

**TRPA
GOVERNING BOARD
PACKETS**

**JULY
1989**

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BODY

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

July 26, 1989 9:30 a.m.
July 27, 1989 8:00 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 page 3) *(approved as modified)*
- VI ✓ PROJECT REVIEW
 - A ✓ Kjer Commercial Foundation Exemption, Douglas County APN 07-292-01 *approved* 85
 - B ✓ TRPA Air Quality Monitoring Station, Special Use Determination, D.L. Bliss State Park, El Dorado County APN 17-041-28 *approved* 91
 - C ✓ Tahoe Ready Cab, Special Use Determination, Change in Use, El Dorado County APN 32-291-23 *approved* 107
 - D ✓ Showboat Lines, Inc., Special Use Determination, Change in Use, El Dorado County APN 32-291-23 *approved* 115
 - E ✓ Alpine Meadows Ski Lift Relocation, Special Use Determination, Placer County APN 83-010-14, -50, -51, and -65 *approved* 124
 - F ✓ City of South Lake Tahoe, Stateline Erosion Control Project (Drainage Basin B), El Dorado County APN 510-110-89/9 *approved* 138
 - G ✓ Washoe County School District, Incline High School Football Field Lights, Washoe County APN 124-071-42 *approved* 148
 - H ✓ Tom and Evelyn Nored, Special Use Determination, New Single Family Dwelling in a Commercial Land Use District, 6851 Westlake Boulevard, Placer County APN 98-200-23 *approved* 180
- VII PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS/EIS CERTIFICATION
 - A ✓ Amendment of the Goals and Policies and Code to Modify Land Coverage Transfer Requirements Relative to Erosion Control and Other Environmentally Oriented Projects *unco* 192

- ✓ B. Scenic Resources Management Package, Including Adoption of Chapter 26 (Signs), Design Review Guidelines, and Scenic Quality Improvement Program; and Amendment of Chapters 30 (Design Standards), 2 (Definitions), 4 (Project Review and Exempt Activities), and 12 (TRPA Regional Plan Maps); and Certification of the EIS - 1:30 p.m. 202
Wednesday, July 26

- ✓ C. Amendment of the Code and Rules of Procedure to Provide for Alternative Methods of Field Verifications and Land Capability Challenges for TRPA-Designated Land Banks 206

- ✓ D. Amendment of Articles V (Project Review) and VI (Environmental Impact Statements) of the Rules of Procedure 204

WIII PLANNING MATTERS

- ✓ A. Discussion With State Highway Officials and Action, If Necessary, Regarding Use of Salt on Highways and Damage to Roadside Vegetation

- ✓ B. Status Report and Action, If Necessary, on El Dorado County Position on Highway 50 Study and Freeway Route Rescission Analysis *revised*
rescinded
adopted

- ✓ C. Amendment of Agreement Regarding South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Redevelopment Plan for Ski Run/State Line Areas 312

IX ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- ✓ A. Review of Accomplishments of Program of Work for FY 1988-89 *insert*

- ✓ B. California and Nevada Lay Member Appointments to the Advisory Planning Commission (Two Terms Expire August 1989) 314

✓ REPORTS

- ✓ A. Status Report on the Tahoe Transportation District

- ✓ B. Legal Committee Report and Board Action on Co-Counsel Position 316

- ✓ C. Rules Committee Report and Board Action on Recommendations Regarding Amendment of Articles V (Project Review) and VI Environmental Impact Statements) of the Rules of Procedure *see above*

- ✓ D. Finance Committee Report and Board Action on Recommendations

- ✓ 1. Receipt of the June Financial Statement

- ✓ 2. Status Report on FY 89-91 Budget Requests to California and Nevada

- ✓ 3. Adjustments in Salaries of Executive Director and Agency Counsel

- h. Executive Director
- 1. Status Report on Projects Reviewed at Staff Level and on Emergency Permits Issued by Executive Director 322
- 2. Status Report and Board Action, If Necessary, on Code Interpretations Made by Executive Director none
- 3. Status Report on Residential Allocations Issued in the South Tahoe Public Utility District Service Area of El Dorado County and the City of South Lake Tahoe 329
- 4. Erosion Control and Building Awards Presentations - 3:45 p.m., Wednesday, July 26
- 5. Notice of Circulation of a Draft EIS on the Possible Visual Impact of the Highway 89 Improvement Project at Emerald Bay

6. Other

F. Agency Counsel - *Kelly - denied request for a Hrs \$ 130,000 fees.*

G. Governing Board Members

XI RESOLUTIONS

- A. For Former Board Member Chuck Deaner 3:30 p.m. - Wednesday, July 26
- B. Other

screening & selection committee

appoint Delaney to Legal Committee

XII CORRESPONDENCE

XIII PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

XIV ADJOURNMENT

CONSENT CALENDAR

<u>Item</u>	<u>Recommended Action</u>
1. Davis, Pier Repair and New Boatlift, Placer County APN 84-121-08	Approval With Findings And Conditions
2. Hillstrom/Catron, Pier Relocation, Recognition of Multiple Use Facility, El Dorado County APN 17-021-20 and -21	Approval With Findings And Conditions

Consent Calendar (continued)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Recommended Action</u>
3. City of South Lake Tahoe, Bijou Park Infrastructure Improvements, APN 510-100-80/3	Approval With Findings And Conditions
4. U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Big Meadow/Tahoe Rim Trail Trailhead Parking Area, TRPA File No. 580-100-89/1, El Dorado County	Approval With findings And Conditions
5. Allocation of FY 89-90 Local Transportation Funds to El Dorado County	Approval
6. Allocation of FY 89-90 Local Transportation Funds to Placer County	Approval
7. Release of Water Quality Mitigation Funds to Placer County for Purchase of Specialized Equipment for Erosion Control Maintenance	Approval

Completed Land Capability Challenges: Approval With Findings

- 8. Dennis and Lisa Erickson, 790 Geraldine Drive, Washoe County APN 125-254-04
- 9. Abramson/Marquez/Connolly, 7193 Third Avenue, El Dorado County APN 015-214-19 and -20
- 10. Julie Mittino, 542 Koru, El Dorado County APN 034-462-12
- 112. Andy and Zaida Saberi, 940 Tyner Way, Washoe County APN 125-162-07 cont
- 12. Lien, 390 Crynos Way, Placer County APN 93-280-13

<u>Item</u>	<u>Recommended Action</u>
13. Resolution Authorizing Executive Director to Sign An Agreement With the California State Water Resources Control Board	Approval

These consent calendar items are expected to be routine and noncontroversial. They will be acted upon by the Governing Board at one time without discussion. If any Governing Board member or noticed affected property owner requests that any item be removed from the consent calendar, it will be taken up separately under the appropriate agenda category.

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.

- Article III(g) Public Law 96-551

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, NV

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

July 17, 1989

To: Governing Body

From: Gary D. Midkiff, Assistant Executive Director

Subject: Field Trip for Governing Board on July 27, 1989

As we discussed last month staff is arranging an all day field trip for Thursday, July 27. Please be aware that contrary to the previous notice with the tentative agenda we plan to depart from the TRPA office at 8:00 am.

Staff is still preparing the itinerary for the day and will have it for you at the Governing Board meeting. We will be attempting to show you a cross section of items of interest including at least the following:

- one of our first stops will be in Tahoe City at the Boat Works Marina where we will embark on the Research Vessel LaConte. The LaConte is operated by the Tahoe Research Group, and is used extensively in the research and monitoring programs under the auspices of the Tahoe Interagency Monitoring Program directed by the Interagency Monitoring Committee. While on the boat we will see and possibly participate in sechi disk readings, a phytoplankton tow, and a demonstration of the newly acquired Remote Operated Vehicle which transports a remote camera used in a variety of research projects including the fish study now underway
- several of the commercial, public service and erosion control projects which have won awards for outstanding design and landscaping/erosion control (this year's awards will be presented on Wednesday, July 26)
- public service projects including SEZ restoration, erosion control and water quality projects, air quality and visual monitoring sites, wildlife habitat enhancement, beach access and more as designed, funded, and supported by the Forest Service, California Tahoe Conservancy, TRPA Air and Water Quality Mitigation Funds and other programs
- a range of lots which received IPES scores and how the score was derived
- the South Tahoe Redevelopment Project areas (including demolition which is now underway

AND MORE.....

Memo to the TRPA Governing Board
July 17, 1989
Page Two

We have also invited Mr. Bob Harris, Supervisor of the USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, and Mr. Dennis Machida, Executive Officer of the California Tahoe Conservancy to join us for at least a portion of the trip so that you can get to know them. Both Bob and Dennis play an active role in the day to day activities of land management and providing public access and environmental protection to the Tahoe Basin. This trip should give you all a chance to get to know them and their programs better. Additionally, staff from these and other agencies may meet us at strategic points along our trip to share their detailed knowledge with all of us.

I will attempt to provide additional background and a more specific itinerary at least by Wednesday, July 26.

We will be picking up box lunches and should arrive back at the TRPA offices by 5:00 p.m.

If anyone has further question prior to the Board meeting, please feel free to contact me.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, NV

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

July 17, 1989

To: The TRPA Governing Board

From: The Staff

Subject: Minutes to be Acted on at July Meeting

Following are two sets of minutes to be acted on at the July Board meeting - the June 7 minutes for the special joint Governing Board/Advisory Planning Commission meeting and the regular June 28, 29, 1989 meeting minutes.

jf
7/17/89

AGENDA ITEM III

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
GOVERNING BOARD AND
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

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

June 7, 1989

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

I PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Governing Board Chairman Roland Westergard called the special meeting of the Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:30 a.m. and asked Board member Chester Gibbs to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

II ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Board Members Present: Mr. Cefalu, Mr. Kanoff, Mr. Fluty, Mr. Chimarusti, Mr. Klein, Mr. Toll, Mr. Harper, Mr. Reed, Mr. Gibbs, Ms. Del Papa (present at 9:40 a.m.), Mr. Deaner (present at 10:10 a.m.), Mr. Westergard

Board Members Absent: Mr. Cronk, Mr. Houghteling, Mr. Hime

Chairman Westergard noted that he had received letters from Washoe County and Carson City appointing Mike Harper and Eric Toll, respectively, to represent those jurisdictions for the meeting.

APC Members Present: Ms. Huber, Mr. Renz, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Hofer (present at 9:35 a.m.), Ms. Becker, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Roberts, Mr. Hansen (present at 9:40 a.m.), Mr. Thrans (present at 9:45 a.m.), Mr. Brooks, Mr. Katai (for Washoe County)

APC Members Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. DeMello, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Bedard, Mr. Combs, Nevada Lay Member (position vacant)

III APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agency Executive Director Bill Morgan explained that the staff presentations on the redevelopment project and its EIS would be done concurrently. Public comments would follow. The Board would be asked first to act on the Harrah's garage modification (agenda item IV A.) because of its relationship with redevelopment.

MOTION by Mr. Klein to approve the agenda as described. The motion carried unanimously.

Prior to moving on to the next item, new staff planner Coleen Shade and transportation planner Keith Norberg were introduced to the Board.

IV PROJECT REVIEW

A. Harrah's Parking Garage, Modification of Prior Approval, Douglas County APNs 07-150-01, -05, -06, -07, and -08 (Governing Board)

Mr. Jerry Wells, Chief of Project Review, presented a general summary of what the Board would be considering. The components of the redevelopment project at this stage included the Embassy Suites project adjacent to Harrah's; the Ski Run site, which earlier had included an expanded marina; the southwest corner site at Highway 50 and Ski Run; and Harrah's parking garage. The Board would be acting first on Harrah's and then on the other components which, together, were known as the Redevelopment Project No. 1. Two other components which would come to the Board in later months were Drainage Basin B, in the Stateline area, and Drainage Basin E, which included the wetland proposal near Ski Run. All these projects needed approval before the redevelopment project could proceed.

Mr. Wells presented the summary of the Harrah's garage project, which previously had been acted on by the Board in 1979, but which had been held up since then because of litigation. Upon approval of a modified project by TRPA today, the plaintiffs would be dismissing the litigation so that construction of a modified garage could proceed. Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code provided for projects approved by TRPA prior to adoption of the Regional Plan to be reviewed under the terms of the original conditions of approval. Staff had approached the garage project in that manner and had not treated it as an existing project seeking modifications. The proposal called for a reduction in spaces from approximately 3,600 spaces to 2,600 spaces and a reduction in total project area. The pending sale of the Embassy Suites site, now a part of Harrah's, would reduce the overall project area and confine it to Nevada. There would also be a reduction in the parking garage footprint from 153,000 square feet to 139,000 square feet. The original garage proposed three levels below grade; the modification proposed one level below grade. Harrah's also proposed converting two underground pedestrian tunnels connecting the garage with the casino to two above-grade overpasses. Three hundred sixty-eight off-site parking spaces would be provided at the Crescent V shopping center; 271 of those had been acted on by TRPA in the past and had been approved. Essentially, Harrah's was asking for an addition of 97 spaces at Crescent V. Mr. Wells presented more details on the proposed modifications and specifically addressed size, height, construction phasing, the environmental assessment of impacts related to TRPA's thresholds, impacts (parking, traffic, air quality, land coverage, excavation, storm drainage and groundwater), mitigation, and required Board findings for approval. Mr. Wells asked that the last paragraph on page two of the staff summary be modified to read, "There will be an 846-space parking deficiency during construction of Phase I of the proposed modified project as compared to current parking conditions ~~and an additional~~ including 371-space parking deficiency as a result of the Embassy Suites construction." The spaces were not additive; the 846 included the 371.

Ms. Janet Beronio, representing Harrah's, spoke on the link between this modification and redevelopment and the fact that part of the original site for the parking garage project included land in California. Unless Harrah's unencumbered the land, it could not be sold for the Embassy Suites project and commencement of redevelopment. Harrah's was pleased that agreement had been reached with the plaintiffs in the litigation and that the process could proceed. With respect to the staff summary, there were some points to be

clarified. Harrah's had some concern with the manner in which the matter was brought to the Board as a project for review. While Harrah's saw this more as settlement of litigation, Harrah's appreciated the issues involved and the circumstances surrounding redevelopment. It should be noted that, in the original approval on the parking garage, one of the conditions of approval was that, should the garage ever be modified to exceed or add additional spaces, it would have to come before TRPA for review. There was not a condition that it would need to come before TRPA for review and approval for a reduction. With regard to offsite parking, in the early 1980s, Harrah's entered into an arrangement with the Crescent V Center to park some of Harrah's employees offsite. That matter was brought before the TRPA Board and a determination made that use of the site for parking was not a project and therefore not subject to TRPA's approval. The point was made that the site was already used for parking and it was just a matter of who was using it. At that time there were approximately 271 cars parked on the site. The arrangement with Crescent V did not limit the number of spaces and as many spaces as Harrah's could put within its assigned area, provided City requirements were met, was satisfactory to the landlord. Two years ago, Harrah's had the opportunity to acquire an additional area for parking which was previously leased by Greyhound for its buses. Since then, this space as well had been used for offsite employee parking, bringing the total to 368 spaces. Harrah's wanted to ensure that through good management it could put more cars in this area through striping for compact cars and valet parking to meet the needs for temporary offsite parking during construction. With regard to the temporary parking, during Embassy Suites' construction and forever, Harrah's would lose 371 spaces. The staff summary referred to a requirement that Harrah's provide 371 spaces offsite. Harrah's would like to have the opportunity to see if, on the site, provision could be made for compact cars spaces and the Crescent V site managed and used to meet the 371 space deficiency so that the Embassy project and redevelopment could proceed without that being a condition of the approval.

With regard to the parking mitigation measures (page 4 of the staff's summary) and the requirement for 371 temporary offsite parking spaces, Harrah's would prefer that the condition require mitigation for the loss of 371 spaces (or whatever the number was) as opposed to the requirement to provide it offsite. If Harrah's could accommodate 10 or 15 spaces on its site and 350 at Crescent V, Harrah's would like the opportunity to do so. With regard to storm drainage (page 5 of the staff's summary), the summary stated that the applicant should install a new storm drainage and water quality treatment system. Ms. Beronio requested deletion of the term "new" because Harrah's already had a system which was being expanded to meet 208 water quality plan requirements and to retrofit the site. Section II. 2.b. of the required actions and findings (page 11) referred to posting a security deposit in an amount determined to be adequate by TRPA to ensure availability of all required temporary offsite parking. Because Harrah's had to have a plan approved ahead of time for offsite parking, it was unclear why a security was being required. Condition 2.n. on page 13 of the staff summary required the permittee to submit a plan to meet the 371-space and 846-space temporary offsite parking requirements. The 846-space requirement was a maximum; the 371 was already included in the 846 (as pointed out earlier by staff in its presentation). Condition 2.o. required assurance that the 97 spaces at Crescent V would always be available. This conflicted with condition 18. which required removal of all parking spaces upon construction of the garage. It would be clearer to say there would be 97 spaces until such time as the garage was completed. Condition 17 on page 15 related to offsite parking,

and it was felt that staff's intent was to ensure that Harrah's not exceed 3,841 spaces total. To delineate how many were offsite and how many were onsite could cause future problems in the event Harrah's was able to do some restriping. To give Harrah's some flexibility, Ms. Beronio asked that the condition require parking not to exceed 3,841 spaces. Condition 18 (page 15) required that upon completion of the garage Harrah's would remove all offsite parking; as stated previously, this was inconsistent with the earlier requirement that there always be offsite parking. Condition 24 (page 16) provided that no parking along the Loop Road should be permitted; Harrah's could not control this. It was more within the control of Douglas County or the City of South lake Tahoe.

Mr. Wells responded that the security required in condition II. 2.b. was to ensure that offsite parking would be available during construction. Leases could be cancelled and things could change, resulting in a deficit. TRPA wanted to ensure there would be necessary parking, and staff had understood that Harrah's did not have room onsite - at least not the numbers being discussed.

Mr. Morgan suggested that demonstrating parking could be provided was not the same as actually doing so. Before approving the project, TRPA wanted to ensure there was no choice for Harrah's but to make up for the 371 space parking deficit created by the selling of land to Embassy. Requiring a security gave more assurance that this would occur. Should Harrah's decide to drop the garage or should the matter become tied up in litigation, there would be a 371-space deficit. Because the same condition was placed on Embassy Suites, one or the other project proponent would take care of the deficit. Staff was not prepared to drop the security.

Mr. Harper suggested that the security was more like a fine. Would the security buy more spaces? If the intent was to force Harrah's never to create a deficit, a condition should require that construction not proceed to additional phases until the deficit was resolved.

Mr. Morgan explained that the security was an alternative, not a sole solution to a possible problem. The security would only be used for a specified purpose. One option was to provide a lease for additional parking spaces, and the security had to be large enough to provide for that. Mr. Wells reiterated that the same condition was being placed on Embassy Suites and that parking had to be provided before Embassy could break ground. There were several way to ensure the condition was satisfied.

With regard to condition II. 2.n., Mr. Wells agreed that the condition should be reworded to clarify that the 371 parking spaces was part of the 846 spaces. Should Harrah's not proceed with its parking garage, there would still need to be the 371 spaces for Embassy.

In response to Ms. Beronio's concerns with the Environmental Assessment (EA), Mr. Morgan responded that what really counted were changes made in the conditions. The EA was complete and a matter of record; it was not the subject of Board certification but rather the basis for the Board to take action on the project. Subsequent comments made relative to conditions would take care of questions on the EA. TRPA staff had no problem with removing the language and conditions that suggested the only options available to Harrah's were offsite.

TRPA/APC SPECIAL MEETING JUNE 7, 1989

Staff would be proposing modifications to conditions to provide flexibility for provision of parking.

With regard to condition 17. on page 15 and the number of spaces onsite and off-site, Mr. Wells explained that staff's intent was that 368 off-site parking spaces not be exceeded. The condition could be restated to allow Harrah's to provide those spaces on-site. With regard to condition 24 and the prohibition on Loop Road parking, staff's intent was not to require Harrah's to enforce the prohibition on Loop Road parking but rather that it not be used for the temporary off-site parking requirement. This could be redrafted to clarify intent.

With regard to condition 24, Mr. Morgan explained that once the circulation system was completed and 5 lanes of traffic were directed off of Highway 50 there was to be no parking on the Loop Road. Using portions of the Loop Road during the interim was not the problem. In fact, that could be a very sensible off-site parking situation. Staff would clarify the condition.

Ms. Beronio suggested that, with respect to the 371 spaces, it was clear they were a loss to Harrah's, and Harrah's intended to make them up wherever it could. The EA indicated that if the Crescent V Center could be valet parked Harrah's could more than exceed the requirement, both for the 371 spaces and the temporary parking during Harrah's construction. The availability of additional spaces at Crescent V had been discussed with the landlord.

Mr. Tom Martens, Executive Director of the League to Save Lake Tahoe, explained the League did not oppose the redevelopment project or intend that his testimony would delay that project. There had been good faith discussions and cooperation between the City and TRPA and others in the redevelopment process. That spirit of cooperation had not existed with Harrah's in dealing with the potential problems of the parking garage, problems that had their philosophical underpinnings dating back to 1979. The League had had conversations with Harrah's and with many of the redevelopment parties trying to suggest ways to tailor the parking garage modification to achieve the goal of getting people out of their cars and implementing transit improvements. Some had included trying to deal with the offsite parking problem and moving offsite employee parking further out into the City or into Douglas County closer to where the employees lived so they could be bused in. TRPA was about to floor in offsite parking for a long time into the future. The League had a number of reasons for objecting to the project. First, it was a new project and not a modification of an old one. The project had been substantially changed from the 1979 approval - so substantially changed that it had to be considered a new project. Because it was a project proposed since amendment of the Compact, all the findings relative to meeting the thresholds had to be made. The original project did not consider the offsite parking which was now a part of the project. The phases had been dramatically altered; the circulation system had been altered; and the project was being done in conjunction with a 400-room hotel - none of which were a part of the original project. The restoration schedules for the coverage had been dramatically altered, and the original project did not involve Bill's Casino. The project needed to be considered under the Compact as a new project, requiring Article Vg findings and a complete environmental impact report. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMTs) and air quality impacts needed to be calculated. An analysis of the cumulative effect of large parking garages on traffic flows and air quality impacts in Tahoe was needed. This parking garage was not