

**TRPA  
GOVERNING BOARD  
PACKETS**

**JULY  
1987**

July 1987  
25

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
NOTICE OF MEETINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on July 22 and 23, 1987, commencing at 9:30 a.m. both days, at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada, the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting. The official agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on July 22, 1987, at 8:30 a.m., in the same location, the Finance Committee of said agency will meet to discuss the following: 1) receipt of the June financial statement; 2) status of budget requests from the States of Nevada and California; 3) reallocation of Placer County Local Transportation Funds for TRPA; 4) allocation of Local Transportation Funds to TRPA for Administration and Planning; and 5) proposed program of work for staff for FY 87-88.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on July 22, 1987, at 12:00 noon, the Rules Committee will meet to discuss the revision of the Agency's Rules of Procedure, the Administrative and Fiscal Procedures Manual, and enforcement procedures.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on July 23, 1987, at 8:30 a.m. in the same location, the Legal Committee will meet in open and closed sessions to confer with counsel on the following: 1) State of California/ League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA; 2) Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council v. TRPA, et al. (Eastern District of California and District of Nevada); 3) Walshaw v. TRPA (King Arthur's Palace); and 4) Wolf v. TRPA (Washoe County). The Committee will meet in open session on the following: 1) Leroy Land v. TRPA (Bitterbrush settlement); and 2) treatment of existing multi-residential and nonresidential building foundations without current TRPA approval.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on July 22, 1987, at 8:30 a.m. in the same location, the Retirement Committee will discuss revision of the retirement package pursuant to new federal law.

Date: July 15, 1987

By: William A. Morgan  
William A. Morgan  
Executive Director

NOTE Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
GOVERNING BODY

TRPA Office 195 U.S. Highway 50  
Zephyr Cove, Round Hill, Nevada

July 22, 1987 9:30 a.m.  
July 23, 1987 9:30 a.m.

---

OFFICIAL AGENDA

I PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

III APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV APPROVAL OF AGENDA

V CONSENT CALENDAR (see third to last page)

VI ORDINANCES

- A. Review of Ordinance Adopted as an Emergency on June 25, 1987,  
(Ordinance Setting Forth Standards for Amendment of the Regional  
Plan and Code of Ordinances)

VII PROJECT REVIEW

- A. Richard Ray, Pier Reconstruction, Douglas County APN 03-210-03
- B. IVGID Parking Lot Expansion For Incline Beach, Washoe County, APN  
127-280-01
- C. American Eagle, Finding of No Significant Effect on Environmental  
Assessment and Approval of Increased Level of Service at Lake Tahoe  
Airport
- D. Glenbrook Co./Robert Curiel, New Single Family Dwelling in the  
Shorezone, Glenbrook, Douglas County APN 01-070-16
- E. Glenbrook Co./Robert Curiel, New Single Family Dwelling in the  
Shorezone, Glenbrook, Douglas County APN 01-070-17

VIII PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Approval of Resolution Regarding Unmet Transit Needs  
in the Unincorporated Portion of El Dorado County
- B. Calculation of Land Coverage in Tahoe Keys (9:30 a.m. July 23, 1987)

- C. Approval of Resolution Adopting TRPA Trip Table
- D. Status Report on Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program
- E. Certification of Environmental Impact Statement, Placer County Criminal Justice Facility and Administrative Center
- F. Consideration of Mitigation Fee Credits
- G. Approval of Planning Team for Placer County Community Planning Process

IX LITIGATION

- A. Legal Committee Report and Board Action, If Necessary, on the Following:
  - 1. State of California/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA
  - 2. Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council v. TRPA, et al. (Eastern District of California and District of Nevada)
  - 3. Walshaw v. TRPA (King Arthur's Palace) (Eastern District of California)
  - 4. Wolf v. TRPA (Washoe County)
- B. Closed Session to Confer on the Following:
  - 1. State of California/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA
  - 2. Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council v. TRPA, et al. (Eastern District of California and District of Nevada)
  - 3. Walshaw v. TRPA (King Arthur's Palace) (Eastern District of California)
  - 4. Wolf v. TRPA (Washoe County)

X ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Appointment of California Lay Member to the Advisory Planning Commission
- B. Approval of Resolution Modifying Filing Fees for Temporary Events

XI REPORTS

- A. Finance Committee Report and Board Action on Recommendations
  - 1. Status of Budget Requests for FY 1987-89
  - 2. Receipt of the June Financial Statement

- B. Rules Committee Report and Board Action on Recommendations
  - 1. Report and Recommendation by Rules Committee on Adoption of Articles of the Rules of Procedure Relating to Definitions, Adoption of Plans and Ordinances, Notice, and Appeals
  - 2. Public Hearing on Articles of the Proposed Rules of Procedure Relating to Adoption of Plans and Ordinances
  - 3. Approval of Resolution Adopting Articles of the Rules of Procedure Relating to Adoption of Plans and Ordinances
  - 4. Discussion of Show Cause Hearing Procedures
- C. Executive Director
  - 1. Status Report on Plans for 1986 and 1987
  - 2. Status Report on Projects Approved at Staff Level
  - 3. Status Report on Exemption Requests in Regional Plan Suit
  - 4. Review of Accomplishments of Program of Work for FY 86-87
  - 5. Proposed Work Program for Staff for FY 1987-88
  - 6. Status Report on Administrative Draft of the Regional Transportation Plan
  - 7. Other
- D. Agency Counsel
- E. Governing Board Members

XII PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

XIII ADJOURNMENT

-----

CONSENT CALENDAR

<u>Item</u>	<u>Recommended Action</u>
1. El Dorado Erosion Control, Country Club Heights, El Dorado County APN 520-100-00/87-11	Approval With Findings and Conditions
2. El Dorado County Erosion Control, Echo View Estates #1, El Dorado County APN 520-100-00/87-10	Approval With Findings and Conditions

- |     |                                                                                                                                                                                |                                       |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 3.  | El Dorado County Erosion Control, Tahoe Paradise, El Dorado County<br>APN 520-100-00/87-8                                                                                      | Approval With Findings and Conditions |
| 4.  | Tahoe Airport Erosion Control, City of South Lake Tahoe, APN 32-090-02/04/06/08/09/10/11 and 32-100-04/05/07                                                                   | Approval With Findings and Conditions |
| 5.  | J. T. Posey, New Single Family Dwelling, Tennis Court and Guest House in the Shorezone, U. S. Highway 50, 1/2 Mile South of Uppaway Development, Douglas County, APN 01-120-03 | Approval With Findings and Conditions |
| 6.  | D. L. Bliss State Park Rehabilitation, California Department of Parks and Recreation, El Dorado County, APN 17-041-28                                                          | Approval With Findings and Conditions |
| 7.  | Tahoe City Fire Protection District, New Fire Station, Placer County, APN 84-160-01                                                                                            | Approval With Findings and Conditions |
| 8.  | Tahoe City Public Utility District Bunker Springs Redevelopment, Placer County, APN 94-010-11, 95-010-10, 94-010-01 and 10                                                     | Approval With Findings and Conditions |
| 9.  | Reallocation of Placer County Local Transportation Funds for TART                                                                                                              | Approval of Resolution                |
| 10. | Allocation of Local Transportation Funds to TRPA for Administration and Planning                                                                                               | Approval of Resolution                |

Successful Land Capability Challenges

Approval With Findings and Conditions

- |     |                                                                       |                                                                                            |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11. | Jon and Paula Corley, Grass Lake Road, El Dorado County,<br>36-370-29 | 13. Feige/Foster, Lot 141, Tahoma Ave., Dollar Point, Placer County APN<br>APN 93-092-07   |
| 12. | Dale E. Smith, Incline Village Washoe County,<br>APN 125-531-16       | 14. Glouner/Foster, Lot 551, Edgewood Drive, Dollar Point, Placer County,<br>APN 93-370-15 |

Four of the members of the governing body from each State constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the agency. The voting procedure shall be as follows:

(1) For adopting, amending or repealing environmental threshold carrying capacities, the regional plan, and ordinances, rules and regulations, and for granting variances from the ordinances, rules and regulations, the vote of at least four of the members of each State agreeing with the vote of at least four members of the other State shall be required to take action. If there is no vote of at least four of the members from one State agreeing with the vote of at least four of the members of the other State on the actions specified in this paragraph, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

(2) For approving a project, the affirmative vote of at least five members from the State in which the project is located and the affirmative vote of at least nine members of the governing body are required. If at least five members of the governing body from the State in which the project is located and at least nine members of the entire governing body do not vote in favor of the project, upon a motion for approval, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken. A decision by the agency to approve a project shall be supported by a statement of findings, adopted by the agency, which indicates that the project complies with the regional plan and with applicable ordinances, rules and regulations of the agency.

(3) For routine business and for directing the agency's staff on litigation and enforcement actions, at least eight members of the governing body must agree to take action. If at least eight votes in favor of such action are not cast, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: El Dorado County Erosion Control - Country Club Heights

Application Type: Public Service - Erosion Control

Applicant: El Dorado County

Applicant Representative: James Haen

Location:

Immediately adjacent to the Upper Truckee River and Highway 50 Bridge crossing between Elks Club Drive and Meadow Vale Avenue and approximately 3½ miles south of the South Tahoe "Y" in El Dorado County.

TRPA File Number: 520-100-00/87-10

Project Description:

Eroding slopes along Thunderbird and Elks Club Drives and adjacent streets will be revegetated and mechanically stabilized in the steeper portions. Pavement will be removed from Boca Raton Drive from the end of the cul-de-sac below Elks Club Drive to approximately halfway between Meadow Vale and Elks Club Drives. The former roadbed will be revegetated and will serve as a marsh/sediment basin to remove pollutants from the runoff before it discharges into the Upper Truckee River. The project specifically includes the following:

1. Installation of 1,827 lineal feet of rock wall.
2. Installation of 1,062 lineal feet of tiered gabions.
3. Installation of 2,629 lineal feet of willow wattling
4. Installation of 1,900 lineal feet of paved shoulder ditch.
5. Installation of 240 lineal feet of CMP culverts.
6. Installation of 3 barrier gates.
7. Removal of 767 cubic yards of pavement.
8. Revegetation of approximately 4 acres of SEZ.
9. Installation of 4 rock check dams.
10. Water quality monitoring program (monitoring by Lahontan).

The total estimated cost of the project is \$377,000 which is being funded by the California Tahoe Conservancy.



Site Description:

The site consists of steep, unvegetated road cuts along Thunderbird Drive and roadside ditches and slopes along Elks Club Drive which are eroding. The sediment-laden runoff from these slopes and ditches drains to a large roadside ditch along Boca Raton Drive and then empties into the Upper Truckee River.

Review Per Section:

1. Subparagraph A(2), Preliminary Injunction Order
2. Section 3.00, Ord. 84-1 (Article V(g) Findings)
3. Section 4.30(2), Ord. 84-1 (Review of Other Pending and New Projects)
4. Section 4.31(1) and (2), Ord. 84-1 (Review Criteria)
5. Section 5.00, Ord. 84-1 (Implementation of Regional Plan)
6. Section 4.12(d), California Side Land use Ordinance (Public Works Projects)
7. Section 13.31, Ord. 81-5 (Exemption to Prohibition of Disturbance in a SEZ)
8. Policy #7, Stream Environment Zone Subelement; Conservation Element, 1984 Regional Plan Goals and Policies (Exemption to prohibition of development in a SEZ to allow for certain public works projects.)

NOTE: This project was submitted under the original Preliminary Injunction Order and as such, has been reviewed under the policies and ordinances in effect at the time the order was signed.

Environmental Documentation:

The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist in order to assess the environmental impacts of the project. El Dorado County has filed a Categorical Exemption which satisfies the CEQA requirements. Agency staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment (see attached checklist).

Other Agency Approvals

Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board: Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements (pending)

Staff Analysis:

- A. Plan Area Statement: This project is located within Plan Area 119, Country Club Meadow. The Plan Designation for the area is Recreation/Mitigation. Agency staff has reviewed the 1983, 1984, and 1987 Plan Area Statements and has identified the following items (underlined) as being applicable to the project. Following each item is a brief statement addressing consistency.

1. Planning Statement:

- a. This area should be managed for outdoor recreation and natural resource values to include opportunities for SEZ restoration:

The project includes removal and revegetation of an existing paved road (Boca Raton Drive) which is located within a SEZ.

2. Special Policies:

- a. Whenever possible, opportunities for restoration of disturbed SEZ's and land coverage removal should be encouraged.

The project proposes to remove approximately one acre of existing paved roadway and to restore approximately four acres of SEZ.

3. Improvement Programs:

- a. The following capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for the area shall be implemented: Improvements required by the Surface Water Management Plan and Stream Environment Zone Restoration as indicated in the SEZ Restoration Program.

The project involves surface water drainage improvements and SEZ restoration which is consistent with these programs.

- B. Land Capability District/Land Coverage: The project area consists of land capability 1b (SEZ). In order to install the necessary drainage and erosion control facilities, land disturbance within portions of the SEZ cannot be avoided. Approximately 3,000 square feet of SEZ will be disturbed as a result of the project.

Section 13.31 of Ordinance 81-5 provides for the Governing Board to approve disturbance in a stream environment zone provided that the Governing Board finds that such work is necessary for the protection of the public health, safety or general welfare and that all other feasible alternatives not involving disturbance in a SEZ have been exhausted.

Policy #7, Stream Environment Zone Subelement, Conservation Element of the 1984 amended Regional Plan provides that:

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS ARE PERMISSIBLE USES IN STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES IF:  
(1) THE PROJECT IS NECESSARY FOR PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, OR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION; (2) THERE IS NO REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE, INCLUDING SPANS, WHICH AVOID OR REDUCE THE EXTENT OF ENCROACHMENT IN STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES;

(3) THE IMPACTS ARE FULLY MITIGATED; AND (4) STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE LANDS ARE RESTORED IN THE AMOUNT OF 1.5 TIMES THE AREA OF STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE WHICH IS DISTURBED OR DEVELOPED BY THE PROJECT.

The following information provides a basis for which these required findings can be made:

Historically, during spring runoff or intense summer storms, runoff created in the project area results in significant erosion problems. The proposed drainage improvements and revegetation program will significantly reduce the current erosion problems. The project, as designed, will provide for added environmental protection of the waters of Lake Tahoe by reducing sediment and nutrient transport through revegetation, detention basins, and control of surface runoff. Due to the inherent nature of this type of project, the only hydrologically sound location for some of the drainage improvements is within portions of the SEZ. Since SEZ's are generally located at points of lowest topography most drainage facilities must occur in these areas to provide for the most efficient design. The project is designed to reduce sediment and nutrient loads to the Lake and an area in the amount of 1.5 times the area of SEZ land being disturbed will be restored within the same watershed. Approximately four acres of existing SEZ will be restored as a result of the project. The policy requires .10 acres to be restored; therefore 3.90 acres of restoration will be credited to the County to be used to offset restoration required later, if any is later required.

Although the policies and ordinances currently in effect require that the above findings be made for this project, the 1987 Regional Plan provides for land disturbance in a SEZ for SEZ restoration and erosion control projects without any special findings being made (Conservation Element, Stream Environment Zone Subelement, Policy 5.E).

C. Article V(g) Findings (Section 3.00, Ordinance 84-1):

The following is a list of the V(g) findings as set forth under Section 3.00 of Ordinance 84-1. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the required finding may be made.

1. The project is consistent and complies with the Agency ordinances, maps, rules, regulations, and policies in effect on August 25, 1983 where said ordinances, maps, rules, regulations, and policies are not inconsistent or in conflict with the amendments to the Regional Plan adopted by this ordinance. In the event said ordinances maps, rules, regulations, or policies are inconsistent or in conflict with said amendments to the Regional Plan, the Agency shall find that the project is consistent and complies with said amendments to the Regional Plan.

This project has been reviewed under all applicable existing TRPA ordinances, maps, rules, regulations, and policies, including the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan and it has been determined that the project is consistent with said ordinances, maps, rules, regulations, Goals and Policies.

2. The project has been processed in accordance with the Agency's Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure.

A complete application has been submitted, all required notices have been made and the project is properly before the Governing Board for consideration.

3. With respect to projects for which an environmental impact statement has not been prepared, the project, including compliance with the conditions of approval, will not have an adverse significant, individual, or cumulative impact on the environment.

An Initial Environmental Checklist has been completed for the project and staff's analysis concludes that the project will not have any adverse significant individual or cumulative impact on the environment. In addition, a Categorical Exemption was filed in accordance with CEQA requirements.

4. The establishment, maintenance, and operation of the project will not be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, comfort, or general welfare of the Lake Tahoe Region.

This project will improve storm drainage and prevent erosion in an existing residential development. There is no evidence that the project will be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, comfort, or general welfare of the Lake Tahoe Region.

5. The project, including compliance with the conditions of approval, is consistent with, and thus will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, as amended hereby, including but not limited to the Land Use, Water Quality, Transportation and Air Quality, Conservation, Recreation, Public Services and Facilities, and Implementation Elements of the Regional Plan. Further, the project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded. (see Findings 6 through 13 below)

6. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Land Use Element of the Regional Plan, as amended hereby.

The adopted Plan Area Statement designates the project area as Residential/Mitigation. The project is consistent with the planning statement (see Section A above).

7. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Water Quality Element of the Regional Plan, as amended hereby, and therefore will not cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for water quality to be exceeded.

The project is consistent with the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan (208 Plan) and has been identified in the Regional Plan Goals and Policies as a part of the Surface Water Management Plan and SEZ Restoration Program.

8. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Transportation and Air Quality Elements of the Regional Plan as amended hereby, and therefore will not cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for air quality to be exceeded.

The project includes the revegetation of approximately 2 acres of existing denuded areas which will improve air quality in the area by eliminating dust problems. The project proposes no changes to the existing transportation facilities and therefore will not cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for air quality to be exceeded.

9. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan, as amended hereby, and therefore will not cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for vegetation, wildlife, fisheries, soils, and scenic quality to be exceeded.

The project includes revegetation of 2 acres of existing denuded areas, bank stabilization, planting and drainage improvements. There is no evidence that the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for vegetation, wildlife, fisheries, soils and scenic quality will be exceeded.

10. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Recreation Element of the Regional Plan, as amended hereby, and therefore will not cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for recreation development to be exceeded.

The project involves the installation of drainage improvements and revegetation and there is no evidence that the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for recreation development will be exceeded.

11. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Public Services and Facilities Element of the Regional Plan, as amended hereby.

The project is a public service erosion control and water quality project and is consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Public Services and Facilities Element of the Regional Plan.

12. The project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Implementation Element of the Regional Plan, as amended hereby.

Since the project is an erosion control and water quality project for an existing residential development there is no impact on development priorities anticipated. The project is a public service project, will not require any new allocations, and is consistent with the Implementation Element of the Regional Plan.

13. It has been demonstrated that the suppliers of water, sewage treatment, fire protection, educational services, police protection and other appropriate utilities have or will have the physical and legal capacity to supply said services to the project.

Since the project is an erosion control and water quality project for an existing residential development no new systems or expansion of existing facilities will be required as a result of the project.

Required Actions and Findings: Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the subject project by taking the following actions and making the following findings:

- I. A motion, based upon the staff summary, for a finding of no significant environmental effect with direction of staff to prepare the necessary certification documents to be included with the permit and for the following findings:
1. The V(g) Findings (Section 3.00, Ordinance 84-1).
  2. The project will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan or cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.
  3. The land disturbance proposed in the SEZ is necessary for the protection for the public health and safety and is necessary for protection of the environment.

4. There are no feasible alternatives to land disturbance within the SEZ.
5. The impacts of disturbance in the SEZ have been fully mitigated.
6. Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) lands will be restored in an amount equal to or greater than 1.5 times the area of SEZ which is being disturbed.

II. A motion to approve the project, based upon the staff summary, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Standard Conditions of approval listed in Attachment D with the following modifications:

Delete:

- 1.(b) Security
- 1.(c) Drainage improvement calculations
20. Water conservation devices
21. Water heaters
22. Space heaters
23. Woodstoves

2. The following special condition:

- a. The project specifications shall indicate a maximum fertilizer application rate of 300 pounds per acre based on the use of slow release fertilizers.

**POOR  
QUALITY  
ORIGINAL (S)  
TO FOLLOW**



**HIGH DESERT MICROIMAGING, INC.  
1225 FINANCIAL BLVD  
RENO, NV 89502  
(775) 359-6980**