lands in the Basin.
2. Maintain and/or improve the aesthetic characteristics of the man-made environment to be compatible with the natural environment.
3. Restore, whenever possible, damaged natural landscapes.

These value statements were compiled from existing goal statements contained in various documents adopted by TRPA or local, state, or federal agencies with jurisdiction in the Tahoe Basin. It was used to focus the scope of work on protection of the natural landscape and improvements in the built environment. The scope of work also emphasized identification and protection of existing scenic resources.

8.2.1 MEASUREMENT AND MONITORING OF INDICATORS AND STANDARDS

SR-1 Travel Route Rating

The travel route rating threshold tracks long-term, cumulative changes to views seen from major roadways in urban, transitional, and natural landscapes in the region and changes to the views seen from Lake Tahoe looking toward the shore. To secure threshold attainment, all travel routes with a 1982 score of 15.5 (roadway) or 7.5 (shoreline) or greater must maintain their scores, and all travel routes with a 1982 score of 15 (roadway) or 7 (shoreline) or less must improve their scores until the threshold score is reached.

To establish the threshold travel route ratings, an updated analysis of the principal travel routes was conducted in 1982. The analysis became the baseline condition of existing resources, so that threshold levels can be tied to measurable degrees of change in resource status, which would result from change in the landscape. The 33 shoreline units defined by the 1971 study were used for this inventory.

Each scenic shoreline unit was surveyed and evaluated. The 1982 update evaluated scenery for each shoreline unit based on the following criteria:

1. Man-made features along the shoreline.
2. General landscape/background views from the shoreline units.
3. Variety of scenery from the shoreline units.

For the analysis within each criterion, numerical grades were assigned from 1 to 5, with 1 for low, 3 for medium, and 5 for a high rating. For the scoring, the threshold study team traveled at a slow speed around the lake at a distance from shore similar to that traveled by sight-seeing boats. A continuous section of lakeshore with similar landscape characteristics was designated as a unit. Shoreline units could have scores from a minimum of 3 to a maximum of 15; the actual scores ranged from 5 to 14. The results of the 1982 update were summarized in the 1982 *Study Report for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities* (TRPA 19892) and became the baseline condition against which the threshold standards were measured.

The adopted threshold policy was expressed in numeric terms, and represents existing scenic quality for each shoreline unit. It also recommended that the scenic quality of the travel experience (travel route rating) on major roadways and shoreline units should be monitored through periodic updates (threshold evaluations) of the scenic analysis of principal travel routes, to maintain and attain

the ratings established in the 1982 update. The policy stated the following: "Maintain the 1982 travel route ratings on all roadway and shoreline units. Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below and shoreline units rated 7 or below."

In practice, the adopted threshold rating (i.e., existing scenic quality) was to be maintained or improved and mechanisms for ensuring this level of scenic quality were adopted in the Regional Plan. This threshold was based on average scenic quality as the minimum threshold standard to be met in achieving attainment, and beyond that to maintain the baseline condition for units that had better than average scenic quality.

SR-2 Scenic Quality Rating

The scenic quality rating threshold protects specific views of scenic features of Tahoe's natural landscape that can be seen from major roadways and from the Lake. To secure threshold attainment, all 1982 scenic quality scores must be maintained.

The Threshold Study Report recommended the use of a second threshold system known as the Scenic Quality Rating, to focus on the relative scenic quality of individual scenic resources that could be seen from the same travel routes (Iverson et al. 1992). The purpose of scenic quality thresholds is to maintain or enhance existing scenic resources. Building on previous work by the Forest Service, the scenic resources in the region including views of the natural landscape and distinctive natural features were identified, mapped, described, and evaluated in 1982. There are 205 scenic resources visible from the roadway units and 185 from shoreline units, including three roadways and one shoreline resource added in 2001. They include the following types of resources:

1. Foreground, middleground, and background views from roadways of the natural landscape;
2. Views to Lake Tahoe from roadways;
3. Views of Lake Tahoe and natural landscape from roadway entry points into the region;
4. Unique landscape features such as streams, beaches, and rock formations that add interest and variety, as seen from roadways;
5. Views of the shoreline, the water's edge and the foreground as seen from the Lake;
6. Views of the backdrop landscape, including the skyline, as seen from the Lake; and
7. Visual features seen from the Lake that are points of particular visual interest on or near the shore.

Scenic quality threshold ratings are a unitless composite index of relative scenic quality of specific natural features. As defined in the 1982 Study Report, the

relative quality of each resource is rated using the following indicators: unity, vividness, variety, and intactness. The indicators are well documented in academic and professional literature as useful measures of relative scenic value between resources.

Each indicator is rated using an index from zero (absent) to three (high). Ratings for all four indicators are summed to form the threshold rating. The ratings are intended to express comparative scenic quality ratings of low (rating of one), moderate (rating of two), and high values (rating of three), among all roadways or all shoreline mapped resources and should not be mistaken for absolute measurements of scenic quality.

Scenic quality ratings do not provide a means of evaluating urban or recreational development, but are used to ensure that development does not remove or substantially degrade individual scenic resources. The ratings are used to evaluate development only insofar as development affects natural features. This threshold is much more sensitive to change from development than the travel route rating threshold, because the view of the resource can be blocked or significantly modified by an individual project. It can, however, be difficult to accurately predict the effects of a development proposal on a specific resource during the project review process until it is too late.

SR-3 Public Recreation Areas and Bike Trails

The public recreation area threshold protects the viewshed from public recreation areas and certain bicycle trails. To secure threshold attainment, all 1993 scenic quality scores must be maintained.

The Public Recreation Area and Bike Trails threshold applies to 37 public recreation areas including beaches, campgrounds, and ski areas. It also applies to 11 segments of Class I and Class II bicycle trails. Views and scenic resources visible from these areas were considered of value because they are major public gathering places, they are generally highly scenic to begin with, and they are places where people are static (compared to the travel routes) and have more time to linger and focus attention on the views and resources.

The threshold contains three general types of scenic resources: (1) views from the recreation area or bicycle trail; (2) views of natural features within the recreation area or along the trail; and (3) visual quality of man-made features within the recreation area or adjacent to the trail. For bicycle trails, lake views are also included and rated. Threshold ratings for views from the recreation area or bicycle trail, views of natural features, and lake views use the same criteria established for the scenic quality rating system. This involves ratings for unity, vividness, variety and intactness. Each of the criteria is assigned a value from one (low) to five (high). The sum of the ratings for each indicator is the threshold rating for the resource. Man-made features are rated using different criteria than for other threshold indicators. The following criteria respond to the visual character of the built environment rather than the natural environment:

- Coherence refers to a coordinated approach to the man-made facilities in terms of possessing some unifying characteristic or quality.

- Condition refers to the general physical condition of the man-made elements.
- Compatibility is the sense of fit between the man-made features and the surrounding natural landscape. Man-made features that are highly compatible blend in with their surroundings and defer to the form, colors, and textures of the natural landscape.
- Design quality refers to the relative presence or lack of architectural qualities that make the man-made elements a visual feature in and of themselves.

Man-made features are evaluated against each of the criteria and assigned a numerical rating between one (low) and five (high). The sum of the ratings for each indicator is the threshold rating for the feature.

As with the other thresholds, the ratings are intended to express comparative scenic quality ratings of low, moderate, and high values, and should not be mistaken for absolute measurements of scenic quality.

SR-4 Community Design

The community design threshold is a policy statement that applies to the built environment and is not restricted to roadways or shoreline units. Design standards and guidelines found in the Code of Ordinances, the Scenic Quality Improvement Program, and in the adopted Community Plans provide specific implementation direction. To secure threshold attainment, design standards and guidelines must be widely implemented to improve travel route ratings and produce built environments compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreational values of the region.

The visual quality of the built environment has also become an issue of increasing importance to residents, local businesses, and community leaders. Because the early design and signage policies of the local governments and TRPA were inadequate, there was a critical need to develop greater sensitivity to site design and visual impacts to protect the Lake's future as a premiere vacation area.

The Goals and Policies contain a Community Design Subelement within the Land Use Element, which sets forth policies for new and existing development. The following goals in the Regional Plan guide implementation of the threshold.

- Goal #1 - Insure preservation and enhancement of the natural features and qualities of the region, provide public access to scenic views, and enhance the quality of the built environment.
- Goal #2 - Regional building and community design criteria shall be established to ensure attainment of the scenic thresholds, maintenance of desired community character, compatibility of land uses, and the coordinated project review.

The community design threshold is implemented in two ways. First, the community plan and redevelopment plan process has been used to develop design standards

and guidelines that are tailored to the needs and desires of individual communities. The standards are considered “substitute” standards because they replace all or portions of TRPA ordinances adopted to regulate the same subject. This process has been used extensively throughout the region to provide community-specific sign standards, yet it has also addressed issues such as building height and architectural design guidelines. Secondly, the site planning and design principles contained in the ordinances and guidelines are implemented as part of individual development or redevelopment projects, and are reviewed and approved, by TRPA and local government.

8.3 THRESHOLD STATUS

The history of monitoring and assessment differs for the distinct elements of the scenic quality and community design thresholds. Region-wide monitoring for travel route ratings occurred in 1971, 1982, 1986, and as part of the 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2006 Threshold Evaluations. Monitoring of the community design threshold was conducted as part of the 1991, 1996, 2001 and 2006 Threshold Evaluations. This represents the most extensive and well-documented chronology of change to resources available within TRPA’s entire environmental threshold evaluation system. In contrast, the bike trails and recreation areas were inventoried in 1982, and their condition assessed based solely on fieldwork completed for their associated roadways in 1993 and 2001.

8.3.1 SR-1 TRAVEL ROUTE RATINGS

Status of Indicators

Non-Attainment

The 2006 status includes 32 roadway units in threshold attainment and 21 units out of attainment with the travel route rating criteria. This is an increase of five additional units reaching attainment status and no new units falling into non-attainment since 2001. Overall, a total of 22 roadway units showed improvements in scenic quality accounting for an increase of 23.5 points.

The 2006 condition for shoreline units includes 20 shoreline units in threshold attainment and 13 units out of attainment with the travel route rating criteria. Compared to the 2001 situation, none were raised into attainment and none were dropped into non-attainment (although improvements were noted in the shoreline). The status of each unit is outlined in Appendix 1.

This threshold is in non-attainment but monitoring has shown a positive trend that is tracking towards attainment within the roadway units. Monitoring indicates the same for shoreline units however; it is more difficult to predict the schedule for attainment in the shoreline. The trend in shoreline units is starting to show positive trends at the parcel level as a result of the adoption of the Shoreland Ordinances following the 2001 Threshold Evaluation. However, a critical massing of projects has not been realized in individual shoreline units to directly result in scenic quality rating increases at the unit level.

Trends

Fieldwork completed for this evaluation identified several clear trends related to scenic threshold issues. The following paragraphs discuss trends important for the travel route.

Improvements in Commercial and Urban Districts

The majority of roadway units with improved scores fall partially or wholly within community plan areas. Removal of degraded structures, improvement in architectural quality of new and remodeled structures, increased landscaping and landscaped open space, decreases in highway curb cuts, and improved signage have all contributed to a remarkable transformation in many of these units. This improvement affects both travel route and scenic quality ratings. Current plans for continued improvement in this unit are expected to result in threshold attainment.

Improvement in Shoreline Units

It is difficult to predict the schedule for attainment in the shoreline. The trend in these units is starting to show positive trends at the parcel level as a result of the adoption of the Shoreland Ordinances following the 2001 Threshold Evaluation. However, a critical mass of projects has not been realized in individual shoreline units to directly result in scenic quality rating increases at the unit level. However, cumulative improvements are being realized basin wide in the shorezone.

2006 Status Evaluation Relative to Threshold Attainment Schedules

The contribution of compliance measures to threshold attainment and the achievement of interim targets are summarized in the Compliance Forms at the end of this chapter and Appendix A.

Threshold interim target status

Previous Threshold Evaluations established interim targets for travel route rating improvements needed to assure threshold attainment within the 20 year Regional Plan timeframe. Since that time, travel route scoring has been modified to allow for half point increases/decreases. Assessment of the targets for this evaluation, therefore, recalculates the total points needed in each jurisdiction for threshold attainment. It then evaluates actual point changes in 2006 against the interim targets presented in the in the 2001 Threshold Evaluation. This is presented below in Table 8-1.

See Table SR-1 in Compliance Form SR-1 for updated interim targets.

Table 8-1: Status of SR-1 Interim Targets

Jurisdiction	Total Points Needed for Complete Threshold Attainment following 2006 Evaluation	Change to Units Following 1991 Evaluation	Change to Units Following 1996 Evaluation	Change to Units Following 2001 Evaluation	2001 Target Met	2006 Targets	Change to Units Following 2006 Evaluation	Target Met?
El Dorado County								
Roadway	3	-2	+0.5	+0	No	+4	+6.5	Yes
Shoreline	1.5	-1	+0	-0.5	No	+1	+0	No
City of South Lake Tahoe								
Roadway	28	+1.5	+1.5	+5	No	+10	+3.5	No
Shoreline	0	+0	+0	+1.5	NA	+0	+0	NA
Placer County								
Roadway	31	+4	+4	+7.5	Partial	+7	+4.5	Partial
Shoreline	7.5	-1	-1.5	-0.5	No	+4.5	+0.5	No
Washoe County								
Roadway	7	-2.5	+0	+2	Partial	+4	+2.5	Partial
Shoreline	+0	-3	+0	-1	No	+1.5	+0	No
Douglas County								
Roadway	6.5	-2	+0	+2.5	Partial	+2.5	+6.5	Yes
Shoreline	+0	-1	-0.5	-0.5	No	+0.5	+0	No

¹ The total points needed for threshold attainment reported in the 1989 Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) have been revised to reflect threshold attainment at 15.5 for roadway and 7.5 for shoreline units.

Threshold Target Dates

Roadway scenic quality in many developed commercial centers is improving. Several factors contribute including the concentration of public and private attention and funds and the planning direction and incentives provided by community plans. Considering existing trends and planning efforts, and the scope of needed improvements to reach attainment, roadway units 18 and 25, Carnelian Bay and Crystal Bay, are positioned to reach attainment in the short-term. In addition, continued improvements in Unit 20B, Kings Beach and Unit 33, The Strip, are underway and may produce scores much closer to attainment within the next five years.

It is difficult to predict the schedule for attainment in the shoreline units. The scenic problems in these areas do not lend themselves to single public works or redevelopment projects that can be targeted, pursued, and then implemented. The trend in these units is generally positive since the adoption of the shoreland ordinances. Although, in the past five years, improvements have been noted at the parcel level it has not yet translated to the unit level. A critical mass of projects in any one shoreline unit has not been realized that would result in a rating increase. It is anticipated that with the recent modifications to Code design allowances for shoreland and anticipated shorezone ordinances, the negative trend will be reversed and improvement towards threshold attainment can be realized within the timeframe of the updated Regional Plan or by 2011.

8.3.2 SR-2 SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS

Status of Indicators

Non-Attainment, but Near Attainment

Overall this threshold is non-attainment, but near attainment. Minor changes were detected in 2006 relative to the most recent 2001 Threshold Evaluation. As of 2006 the status of SR-2 is 6 roadway and 16 shoreline scenic resources in non-attainment. Compared to 2001 this is an improvement of 1 roadway and 1 shoreline resource reaching attainment. This evaluation also noted improvements to one roadway resource that is currently in attainment as a result of a scenic improvement project. Appendix 2 contains details of the changes noted in this evaluation.

Trends

Trends affecting the scenic quality rating indicator are the same as those described above for the travel route rating indicator.

2006 Status Evaluation Relative to Threshold Attainment Schedules

The contribution of compliance measures to threshold attainment and the achievement of interim targets are summarized in the Compliance Forms at the end of this chapter and Appendix A.

Threshold Interim Target Status

Previous Threshold Evaluations established interim targets for scenic quality rating improvements needed to assure threshold attainment within the 20 year Regional Plan timeframe. The assessment of the targets for this evaluation, therefore, recalculates the total points needed in each jurisdiction for threshold attainment. It then evaluates actual point changes in 2006 against the interim targets presented in the 2001 Threshold Evaluation. This is presented in Table 8-2 below.

See Table SR-2 of Compliance Form SR-2 for updated interim targets.

Table 8-2: Status of SR-2 Interim Targets

Jurisdiction	Total Points Needed for Complete Threshold Attainment following 2001 Evaluation	By 2002	By 2004	By 2006	Change to Units Following 2006 Evaluation	Target Met?
El Dorado County						
Roadway	0	--	--	--	--	--
Shoreline	1	+1	--	--	+0	No
City of South Lake Tahoe						
Roadway	0	--	--	--	--	--
Shoreline	0	--	--	--	--	--
Placer County						
Roadway	3	+1	+1	+1	+0	No
Shoreline	5	+1	+1	+3	+0	No
Washoe County						
Roadway	2	+1	+1	--	+0	No
Shoreline	9	+3	+3	+3	+0	No
Douglas County						
Roadway	2	+1	+1	--	+0	No
Shoreline	4	+1	+2	+1	+0	No

Threshold Target Dates

As discussed earlier, this evaluation did not see any improvement or degradation over the 2001 conditions. Eight roadway resources are still out of attainment while 17 shoreline resources are out of attainment. With the overall trend towards improvements in the roadway units it is expected that with time the non-attainment roadway resources will reach threshold attainment ahead of the shoreline units. The shoreline resources are expected to reach attainment albeit at a much slower pace as improvements are implemented under the shoreland ordinances and the application of painting, re-roofing, and residing consistent with the Munsel Color requirements. Threshold attainment for scenic quality ratings is expected within the timeframe of the updated Regional Plan or by 2011.

8.3.3 S-3 PUBLIC RECREATION AREAS AND BIKE TRAILS

Status of Indicators

Non-Attainment, but Near Attainment

Overall this threshold is in non-attainment, but near attainment. The 2006 condition for scenic resources for recreation areas and bike trails indicates a total of 2 resources reaching attainment while 5 remain in non-attainment status. Of the five remaining non-attainment resources, two resources showed an improvement of +0.5 point each, but not enough to bring them into full attainment. This evaluation also noted improvements to 13 scenic resources that were already in attainment due to redesign and redevelopment and the addition of two new resources to existing inventoried sites. Appendix 3 contains details of the changes noted in this evaluation.

Trends

Since threshold adoption in 1993, important improvements to recreation areas and bike trails have been funded, resulting in upgraded and new facilities available to the general public. Substantial investment leading up to the 2006 Threshold Evaluation greatly improved the maintenance of many facilities and added needed new facilities. Landscaping and parking lot improvements at Eagle Falls Picnic Area have improved an already highly rated resource a total of 4 points. Major improvements to Vikingsholm/Emerald Bay were noted in the previous evaluation. In the current evaluation the design quality score has been raised 1 point to account for the completion of the recreation area sign that blends and is appropriate for the historic character of the area.

Nearly all the recreation areas assessed displayed good or improving maintenance conditions, and several areas offered dramatically improved facilities. The lake access projects funded by the California Tahoe Conservancy offer the best example of use of public funds to both create and improve the scenic quality of public recreation areas. Redeveloped beach parcels in Tahoe City, Kings Beach, Carnelian Bay, and Tahoe Vista restore important landscape characteristics and offer built features completely in harmony with the natural landscape and high expectations of the recreational visitor. The City of South Lake Tahoe (El Dorado Beach), Nevada State Parks (Memorial Point), California State Parks (Vikingsholm parking area), and the Incline Village General Improvement District (Incline Beach) are other examples of organizations making improvements.

Impacts From Changing Off Site Conditions

The primary concerns related to recreation areas and bike trails are changing scenic conditions occurring off site. The primary off site feature creating concern is shoreline and littoral parcel development. Trends related to construction of large shoreline residences and increases in length of piers potentially have impacts on views from recreation areas. However, this evaluation noted that these impacts can generally be mitigated through design changes because these resources are static. A good example is the required mitigation to redesign the proposed bulkhead at the Tahoe City Marina so that it does not intrude into the existing viewshed from Commons Beach. Applying this level of scrutiny at the project review level for projects that are adjacent to identified recreation areas will generally result in no net degradation of scenic resources.

Public Recreation Areas and Bike Trails Not Protected

This evaluation continues to note a high number of developed public recreation and bikeway facilities that are not included in the 1993 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation inventory. This includes recent expansion of existing areas as well as developed recreation facilities that are located within noted units, but are not included in the inventory. It also includes property more recently acquired for public recreation purposes or simply overlooked during earlier inventory processes. This growing list exposes recreation sites important to residents and visitors to inadvertent loss of scenic quality.

2006 Status Evaluation Relative to Threshold Attainment Schedules

The contribution of compliance measures to threshold attainment and the achievement of interim targets are summarized in the Compliance Forms at the end of this chapter and Appendix A.

Threshold Interim Target Schedules

The assessment of the targets for this evaluation, therefore, recalculates the total points needed in each jurisdiction for threshold attainment. It then evaluates actual point changes in 2006 against the interim targets presented in the in the 2001 Threshold Evaluation. This is presented in Table 8-3 below.

TRPA should update the following two recreation areas in the updated Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Plan scheduled for adoption in 2008 to add new identified resources: Sand Harbor Feature-4-j and Eagles Falls-Feature 27-c. See Table SR-3 of Compliance Form SR-3 for interim targets for the seven non-attainment scenic quality resources.

Table 8-3: Status of SR-3 Interim Targets

Jurisdiction	Total Points Needed for Complete Threshold Attainment following 2001 Evaluation	By 2002	By 2004	By 2006	Change to Units Following 2006 Evaluation	Target Met?
Washoe County						
Sand Harbor Resource 4-2	1.0	1.0	--	--	1.0	Yes
Sand Harbor Resource 4-7	4.5	2.0	2.0	0.5	0.5	Partial
Incline Beach Resource 7-2	1.0	1.0	--	--	1	Yes
Burnt Cedar Beach Resource 8-2	1.0	1.0	--	--	0.0	No
Burnt Cedar Beach Resource 8-b	1.0	1.0	--	--	0.5	Partial
Douglas County						
Zephyr Cove Resource 2-3	1.0	1.0	--	--	0.0	No
Cave Rock Resource 3-a	1.0	1.0	--	--	0.0	No

Threshold Target Dates

Three of seven resources or features out of threshold attainment can be improved with a remedial project planned and implemented by the recreation provider. Attainment for these resources is expected by 2011. The improvement schedule for the rest of the non-attainment resources is more difficult to predict but is expected to be achieved in the timeframe of the updated Regional Plan.

8.3.4 SR-4 COMMUNITY DESIGN

Status of Indicators

Non-Attainment, but Near Attainment

This threshold is in non-attainment, but near attainment. The effects of changes to the built environment, central to the evaluation of the community design threshold, are identified and discussed throughout this report. Although a numerical standard to assess threshold attainment for community design does not exist, it is possible to draw conclusions from other numerical ratings. Overall, the contributions from the built environment toward attainment for travel route and scenic quality ratings have increased dramatically over time beginning with the first evaluation and accelerating in the past ten years. Specifically, the quality of the built environment is being enhanced in most areas of the Basin with the majority of improvements occurring within the urban/commercial centers. The goal of maintaining desired character cannot be attained in many communities because of the failure to specify desired community character.

Trends

The fieldwork and assessment completed for this evaluation noted several important trends related to community design standards. They are described below.

Increased Use of Regionally Appropriate Architectural Elements and Other Design Changes

As noted previously, substantial public and private investment in redevelopment has and is occurring in the Lake Tahoe Region. Almost without exception, new projects introduce high quality materials and involve superior design elements. Both commercial and residential redeveloped properties often include design characteristics commonly called “Tahoe rustic” or “Old Tahoe” or “National Park”. This includes use of peeled logs, natural wood and stone exterior siding, and steeply pitched roofs with dormer windows. Many projects also include paned glass for windows and richly detailed garden areas. These design elements often create regionally appropriate architectural improvements compared to the structures they replace.

Public/Private Projects Making Substantial Improvements

Throughout the region, public and joint public/private investments have produced substantial improvements to community character. These projects include several sidewalk/landscaping projects, erosion control and water quality improvement projects, land buy-out by public agencies that involves removal of decrepit structures, and the numerous projects involved in the South Lake Tahoe redevelopment area. Without exception, investment made in these projects has resulted in improving the sense of place and the functionality of core community areas. As noted in other sections of this chapter, public leadership in these projects has often encouraged private investment on nearby properties, expanding the benefits beyond the public project area boundaries.

Change in Community Character

Goal #2 of the Community Design Threshold states, “Regional building and community design criteria shall be established to ensure...maintenance of desired community character...” The Regional Plan defines community character very broadly as “that which respects the recreational and natural values of the region.” Some community plans and the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan provide more specific direction. These plans use a combination of descriptive themes, allowed heights and densities, and allowed uses to define the desired future for the commercial areas. However, even with this level of detail many of the current community plans do not define community character specifically. For example, they do not include descriptions of the specific features, either those currently in place or planned for the future, that make a given area distinct.

Most areas of the region lack a definitive statement concerning community character or a clearly articulated set of guidelines. These areas may, in fact, lack a broad community consensus about what such a character is or should be. In the absence of such a statement, it is possible to identify a change in character, but not to definitively assess the effect of that change relative to the requirements of Goal #2, i.e., how can one “maintain desired community character” if that character is not well defined?

2006 Status Evaluation Relative to Threshold Attainment Schedules

The contribution of compliance measures to threshold attainment and the achievement of interim targets are summarized in the Compliance Forms at the end of this chapter and Appendix A.

Threshold Interim Target Status

No interim targets are established for community design; however, it is possible to draw conclusions from other numerical ratings. Overall, the contribution from the built environment to attainment for travel route and scenic quality ratings has improved. If the trends noticed in the past evaluation continues it is expected that the community design threshold standards will be achieved within the timeframe of the updated Regional Plan.

Threshold Target Dates

Although a numerical standard to assess threshold attainment for community design does not exist, it is possible to draw conclusions from other numerical ratings. Overall, the contribution from the built environment to attainment for travel route and scenic quality ratings has improved. The trends are generally positive in most developed commercial centers. Outside of these areas, scenic improvement trends are slower but improving.

The goal of maintaining desired character cannot be attained because of the failure to specify desired community character in many communities. It is anticipated that this goal will be achieved through the place-based planning process that involves substantial public involvement. The question of desired community character can be answered for those communities that lack strong statements of desired community character. The results of this planning process would be used to update the Community Design Threshold. It is expected that with clearly defined community character desired conditions adopted as part of the new plan,

attainment of this threshold is expected within the timeframe of the updated Regional Plan or by 2011.

8.4 EIP IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

8.4.1 COMPLETED EIP PROJECTS AND CONTRIBUTION TO THRESHOLDS

Approximately 80 Environmental Improvement projects focused on scenic resource improvement have been identified in the Environmental Improvement Program. TRPA records indicate that 15 of these improvement projects have been completed to date. In addition another 22 EIP projects have had numerous subprojects completed to date (Table 8-4).

The Scenic Resources EIP (10/30/00) contains 89 projects. Most of these projects involve public or private investment in physical improvements. Some of them, however, are modifications to the regulations that will reduce the negative effects of new projects. Considering the current trends presented in this report, it illustrates a direct link between the physical improvements that have occurred and the direct increases and improvements in the scenic quality of the Basin identified in the monitoring data. Most noteworthy are the urban design projects in the north and south shore, the under grounding of utilities on the California side and the public improvements to recreation facilities. All these improvements have directly improved the scenic quality ratings at the travel route and at the scenic resource level.

An additional regulatory project has been completed (amending the City of South Lake Tahoe sign ordinances) that has resulted in an overall benefit to the scenic program. The adoption of the shoreland ordinances has created a more objective project review process and has shown small incremental improvements within the shoreland areas of Lake Tahoe.

The EIP program is currently in the process of being updated. Therefore, recommendations for projects directed toward meeting attainment of the scenic thresholds will be made through that process.

Table 8-4: Completed EIP Capital Improvement Projects

EIP Number	Title	Project Description	Status
58	Highway 50 Utility Under grounding Elks Club Drive Area	Utility companies & El Dorado County will put underground existing overhead utilities lines along Hwy 50 near Meadowvale Drive, property owner will remove derelict buildings, and billboards.	Completed
60	North Stateline Community Plan Urban Design Project	Washoe County, NDOT, casinos & other property owners will install urban design and WQ improvements. Phase I will begin in 1998 and only include Nevada side.	Completed
83	Scenic Road Unit #7 Meeks Bay Improvement	Implement landscape frontage improvements, access controls, sign conformance, replace fence at campground, reforestation of resort campground throughout the mapped area of concern. Underground utility lines adjacent to roadway.	Multiple subprojects completed
86	Scenic Road Unit #11 Homewood Improvement	Implement landscape frontage improvements, access controls, building upgrades, sign conformance & walkways throughout the mapped area of concern. Underground utility lines adjacent to roadway throughout the unit.	Subproject completed
87	Scenic Road Unit #13 Sunnyside Improvement	Implement landscape frontage improvements, access controls, building upgrades, sign conformance & walkways throughout the mapped area of concern. Underground utility lines adjacent to roadway. Remove solid barriers along Ward Creek.	Subproject completed
88	Scenic Road Unit #14 Tahoe Tavern Improvement	Install landscape frontage improvements, access controls, sign conformance, building upgrades throughout the mapped area of concern.	Subproject completed
89	Scenic Road Unit #15 Tahoe City Improvement	Install Tahoe City downtown project: sign conformance, access controls, landscaping frontage improvements, walkways & building upgrades throughout the mapped area of concern.	Subproject completed
91	Scenic Road Unit #18 Carnelian Bay Improvement	Install landscape frontage improvements, access controls, sign conformance, building upgrades, walkways throughout the mapped area of concern. Convert existing head-in parking to parallel parking.	Subproject completed
93	Scenic Road Unit #20 Tahoe Vista Improvement	Multi-phase project involving landscape frontage improvement access controls, walkways, architectural upgrades. Screen or relocate satellite dishes, sign conformance w/cp standard utility	Subproject completed

EIP Number	Title	Project Description	Status
94	Incline Village State Route 28 Downtown Pedestrian Paths	Construct new pedestrian paths, sidewalks, landscaping, and water quality improvements. This will be Phase I of the Scenic Roadway Unit #22 improvement projects needed for threshold attainment.	Completed
95	Scenic Road Unit #25 Ponderosa Area Improvement	Ponderosa Ranch design and site improvements: landscape frontage improvements, screen or relocate satellite dishes, access controls, walkways, sign conformance, building upgrades in conformance with community plans.	Multiple subprojects completed
96	Scenic Road Unit #31 Meadow Improvement	Underground overhead utility lines adjacent to roadway throughout the unit. Access controls, walkways, sign conformance, landscape frontage improvements, and landscape screening along US 50 within the mapped area of .	Completed
97	Scenic Road Unit #32 Casino Area Improvement	Underground overhead utility lines adjacent to roadway throughout the unit. Landscape center median throughout casino core, walkways, screen or relocate satellite dishes, landscape frontage improvements, sign conformance, architectural improvements.	Multiple subprojects completed
98	Scenic Road Unit #33 The Strip Improvement	Install Tahoe City downtown project: sign conformance, access controls, landscaping frontage improvements, walkways & building upgrades throughout the mapped area of concern.	Completed
99	Scenic Road Unit # 35 Al Tahoe Improvement	Install landscape frontage improvements. Building upgrades, shared-use path, access controls, screen or relocate satellite dishes, sign conformance throughout the mapped area of concern. Replace overhead lights in large parking areas along US 50. Screen tennis courts at middle school , install non-reflective roofs on middle school buildings.	Multiple subprojects completed
100	Scenic Road Unit #36 Airport Area Improvement	Install landscape frontage improvements. Building upgrades, walkways, access controls, screen or relocate satellite dishes, sign conformance throughout the mapped area of concern. Underground utility lines. This is Phase II of the project.	Multiple subprojects completed
102	Scenic Road Unit #44 Kingsbury Grade Improvement	Sign conformance, sidewalks, and utility undergrounding.	Multiple subprojects completed
104	Scenic Road Unit #40 Brockway Cutoff Improvement	Install Tahoe City downtown project: sign conformance, access controls, landscaping frontage improvements, walkways & building upgrades throughout the mapped area of concern.	Completed

EIP Number	Title	Project Description	Status
106	Scenic Shore Unit # 15 Tahoe City Improvement	Revegetate slope in commons beach, add landscape screening between lake and commercial development, replace light-colored metal roofs with darker colors, clean up appearance of marina upgrade building materials on large metal warehouse.	Completed
108	Scenic Shore Unit # 19 Carnelian Bay Improvement	Implement CTC Carnelian Bay projects, reduce color contrast on Sierra Boat Co. building and related scenic improvements. Add landscape screening to uses within mapped area of concern.	Completed
134	Tahoe City Utility Undergrounding Phase 2	Underground overhead utility lines adjacent to roadway throughout the unit.	Completed
331	City of South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Area Sign Replacement Program	Redevelopment Agency will implement the sign ordinance, establishing a low interest revolving loan fund within the redevelopment plan area (Stateline/Ski Run CP) to bring existing signs into compliance.	Completed
336	Tahoe Meadows Linear Park	Construct a multiuse path along highway 50 from the intersection of Pioneer Trail and US 50 to Ski Run Boulevard. Implement landscape frontage improvements between the highway and the path.	Completed
420	Carnelian Bay State Rout 28 Utility Undergrounding	Sierra Pacific Power and Pacific Bell will put underground overhead utilities along SR 28 in Carnelian Bay CP.	Completed
503	Scenic Road Unit #2 Camp Richardson Improvement	Reduce excess signage, install landscape screening, especially along campground, reduce clutter and distractions visible from roadway, underground utility lines, improve organization of uses along roadway at resort.	Multiple subprojects completed
506	Scenic Shore Unit #30 Edgewood Improvement	Add landscape screening and reduce clutter in mapped areas of concern, underground utility lines along shoreline reduce contrast of lakefront structures.	Subproject completed
541	South Stateline Highway 50 Scenic Improvement	Hold a design workshop with the gaming alliance to re-start implementation of the scenic improvement package and develop contingency plan for lack of 3 travel lanes through casino core.	Completed
869	Scenic Road Unit #22 Crystal Bay Phase II	Phase II scenic improvements along SR 28 through Incline commercial and tourist CPS and other mapped areas of concern does not include utility undergrounding.	Multiple subprojects completed
872	US 50/Ski Run Boulevard Utility Undergrounding	Underground overhead utility lines at the intersection of US 50 and Ski Run Blvd. Additional undergrounding up Ski Run Blvd. to Pioneer Trail is scheduled for Phase II.	Completed

EIP Number	Title	Project Description	Status
875	Sign Amortization Program	Phase I consists of TRPA conducting inventory of non-conforming signs and notifying sign owners Phase II consists of sign owners bringing signs into conformance. Separate schedules in effect in PAS 032, 089a.	Completed
10001	Roadway Unit #2 Camp Richardson	Landscape and screen parking areas; landscape, revegetate and screen group campground; prevent roadside parking.	Multiple subprojects Completed
10003	Roadway Unit #25 Ponderosa Landscape Screening	Landscape screening needed along Ponderosa Ranch Parking and stables, Tahoe Storage Units need to be screened , parking needs to be organized to eliminate off site parking and screen on site parking.	Multiple subprojects completed
10007	Roadway Unit #28 Spooner Summit Restore Temporary Construction Sites	Additional work needs to be completed at the intersection of Hwy 28 and Hwy 50. Recent road work has caused reduction in the unit score which was already at risk. The guardrails need redesigning to reduce contrast, new parking lot needs landscaping, and the construction staging area needs to be fully restored.	Subproject completed
10009	Roadway Unit #28 NDOT Maintenance Yard Spooner Summit	NDOT maintenance yard needs improved screening, siting, and design of structures. Spooner Summit is a Gateway to Tahoe. Attaining and Preserving Scenic quality within this gateway is a priority.	Completed
10013	Shoreline Unit #4 Taylor Creek Meadow Parking Lot Improvement	Screen Parking lot from lake view shed.	Completed
10014	Shoreline Unit #5 Ebright	Minimize the visibility of the new trail that was cut through manzanita and other shrubs on California State Park land between Eagle Point and Cascade Properties	Completed
10015	Shoreline Unit #6 Emerald Bay Road Scar Treatment	Vikingsholm dirt road scars along north slope of Bay need to be revegetated and rock used in stabilization should be stained a darker color.	Completed

8.5 THRESHOLD NEED FOR CHANGE

A conclusion of this evaluation is that two of the scenic threshold standards, management standards and policies require re-evaluations for either recalibration or amendment. These changes also relate to updating the management system itself and coordination with other agencies. It is the recommendation of this report that TRPA should pursue the amendments to the environmental threshold carrying capacities developed and recommended as part of the Pathway 2007 process. The sections below summarize the proposed amendments. As noted,

amendments are scheduled for action with adoption of the Regional Plan package in 2008, while others will require further development and analysis by TRPA. The proposed changes include replacing the current value statements with the statement of an all encompassing vision for scenic resources, and more specific threshold goals for natural environment and community design.

The following proposed Vision Statement and Threshold Goal Statements reflect the recommended basis for changing the existing threshold standard.

Scenic Quality Vision: The Lake Tahoe Basin is internationally recognized for its outstanding natural beauty and is a resource of national significance. Characteristic views within the Basin are of the natural appearing forest, meadows, mountains, and expansive blue lake. The built environment harmonizes with this natural appearing setting in a sustainable manner that supports a vibrant community and healthy economy.

In addition to the vision statement, two separate threshold goals were developed. They include:

Threshold Goal 1 - Natural Environment: Scenery viewed from Lake Tahoe and the Basin's major roadways, public recreation areas, trails, and urban centers predominantly displays natural appearing forest, meadows, mountains, and the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. Development, where visible, complements the natural setting.

The scenic thresholds (SR-1, 2, and 3) fall under this threshold goal.

Threshold Goal 2 - Community Design: Communities of the Lake Tahoe Basin are planned and designed with aesthetic characteristics that respect the local natural systems. Lake Tahoe's built environment is diverse yet appropriate in scale and style. It helps foster the identity of individual communities and a sense of place.

The community design threshold (SR-4) falls under this threshold goal.

The Tahoe Scenic Threshold System is unique and innovative for the time of its development in the 1970s. However, as the system has evolved over thirty years in order to address new trends, it has grown and changed incrementally. The Scenic Threshold System is in need of reorganization and streamlining. This section assesses discusses a basis for substantive amendment to the system based on key principles for appropriate scenic resource management in the Basin.

8.5.1 SR-1 THROUGH SR-3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Threshold Recommended Changes

The primary recommendation is to amend the threshold goal, indicator, and standard for Natural Environment and SR-1 Travel Route Ratings that reflects a need to have standards based on the extent of visual evidence of development in different areas throughout the Basin if Tahoe's scenic beauty is to be preserved.

The threshold goal for the natural environment is to preserve and enhance the scenery as viewed from Lake Tahoe and the Basin's major roadways, public recreation areas, trails, and urban centers as natural appearing forest, meadows,

mountains, and the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. Development, where visible, appears subordinate to and harmonious with the surrounding setting. This threshold goal proposes to use Scenic Integrity as an indicator which is a measurement of visible development, its contrast, and its dominance of the landscape. The recommended standard is to maintain or achieve the assigned numerical Scenic Integrity Level rating assigned each roadway and shoreline unit to achieve the desired condition for scenic resources. These proposed changes will apply to lands within the Tahoe Basin visible from TRPA's identified scenic roadway and shoreline corridors and will be implemented upon adoption of a new TRPA Regional Plan.

It is recommended that the existing thresholds and standards for SR-2, Scenic Quality Ratings and SR-3 Public Recreation Areas and Bicycle Trails are maintained in the new TRPA Regional Plan.

Rationale for Change

The Travel Route Rating Methodology forms the backbone of the larger Scenic Threshold System. The Travel Route Ratings are based on a mix of factors that were not specifically designed to reflect the needs of the transitional areas and the urban areas. The Travel Route Rating Methodology assumes all parts of the roadway have the same inherent scenic quality and visual absorption capability and assumes all parts of the shoreline have the same inherent scenic quality and visual absorption capability.

The scenic thresholds are set up in a manner that anticipates all roadway units and all shoreline units will achieve or exceed a similar acceptable rating despite differences in the inherent landscape character of each unit and capability to visually absorb development. Although it is ideal to have a high degree of natural scenic quality in all units, those which do not have views of the Lake or are dominated by development are in essence penalized under the current system.

While the goal is still to maintain or improve the scenic quality of the Lake Tahoe Basin, there needs to be some adjustments for attaining improved scenic quality in urbanized areas.

As discussed above, there is a need to change the existing threshold standards and indicators based on technical information that illustrates the current system does not account for differing landscape themes present in the Basin, and generally is not sensitive to the desired vision of a community as it relates to the built environment.

8.5.2 SR-4 COMMUNITY DESIGN

Threshold Recommended Changes

The primary recommendation is to amend the threshold goal, indicator, and standard for SR-4 Community Design to reflect a need to have standards that are appropriate for the Region, but yet recognize the desired visual attributes of a community and are measurable.

The proposed threshold goal for Community Design states that development in the Lake Tahoe Basin is planned and designed with aesthetic characteristics that respect the local natural systems and that the built environment is diverse, yet appropriate in scale and style, and fosters the identity of individual communities and creates a sense of place. The proposed indicator for this threshold is the

implementation of applicable design and development measures such as height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signage, and siting. The recommended standard is to achieve implementation of the design and development measures (height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signage, siting and other design elements) in new, remodeled, and redeveloped buildings in a manner that is compatible with the natural, scenic, recreation, and community desired visual values for the Region. TRPA has not developed a quantitative method to measure attainment other than to rely on the other indicators.

The ideal indicator for community design would be implementation of applicable development and design measures that create and reflect a regionally appropriate design and character for the Lake Tahoe Basin. The design and development measures would be based on accepted elements of design such as height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signage and siting.

The standard for community design would be based on implementation of the design and development measures at a regional and sub-regional perspective that reflects the regionally appropriate design. The list of specific design elements that reflects desired community visual values can be formulated for a Region as a whole and for each distinct community.

Progress toward achieving community design standards would be assessed through measurement (field inspections) of the indicators listed above. These proposed changes will apply to the built environment within the Tahoe Basin and will likely be implemented in the future after further analysis by TRPA..

Rationale for Change

The recommended changes to existing thresholds for Travel Route Ratings are based on the findings that new scientific or technical information indicates that a threshold standard is insufficient to maintain a significant value of region. Currently, the community design threshold policy does not have measurable indicators and standards that will function within an adaptive management system.

Community design and aesthetic quality of the built environment continues to be an important element for maintaining scenic quality in the Tahoe Region. Because development either already exists or is anticipated at some level in certain areas in the Basin, it is necessary to ensure that when it does occur, development is appropriate in terms of its size, mass, architecture, and density for the area (i.e. landscape type) and reflects the valued visual attributes of the community in which it will be located.

8.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.6.1 ALL THRESHOLDS

STATUS OF 2001 THRESHOLD RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2001 Threshold Evaluation found both improvements and increasingly troublesome trends for the scenic quality thresholds. It identified recommendations needed to reverse negative trends and move the region toward threshold attainment. Of these, nine have been accomplished.

The following discussion refers to recommendations included in the 2001 Evaluation for all four threshold indicators.

Table 8-5: Status of 2001 Threshold Recommendations

Recommendation	Rationale	Status
Buoy sticker program	Implement the proposed buoy sticker program to better identify buoys with permits and allow easier removal of those without.	Completed
Highway design standards and guidelines	TRPA should complete the task of completing the highway design standards. Coordination with Caltrans and NDOT has occurred, and initial concepts developed.	Incomplete. Staff proposes to drop this recommendation and incorporate roadway design standards into the updated Code of Ordinances
Code amendment of Chapter 71, Forest Health	Amend Chapter 71 to require a scenic professional be consulted prior to approval of all forest health projects. The thinning prescription should take into account the potential for increasing view of structures from scenic corridors. This should include a reduced cut prescription in situations with light colored structures, large amounts of glass, and reflective roof materials.	Incomplete. Staff recommends this recommendation be dropped. Staff already works closely with USFS landscape architects to reduce the overall scenic impact of forest health projects

Recommendation	Rationale	Status
Recreation area enforcement program	TRPA should work with the USFS and State Parks of both states to enforce restrictions on temporary and seasonal uses so that undesigned parking, unpermitted signage, and other uses near recreation areas, bike trails, and within the scenic corridor viewshed do not occur. (EIP #503, #10001)	Ongoing. Additional parking has been provided that has improved the parking situation in many recreation areas. Signage compliance has also improved in many recreation facilities operated by the USFS.
Region wide view enhancement and development of scenic turnouts	Targeted vegetative clearing, thinning, or pruning should be accomplished to maintain or improve lake views from certain roadway units. This must be carefully planned and executed to avoid creating new scenic impacts from other viewing points.	Ongoing
Update Shoreline and Roadway Travel Route Inventory	Update the Scenic Resource Inventory to create two shoreline units from Unit #26, Cave Rock and re-rate the units based on the threshold criteria. Update roadway unit #20, Tahoe Vista to create four new units, update roadway unit #30, Lincoln Park, to create four new roadway units, and update roadway unit #36, Airport Area, to create three new units and adopt the assigned scores from the 2001 Threshold Evaluation.	Completed
Amend Code Chapter 20, Coverage	TRPA should amend Chapter 20 of the Code to permit additional coverage to be used on driveways when the coverage will lengthen a driveway to create a deeper setback.	Incomplete
Identify and pursue scenic conservation easements	Identify and pursue the opportunity to use scenic conservation easements, to mitigate potential impacts from development in visually sensitive areas, particularly to preserve lake views.	Incomplete
Update Lake Tahoe Scenic Resource Evaluation	TRPA should update the Lake Tahoe Scenic Resource Evaluation to add newly acquired public recreation sites, developed scenic overlooks, major public gathering areas, extensions of existing bike trails, and new bike trails to assure timely threshold protection.	Incomplete

Recommendation	Rationale	Status
Review and revise Scenic Resource Thresholds	Based on the Visual Perception Survey for Lake Tahoe and the adopted evaluations, assess existing TRPA threshold standards and indicators for consistency with desired future conditions and make recommendations for revising threshold standards and indicators consistent with environmental threshold carrying capacities. Consideration should be given to developing a quantifiable system to measure scenic quality and changes in the landscape. Consideration for this assessment should include 1) classification of different landscape character types and absorption capacities, 2) development of a measurable system that can quantify effects of human activities, and 3) evaluation protocols that ensure attributes are measured accurately and precisely.	Completed
Institute a scenic monitoring program	Develop and institute a comprehensive scenic monitoring system that allows more frequent field visits and annual assessments of scenic conditions. In part, this system should identify the critical viewing periods to standardize the assessment methodology. It should also include photo documentation and be integrated into the GIS system in such a way as to allow easy access by staff and members of the public. (EIP # 609)	Completed
Develop a demonstration painting project	Develop a demonstration painting project or a widely dispersed simulation that illustrates the benefits of minimizing color contrast when choosing exterior building colors.	Incomplete
Amend Code Chapter 29, Historic Resource Protection	TRPA should amend Code Chapter 29, Historic Resource Protection, to include a region-wide inventory of historic structures, historic places, and historic development patterns that create distinctive scenic features and community character. The structures and areas inventoried would establish the important architectural and landscape architectural features necessary to consider when planning redevelopment or reuse of affected properties. It will usually be possible to protect these features and accommodate redevelopment if their details and patterns direct the manner and style of redevelopment activities.	Incomplete
Data information system	Develop a modern data archive and retrieval system that allows easy access by TRPA staff and the public to information critical to protection of scenic resources. This system should be GIS based and available on line. It should allow query from a map and by other metadata elements (e.g., date, location, name, content)	In progress. TRPA has recently purchased ACCELA which will improve the ability to retrieve data.

Recommendation	Rationale	Status
Standardize scenic requirement for project applications and develop scenic requirement checklist.	Immediately improve the ability of the TRPA Project Review staff to adequately apply existing requirements to protect scenic resources. This includes scenic evaluations which include simulations and a visual magnitude analysis for all projects visible from non-attainment and at risk roadway and shoreline units. Implement a scenic requirement checklist for use throughout the region that addresses color, roof material, setback, siting and mass, height, and window area. Additionally, TRPA should develop specific standards for scenic evaluation reports and simulations.	Completed
Amend Code Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities	Amend Code Chapter 4 to clarify that for structures visible from threshold view points, repairs and alterations to a structure's color and material must be consistent with earth tone colors and meet the Munsell Color Value of 0-6 and Munsell Chroma Value of 0-4. Clarify that the alteration of an existing roof to add a metal roof is a qualified exempt activity that requires submittal of material and color samples and shall be consistent with color ranges adopted for metal roofs.	Completed
Amend Code Chapter 4 Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 30, Design Standards, to limit the color of metal roofs to dark, matte finishes.	Amend Chapters 4 and 30 to require that metal roofs to be compatible with their surroundings and composed of non-glare earth tone colors. Metal roofs colors shall meet the Munsell Color Value of 0-4 and Munsell Chroma Value of 0-4.	Completed
Scenic mitigation security	For projects visible from non-attainment and at risk areas, require project security equal to the cost of scenic mitigation measures and a five-year check on their continued presence.	Implemented
Develop new design standards for development on littoral parcels	For all littoral parcels, develop a new approach to design standards that allows a streamlined and quantifiable review process for adherence to protective standards and a more flexible process with increased review and evaluation. The streamlined process should include establishing bulk/massing limits that allow some increase in structure size, yet avoid the greatly increased mass and scale. (This bulk/mass limit would be established by amending Chapter 30. This process should also include specific requirements for color, setback, landscaping, roof material, and window area. A more flexible process should include improved design standards, yet could allow a wider field of design choices based on inherent characteristics of a particular site or neighborhood. In the future, a more flexible system should also allow for certain tradeoffs, such as increased height for increased setback. (EIP #537).	Completed

Recommendation	Rationale	Status
Develop scenic banking and offsite mitigation program	TRPA should develop a system to bank scenic credit. This system should address the problem of removing structures in advance of a specific project proposal for redevelopment of the site. Dr. Stephen Sheppard is currently working on this program. (EIP #542)	Incomplete
Complete and adopt proposed shorezone ordinances	Adopt the proposed Shorezone Ordinance with the new shorezone scenic system. Until these provisions are adopted, TRPA should use the determination of visual landscape type, the adopted visual magnitude system outlined in the SQIP and Design Review Guidelines, and the provisions of the Scenic BMP program as tools to assess potential for significant impact and as a guide for effects of proposed mitigation.	In progress
Code amendments for Chapter 30, Design Standards	Develop a new section of Code Chapter 30, Design Standards that creates limits on the size and scale of new structures using a floor area ratio or other equivalent quantitative measure. These limits should be specific to the different landscape types (urban, transition, natural), the degree of visibility of the proposed project, and setback from scenic corridors and viewpoints. (For example, increased mass would be allowed for structures in urban areas with good vegetative screening and generous setbacks.) This would also require amendments to Chapter 22, Height Standards, to reflect a different approach to determining maximum height. (EIP #537)	Shoreland Ordinances completed. Staff is currently working on updated thresholds standards that account for different landscape types.
Amend Code Chapter 30, Design Standards, to protect lake views from the roadway, to potentially differentiate shoreline types, and to consider transfer systems.	Amend the Code to specifically require all new projects along the roadways to avoid net loss of lake views, including reducing the structural mass or height currently allowed. Project assessment must consider the effects of all aspects of the project, including primary and accessory structures and proposed landscaping.	Incomplete
Code amendment Chapter 22, Height	In coordination with a new approach to permitting size and mass of structure, TRPA should amend Chapter 22 of the Code to clearly identify how additional height findings are made, particularly with respect to establishing a tree canopy height. It will be important to include trees that will be used to provide the screening of the building or structure from the sensitive viewpoint.	Incomplete

Recommendation	Rationale	Status
Code amendment Chapter 30, Design Standards	Amend Chapter 30 of the Code to strengthen restrictions on new sports field and ski area lighting which would be visible from threshold travel routes, threshold recreation areas and bike trails, and the region's wilderness areas. TRPA should clarify the existing exterior lighting standards relative to location and direction of light sources and acceptable levels of building and landscape area lighting. TRPA should also add standards to establish specific maximum lighting levels for parking lots and garages, and more general standards for commercial, recreation and tourist accommodation uses. (EIP #537)	Incomplete
Initiate region-wide visual perception survey (VSP)	TRPA should initiate a region-wide survey to identify "desired" community character and revise development standards where needed to assure its creation or maintenance. This should be used to define a more precise threshold measure for Community Design and to amend the Community Design Threshold Policy Statement to include compatibility with historic values (see below). Community-based processes are commonly used throughout the country to develop site appropriate design standards; they include use of visual preference surveys and community workshops. Some areas of the region, particularly some of the community plan areas, already utilize this tailored approach to design standards. The rest of the region, including the shoreline properties and some urban and transitional roadways, need this same attention to community character. Benefits to improved public awareness of scenic thresholds can also be expected from this process.	Completed
Stateline CP Amendments	The Stateline CP update should discuss the need to install public design improvements, the time schedule established in the Community Plan's US 50 scenic improvement package, and the possibilities of urban improvement given the revised Loop Road project. A special improvement district or similar method should be investigated as an implementation strategy. (EIP #541)	In progress
Enhanced signage program	Work with the local governments to revise and then consistently enforce a substitute sign ordinance that meets the requirements of Code Chapter 26. Work with other jurisdictions, including the USFS related to concession areas, to improve the pace of signage replacement and compliance. (EIP #545, #546, and #875)	Incomplete

Recommended Changes for 2006

The recommendations for changes to scenic thresholds are described in section 8.5 and are also included in the Draft Pathway 2007 Evaluation Report (Version 1.1, 2006) and Technical Supplement. Some of the recommended changes will be

addressed in the 2008 Regional Plan Update. The specific changes to be brought forth in the update will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Statement to be completed before public hearings and requests for Governing Board action. The Compliance Measure updates listed in this document are intended to provide new information on monitoring, interim targets and to correct previous grammatical and factual errors. Potential changes to threshold standards and indicators will be addressed in the Threshold Update portion of the EIS for the Regional Plan Update.

Since the first threshold evaluation in 1991, scenic resource professionals have provided substantial comment on the Tahoe Region's scenic threshold system. These professionals, both TRPA staff and noted consultants, concluded that the current system embodies both positive and negative features. On the whole, the current system is difficult to use as a practical planning and implementing tool to assure maintenance of and access to the region's valuable scenic qualities.

The region benefits from a fairly well documented scenic condition, beginning with the first roadway and shoreline travel route ratings produced in 1971 and extending to comprehensive evaluation completed in 2000. This represents an internationally unique dataset for scenic monitoring. Region-wide community efforts, representing the input of a cross section of residents and stakeholders, to develop design standards and guidelines and community plans have taken place. Additionally, extensive research and program development has been undertaken to consider the scenic condition in the shorezone.

This documentation history will prove valuable as the current system is revised, although it does not include several vital pieces of information. The following specific information or techniques should be developed through the Regional Plan Update process in order to revise the scenic system to overcome its current limitations:

- Update the current Threshold Travel Route Rating System (SR-1) to change how the indicators are measured. The existing indicators for SR-1 should be replaced with the Scenic Integrity (SI) indicator. In addition, the standards for the scenic travel routes should be set based on the landscapes inherent ability to absorb visual impact.
- Develop a Scenic Integrity Level Handbook that describes the methodology for inventorying and measuring Scenic Integrity.
- Update the current Community Design Threshold from a policy statement to a more quantitative system. Adopt design and development measures as indicators and set a standard based on the Community Design Index Level (CDIL). The standard for Community Design should be based on the valued character, design, and form that is developed during the visioning process in the Pathway 2007 Place-Based planning process.

- Continue development of the Scenic Stability Indicator (SSI) as a possible method to preserve valued natural landscape features in the Basin. This would require inventorying the existing scenic quality resources and identifying those natural landscape features that are valued attributes and determining how to perpetuate them in the future.

Implementation of Supplemental Compliance Measures

No additional supplemental compliance measures are recommended at this time.

Modifications or Deletions of Past Compliance Measures

No modifications or deletion of past compliance measure are recommended at this time.

8.7 REFERENCES

- Wayne D. Iverson, Stephen R. J. Sheppard, and R. Andrew Strain. 1992. Managing Regional Scenic Quality in the Lake Tahoe Basin. *Landscape Journal*. pp. 23-39.
- TRPA. 1982. Study report for the establishment of environmental threshold carrying capacities. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Zephyr Cove, NV
- TRPA. 1989. Scenic Quality Improvement Program and Technical Appendices. Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Zephyr Cove, NV.

Category: scenic resources
Parameter: roadway and shoreline travel route rating (TRR)

1. STANDARD: maintain or improve the 1982 TRRs published in the Threshold Study Report (TRPA, 1982). Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below. Restore scenic quality in shoreline units rated 7 or below.
2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Travel route rating (TRR) as measured by a unitless composite index of relative scenic quality for all viewsheds seen from state and federal highways and Pioneer Trail, and from Lake Tahoe looking toward the shoreline using the following criteria:
 - a. man-made features along roadway and shoreline;
 - b. physical distractions to driving along roadways;
 - c. roadway characteristics;
 - d. views of the lake from roadways;
 - e. general landscape views from roadways and shoreline; and
 - f. variety of scenery from roadways and shoreline.

NOTE: Roadway threshold rating use all six criteria; shoreline threshold rating use criteria a), e), and f).
3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Since the 1982 adoption of the travel route rating threshold, the ratings have been updated in 1986, 1991, and 1996, 2001 and 2006. The travel route rating will be monitored every five years, as part of threshold evaluations. Annual photographic monitoring ~~is being~~ was implemented in 2001 for non-attainment and at risk units for both shoreline and roadway threshold travel routes. Annual monitoring will track potential adverse impacts of development on the travel routes.

The following roadway units have shown considerable scenic quality improvements and are now in threshold attainment: Unit #2, Camp Richardson, Unit #10, Quail Creek, Unit #14 Tahoe Tavern, Unit #40 Brockway Cutoff, and Unit #44 Kingsbury Grade.

Considering existing trends and ~~planning efforts and continued improvements in community design the scope of needed improvements to reach attainment,~~ the following roadway units are positioned to reach attainment in the fairly short-term. ~~Unit 18, Carnelian Bay continued improvements in community design the following roadway units are positioned to reach attainment in the fairly short-term:~~ Unit 20 B, Kings Beach, Unit 22, Crystal Bay, Unit 33, The Strip, and Unit 36C, Meyers. The trend identified in 2001 of scenic quality improvements within the basin's roadway units and within the urban areas continues in this evaluation. Improved quality of the built environment and implementation of sidewalks basin wide has directly improved the scenic quality of the roadway units and positively contributed to the Community Design Threshold. In addition, continued improvements in Unit 20B, Kings Beach and Unit 33, The Strip are underway

~~and may produce scores much closer to attainment within the next five years.~~

It is difficult to predict the schedule for attainment in the shoreline ~~and some of the urban and transition roadway units.~~ The trend in these units is ~~negative and involves the cumulative effects of small actions~~ starting to show positive trends at the parcel level as a result of the adoption of the Shoreland Ordinances following the 2001 Threshold Evaluation. However, a critical mass of projects has not been realized in individual shoreline units to directly result in scenic quality rating increases at the unit level. However, cumulative improvements are being realized basin wide in the shorezone. The scenic problems in these areas do not lend themselves to single public works or redevelopment projects that can be targeted, pursued, and then implemented. Certainly without immediate modifications to the Code design allowance, the negative trends will continue and threshold attainment on any schedule will become increasingly difficult.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-Attainment. TTRs for ~~26~~21 roadway units are in non-attainment and ~~27~~32 roadway units are in attainment. Three new roadway units ~~dropped into non-~~ reached attainment and ~~4 roadway units went into attainment as of 2001-~~ none went into non-attainment status as of 2006. In total, TRRs for ~~45~~22 roadway units increased in the ~~2001-2006~~ ratings and ~~7 roadway units decreased in the 2001 ratings~~ no decreases were detected. An additional 11 roadway units have been added to the ~~roadway unit~~ inventory. TTRs for 13 shoreline units are in non-attainment and 20 shoreline units are in attainment. ~~This is an increase of 4 additional shoreline units dropping into non-attainment.~~ In total, TRRs for ~~five shoreline units decreased and only one realized a rating increase (+1.5 pts.)~~ 1 shoreline unit increased in the 2006 ratings and no decreases were detected.

~~26 of~~ 21 of 53 roadway units, and 13 of 33 shoreline units, do not attain the threshold standard and are targeted for restoration. This is ~~an increase of 3~~ a decrease of 5 roadway units and ~~4 shoreline units~~ no change in the shoreline units since the 1996 ratings. The status of individual units is identified in the ~~2004~~ 2006 Threshold Evaluation Appendix.

This Evaluation also recommends dividing Scenic Roadway Unit #35 within the City of South Lake Tahoe into two sub-units.

5. TARGET DATE: ~~2006~~ 2011

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Every five years with the next evaluation date in ~~2006~~ 2011. Photographic monitoring will occur annually.
 7. INTERIM TARGETS: See Table SR-1 below.
 8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:
 - a. MEASURES IN PLACE: SCENIC RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY DESIGN – ~~01 through 17~~ 206 through 221, inclusive
 - b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The existing compliance measures in place ~~are moderately~~ have become more effective in attaining the threshold after TRPA implemented the 2001 Threshold Recommendation to amend Chapter 4 and 30 to implement additional design standards and the Shoreland Ordinances. The compliance measures in place include the primary ordinance standards and recommended guidelines addressing physical design and site planning. All measures in place are implemented as part of the project review and approval process.
 9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES:

Chapters 22, 26, 30, 52, 53, and 54, together with the Design Review Guidelines and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program, are the most effective compliance measures.

 - c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: Continuing implementing the following measures by TRPA to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance:
SCENIC RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY DESIGN – ~~01, 02, and 03~~ 227 & 228
 - d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: Supplemental measures are generally expected to be highly effective to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance.
- With the ~~addition of the recommended supplemental compliance measures and~~ revisions to the measures in places following the 2001 Threshold Evaluation, the compliance measures are expected to be adequate to attain and maintain the threshold.

Table SR-1 INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS: SCENIC RESOURCE THRESHOLD – TRAVEL ROUTE RATINGS (TTR) ITERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BY JURISDICTION BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE 2004 2006 THRESHOLD EVALUATION								
Travel Route Rating Interim Improvement Targets for Each Five-Year Review								
Jurisdiction	Total Points Needed For Threshold Attainment of all Non-Attainment Scenic Resources Following 2001 Evaluation	By 2001*	Actual 2001	By 2002	By 2004	By 2006*	Actual 2006	Interim Target Met?
El Dorado County								
Roadway	10	+6	+0	+3	+3	+4	+6.5	Yes
Shoreline	3	+1	-0.5	+1	+1	+1	0	No
City of South Lake Tahoe								
Roadway	20	+14	+5	+5	+5	+10	+3.5	No
Shoreline	0	0	0+1.5	0	0	0	0	NA
Placer County								
Roadway	21	+15	+7.5	+7	+7	+7	+4.5	Partial
Shoreline	10.5	+5	-0.5	+3	+3	+4.5	+0.5	No
Washoe County								
Roadway	10	+6	+2	+3	+3	+4	+2.5	Partial
Shoreline	24	+1	-1	+1	+1.5	+1.5	0	No
Douglas County								
Roadway	6.5	+4	+2.5	+2	+2	+2.5	+6.5	Yes
Shoreline	12	+0.5	.5	+1	+0.5	+0.5	0	No
* 2001 and 2006 interim targets have been revised to include the updated 1991, 1996, and 2001 Travel Route Ratings.								
** 8 additional units have been added to the Roadway Unit Threshold Travel Route Inventory.								

<p style="text-align: center;">Table SR-1 (Continued) INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS: SCENIC RESOURCE THRESHOLD – TRAVEL ROUTE RATINGS (TTR) ITERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BY JURISDICTION BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE 2006 THRESHOLD EVALUATION</p>						
		Travel Route Rating Interim Improvement Targets for Each Five-Year Review				
Jurisdiction	Total Points Needed For Threshold Attainment of all Non-Attainment Scenic Resources Following 2006 Evaluation	By 2007	By 2008	By 2009	By 2010	By 2011
<u>El Dorado County</u>						
Roadway	4.5	+1	+1	+1	+1.5	0
Shoreline	3			1	1	1
<u>City of South Lake Tahoe</u>						
Roadway	16.5	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2
Shoreline	0					
<u>Placer County</u>						
Roadway	16.5	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2
Shoreline	10.5	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2.5
<u>Washoe County</u>						
Roadway	8	+2	+2	+2	+2	
Shoreline	24	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2
<u>Douglas County</u>						
Roadway	3	+1	+1	+1-		
Shoreline	12	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2

Category: scenic quality

Parameter: roadway and shoreline resources scenic quality rating (SQR)

1. STANDARD: Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each unit, including the rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory, and the Threshold Study Report (TRPA, 1982)
2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Scenic quality rating as measured by a unitless total score of relative scenic quality of 202 specific scenic resources (e.g., natural features) visible from state and federal highways and Pioneer Trail, and of 184 specific scenic resources visible from Lake Tahoe looking toward the shoreline. The relative value of each resource within a given travel route is measured using the following criteria:
 - a. Unity
 - b. Vividness
 - c. Variety
 - d. Intactness

Each criterion is scored using a unitless score from zero (absent) to three (high). Criterion scores are summed for each identified resources identified within each unit. The total score of the four criteria is the threshold rating.

A sensitivity to change rating using a unitless rating from one (least sensitive) to three (most sensitive) is assigned to each travel unit. It is not a part of the threshold rating. Sensitivity to change rates the relative visual vulnerability of landscape units to absorb man-induced modifications.
3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Since the 1982 adoption of the scenic quality rating threshold, the ratings have been updated in 1986, 1991, 1996, and 2001. All the scenic resources are to be monitored every five years, as part of threshold evaluations. In addition, selected scenic resources are to be monitored annually. Annual photographic monitoring of selected resources is being implemented. Annual monitoring would closely track potential adverse effects of development on resources. Data regarding the effects of incremental changes to the resources due to development activity could be used as a predictive tool in future project evaluations.
4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non Attainment—Scenic Quality Ratings (SQR) improved for 11 roadway units and 5 shoreline units. SQR declined for 4 roadway units and 6 shoreline units resulting in an additional 3 roadway and 5 shoreline scenic resources falling from attainment when compared to the 1996 conditions. Only Minor changes were detected in 2006 relative to the most recent 2001 Threshold Evaluation. As of 2006 the status of SR-2 is 6 roadway and 16 shoreline scenic resources in non-attainment. Compared to 2001 this is an improvement of 1 roadway and 1 shoreline

resource reaching attainment. This evaluation also noted improvements to one roadway resource that is currently in attainment as a result of a scenic improvement project. Appendix 2 contains details of the changes noted in this evaluation. ~~one resource made sufficient improvement to reach threshold attainment.~~ Four new scenic resources have been inventoried and added to the scenic resource inventory. For details on ratings of individual scenic resources, see the ~~2001~~ 2006 Evaluation.

5. TARGET DATE: ~~2006~~2011
6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Every five years with the next evaluation date being in 2011~~04~~. Photographic monitoring will occur annually.
7. INTERIM TARGETS: See Table SR-2 below. ~~June 30, 2002, TRPA should establish permanent photographic monitoring viewpoints for annual monitoring of selected resources.~~
8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:
 - a. MEASURES IN PLACE: SCENIC RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY DESIGN - ~~04~~ 206 through ~~47~~221, inclusive.
 - b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in place include the primary ordinance standards and recommended guidelines addressing physical design and site planning. All measures in place must be implemented as part of the project review and approval process in order to maintain the scenic quality of identified resources. Chapters 22, 26, 30, 52, 53 and 54, together with the Design Review Guidelines, the Scenic Quality Improvement Program and the Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation, are the most effective compliance measures. ~~Revisions to the measures in place to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance.~~
 - c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The following Continue implementing the following measures ~~should be implemented~~ by TRPA to enhance threshold attainment: SCENIC RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY DESIGN - ~~01, 02, and 03~~227 & 228
 - d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: Supplemental measures are generally expected to be highly effective to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance.
9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: With the ~~addition of the recommended supplemental compliance measures and~~ revisions to the measures in places following the 2001 Threshold Evaluation, the compliance measures are expected to be adequate to attain and maintain the threshold standard.

TABLE SR-2:
INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS:

SCENIC RESOURCE THRESHOLDS -- SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS (SQR)

INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BY JURISDICTION

Table SR-2 INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS: SCENIC RESOURCE THRESHOLD – SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS (SQR) ITERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BY JURISDICTION								
Travel Route Rating Interim Improvement								
Jurisdiction	Total Points Needed For Threshold Attainment of all Non-Attainment Scenic Resources Following 2001 Evaluation	By 2001	Actual 2001	Revised 2002	Revised 2004	Revised 2006	Actual	Target Met?
El Dorado County								
Roadway	0	+0	0	0	0	0	0	No
Shoreline	1	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	No
City of South Lake Tahoe								
Roadway	0	NA	+3	NA	NA	NA	0	No
Shoreline	0	NA	+4	NA	NA	NA	0	No
Placer County								
Roadway	3	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	No
Shoreline	5	+1	-3	+1	+1	+3	0	No
Washoe County								
Roadway	2	NA	-2	+1	+1	+0	0	No
Shoreline	9	+2	-2	+3	+3	+3	0	No
Douglas County								
Roadway	2	NA	-2	+1	+1	+0	0	No
Shoreline	4	+1	-1	+1	+2	+1	0	No

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Table SR-2 Continued</u> <u>INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS:</u> <u>SCENIC RESOURCE THRESHOLD – SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS (SQR)</u> <u>ITERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BY JURISDICTION</u></p>						
		<u>Travel Route Rating Interim Improvement</u>				
Jurisdiction	Total Points Needed For Threshold Attainment of all Non-Attainment Scenic Resources Following 2001 Evaluation	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
El Dorado County						
Roadway	0	+0	0	0	0	0
Shoreline	1	+1	0	0	+1	0
City of South Lake Tahoe						
Roadway	0	NA	+3	NA	NA	NA
Shoreline	0	NA	+4	NA	NA	NA
Placer County						
Roadway	3	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1
Shoreline	5	+1	-3	+1	+1	+3
Washoe County						
Roadway	2	NA	-2	+1	+1	+0
Shoreline	9	+2	-2	+3	+3	+3
Douglas County						
Roadway	2	NA	-2	+1	+1	+0
Shoreline	4	+1	-1	+1	+2	+1

Category: scenic quality**Parameter: bike paths and outdoor recreation areas scenic quality rating (SQR)**

1. STANDARD: 1993 scenic quality rating of individual scenic resources visible from or within public recreation areas and bicycle trails
2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Scenic quality rating as measured by a unitless total subcomponent rating of relative scenic quality of specific resources (also referred to as subcomponents) visible from 39 public outdoor recreation areas and from 11 Class I and II – bike paths. Resource components include: views of the Lake and natural landscape from the recreation area or bike path; special landscape features, such as streams, beaches, rock formations, topographical features and special vegetation patterns; and man-made features within the recreation area. The relative value of views of the Lake, views of the natural landscape, and special landscape features visible from a given recreation area or bike path are measured using the following criteria:
 - a. Unity
 - b. Vividness
 - c. Variety
 - d. Intactness

The relative value of man-made features within the recreation area is measured using the following criteria:

 - a. Coherence
 - b. Condition
 - c. Compatibility
 - d. Design Quality

Each criterion is scored for each resource using a unitless index from one (poor) to five (high). The threshold rating for the resource is the sum (i.e., subcomponent total) of criteria scores with a possible range of four to 20. Threshold ratings for all resources are contained in the LAKE TAHOE BASIN SCENIC RESOURCE EVALUATION, 1993 and associated worksheets.
3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Threshold scores for recreation areas and bike trails were first adopted in 1993 and were not evaluated for change during the ~~1996~~ 2001 Threshold Evaluation. The 2001 Threshold Evaluation noted improvements and degradations in threshold scores, as well as new features that have been scored and added to the inventory. The 2006 Evaluation noted improvements to existing resources and no degradation. The 2006 Evaluation indicates 5 non-attainment units. This is an

improvement over the 2001 conditions with two resources reaching attainment. Of the five remaining non attainment resources, two resources showed an improvement of +0.5 point each but not enough to bring them into full attainment. The SQRs for 20 -5 resources improved while 7 resources declined in 2001 continues to be in non-attainment status.

This is an improvement of 2 units reaching attainment since the 2001. This Evaluation noted improvement to two non-attainment resources but not enough to bring it into threshold attainment. In addition, 13 resources currently in attainment realized an increased in scores due to redesign and redevelopment. Two new resources ~~have been~~ were inventoried and added to the scenic resource inventory in 2006 and this Evaluation recommends inventorying one facility for scenic resources. Annual photographic monitoring of selected resources is recommended. Annual monitoring would closely track potential adverse effects of development on resources. Data regarding the effects of incremental changes to the resources due to development activity could be used as a predictive tool in future project evaluations.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: ~~Non-Non~~ Attainment.
5. TARGET DATE: ~~Not applicable~~ 2011
6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Comprehensive reevaluation of all roadway and shoreline scenic resources every five years, ~~with the next evaluation in 2006.~~
7. INTERIM TARGETS: ~~June 30, 2002, TRPA should establish permanent photographic monitoring and viewpoints for annual monitoring of selected resources. By March 31, 2002, TRPA should update the following recreation areas to add new identified resources: Sand Harbor Feature-4-j4-l, Kings Beach-Feature 9-9, Patton Beach-Feature 12-a, 12-b, and 12-c, Kaspian Recreation Area-Feature 19-1a and 19-c Eagles Falls-Feature 27-c in the updated Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Plan scheduled for adoption in 2008, and Eagle Falls Picnic Area-Feature 27-b.~~

See Table SR-3 below for interim targets for the seven non-attainment scenic quality resources.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:
- MEASURES IN PLACE: Scenic Resources ~~AND~~ and Community Design - ~~04~~ 206 through ~~47~~221, inclusive.
 - EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in place include the primary ordinance standards and recommended guidelines addressing physical design and site planning. All measures in place must be implemented as part of the project review and approval process in order to maintain the scenic quality of identified resources. Chapters 22, 26, 30, 52, 53 and 54, together with the Design Review Guidelines, the Scenic Quality Improvement Program and the Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation, are the most effective compliance measures. Revisions to the measures in place are recommended to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance.
 - SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: ~~The following measures should be~~ Continue implementing the following measure implemented—by TRPA to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance: Scenic Resources And Community Design- ~~(02)~~227 & 228
 - EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: Supplemental measures are generally expected to be ~~highly~~ effective to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance.
9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: Threshold attainment and maintenance is enhanced with the revisions to the compliance measures in place following the adoption of the 2001 Threshold, and the continued implementation of the supplemental compliance measures listed above. In addition, the ~~R~~recommendations contained in the section of each recreation area and bike path evaluation entitled "Recommendations for Preserving the Scenic Quality" must be implemented as part of the project review process in order to maintain scenic quality ratings. Since the majority of resources are located on recreation lands managed by public agencies, many of the activities may be carried out in the operations and management of the facilities not subject to TRPA review (i.e., exempted under Chapter 4). It is incumbent upon them and their concessionaires not to inadvertently degrade the resources through operations and management activities.

TABLE SR-3 INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BIKE PATHS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE 2001 THRESHOLD EVALUATION						
Scenic Resources	Scenic Quality Interim Improvement Targets					
	Total Points Needed For Threshold Attainment of all Non-Attainment Units Following 2001 Evaluation	By 2002	By 2004	By 2006	Actual 2006	Interim Target Met
Washoe County						
Sand Harbor View 4-2	1.0	1.0			1	Yes
Natural Feature 4-7	4.5	2.0	2.0	0.5	0.5	Partial
Incline Beach View 7-2	1.0	1.0			1	Yes
Burnt Cedar Beach View 8-2	1.0	1.0			0	No
Man-made Feature 8-b	1.0	1.0			+0.5	Partial
Douglas County						
Zephyr Cove View 2-3	1.0	1.0			0	No
Cave Rock Man-made Feature 3-a	1.0	1.0			0	No

TABLE SR-3 (Continued) INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BIKE PATHS AND OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS INTERIM THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT TARGETS BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE 2001 THRESHOLD EVALUATION							
Scenic Resources	Scenic Quality Interim Improvement Targets						
	Total Points Needed For Threshold Attainment of all Non-Attainment Units Following 2006 Evaluation	By 2007	By 2008	By 2009	By 2010	By 2011	
Washoe County							
Natural Feature 4-7	4.0	+1.0	+1.0	+1.0	+1.0	--	
Burnt Cedar Beach View 8-2	1.0	--	+0.5	+0.5	--	--	
Man-made Feature 8-b	0.5				+0.5	--	
Douglas County							
Zephyr Cove View 2-3	1.0	--	+1.0	--	--	--	
Cave Rock Man-made Feature 3-a	1.0	--	+1.0	--	--	--	

Category: community design

Parameter: design of the built environment

1. STANDARD: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, to insure the height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signing, and other design elements of new, remodeled and redeveloped buildings be compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreational values of the Region.
2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Community design is measured qualitatively by the physical design of the built environment. It is indirectly measured quantitatively through the travel route rating thresholds which are identified in SR-1.
3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Evaluation of this threshold grew out of the work produced for the other thresholds. The [2001-2006](#) findings area listed below:
 New landscaping and successful erosion control revegetation are making widespread improvements in developed areas. ~~However, loss of native vegetation and inadequate screening of new and existing structures and uses are contributing to degradation throughout the Region.~~
 The commercial areas of the Region that are making the most impressive gains are doing so by creating improvements to many of the community's design elements. Improved architectural details, building siting, parking, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities all contribute.
~~The elements of the Scenic Quality Management Plan that are producing the most serious concerns are obvious: structure height, structure mass, structure materials and color, inadequate screening, and loss/lack of native vegetative screening, inadequate setbacks, and shorezone structures. Refer to SR-1 for monitoring summary of portions of the threshold travel route ratings which address the built environment.~~ The trend in shoreline units is generally positive since the adoption of the shoreland ordinances. The ordinances have resulted in improved community design features that have contributed to small incremental improvements. Although, in the

past five years, improvements have been noted at the parcel level it has not yet translated to the unit level. A critical mass of projects in any one shoreline unit has not been realized that would result in increasing the ratings.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-Attainment. ~~The primary reasons for non-attainment are the lack of progress toward amortization of non-conforming signs visible from threshold travel routes and public recreation areas, and the slow progress toward meeting interim targets for improving threshold travel route ratings. Refer also to SR-1. The trends are generally positive in most developed commercial areas, although implementation of improvement projects is progressing slowly. Most of the buildings and sites which have been developed or redeveloped since 1989 contribute to threshold attainment. Outside of these areas, existing trends are either stationary or negative. Many older buildings and sites predate the threshold and do not positively assist in attaining the threshold.~~
5. TARGET DATE: ~~2006~~[2011](#)
6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Comprehensive reevaluation of regional design review program elements are recommended in the 2001 Threshold Evaluation.
7. INTERIM TARGETS: The Community Design Threshold is linked to the Threshold Travel Route (SR-1). No interim targets are established for community design; however, it is possible to draw conclusions from other numerical ratings. Overall, the contribution from the built environment to ~~non-attainment~~ attainment for travel route and scenic quality ratings ~~precludes meeting the requirement to produce buildings compatible with the natural, scenic and recreational values of the region.~~ has improved. By July 31, 2003, TRPA should examine, as part of the Regional Plan update, amending the current community design threshold standard to reflect the design concepts and principles that are being developed through the Pathway 2007 Place-Based planning. The principles should be used as indicators for evaluating threshold attainment for community design and the built environment. ~~implement the roadway design~~

~~standards, revised height standards, revised exterior lighting and shoreline setback standards; December 31, 2006 for the removal and/or conformance of all non-conforming signs visible from threshold travel routes and public recreation areas.~~

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:

- a. MEASURES IN PLACE: Scenic Resource ~~And~~ and Community Design - ~~01~~ 206 through ~~15~~221, inclusive identified for SR-1 and SR-2.
- b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in place include the primary ordinance standards and recommended guidelines addressing physical design, site planning and signage. All measures in place must be implemented as part of the project review and approval process in order to maintain the scenic quality of identified resources. Chapters 22, 26, 30, 52, 53 and 54, together with the Design Review Guidelines, are the most effective compliance measures. Revisions to the measures in place are recommended to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance.
- c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: ~~The following~~ Continuing implementing the following measures ~~should be implemented~~ by TRPA to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance: Scenic Resource And Community Design ~~-01 and 03~~227 & 228.
- d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: Generally expected to be highly effective to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: With ~~the addition of the recommended supplemental compliance measures and~~ revisions to the measures in places following the 2001 Threshold Evaluation, the compliance measures are expected to be adequate to attain and maintain the threshold.

Appendix 1. TRAVEL ROUTE RATINGS

Roadway Units

Unit 1. Tahoe Valley (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	11	2	2	2	1	2	2
1991	11	2	2	2	1	2	2
1996	12	3	2	2	1	2	2
2001	12	3	2	2	1	2	2
2006	12	3	2	2	1	2	2

1996 Comments: The man-made features subcomponent has improved with the addition of several new and several remodeled buildings of improved architecture. The addition of a new nursery and other landscaping along the corridor has contributed to the improved condition, as well as new or remodeled signs which conform to TRPA's sign ordinance.

2001 Comments: No change to the scenic condition occurred. The scores for lake views and variety have been switched to reflect correction of a long standing typographical error. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: No Comments.

Unit 2. Camp Richardson (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	20	4	4	4	2	3	3
1991	19	4	3	4	2	3	3
1996	19	4	3	4	2	3	3
2001	18	3.5	2.5	4	2	3	3
2006	20	4	3	4	5	3.5	3.5

1991 Comments: Decrease in roadway distraction subcomponent due to added congestion with other users including mopeds, horses, cyclist; added roadside sales, rentals.

1996 Comments: There was no change to the unit's ratings during the past five years; however, an addition to the SQIP is needed to reflect the change in the 1991 Evaluation rating.

2001 Comments: Both man-made features and roadway distractions drop due to the increase in congestion and impacts from temporary and seasonal uses. This includes temporary sign and banner clutter, increased on and off street parking visible from the roadway, and outdoor storage of recreational equipment. This has occurred at Camp Richardson and at the entrance to Valhalla. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments: Improvements in scores have been realized due to recent improvements to the historic structures located at Camp Richardson and the reduction of impacts from signage and parking.

Unit 3. Emerald Bay (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	26	5	3	3	5	5	5
1991	26	5	3	3	5	5	5
1996	26	5	3	3	5	5	5
2001	26.5	5	3.5	3	5	5	5
2006	26.5	5	3.5	3	5	5	5

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This evaluation includes correction of the roadway distractions score for the period 1982-2001, reflecting on highway parking and roadway pedestrian and vehicle congestion. Building a designated trail and improving the parking at the Vikingsholm parking lot have made improvements. Landscape quality is negatively affected by standing dead trees, although this is insufficient to lower the score. Some improvement related to bare slope revegetation is noted.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 4. Bliss State Park (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	21	5	5	3	3	2	3
1991	21	5	5	3	3	2	3
1996	21	5	5	3	3	2	3
2001	21	5	5	3	3	2	3
2006	21	5	5	3	3	2	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: A new driveway entrance is noticeable, but not sufficient to degrade scores.

2006 comments: No comments.

Unit 5. Rubicon Bay (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	17	2	3	1	4	4	3
1991	18	2	3	2	4	4	3
1996	18	2	3	2	4	4	3
2001	18	2	3	2	4	4	3
2006	18	2	3	2	4	4	3

1991 Comments: Increase in road structure subcomponent due to addition of erosion control and rock slope protection of cut slope.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 6. Lonely Gulch (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	17	2	3	2	4	4	2
1991	17	2	3	2	4	4	2
1996	18	2	3	3	4	4	2
2001	18	2	3	3	4	4	2
2006	18	2	3	3	4	4	2

1996 Comments: Added rock slope protection and curb and gutter along most of this unit's length have improved the road structure subcomponent.

2001 Comments: Revegetation establishment is noticeable along the cut slopes and strengthens the score improvement noted in 1996.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 7. Meeks Bay (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	13	3	2	3	2	1	2
1991	13	3	2	3	2	1	2
1996	13	3	2	3	2	1	2
2001	14	3	2	3	2	2	2
2006	14	3	2	3	2	2	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This evaluation includes an amended score to reflect view of Meeks Creek and its meadow. Roadside parking continues to be a distraction. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 8. Sugar Pine Point (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	23	4	5	4	3	4	3
1991	23	4	5	4	3	4	3
1996	23	4	5	4	3	4	3
2001	23	4	5	4	3	4	3
2006	23	4	5	4	3	4	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Debris remaining in General Creek after the 1997 flood has not been removed. The debris is not highly noticeable.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 9. Tahoma (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	13	2	2	3	1	3	2
1991	13	2	2	3	1	3	2
1996	13	2	2	3	1	3	2
2001	14	3	2	3	1	3	2
2006	14	3	2	3	1	3	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The increase in man-made features reflects both improved structure maintenance (primarily structure painting), and an adjustment to previous ratings to reflect the generally better scenic quality in the commercial area than previously credited. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 10. Quail Creek (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	14	2	2	3	2	2	3
1991	14	2	2	3	2	2	3
1996	14	2	2	3	2	2	3
2001	14	2	2	3	2	2	3
2006	15.6	2.5	2	3	3	3	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Recent upgrades to existing residential units have improved the overall architectural features and the introduction of extensive landscaping along Highway 89 resulted in an improvement to the man-made feature score for this unit. The landscape view score was amended to reflect the sweeping and generally unobstructed panoramic view of the lake and distant east shore from this highway unit.

Unit 11. Homewood (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	13	2	1	3	3	2	2
1991	12	2	1	3	2	2	2
1996	12	2	1	3	2	2	2
2001	11.5	2	1	3	1.5	2	2
2006	12.0	2.5	1	3	1.5	2	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Reduction in lake views due to new large residences at the north end of the unit. The unscreened modular structure at Homewood Mountain Resort produces negative effects on man-made features, although it is not sufficient to drop the score. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments: Recent upgrades that has improved the overall architectural features and extensive landscaping and a sidewalk has been introduced that improves the overall aesthetic character of this unit has resulted in an improvement to the man-made features score.

Unit 12. Tahoe Pines (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	17	2	2	4	3	3	3
1991	17	2	2	4	3	3	3
1996	17.5	2.5	2	4	3	3	3
2001	17.5	2.5	2	4	3	3	3
2006	17.5	2.5	2	4	3	3	3

1996 Comments: The utility undergrounding project along the roadway near Cherry Street has slightly improved the man-made features subcomponent.

2001 Comments: The addition of several new fences continues a trend identified as a problem in the SQIP. Continuation of this trend will adversely affect the man-made features rating.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 13. Sunnyside (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	14	2	2	4	1	2	3
1991	14	2	2	4	1	2	3
1996	14	2	2	4	1	2	3
2001	14	2	2	4	1	2	3
2006	14	2	2	4	1	2	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Several large rebuilds on the lake are visible from the roadway, but generally avoid scenic degradation. However, new fences continue a generally negative trend. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 14. Tahoe Tavern (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	13	2	2	4	1	2	2
1991	14	2.5	2	4	1	2.5	2
1996	14.5	3	2	4	1	2.5	2
2001	14.5	3	2	4	1	2.5	2
2006	15.5	3	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	2

1991 Comments: Increase in man-made features and landscape views subcomponents due to redevelopment of 64-acre tract and removal of structures; organized entry and parking.

1996 Comments: The utility undergrounding project near the meadow combined with redevelopment in and near 64-Acre Tract (e.g., Tahoe Tree Co.) slightly improved the man-made features subcomponent.

2001 Comments: Parking lot redesign at the Bridgetender improves roadway distractions in that area, but the spaces left on the highway continue to add to the congestion and confusion at the bridge and prevent improvement in the score. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Renovations of the Gatekeepers Museum and associated facilities has improved the roadway distraction score. In addition, the recent completion of the bridge spanning the dam has improved visual access to lake views.

Unit 15. Tahoe City (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	12	1	1	2	3	3	2
1991	13	2	1	2	3	3	3
1996	13	2	1	2	3	3	3
2001	16.5	3	2	2	3.5	3	3
2006	16.5	3	2	2	3.5	3	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Big improvement results from the downtown project due to streetscape improvements, improved access to lake views, and reduction in roadway distractions. Some commercial facade improvements have also been made, although the loss of landscape screening in the Safeway parking lot produces unnecessary degradation. This unit is now in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Access improvements to Commons Beach is noted in this evaluation has having positive scenic benefits but not enough to warrant a change in the overall score.

Unit 16. Lake Forest (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	13	1	1	4	2	3	2
1991	13	1	1	4	2	3	2
1996	13	1	1	4	2	3	2
2001	16.5	2.5	3	4	2	3	2
2006	16.5	2.5	3	4	2	3	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Amendment to previous scores notes improved conditions related to developed areas. New homes and new office building noted, but they avoid degradation. Unit is in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 17. Cedar Flat (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	17	2	2	3	4	3	3
1991	17	2	2	3	4	3	3
1996	17	2	2	3	4	3	3
2001	15.5	2	2	3	3	2.5	3
2006	15.5	2	2	3	3	2.5	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Residential rebuilds, garages close to roadway and new fences result in important loss of lake views, reduction of landscape screening and views of native landscapes. This unit was considered at risk in 1996 and has realized a substantial drop since then. This unit is not in threshold attainment and continues to be at risk.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 18. Carnelian Bay (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	14	1	1	3	4	3	2
1991	14	1	1	3	4	3	2
1996	14	1	1	3	4	3	2
2001	15.5	1.5	1	3	4	4	2
2006	15.5	1.5	1	3	4	4	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Improvements due to landscape restoration on both sides of Sierra Boat Company and painting large marina structure. The mural on the east side provides visual interest without detracting from natural setting and produces improvement to a large flat surface. These changes improve man-made features and landscape views. The new, large commercial structure currently under construction, with no mature vegetative screening, threatens these improvements. The low man-made features score places this unit at risk. This unit is now in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 19. Flick Point (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	14	2	2	4	1	3	2
1991	14	2	2	4	1	3	2
1996	16	2	2	4	3	3	2
2001	15.5	2	2	4	2.5	3	2
2006	15.5	2	2	4	2.5	3	2

1996 Comments: No comments. (See below for explanation of the amended 1996 score.)

2001 Comments: The quality of the lake views available in this unit are higher than scored previously, so the 1996 score is amended accordingly. Changes noted in 2001 include loss of some of the lake views due to large residential rebuilds that block lake views. This unit is in threshold attainment, yet will remain at risk.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 20 A-D (Placer and Washoe Counties)

Unit 20, Tahoe Vista, is recommended to be separated into four units due to its length and diversity of character. The following scores reflect those proposed in 2001 for each new unit.

Unit 20A. Tahoe Vista (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	13	3	1	1.5	2.5	3	2
2006	13	3	1	1.5	2.5	3	2

1996 Comments: No comments made for this section.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately 1.1 miles from Stage Drive to Beach St. Improvement since 1996 includes removal of a restaurant and expansion of the lake view at Agatam Beach. Increase in mass and scale of new lakeside structures affects lake views and landscape views, but has not yet produced decreases in the score. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 20B. Kings Beach (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	12.5	2	2	1	3	2.5	2
2006	13.5	2.5	2.5	1	3	2.5	2

1996 Comments: Improvements in this area noted in 1996 are: completion of the California Tahoe Conservancy lakefront access project, several commercial remodels in Kings Beach, and completion of utility undergrounding have collectively improved the man-made features subcomponent.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately 1.2 miles from Beach St. to lakeside part of Chipmunk Dr. Improvements noted since 1996 include remodel of Safeway and landscaping and structure upgrade at the golf course, and the California Tahoe Conservancy removal of fence and spa building at North Tahoe Beach Center site. Some sign and facade improvements have also occurred in Kings Beach. The new fish mural is an improvement to a large blank wall without creating distraction from natural setting. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments:

Unit 20C. Brockway (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	16	3	3	1.5	3	3	2.5
2006	16	3	3	1.5	3	3	2.5

1996 Comments: Improvements in this area noted in 1996 are: The Brockway Hill erosion control project, with added rock slope protection, rock-lined channels and curb and gutter, has improved the road structure subcomponent.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately .7 miles from the lakeside part of Chipmunk Dr. to the state line.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 20D. North Stateline Casino Core (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	13	2.5	2.5	3	1	1	3
2006	13.5	2.5	3	3	1	1	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately .3 miles from the state line to the boundary of Unit 21. Important improvements realized with the sidewalk/landscaping project. This decreases roadside distractions and improves variety. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Removal of the billboard located within this scenic unit has improved the roadway distraction score.

Unit 21. Stateline (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	20	2	2	4	5	4	3
1991	18.5	1.5	2	4	5	3	3
1996	18.5	1.5	2	4	5	3	3
2001	18.5	1.5	2	4	5	3	3
2006	18.5	1.5	2	4	5	3	3

1991 Comments: Decrease in man-made features and landscape views subcomponent due to poorly sited new structures; new colors on condominium project; reduced views to landscape features from road.

1996 Comments: There was no change to the unit's ratings during the previous five years; however, an addition to the SQIP is needed to reflect the change in the 1991 Evaluation rating.

2001 Comments: View of large, light colored homes on the slopes above Incline Village threatens to degrade the landscape view from this roadway unit. This view increased by tree removal resulting from forest health improvement projects. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 22. Crystal Bay (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	12	1	1	2	2	3	3
1991	12	1	1	2	2	3	3
1996	12	1	1	2	2	3	3
2001	13.5	1.5	2	2	2	3	3
2006	14	2	2	2	2	3	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Improvements include new sidewalks that benefit roadway distractions, although the lack of other urban streetscape amenities limits improvement. Some in-fill structures with good setbacks and design features, and some facade improvements raise the score for man-made features. This improvement is threatened, however, by color changes to several large condo developments that are too light. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Continue construction of the sidewalks and water quality BMP project has improved the man-made features for this unit.

Unit 23 and 24. Mt. Rose Highway and Washoe Meadows (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	25	3	5	2	5	5	5
1991	25	3	5	2	5	5	5
1996	25	3	5	2	5	5	5
2001	25.5	3	5	3.5	5	4	5
2006	25.5	3	5	3.5	5	4	5

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Improvements in road structure result from landscape restoration along roadcuts with good treatments.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 25. Ponderosa Area (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	12	1	2	3	3	2	1
1991	11	1	1	3	3	2	1
1996	11	1	1	3	3	2	1
2001	11.5	1.5	1	3	3	2	1
2006	12.5	1.5	2	3	3	2	1

1991 Comments: Decrease in roadway distractions subcomponent due to addition of scattered farm machinery and unscreened outdoor vehicle storage; unapproved billboard-scale image.

1996 Comments: No change.

2001 Comments: A slight improvement to man-made features results from highway landscaping improvements along the Ponderosa parking lot and maturing vegetation in the frontage at the transfer station. More substantial improvement at the Ponderosa is prevented by the narrow width of the planted area and the vast expanse of asphalt, some of it used as an unscreened outdoor equipment storage area. This unit is not in threshold attainment and continues at risk.

2006 Comments: Removal of the non-conforming billboard at the Ponderosa Ranch has reduced roadway distractions within this unit.

Unit 26. Sand Harbor (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	26	4	3	4	5	5	5
1991	26	4	3	4	5	5	5
1996	26	4	3	4	5	5	5
2001	26.5	4	4	3.5	5	5	5
2006	27	4	4.5	3.5	5	5	5

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Roadway distraction improvement resulting from removal of some roadside parking is somewhat offset by the poor material/color choice for the rockwork in the 1998 erosion control project (the rock is too angular and too light). Standing dead tree removal has improved landscape views and lake views in some areas. The new performance amphitheater on Sand Point is visible from the highway; completion of the mitigation measures will help it blend into the background. The new Memorial Point overlook and boundary fence at the State Park entrance represent improved conditions.

2006 Comments: Construction of visually permeable fence has reduced roadway distraction within this unit.

Unit 27. Prey Meadow (Washoe County, Carson City and Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	27	4	5	4	5	5	4
1991	27	4	5	4	5	5	4
1996	27	4	5	4	5	5	4
2001	27	4	5	4	5	5	4
2006	27	4	5	4	5	5	4

1996 Comments: No comments

2001 Comments: The 2000 erosion control project includes better material/color choice (the rock is a better color and less angular). The salvage cut in this area generally avoided creating visual concerns in the roadway viewshed. The new guardrails placed at the approach to the Spooner Summit intersection are too large, a poor color, and create a sense of enclosure both inappropriate and unnecessary.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 28. Spooner Summit (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	16	3	3	3	4	1	2
1991	16	3	3	3	4	1	2
1996	16	3	3	3	4	1	2
2001	14.5	2	3	2.5	4	1	2
2006	14.5	2	3	2.5	4	1	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Work completed at the US 50/SR 28 intersection reduces the scores in a unit already at risk. The new guardrails are too large, a poor color, and create a sense of enclosure both inappropriate and unnecessary. The new snow play parking lot, while an improvement for circulation and recreation use purposes, lacks screening in a highly sensitive visual location. No progress has been made for visual improvements for the NDOT maintenance facility, the highway road cut, or the degraded roadside pull out (used as a construction staging area in 2000). This unit was considered at risk in 1996 and has since fallen out of threshold attainment. This unit remains at risk.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 29. Cave Rock (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	23	3	4	3	5	5	3
1991	23	3	4	3	5	5	3
1996	23	3	4	3	5	5	3
2001	23	3	4	3	5	5	3
2006	23.5	3	4.5	3	5	5	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Changes in this unit produce minor improvements and degradations without altering the unit's composite score. These include neutral or positive actions related to new structures in Uppaway Estates, and use of a good color choice for the wire mesh rock fall protection (otherwise a potentially negative feature). Generally negative features include use of a red metal roof at the fire station, new road cuts, and the new retaining wall near the entrance to Glenbrook.

2006 Comments: The replacement of the metal beam guardrail with an enhanced barrier rail that mimics the natural rock patten of Cave Rock has improved the roadway distraction score.

Unit 30A. Lincoln Park-Skyland (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	16	2.5	2	3.5	4	2	2
2006	16	2.5	2	3.5	4	2	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately 1.65 miles from just south of Cave Rock to the southern end of the Skyland subdivision. Changes note in 2001 include two new residences on the east side of the highway, a new water treatment structure near Cave Rock with inadequate landscaping, and a well executed salvage cut.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 30b. Tahoe School (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	16.5	3	3.5	2	2.5	3	2.5
2006	16.5	3	3.5	2	2.5	3	2.5

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately .8 miles from Skyland to and including the stream zone north of the entrance to Zephyr Cove Resort. No substantial changes noted, yet increasing roadside parking near the Zephyr Cove resort exists and could threaten roadway distractions in the future.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 30C. Zephyr Cove (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	15.5	2	3	3	3.5	2	2
2006	16	2.5	3	3	3.5	2	2

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately 1.3 miles from Zephyr Cove Resort to the southern end of the Pinewild condominium development. Degradation to roadway distractions has occurred due to the growing clutter associated with the Zephyr Cove Resort: banner signs, outdoor storage in the campground area, and on street parking. Increased view of the tennis courts in Marla Bay also detracts.

2006 Comments: Upgrades to the parking lot and extensive landscaping at Zephyr Cove Resort and complete redevelopment of the campground has improved the man-made feature score for this unit. In addition, the implementation of corten steel guardrail has contributed to this improvement.

Unit 30D. Round Hill (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
2006	19	3.5	3.5	3	3	3	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately 1.0 miles from Pinewild to Elks Point Road. Improvement to man-made features results from redevelopment of the shopping area in Roundhill with improved architecture and landscape features.

2006 Comments: Recent upgrades to the Chase Realty, Dickson/McCall, Cedar Room, and Feldman/Shaw buildings and completion of the sidewalks and extensive landscaping has improved the overall community design character in this unit.

Unit 31. Meadow (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	14	1	2	3	3	1	4
1991	14	1	2	3	3	1	4
1996	14	1	2	3	3	1	4
2001	16	2	2	3	3	2	4
2006	17.5	3	2.5	3	3	2	4

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Improvement to man-made features results from redevelopment of the former Nugget casino. Landscape views have improved as the vegetation in the Jennings casino site restoration project has matured. It now provides increased interest in the meadow and better screens the residential development along Kahle Drive. This unit is now in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Improvement to man-made and roadway distraction scores results from continue redevelopment of the Prim parcel, introduction of landscaping, improved signage, and removal of the Love Chapel.

Unit 32. Casino Area (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	13	3	1	2	2	1	4
1991	11	2	1	2	2	1	3
1996	11	2	1	2	2	1	3
2001	11.5	2.5	1	2	2	1	3
2006	13.5	3.5	2	2	2	1	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Man-made feature improvements result from better landscape screening and rehabilitation at the Douglas County government site, and painting and landscape improvements in the casino core. The casino core improvements include the dark green color for Harrah's tower and the Horizon parking garage, and landscaping along the street and at casino entries. The man-made features score would be improved to a 3 as a result of these features, except the new view of the gondola cut drops the score here by 0.5. As the Van Sickle cut is revegetated, it is expected that the score will improve by 0.5. Construction at the Prim site near the US 50/SH 207 intersection creates a temporary visual problem. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Improvement to man-made and roadway distraction scores result from the removal of an existing cyclone fencing at the Edgewood Golf Course, completion of the sidewalk along Lakeside drive, repainting of the Horizon building and implementation of a landscaping along Highway 50 within the casino core.

Unit 33. The Strip (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
1991	7	1	1	1	1	2	1
1996	7.5	1	1.5	1	1	2	1
2001	11.5	3	3	1	1.5	2	1
2006	14	4	4	1	1.5	2.5	1

1991 Comments: Increase in landscape views subcomponent due to demolition of unsightly foreground structures permitting visual access to mountain backdrop.

1996 Comments: The site design and architectural quality of several remodeled and redeveloped uses (e.g. McDonald's, Fantasy Inn), combined with the removal of several older structures and related cur cuts and signs, have slightly improved the roadway distractions subcomponent.

2001 Comments: Major improvements in this unit have occurred in the last five years. Improvements that increase both the man-made features and roadway distractions scores include: beginning implementation of the Park Ave. Project, completion of the Embassy Suites Vacation Resort and marina buildings, several hotel remodels along the strip, and completion of the linear park and the drainage features with their park-like appearance. The lake view near the marina is improved with better view access due to improved site design. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: This unit continues to improve with completion of the Park Ave. project and Raley's Shopping Center. Landscape views continue to improve as the native vegetation installed along wildwood has matured.

Unit 34. El Dorado Beach (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	16	4	1	2	4	3	2
1991	16	4	1	2	4	3	2
1996	17	4	2	2	4	3	2
2001	16	3.5	1.5	2	4	3	2
2006	16	3.5	1.5	2	4	3	2

1996 Comments: The redesign of the public park and open space at El Dorado Beach has reduced the roadway distractions along the unit.

2001 Comments: Increased commercial activity along Harrison Ave., accompanied by increased signage and increased unscreened parking and parking congestion, reduce both the made-made features and roadway distractions scores in this unit.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 35. AI Tahoe (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	7	2	1	1	1	1	1
1991	7.5	2.5	1	1	1	1	1
1996	7.5	2.5	1	1	1	1	1
2001	7.5	2.5	1	1	1	1	1
2006	8	3	1	1	1	1	1

1991 Comments: Increase in man-made features subcomponent due to incremental remodeling and improvements to built environment.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: This review notes the overall lack of improvement throughout this unit, particularly compared to other commercial districts in the Region. Specific improvements and degradations have occurred in this unit without changing the scores. Improvements include some new structures with improved design at the southern end of the unit and some frontage landscaping improvements. Several new signs produce new visual problems. With a better structure color, modifications at the middle school could produce an improvement. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments:

Unit 36A. Airport Area (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	10.5	1.5	2	2	1	2	2
2006	13	2.5	2.5	2.5	1	2.5	2

1996 Comments: Changes noted for this area in 1996 are: Commercial improvements near the south end of US 50 in South Lake Tahoe have slightly improved the man-made features subcomponent.

2001 Comments: This unit extends approximately 1.65 miles from D Street in South Lake Tahoe to the southern end of the industrial development. Although most of the developed uses in this unit continue their degraded scenic condition, removal of the clutter, disturbance and signage associated with Sunset Ranch and the associated site restoration produces noticeable improvements to man-made features and a more limited improvement to landscape views. Tree growth on the slope above the airport is better screening view of the development, while also blocking view of distant ridges.

2006 Comments: Improvements in this scenic include the removal of a building located along Highway 50 and the implementation of the water quality BMP project within Caltrans right-of-way.

Unit 36B. Lake Valley (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	19	3	4	3	1	4	4
2006	20	3	4.5	3.5	1	4	4

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Significant improvements have resulted from the removal of billboards, utility undergrounding, and removal of two abandoned model homes.

2006 Comments: Caltrans water quality BMP project has improved the score for roadway distractions and roadway structure.

Unit 36C. Meyers (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	NA						
1991	NA						
1996	NA						
2001	14	2.5	2.5	2	1	3	3
2006	15	3.5	2.5	2	1	3	3

1996 Comments: Improvements noted for this area in 1996 are: Commercial improvements in Meyers have slightly improved the man-made features subcomponent.

2001 Comments: Redevelopment of Yanks Station property includes upgrade of the motel tower and extensive remodel of an old restaurant and retail shop area. This creates improved man-made features, yet would have been improved with more space devoted to landscaping. Lack of sign compliance continues to be a major scenic problem throughout Meyers.

2006 Comments: Improvements in this scenic unit include the construction of the US Post office, the California Highway Patrol office, and the Commercial Center located adjacent to the USFS Visitor's Center.

Unit 37. Echo Summit (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	26	4	5	5	4	3	5
1991	26	4	5	5	4	3	5
1996	26	4	5	5	4	3	5
2001	26	4	5	5	4	3	5
2006	26	4	5	5	4	3	5

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 38. Upper Truckee River (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	18	3	4	4	1	3	3
1991	18	3	4	4	1	3	3
1996	18	3	4	4	1	3	3
2001	18	3	4	4	1	3	3
2006	18	3	4	4	1	3	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No change noted. The scores for lake views and landscape views have been switched to reflect correction of a long standing typographical error.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 39. Alpine Summit. (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	24	4	5	4	1	5	5
1991	24	4	5	4	1	5	5
1996	24	4	5	4	1	5	5
2001	24	4	5	4	1	5	5
2006	24	4	5	4	1	5	5

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No change noted. The scores for lake views and landscape views have been switched to reflect correction of a long standing typographical error.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 40. Brockway Cutoff (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	15	2	3	3	3	2	2
1991	15	2	3	3	3	2	2
1996	15.5	2.5	3	3	3	2	2
2001	15	2.5	3	3	2.5	2	2
2006	15.5	3	3	3	2.5	2	2

1996 Comments: The man-made features subcomponent has been slightly increased due to the completion of a utility undergrounding project along the roadway.

2001 Comments: The focused lake view down the golf course has been degraded through addition and maturation of landscaping in the fairway and placement of new cafe/pro shop structure. This is true even though the terminus of the view at the lake has improved with removal of structure and fence at Tahoe Beach Center site. The golf course cafe/pro shop displays improved architectural features compared to the previous structure, yet is more visible from this unit. Required landscaping mitigation will likely, over time, allow an improvement in the man-made features score. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Required landscape mitigation has matured and has reduced the overall contrast of the café/pro shop.

Unit 41. Brockway Summit (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	21	3	5	3	3	4	3
1991	21	3	5	3	3	4	3
1996	21	3	5	3	3	4	3
2001	21	3	5	3	3	4	3
2006	21	3	5	3	3	4	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Although completion of the Caltrans erosion control project near the summit produces some benefits for road structure, the rating for this criteria is sufficiently high to reflect the 2001 condition.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 42. Outlet (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	10	1	2	3	1	1	2
1991	12	1	2	3	1	2	3
1996	12	1	2	3	1	2	3
2001	12.5	1.5	2	3	1	2	3
2006	12.5	1.5	2	3	1	2	3

1991 Comments: Correction to 1986 ratings in landscape views and variety subcomponents.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Painting the structures at the Caltrans maintenance facility and completion of the drainage pond/SEZ restoration project have slightly improved the man-made features element in this unit. An increase in river related recreation congestion could threaten roadway distractions. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 43. Lower Truckee River (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	20	3	3	4	1	4	5
1991	19	3	2.5	3.5	1	4	5
1996	19	3	2.5	3.5	1	4	5
2001	19	3	2.5	3.5	1	4	5
2006	19	3	2.5	3.5	1	4	5

1996 Comments: There was no change to the unit's ratings during the past five years; however, an addition to the SQIP is needed to reflect the change in the 1991 Evaluation rating.

2001 Comments: Limited building and landscaping improvements have been made, although the man-made features score is sufficiently high to reflect the 2001 condition. An increase in river related recreation congestion could threaten roadway distractions. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Unit 44. Kingsbury Grade (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	13	1	1	1	3	3	4
1991	13	1	1	1	3	3	4
1996	13	1	1	1	3	3	4
2001	14.5	1.5	2	1	3	3	4
2006	15.5	2	2	1	3	3.5	4

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Improvements to both man-made features and roadway distractions have resulted from new and remodeled buildings, sidewalks and landscaping along the street and landscape restoration of the former disturbed condo site. Sign improvements have also occurred. New projects that are visible but avoid degradation include the water tower and Kahle Park structures. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments: Improvements to both man-made and landscape views resulted from the removal of the Love Chapel, introduction of landscaping at the disturbed site, continue improvements on the Prim Parcel.

Unit 45. Pioneer Trail North (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	10	1	1	3	2	2	1
1991	10	1	1	3	2	2	1
1996	10	1	1	3	2	2	1
2001	11	1.5	1	3	2.5	2	1
2006	12	2	1	3	2.5	2	1

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The removal of a motel near the northern end of the unit and construction of the erosion control project that placed curb/gutter along the roadway improve man-made features in this unit. The expanded lake view at the intersection of Pioneer Trail/Ski Run Blvd. produces improvement, although the traffic volumes at the intersection itself and the distance limit the viewers' appreciation of this feature. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments: Improvement along Ski Run Boulevard (sidewalks, street lights, and landscaping) has improved the man-made score for this unit.

Unit 46. Pioneer Trail South (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Roadway Distractions	Road Structure	Lake Views	Landscape Views	Variety
1982	20	4	4	3	1	4	4
1991	21	4	4	4	1	4	4
1996	21	4	4	4	1	4	4
2001	21	4	4	4	1	4	4
2006	21	4	4	4	1	4	4

1991 Comments: Increase in road structure subcomponent due to erosion control, revegetation and bike trail project.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Changes include the effects of the salvage cut at mid-unit and in the south end. Generally, the tree thinning improves view penetration without changing the character of the forested view. At the south end, extensive tree death opens view to residences at the intersection of Vanderhoof Rd. This is a small area, however, and does not reduce the rating for the unit.

2006 Comments: No comments.

Shoreline Units

Unit 1. Tahoe Keys (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	9	1	5	3
1991	9	1	5	3
1996	9	1	5	3
2001	9	1	5	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

2006 Comments:

Unit 2. Pope Beach (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	8	2	3	3
1991	8	2	3	3
1996	8	2	3	3
2001	8	2	3	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

2006 Comments:

Unit 3. Jameson Beach (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	8	3	2	3
1991	8	3	2	3
1996	8	3	2	3
2001	8	3	2	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Two large residential rebuilds in this unit continue the poor situation related to man-made features. The new pier at Camp Richardson include good design features and is adequately mitigated with on shore improvements. This unit continues to be at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 4. Taylor Creek Meadow (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	13	3	5	5
1991	13	3	5	5
1996	13	3	5	5
2001	13	3	5	5
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Fire kill of small trees and unscreened view of parked cars noted, but not sufficient to reduce the score.

2006 Comments:

Unit 5. Ebright (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	9	2	4	3
1991	9	2	4	3
1996	9	2	4	3
2001	9.5	2.5	4	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: New foot trail is visible for a short distance, but does not create a major impact. Revegetation along the road helps reduce view of the road scar and improves man-made features.

2006 Comments:

Unit 6. Emerald Bay (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	12	2	5	5
1991	12	2	5	5
1996	12	2	5	5
2001	12.5	2.5	5	5
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Continuing vegetation establishment and maturation in the avalanche scar and above the retaining walls along the viaduct is improving the view of man-made features. The retaining walls continue to produce too much color contrast, however. The new foot trail around the Bay avoids new significant degradation.

2006 Comments:

Unit 7. Bliss State Park (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	12	5	4	3
1991	12	5	4	3
1996	12	5	4	3
2001	12	5	4	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

2006 Comments:

Unit 8. Rubicon Point (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	12	3	5	4
1991	12	3	5	4
1996	12	3	5	4
2001	11.5	2.5	5	4
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The score for man-made features is amended to reflect the high visibility of parking along the beach at the state park and the clutter of beach equipment at the south end. A new large residence adjacent to the state park avoids degradation through good use of architectural design, setbacks, and vegetative screening. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments:

Unit 9. Rubicon Bay (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	6	1	3	2
1991	5	1	3	1
1996	5	1	3	1
2001	5	1	3	1
2006				

1991 Comments: Decrease in variety subcomponent due to reduction in variety caused by addition of highly contrasting structures on hillside; bright, linear rip rap without vegetation; numerous additional piers.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: A new, large lakeside residence with poor setbacks and screening is under construction in this unit, further degrading the already rock-bottom man-made features score. This unit is not in threshold attainment and remains at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 10. Meeks Bay (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	9	2	4	3
1991	9	2	4	3
1996	9	2	4	3
2001	9	2	4	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Beach clutter was noted here, but insufficient to lower the score.

2006 Comments:

Unit 11. Sugar Pine Point (El Dorado County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	11	4	4	3
1991	11	4	4	3
1996	11	4	4	3
2001	11	4	4	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

2006 Comments:

Unit 12. McKinney Bay (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	9	3	3	3
1991	9	3	3	3
1996	9	3	3	3
2001	8	2	3	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The reduction in the man-made features score reflects both an amendment to the previous scores and the construction of two large new residences, both with poor setbacks, screening and color, at the north end of the unit. The amendment results from the clutter and scale of boat storage at the Homewood Marina, the amphitheater tent structure, and the high density of structures at the south end of the unit. This unit was considered at risk in 1996 and has since fallen out of threshold attainment. It remains at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 13. Eagle Rock (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	11	2	5	4
1991	11	2	5	4
1996	11	2	5	4
2001	11	2	5	4
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Several large residential rebuilds have occurred in this unit and threaten the threshold rating. The existing pattern of development in many parts of this unit retains significant vegetative screening and is particularly vulnerable to the type of residential rebuilds seen in other areas of the lake. This unit remains at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 14. Ward Creek (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	10	3	3	4
1991	10	3	3	4
1996	9	2	3	4
2001	9	2	3	4
2006				

1996 Comments: The man-made features subcomponent was reduced due to several new large, highly contrasting homes with little or no visual screening or setback from the water's edge. Additional clutter along the shoreline from added piers (or extensions) and clutter on piers, have contributed to the degradation.

2001 Comments: Several large residential rebuilds south of Sunnyside with extensive glass area and poor screening further threaten man-made features. Additional development of this type will lower the score. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 15. Tahoe City (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	5	1	2	2
1991	5	1	2	2
1996	5	1	2	2
2001	5	1	2	2
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The rehabilitation of the large metal warehouse at the Tahoe City Marina produces improvement, but it is not sufficient on its own to improve the man-made features score in this unit. The new structure at the Cobblestone property, with its light colored facade, is distinct from the lake; this color choice should not be repeated. Larger piers with boatlifts are noticeable. This unit is not in threshold attainment and remains at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 16. Lake Forest (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	5	1	2	2
1991	4	1	2	1
1996	4	1	2	1
2001	4	1	2	1
2006				

1991 Comments: Decrease in variety due to addition of many structures that do not blend with setting.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The revegetation project along the road cut at Dollar Hill is beginning to reduce the color contrast in this area. A residential rebuild and use of rock rip-rap without adequate planting pockets along the sewer line alignment both produce negative effects. This unit is not in threshold attainment and remains at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 17. Dollar Point (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	10	3	4	3
1991	10	3	4	3
1996	10	3	4	3
2001	10	3	4	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

2006 Comments:

Unit 18. Cedar Flat (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	8	2	3	3
1991	8	2	3	3
1996	7.5	1.5	3	3
2001	7.5	1.5	3	3
2006				

1996 Comments: The man-made features subcomponent has been reduced due to additional development along the shoreline of piers and pier extensions, and several new or remodeled residences visible along the shoreline which are poorly sited and not well screened in relation to their setting.

2001 Comments: Large residential rebuilds with poor setbacks, inadequate screening, and poor color and material choices continue to produce visual concerns in this unit, although the unit's score will not drop again at this time. Larger piers with boatlifts are noticeable. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 19. Carnelian Bay (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	5	1	3	1
1991	5	1	3	1
1996	5	1	3	1
2001	6.5	2	3	1.5
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: With completion of the two CTC restoration projects and painting the marina structure (including the mural on the east side), the man-made features score improves. (The marina structure color should have been darker; the gray sand color misses an opportunity for more improvement.) The restoration projects also increase shoreline vegetation variety, producing a small improvement in the rating for that subcomponent. This unit is not in threshold attainment.

2006 Comments:

Unit 20. Flick Point (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	8	2	3	3
1991	8	2	3	3
1996	8	2	3	3
2001	8	2	3	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: New residential rebuilds in this unit provide examples of both good and poor results. Two projects avoid degradation with good structure color, varied roof ridgeline elevation, and adequate vegetative screening. Two projects that produce large structures with inadequate setbacks and screening, dominant roof ridgelines, and very large window area threaten to reduce the man-made features score in this unit. Larger piers with boatlifts are noticeable. This unit is at risk.

2006 Comments

Unit 21. Agate Bay (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	8	1	4	3
1991	8	1	4	3
1996	8	1	4	3
2001	8	1	4	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The low man-made features rating reflects, in part, the number of boats and beach equipment clutter found along the beach throughout this unit. Several residential rebuilds include poor setback and screening characteristics. Two tourist accommodation upgrade projects fail to make scenic improvements. This unit remains at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 22. Brockway (Placer County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	10	2	4	4
1991	10	2	4	4
1996	10	2	4	4
2001	9	1.5	4	3.5
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: New medium large houses with inadequate screening and large window area reduce the man-made features score. The reduction in variety reflects an amendment in previous scores and the loss of some native shoreline vegetation. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

2006 Comments:

Unit 23. Crystal Bay (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	11	2	5	4
1991	8	1	4	3
1996	8	1	4	3
2001	7	1	3	3
2006				

1991 Comments: Decreased in background views and variety subcomponent due to addition of new structures along Crystal Bay hillside and in Incline Village background which highly contrast with setting; new ski run clearings consisting of highly contrasting straight lines; new, bright colors on major multi-residential projects along shoreline.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2006 comments:

Unit 24. Sand Harbor (Washoe County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	12	4	5	3
1991	12	4	5	3
1996	12	4	5	3
2001	12	4	5	3
2006				

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: The new stage facility on Sand Harbor is larger and more visible than anticipated. However, it is anticipated that completion of the amphitheater mitigation measures will contribute to improvement of temporary, degraded scenic quality conditions and the man-made environment..

2006 Comments:

Unit 25. Skunk Harbor (Carson City, Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	13	5	4	4
1991	13	5	4	4
1996	13	5	4	4
2001	13	5	4	4

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Placement of unscreened metal monitoring equipment on the shoreline at Thunderbird Lodge produces unnecessary glare and color contrasts.

Unit 26. Cave Rock (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	10	3	4	3
1991	10	3	4	3
1996	10	3	4	3
2001	9.5	2.5	4	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Three large new houses with poor screening, too much window area, reflective metal roofs and inadequate setbacks are highly visible. A rebuilt boat house fails to produce substantial improvement. Piers with boatlifts are noticeable. These features combine with the past development practices to reduce the score for man-made features. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

Unit 27. Lincoln Park (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	8	1	4	3
1991	7	1	4	2
1996	7	1	4	2
2001	7	1	4	2

1991 Comments: Decrease in variety subcomponent due to addition of new structures which dominate the shoreline and highly contrast with forested setting.

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Three new residential rebuilds that are noticeably larger with poor setbacks and screening and too much window area create additional scenic problems. These projects further threaten the score in this unit. This unit is not in threshold attainment and remains at risk.

Unit 28. Tahoe School (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	11	4	4	3
1991	11	4	4	3
1996	11	4	4	3
2001	11	4	4	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Two new residential rebuilds in the south end of the unit create additional scenic problems and threaten the score in this unit. This unit is at risk.

Unit 29. Zephyr Cove (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	9	2	3	4
1991	9	2	3	4
1996	9	2	3	4
2001	9	2	3	4

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: One residential rebuild underway and larger piers with boatlifts create new distractions and threaten man-made features, although not sufficient to reduce the score at this time. This unit remains at risk.

Unit 30. Edgewood (Douglas County)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	11	4	4	3
1991	11	4	4	3
1996	10.5	3.5	4	3
2001	10.5	3.5	4	3

1996 Comments: The man-made features subcomponent of this unit has been reduced due to the addition of new unscreened structures sited too close to the water's edge (including new pump house building near the south end of the unit and a massive residence north of Nevada Beach).

2001 Comments: Two new residences at the north end of this unit are visible; one of these is very boxy with extensive glass and little screening. This unit is not in threshold attainment and is at risk.

Unit 31. Bijou (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	9	1	4	4
1991	9	1	4	4
1996	9	1	4	4
2001	9.5	1.5	4	4

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Redevelopment of the Embassy Suites Vacation Resort removes several poor quality structures and replaces them with structures of higher design value. These features improve man-made features in this unit. Additional improvement could have been possible with an improved roof material/color choice for the Embassy structure. This unit remains at risk.

Unit 32. Al Tahoe (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	9	2	4	3
1991	9	2	4	3
1996	9	2	4	3
2001	10	3	4	3

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: Improved shoreline revetment and revegetation exists along El Dorado and Regan Beaches. New office building demonstrates improved articulation and color, but continues poor setback and revegetation opportunities. These actions improve the man-made features score.

Unit 33. Truckee Marsh (City of South Lake Tahoe)

	Threshold Composite	Man-Made Features	Background Views	Variety
1982	14	4	5	5
1991	14	4	5	5
1996	14	4	5	5
2001	14	4	5	5

1996 Comments: No comments.

2001 Comments: No comments.

Appendix 2. Scenic Quality Ratings

Unit Name/Number	View Type	Scenic Resource No.	1982	1991	1996	2001	2006	Status
Shoreline Units								
3 – Jameson Beach	Shoreline View	3.3	7	7	6	6	6	N
12 - McKinney Bay	Shoreline View	12.6	9	9	9	8	8	N
14 – Ward Creek	Shoreline View	14.4	9	9	9	8	8	N
16 – Lake Forest	Shoreline View	16.7	7	5	5	5	5	N
20 – Flick Point	Shoreline View	20.1	8	8	8	7	7	N
23 – Crystal Bay	Visual Feature	23.2	11	8	8	8	8	N
23 – Crystal Bay	Shoreline View	23.3	10	8	7	7	7	N
23 – Crystal Bay	Shoreline View	23.5	5	4	4	4	4	N
23 – Crystal Bay	Backdrop View	23.6	8	6	6	5	5	N
23 – Crystal Bay	Shoreline View	23.9	11	11	11	10	10	N
24 – Sand Harbor	Visual Feature	24.3	11	11	11	10	10	N
26 – Cave Rock	Shoreline View	26.9	7	7	6	6	6	N
26 – Cave Rock	Visual Feature	26.12	11	10	10	10	12	A
27 – Lincoln Park	Visual Feature	27.3	6	5	5	5	5	N
27 – Lincoln Park	Shoreline View	27.6	8	8	8	7	7	N
27 – Lincoln Park	Visual Feature	27.7	7	6	6	6	6	N
30 – Edgewood	Shoreline View	30.2	8	8	7	7	7	N
Roadway Units								
13 – Sunnyside	Visual Feature	13.2	10	10	9	9	9	N
20 – Tahoe Vista	Landscape View	20.5	12	10	10	10	10	N
26 – Sand Harbor	Lake View	26.5	10	10	8	8	8	N
28 – Spooner Summit	Entry Point View	28.2	7	7	7	6	6.5	N
29 – Cave Rock	Lake View	29.1	9	9	9	9	10	A

Appendix 2. Scenic Quality Ratings

Roadway Units Cont.								
30 – Zephyr Cove/Lincoln Park	Lake View	30.2	12	12	12	11	11	N
40 – Brockway Cutoff	Lake View	40.4	9	9	9	8	9	A
43 Lower Truckee River	Entry Point View	43.2	10	8	8	8	8	N

Shading indicates a change in the resource for the 2006 Threshold Evaluation.

SHORELINE RESOURCES

Shoreline Unit	26				
Shoreline Unit Name	Cave Rock				
Scenic Quality Ratings					
<i>Backdrop View</i>					
26.12					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1982	3	3	3	2	11
1991	2	3	3	2	10
1996	2	3	3	2	10
2001	2	3	3	2	10
2006	3	3	3	3	12
2001 Comment: No Comment.					
2006 Comment: The construction of the rock faced enhanced barrier rail has improved overall scenic quality setting and improved the unit and intactness score.					

ROADWAY RESOURCES

Roadway Unit	29				
Shoreline Unit Name	Cave Rock				
Scenic Quality Ratings					
<i>View to Lake</i>					
29.1					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1991	2	3	3	1	9
1996	2	3	3	1	9
2001	2	3	3	1	9
2006	2	3	3	2	10
2001 Comment: No Comment.					
2006 Comment: The construction of the rock faced enhanced barrier rail has improved overall scenic quality setting and improved the intactness score.					

Appendix 2. Scenic Quality Ratings

Roadway Unit		40			
Shoreline Unit Name		Brockway Cutoff			
Scenic Quality Ratings					
<i>View to Lake</i>					
40.4					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1991	2	3	2	2	9
1996	2	3	2	2	9
2001	2	2	2	2	8
2006	2	3	2	2	9
<p>2001 Comment: The addition of landscaping along the fairway blocks this targeted view. In addition, construction of the relocated café/pro shop at the golf course narrows the frame for the view and changes the character.</p>					
<p>2006 Comment: The teardown at the Tahoe Beach Club in concert with the maturation of the landscape mitigation required for the café/pro shop has increased the scenic quality of this resource and has resulted in returning to threshold attainment.</p>					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

PUBLIC RECREATION AREAS

Recreation Area Number		2			
Recreation Area Name		Zephyr Cove			
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	Paint concession buildings, remodel outside of Sunset Bar with new deck/landscaping, new beach fence, new tiki-style shade umbrellas. Maturation of vegetation associated with parking lot redesign continues to better screen parking. No change to powerlines or arch quality of concession buildings (except bar).				
Off site	One rebuild to south in progress (too early to tell impact) and one other recent. No change to residences on ridgeline.				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
2-3					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1993	5	3	4	3	15
2001	5	3	4	2	14
2006	5	3	4	2	14
Note: New wooden fence at the back of the beach and larger buoy field creates problems with intactness from 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3, but the added close view of nearby residential rebuilds drops the score for 2-3 only.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No change					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
No change					
2001 Recommendations: Redesign and upgrade of concession buildings at the pier still need to be done. This should happen in the context of creating a consistent architectural theme for the entire resort, including the lodge and proposed campground accessory use structures. The campground and lodge should be included in the inventory.					
2006 Recommendations: The linear fence that runs along US 50 that defines the edge of the recreation area should be replaced with a more traditional USFS fence such as split-rail or one similar to the fence that encloses the campground on the east side of the highway. Also see 2001 Recommendation.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	3				
Recreation Area Name	Cave Rock				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Deduct from)					
On site	Monitoring equipment on the restroom roof; large with shiny metal surfaces. Recent upgrades to boat ramp/breakwater not apparent. Replacement of galvanized guardrail with a texture concrete barrier rail that has been stained to match the natural back drop has improved views from the recreation area.				
Off site	None				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
No change.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No change.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
3-a					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	3	5	3	4	15
2001	2.5	5	3	4	14.5
2006	2.5	5	3	4	14.5
Note: Reflective monitoring equipment reduces the coherence of the restroom building.					
2001 Recommendations: Monitoring equipment should be relocated to a less visible location.					
2006 Recommendations: Monitoring equipment should be relocated to a less visible location or painted with a dark matte finish.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	4				
Recreation Area Name	Sand Harbor				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	New visitor center was recently completed.				
Off site	New vacation resort in Incline visible from the water near the boat ramp, but not from any of the mapped viewpoints. New development/redevelopment in the viewshed in Crystal Bay is not prominent from this distance, although some of it is visible. Compared to the 1983 slides, the increase in visibility is negligible.				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
4-2					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1993	5	4	5	3	17
2001	4.5	4	5	3	16.5
2006	5	4	5	3	17
Notes: The score for this resource has been adjusted to account for an error in the 2001 rating. The resource is of a panoramic view of the lake park development is not visible from this viewpoint and therefore does not have an impact on the rating.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
4-7					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1993	5	4	4	4	17
2001	3.5	3	4	2	12.5
2006	4.0	3	4	2	13.0
Notes: The 1993 rating for this resource was low; this evaluation amends the points for Vividness and Variety assigned then. Over time, the vegetation along the beach has receded due to trampling and the addition of the boardwalk, stage, drinking fountain retaining wall, have all combined to reduce the visual quality of the beach.					
Notes: The 2006 unity rating has been improved by 0.5 points due to the construction of a permanent fencing to reduce the trampling of vegetation and the maturing of vegetation that reduce the contrast of the retaining wall.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
4-i Festival Area					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	--	--	--	--	--
2001	4	4	3	4	15
2006	4	4	3	4	15
Notes: The new amphitheater structures display high design values and establish a more organized and coherent festival use compared to the pre-project condition. The size of the new facility and its use of a stone type not compatible with the color and shape of on site rock are detriments, however. The 2000 November condition of the stage reflects several features that may be out of compliance with the TRPA permit, particularly the wall around the stage and the superstructure, both of which were to be removed after the performance season. The vegetation restoration on Sand Point that was part of the amphitheater approval is scheduled to begin in 2001. Completion of the mitigation measures will improve both the condition and compatibility scores for this area.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	4				
Recreation Area Name	Sand Harbor				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Deduct from)					
On site	See above.				
Off site	See above.				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes Cont.					
4-j Visitor Center					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	--	--	--	--	--
2001	--	--	--	--	--
2006	4	5	4	5	18
Note: This is a new man-made resource. The visitor center is setback among existing trees and is an example of good facilities design. The siting, materials, and architectural quality complements and fits within the overall natural scenic setting.					
2001 Recommendations: The concrete retaining walls around the drinking fountains should be faced with sand-colored stone. State Parks should enforce terms of the lease agreement with amphitheater users relative to seasonal removal of stage structures. To reduce the color contrast between the sand and the stone used on the stage structure, additional vegetation capable of growth to 15' should be planted between the stage and the boardwalk. Where possible, additional vegetation should be planted downslope of the boardwalk to reduce the dominance of the shadow line.					
2006 Recommendations: The amphitheater continues to be out of compliance with the TRPA permit conditions and should be stained according the conditions of the permit. Also see 2001 Recommendations.					

Recreation Area Number	7				
Recreation Area Name	Incline Beach				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Deduct from)					
On site	New entry feature and redesigned parking lot. New fence along Lakeshore Blvd.				
Off site	New piers with boathouses (compared to 1983 view) to the west and new/expanded piers to the east. All new boathouses predates 1993 update, but were not noted in the text. Some poor color choices on residences in Crystal Bay. New residences along SR 28 near Lakeshore Blvd.				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
7-2					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1993	3	3	3	3	12
2001	2	3	3	2	10
2006	2	3	3	3	11
Notes: Required additional lakeside landscaping for the new residence to the west has matured since the 2001 Evaluation resulting in an increase to the intactness core. This resource is now in threshold attainment.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
No changes					
Notes: New entry features and parking lot improvements increase the scores for these features.					
2001 Recommendations: Changes to the Design Review Standards are needed to increase lake setback, improve color choices, and reduce bulkiness of new and remodeled residential projects.					
2006 Recommendations: None. However, TRPA has adopted the Shoreland Ordinances that regulates lake setback, color and material choices, and visual magnitude that should improve the scenic quality of resources visible from recreation areas located along the shoreline of Lake Tahoe.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	8				
Recreation Area Name	Burnt Cedar Beach				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	Remove old concession building and replace with three structures that serve the swimming pool. Reconfigure parking lot. New perimeter fence and entry kiosk. New children's play area.				
Off site	New piers to the west and new/expanded piers to the east. Some poor color choices on residences in Crystal Bay visible from the peninsula.				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
8-2					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1993	4	4	4	2	14
2001	3	4	4	2	13
2006	3	4	4	2	13
Notes: Off site development is more prominent from the peninsula and decreases both the Intactness and Unity of the view.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No change.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
8-b					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	4	5	2	4	15
2001	3	5	2	4	14
2006	3.5	5	2	4	14.5
Notes: The copper on the roof has subsequently weathered and as a result is less distractive in the overall setting and results in an improvement in coherence. The stucco is still a poor choice, however, with the adoption of updated ordinances regulating color within the shoreland it is expected that this situation will be remedied in the future through regular maintenance of the structure by IVGID.					
2001 Recommendations: Changes to the Design Review Standards are needed to improve color choices and reduce bulkiness of new and remodeled residential projects. The stucco exterior of the new structures should be painted with a darker color. The reflective qualities of the roof should be reduced. Additional piers should be limited on the sandy beach to the west.					
2006 Recommendations: None. However, changes have been made the Design Review Standards in 2001 to reduce the impacts of shoreland structures to the scenic resources of the basin.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	11				
Recreation Area Name	Tahoe Vista Recreation Area (Agatam Beach)				
Day/Date	Thursday, 10/26/2000				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	The expansion of this recreation site has been completed with upgrades that have improved the overall architectural features and extensive landscaping has been introduced that improves the overall aesthetic character of the Agatam Beach. New sidewalk, retaining walls, concrete stairs, and restroom have been completed that use natural rock and wood materials that complements the site and provides access to the beach and expansive lake views. The parking lot is well designed and landscaped and does not detract from the overall aesthetic character of the recreation area.				
Off site	Caltrans installed a traffic light at the intersection of National Avenue				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
No change. View 11-1 will remain the prominent view from the beach even after an expanded inventory includes the remainder of the publicly owned property.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No change.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
11-a Entry Treatment					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	1	1	2	1	5
2001	1	1	2	1	5
2006	4	5	4	5	18
11-b Parking Area					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	2	1	3	1	7
2001	2	1	3	1	7
2006	4	5	4.5	5	18.5
11-c Restroom Facilities					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	2	2	2	1	7
2001	2	2	2	1	7
2006	4	5	5	5	19
Notes: Extensive upgrades to the existing man-made features and introduction of landscaping has dramatically improved the overall aesthetic character of Agatam Beach.					
2001 Recommendations: Inventory should be updated to include all the public access in this area. New uses planned for this entire parcel should maximize the lake view available from the road, establish an upgraded entry, screen all parking from view from the beach and roadway, and limit the size and mass of future planned structures.					
2006 Recommendations: None					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	26				
Recreation Area Name	Vikingsholm/Emerald Bay				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	The entrance sign has been replaced.				
Off site	None				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
No change.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No change.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
26-d					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	2	4	2	3	11
2001	4	4	4	4	16
2006	4	4	4	5	17
Notes: The redesigned parking lot produces a comprehensible and efficient design small enough to avoid making users feel they are not engulfed in a broad expanse of asphalt. The perimeter granite rock wall is of high quality and evokes the historic rock guardrails found in other areas of Emerald Bay. The entrance sign, damaged by an avalanche several years ago has been replaced with one that is well sited and designed.					
2001 Recommendations: None.					
2006 Recommendations: None.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number		27			
Recreation Area Name		Eagles Fall Picnic Area			
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	The parking lot has been completed redesigned with an improved circulation pattern via a roundabout and improved parking space layout. Extensive native landscaping was introduced into the roundabout. The portable toilets were replaced with a permit restroom facility. The permanent restroom is an example of good US Forest Service facilities design. The siting, materials, and architectural quality complements and fits within the overall natural scenic setting. The existing picnic benches located within a sensitive area were removed and an elevated boardwalk was introduced to manage pedestrian traffic and reduce conflicts with resources and automobiles. Overall, improvements to the recreation have produced tremendous benefits to scenic quality for the man-made features criteria for this resource.				
Off site	None.				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
No change.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No change					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
27-a Parking Lot					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	3	4	3	3	13
2001	3	4	3	3	13
2006	4	5	4.5	5	18.5
2006 Comments: Redesign of the parking lot, introduction of a roundabout with native landscaping , and extensive use of natural rock materials is a good example of good design within a otherwise natural scenic setting. The re-designed facilities reduce the former visual disorder of the site and the materials are very sympathetic with the natural-appearing setting.					
27-b Restrooms (Photos #19)					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	2	3	2	1	8
2001	4	4	4	3	15
2006	4	5	5	5	19
Notes: The permanent restroom is an example of good US Forest Service facilities design. The siting, materials, and architectural quality complements and fits within the overall natural scenic setting.					
27-c Boardwalk					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
2006	5	5	5	5	20
Notes: This is a new man-made resource. : The boardwalk is an example of good US Forest Service facilities design. The siting, materials, and architectural quality complements and fits within the overall natural scenic setting.					
Recommendations: None					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	16				
Recreation Area Name	Commons Beach				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	The restrooms and children's play area has been upgraded since 2001 that has improved the overall architectural features and landscaping has matured improving the overall aesthetic character of the commons beach. New boardwalk at the top of the slope, retaining walls, and concrete stairs have been completed that use natural rock materials that complements site and provides access to the beach and lake views. Construction of the lakeside trail has begun.				
Off site	Large metal building to the north redeveloped with new roof, siding and the addition of windows which results in the reduction in the sense of an industrial area.				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
16-1 Panoramic View from the Recreation Area					
Year	Unity	Vividness	Variety	Intactness	Score
1993	4	4	4	3	15
2001	4	4	4	3	15
2006	4	5	5	3.5	15.5
Notes: This is a correction to the 2001 evaluation score which noted the remodel of the large metal building located at the Tahoe City Marina which was not given credit for its improvements. The reduction in contrast of the structure at the Marina and other associated improvements since 2001 has increased the intactness score for this resource.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No change.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
16-a Restrooms					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	3	4	4	4	15
2001	4	4	4	4	16
2006	4	5	5	5	19
Notes: The restrooms and children's play area have been upgraded since the 2001 and the landscaping has matured improving the overall score for this resource. The lakeside bike trail will run through this park and construction has started. Future projects visible from this parking include marina expansion and the addition of a long pier at the bottom of Grove Street.					
16-b Children's Play Area					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	3	4	3	3	13
2001	4	3	4	3	14
2006	4	4	4	4	16
Notes: See note above.					
2001 Recommendations: Landscaping in the park needs restoration and should include understory establishment in areas near the beach and parking lot, and aggressive treatment of the mistletoe infestation. Bike trail development should not remove lakeside vegetation west of the park.					
2006 Recommendations: Landscaping has matured and has improved the overall character of the recreation area. Construction of the bike trail has started and vegetation west of the park screening the parking lot should be maintained.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

Recreation Area Number	19				
Recreation Area Name	Kaspian Recreation Area				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	The restroom has been replaced with an updated facility.				
Off site	None				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
19-a Restrooms					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	3	4	4	4	15
2001	3	4	4	4	15
2006	4	5	4	5	18
Notes: The updated restroom is an example of good US Forest Service facilities design. The siting, materials, and architectural quality complements and fits within the overall natural scenic setting.					
2006 Recommendations: None					

Recreation Area Number	34				
Recreation Area Name	Pope Beach				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Detract from)					
On site	The USFS has implemented BMPs, introduced landscaping islands, and built enclosures for the trash cans as part of the parking lot redesign continues to improve the scenic quality of Pope Beach				
Off site	None				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Recreation Area</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
34-b Parking Areas					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	3	4	2	3	12
2001	3	4	2	3	12
2006	3	5	3	3.5	14.5
Notes: The USFS currently has recently removed a portion of the existing parking lot and will rebuild the bathrooms which when completed will improve the overall score for this man-made feature and improve views of the natural features of Pope Beach.					
2006 Recommendations: Proceed with proposed plan to replace the existing bathrooms with one that are consistent with the USFS Built Image Guide and shorten the parking lot and restore the SEZ.					

Appendix 3. Recreation Area and Bike Trail Ratings Changes

BICYCLE TRAILS

Recreation Area Number	3				
Recreation Area Name	Tahoe Tavern				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Deduct from)					
On site	Utility undergrounding near the Y, continued restoration of the 64 acre tract, and completion of gateskeeper museum has improved the man-made score.				
Off site	None				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Natural Landscape</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
3-a					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	1	3	2	3	9
2001	3	4	3	3	13
2006	3.5	4.5	3	4	15
Notes:					
2006 Recommendations: No comments.					

Recreation Area Number	11				
Recreation Area Name	El Dorado County				
Description of Changes (Contribute to or Deduct from)					
On site	Redevelopment of historic structures and general landscaping has improved the score for this resource				
Off site	None				
Scenic Quality Ratings Changes					
<i>Views from Natural Landscape</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Natural Features</i>					
No changes.					
<i>Man-Made Features</i>					
11-d					
Year	Coherence	Condition	Compatibility	Design Quality	Score
1993	3	3	3	3	12
2001	2	4	3	4	13
2006	2.5	4	3.5	4	14
Notes:					
2006 Recommendations: No comments.					