

**TRPA  
APC  
PACKETS**

**JUNE  
1993**

Counter  
Copy

June 9, 1993  
APC Packet

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1993, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

June 1, 1993

By: David S. Ziegler  
David S. Ziegler  
Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake  
Boulevard, Kings Beach, California

June 9, 1993  
9:30 a.m.

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

PAGE #

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS
  - A. Amendment of Chapter 30, Design Standards, and Chapter 32, Regional Plan and Threshold Review, to Implement Scenic Resource Thresholds For Views From Public Recreation Areas (to be continued) 1
  - B. Amendment of Chapter 37, Individual Parcel Evaluation System, and Chapter 2, Definitions, Relative to SEZ Indicators 2-19
  - C. Amendment of Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map Pursuant to Man-Modified Determination, Salzberg, Airport Road and U.S. 50, El Dorado County APN 33-050-01 20-29
  - D. Amendment of Prime Fish Habitat Map for Area East of Second Creek in Incline Village, Nevada 30-35
  - E. Amendment of Chapter 14, Community Plans, Subsection 14.6.C, to Make Alternative Plan Requirement Consistent With EIS Alternatives 36-41
  - F. Amendment of Plan Area Boundary Between Plan Area 045, Incline Village Commercial, and Plan Area 046, Incline Village Residential, to Add APNs 132-020-01, -02, and -03 to Plan Area 046 42-45
  - G. Amendment of Plan Area Boundary Between Plan Area 029, Kings Beach Commercial, and Plan Area 031, Brockway, to Include APNs 90-222-28 and -29 in Plan Area 029 46-51
  - H. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, to Adopt MOU Between TRPA and Nevada State Lands to Exempt Certain Activities From TRPA Review and Approval 52-58
  - I. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, to Adopt MOU With El Dorado County to Exempt Certain Public Works Activities From TRPA Review and Approval 59-66

V. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Discussion on Employee Trip Reduction Program and Parking Ordinance
- B. Other

VI. REPORTS

- A. Executive Director
- B. Legal Counsel
- C. APC Members
- D. Public Interest Comments

VII. PENDING MATTERS

VIII. RESOLUTIONS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

# TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

308 Dorla Court  
Elks Point, Nevada

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

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

## MEMORANDUM

May 26, 1993

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 30, Design Standards, Related Amendments to Chapter 12, Regional Plan Maps, and Chapter 32, Regional Plan and Threshold Review, to Implement Scenic Resource Thresholds From Public Recreation Areas

At the May, 1993 Advisory Planning Commission meeting the APC requested staff to update the inventories and contact recreation providers potentially affected by the amendments. This item is continued to the July meeting in order for staff to complete the tasks requested by the APC.

Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.

AS/rd  
5/26/93

AGENDA ITEM IV.A.

# 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

May 25, 1993

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendments of Chapters 37 (IPES) and 2 of the Code of Ordinances  
Relative to Clarification of Secondary Indicators And Disturbed Sites  
For Stream Environment Zones (SEZ)

-----

Proposed Action: To amend Chapters 37 and 2 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances as set forth below.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and, if appropriate, recommend adoption of the proposed Code of Ordinance amendments to the Governing Board.

Background: TRPA staff have brought these amendments before the APC and Governing Board in November 1992 and again in April 1993. The APC recommended approval of the changes to the Governing Board in November. The Governing Board, however, continued the item because of concerns raised at the public hearing consultants, and directed staff to conduct a public meeting where comment could be received and discussed by TRPA's advisory committee and staff. Such a meeting was held on March 3, 1993. Staff made some changes to the amendment language and decided to bring it back before the APC. The APC continued the item and directed staff to address the impact question in writing, provide a roster of SEZ advisory committee members, and see if it were possible to have a few committee members present at the next hearing.

Purpose of Amendments: The amendments to Chapter 37 are intended to clarify code language making it more consistent with the existing Agency interpretation regarding SEZ delineation. For the most part the proposed amendments reflect TRPA's use of the SEZ criteria since 1987. Chapter 2 amendments are proposed to make definitions consistent with one another and to make the Code easier to use (See Exhibit A).

JP/cmh  
5/25/93

AGENDA ITEM IV.B.

Issues:

1. Alluvial Soils -- TRPA staff had identified a technical problem in the criteria for identifying stream environment zones (SEZs), primarily with respect to the secondary SEZ indicators. The specific language in these criteria include (1) the use of the term "alluvial soil type"; (2) the terminology used to describe evidence of a high water table within the soil profile; and (3) language that could prevent soils which do not fit one of the named map units in the Tahoe Basin Soil Survey, but have groundwater or evidence of groundwater between 20 and 40 inches and SEZ vegetation, from meeting the soils criteria for a secondary SEZ. Because these soils do not adequately fit the profile description of the named secondary "alluvial soil" map units (i.e. Lo, Gr, or Co), they may not meet this criteria.

The Code of Ordinances employs, incorrectly, the terminology "alluvial soil types" to identify soils which owe their major characteristics to the presence of surface and subsurface water. The correct definition of alluvial soil types are those soils which were formed by the process of deposition by flowing water. Of the 16 soil map units identified as alluvial soils in the Tahoe Basin Area Soil Survey (Rogers, 1974), only six are principally influenced by the presence of surface water or subsurface water within 40 inches of the surface.

2. Disturbed Sites -- Current Code language is relatively silent on how to delineate SEZ areas that have been disturbed by filling or vegetation removal. Disturbed SEZ sites are candidates for restoration and their identification is important to TRPA's water quality and restoration threshold goals. The proposed amendments provide delineation criteria.

3. Protection of SEZ's Exhibiting Secondary Indicators -- Secondary indicators are not used in the Federal Wetland Delineation Criteria and were developed in TRPA's 1988 208 Water Quality Plan. Typically, secondary indicators include certain types of plant species and the presence of groundwater at sometime of the year between 20 and 40 inches of depth in the soil profile. Because of the sensitive nature of the water quality concerns at Lake Tahoe it is desirable to protect lands exhibiting secondary SEZ characteristics. Development of these areas typically would cause groundwater to be intercepted which exacerbates water quality problems by: increasing the drainage density of a watershed; increasing erosion; increasing peak runoff and peak flows; reducing infiltration of water; and reducing the amount of nutrient uptake by riparian vegetative species.

4. Amendment Criticisms -- Several consultants have criticized the proposed amendments and the process by which they were developed. The proposed amendments to the Chapter 37 SEZ criteria were formulated with the assistance of a

Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission  
Amendment of Chapters 2 and 37 Relative to  
SEZ Soil Criteria Language -- Page 3

committee of 13 people, including private consultants in hydrology and wetland delineation, representatives from state agencies, employees of several federal agencies directly responsible for developing and applying the U.S. Federal Wetland Criteria, and TRPA staff (See Exhibit B). Together this group has an extensive level of expertise and experience in wetlands related matters.

The Committee reviewed the language of the SEZ criteria in Chapter 37 in a series of four meetings held between the spring and fall of 1992, including two field trips to examine the SEZ delineation problems and the usefulness of the proposed amendments to the criteria. Written comments on the amendments were solicited from basin consultants and several public hearings on the subject have been held including a public meeting in March of 1993 with the advisory committee.

Aside from the process issue, the nature of the criticisms involved deleting all Code language associated with secondary indicators, deleting language on disturbed sites, making the TRPA SEZ delineation criteria the same as the federal criteria, improving plant community determination methods, and the significance of the amendments' impact on areas mapped class 5. The importance of protecting lands with secondary indicators, identifying disturbed SEZ sites, and the reason for the difference with the Federal Wetland Delineation Criteria has been briefly explained above. It should be noted that the Federal criteria is in a state of flux and is likely to undergo some revision. It is possible that upcoming revisions may provide a model which could improve TRPA delineation methods, however, such revisions are probably a year or more away. Staff and some committee members concur that plant community descriptions and determination methods may warrant review and improvement. However, staff feels the issue is beyond the scope of these amendments and proposes to continue to assess the scope of the problem, and determine what would be necessary to ameliorate it, if anything. The impact issue is discussed below.

4. 208 Plan -- Upon adoption of these recommended Code amendments by the Governing Board, staff will propose corresponding amendments to the Water Quality Management Plan ("208 Plan"), should they be necessary. Since the proposed Code amendments clarify current interpretation and improve the application of criteria on all lands which exhibit SEZ characteristics, TRPA can implement them immediately without waiting for 208 Plan amendments to take effect.

Impact: TRPA staff queried the IPES database which contained the field records of 10,975 parcels. Of this sample a query of parcels that were 100% SEZ was made and analyzed. The results indicate the proposed amendments affect relatively few properties in the basin (See Exhibit C). In the sample, the acreage of SEZ mapped Co that was based on two secondary indicators amounts to 5.3 percent (11 parcels). No SEZ mapped Lo or Gr was based on two secondary indicators. Parcels mapped JbD and found to be SEZ based on two secondary indicators amounted to 11.3 percent (30 parcels) of the sampled JbD unit. According to the soil survey, the JbD map unit acreage is .1 percent of all soils mapped in the basin. Of the other units mapped class 5, under the Bailey system



the acreage found to be SEZ based on two secondary indicators ranges from 0 to 3.2 percent (0 to 16 parcels) of the sample. Based on this sample analysis it appears that a relatively small acreage of land would be affected by the proposed secondary indicator amendments.

Another database query indicates five IPES scores, on parcels determined to be 100% SEZ based on two secondary SEZ indicators, have been appealed. The appeal work did not change the original evaluation. Two others have requested a Governing Board appeal and are pending action.

The amendments would not affect existing IPES scores except as allowed by Code Section 37.3.E (See Exhibit D). Similarly, land capability verifications and challenges performed by TRPA staff since adoption of the Regional Plan in 1987 would be honored unless obvious errors or omissions were present.

Amend the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 37 as shown below [added language is underlined (included are terms currently underlined) and deleted language is overstricken]:

37.3.A Purpose: One of TRPA's primary goals is to improve the water quality of Lake Tahoe, and Stream Environment Zones (SEZs) are critical components of the sensitive Tahoe landscape because they protect water quality by providing natural treatment and conveyance of surface runoff. Disturbance of and encroachment into SEZs reduces their capacity to filter sediments and nutrients transported by surface waters. As such, TRPA protects SEZs from disturbance and has adopted identification criteria that differs from the Federal Wetlands Criteria. Similarly, TRPA's delineation methodology uses hydrology, soils, and vegetation. Other important benefits provided by SEZ protection include maintenance of flood flow capacity, fish and wildlife habitat, and open space buffers.

37.3.BA Definitions. The definitions are as follows:

~~(X) AXXWYZA/BZYS//AXY/YWZ/XYZOYNG/BZY/YZPS/OWE/YWZY  
WAZOY/XYAZAZYZYZYZS/YO/YWZ/XYZYZYZ/XY/XYZYZYZ/XY  
WAZYZYZYZ/XYZYZ/  
(A)//YZAWY/AXYWYZA/YAZA/(YD)  
(B)//XYZYZA/YZAWY/XYZYZ/SZAZ//WZY/YAZYZA/(EY)  
(C)//XYZYZ/XYZYZ/YZAWY/XYZYZ/SZAZ/(QD)  
(D)//WAZYZ/(WY)  
(E)//XYZYZ/YZAWY/AXYWYZA/YAZA/(QY)  
(F)//XYZYZ/YAZA/(YD)~~

(1) (Z) Confined - Stream types classified under major categories A and B, and stream type C2, as defined in the report entitled " A Stream Classification System," David L. Rosgen, April, 1985.

- (2) ~~(3)~~ Designated Flood Plain - The limits of the Intermediate Regional Flood where established for creeks by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), or the limits of the 100-year flood where established for creeks by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps if USACE maps do not exist for that area.
- (3) ~~(4)~~ Ephemeral Stream - Flows sporadically only in response to precipitation, with flows lasting a short time.
- (4) ~~(5)~~ Groundwater Between 20-40 Inches - ~~Evidence of~~  
Groundwater or evidence of ground water, such as low chroma mottles between 20 and 40 inches below the natural ground surface, or the existing surface, if no fill has been placed ~~(evidence of groundwater between 20 and 40 inches below the natural ground surface, or the existing surface, if no fill has been placed)~~.
- (5) ~~(6)~~ Intermittent Stream - ~~Flows in the season of the year or periodically~~  
~~for part of the year.~~ See Chapter 2.
- (6) ~~(7)~~ Lake - A water body greater than 20 acres in size, exceeding two meters deep at low water and lacking trees, shrubs, persistent emergents, emergent mosses or lichens with greater than 20 percent aerial coverage.
- (7) Low Chroma Mottles - Mottles that have Munsell Soil Color Chart chromas of 2 or less (moist), and values of 4 or more (moist). For soils that have horizons which are dominated by low chroma colors (Munsell chromas of 2 or less), the low chroma horizons are included in the meaning of "mottles that have chroma of 2 or less." These low chroma mottles indicate the horizon that has such mottles is saturated with water at some time of the year or the soil is artificially drained. A complete description of low chroma mottles from Soil Taxonomy (SCS, 1976) is contained in Chapter 37 Technical Appendices K.
- (8) Man-Made Channel - A channel constructed by man for the purpose of conveying water or a channel created by water being discharged from a man-made source, such as a culvert or pipe.
- (9) Natural ground surface - The ground surface existing before placement of fill material. (See Chapter 2 for the definition of fill).

Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission  
 Amendment of Chapters 2 and 37 Relative to  
 SEZ Soil Criteria Language -- Page 6

- (10) (X9) Near Surface Groundwater - Evidence of Groundwater or evidence of ground water, such as low chroma mottles within 20 inches of the natural ground surface, or the existing surface, if no fill has been placed locally indicated/soil.
- (11) (X9) Perennial Stream - Perennially/Lowland/Stream channels//Surface/water flow/throughout the year/except in years of infrequent drought//Perennially/stream channels shall be those shown as/soil/lyde/lines on USGS/Quads/Maps of streams/determined/soil/perennially by TRPA/ See Chapter 2.
- (12) (X9) Pond - A standing water body less than 20 acres in size and/or less than two meters deep at low water.
- (13) (X9) Primary Riparian Vegetation - The following vegetative community types as identified in the 1971 report entitled "Vegetation of the Lake Tahoe Region, A Guide for Planning:"
- (a) Type 0: Open water - Open water, Swamps and pools and Vernal pools.
  - (b) Type 2: Herbaceous - Wet marsh or meadow and Sphagnum bog.
  - (c) Type 7: Riparian shrub - Willow thicket and Alder thicket.
  - (d) Type 9: Broadleaf - Low elevations.
- (14) Primary Soil Map Units - The following soil map units owe their major characteristics to the presence of near surface groundwater and are considered primary indicators of soil wetness.
- (a) Elmira loamy coarse sand, wet, variant (Ev)
  - (b) Marsh (Mh)
- (15) Secondary Soil Map Units - The following soil map units owe their major characteristics to the presence of groundwater or evidence of groundwater such as indicated by evidence such as low chroma mottles between 20 and 40 inches below the natural ground surface or the existing

surface, if no fill has been placed, and are considered secondary indicators of soil wetness.

- (a) Loamy alluvial land (Lo)
- (b) Gravelly alluvial land (Gr)
- (c) Celio gravelly loamy coarse sand (Co)
- (d) Jabu coarse sandy loam, seeped, 2 to 15 percent slopes (JbD)

(16) ~~(13)~~ SEZ setbacks - A strip of land adjacent to the edge of a SEZ, the designated width of which is considered the minimum width necessary to protect the integrity of the various characteristic of the SEZ. The width of the setback shall be established in accordance with the procedure set forth in Subsection 37.3.D.

(17) ~~(14)~~ Secondary Riparian Vegetation - The following vegetative types as identified in the 1971 report entitled "Vegetation of the Lake Tahoe Region, A Guide for Planning:"

- (a) Type 2: Herbaceous - Wet mesic meadow.
- (b) Type 9: Broadleaf - High elevations.
- (c) Type 19: Lodgepole - Wet type.

(18) ~~(15)~~ Slope Condition - The condition of the slope located adjacent to the stream channel or edge of the SEZ shall be defined as follows. The extent of existing slope protection, which is defined as the percent cover of original duff layer, down logs, low growing vegetation or rock fragments greater than 1-2 inches in diameter, shall be given primary consideration when determining slope condition.

- (a) Good - Slopes show little or no evidence of surface (sheet, rill, gully) erosion or mass wasting. Slopes are typically covered 90 percent or more with original duff layer, down logs, slash, low growing vegetation or rock fragments greater than 1-2 inches in diameter. Slope gradient is commonly less than 30 percent. Soil horizons are usually cohesive and consolidated.
- (b) Average - Slopes show evidence of surface (sheet, rill, gully) erosion or mass wasting over 5 to 25 percent of the slope surface. Slopes are typically

covered between 50 to 90 percent with original duff layer, down logs, slash, low growing vegetation or rock fragments greater than 1-2 inches in diameter. Slope gradient is commonly between 30 and 70 percent. Soil horizons are typically moderately cohesive and consolidated.

- (c) Poor - Slopes show evidence of active and pronounced surface (sheet, rill, gully) erosion or mass wasting over more than 50 percent of the slope surface. Slopes are typically covered less than 50 percent with original duff layer, down logs, slash, low growing vegetation or rock fragments greater than 1-2 inches in diameter. Slope gradient is often greater than 70 percent. Soil horizons are typically non-cohesive and unconsolidated. Evidence of seeping is often present.

(19) ~~(18)~~ Terrace - A moderately flat land area, above the flood plain, generally less than 20 percent slope.

(20) ~~(17)~~ Unconfined - Stream types classified under major categories C (excluding stream type C2), D and E as defined in the report entitled "A Stream Classification System," David L. Rosgen, April 1985.

37.3.CB Identification: A stream environment zone (SEZ) shall be determined to be present if any one of the following key indicators is present or, in absence of a key indicator, if any ~~three~~ two of the following secondary indicators are present. Plant communities shall be identified in accordance with the definitions and procedures contained in the 1971 report entitled "Vegetation of the Lake Tahoe Region, A Guide for Planning."

1) Key Indicators: Key indicators are:

- (a) Evidence of surface water flow, including perennial, ephemeral and intermittent streams, but not including rills or man-made channels;
- (b) Primary riparian vegetation;
- (c) Near surface groundwater;
- (d) Lakes or ponds;
- (e) Beach (Be) soil; or
- (f) One of the following ~~primary soil~~ primary soil map units:

- (i) Elmira loamy coarse sand, wet variant (Ev).
- (ii) Marsh (Mh).

(2) Secondary Indicators: Secondary indicators are:

- (a) Designated flood plain;
- (b) Groundwater or evidence of groundwater between 20 - 40 inches; or one of the following ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXX~~ secondary soil map units:
  - (i) Loamy alluvial land (Lo);
  - (ii) Celio gravelly loamy coarse sand (Co); or
  - (iii) Gravelly alluvial land (Gr).
  - (iv) Jabu coarse sandy loam, seeped, 2 to 15 percent slopes (JbD).
- (c) Secondary riparian vegetation; if natural vegetation has been removed or altered, the potential vegetation can be inferred from other sources such as historical photos or vegetation from adjacent sites at similar elevations.

~~XXXX//XXXX/XX/XX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXX~~

~~//XX//XXXX/XXXXXX/XXXX/XX~~

~~//XX//XX/XXXX/XXXX/XXXX/XXXX/XXXX/XX~~

~~XXXX//XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXX/XX~~

37.3.D Boundaries: The boundaries of an SEZ shall be the outermost limits of the key indicators; or the outermost limits where ~~XXXX~~ any two secondary indicators coincide; ~~XX//XX/XX/XX~~ ~~//XX//XXXX/XX/XXXXXX/XXXX/XX~~ ~~XXXXXX/XX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX/XXXXXX~~, whichever limits establish the widest SEZ at any particular point. The outermost boundaries of a stream (including ephemeral and intermittent) shall be the bank full width of such stream, which shall be defined as the level of frequent high flow, i.e., the level of flood with a recurrence interval of approximately 1.5 years.

37.3.E SEZ Setbacks: No buildings, other structures or land coverage shall be permitted in SEZ setbacks, except in accordance with Subsection 20.4.B and the exception for the backshore set forth in Subsection 55.4.D. The restoration requirements set forth in Subparagraph 20.4.A(2)(c) shall not apply within SEZ setbacks. The allowable base land coverage within SEZ setbacks shall be in accordance with Subsection 20.3.A, and may be combined with the allowable base land coverage for the remainder of the parcel to establish a total allowable base land

coverage. A portion of the total allowable base land coverage for the parcel may be used to allow construction in the SEZ setback only in accordance with Subsection 20.4.B and the exception for the backshore set forth in Subsection 55.4.D. SEZ setbacks shall be established in accordance with the following criteria (see also Section I of the Technical Appendices).

- (1) Confined Perennial Stream: When a confined perennial stream is present, the following setbacks shall be established based on the corresponding slope condition:
  - (a) Good Slope Condition: When the slope condition is identified as good, the setback shall be 25 feet from the edge of the SEZ or 15 feet from the edge of a terrace, if present, whichever is less.
  - (b) Average Slope Condition: When the slope condition is identified as average, the setback shall be 35 feet from the edge of the SEZ or 20 feet from the edge of a terrace, if present, whichever is less.
  - (c) Poor Slope Condition: When the slope condition is identified as poor, the setback shall be 60 feet from the edge of the SEZ or 35 feet from the edge of a terrace, if present, whichever is less.
- (2) Unconfined Perennial Stream: When an unconfined perennial stream is present, the setback shall be 50 feet from the edge of the SEZ.
- (3) Confined Ephemeral Or Intermittent Stream: When a confined ephemeral or intermittent stream is present the following setbacks shall be established based on the corresponding slope conditions:
  - (a) Good Slope Condition: When the slope condition is identified as good, the setback shall be 15 feet from the edge of the SEZ or ten feet from the edge of a terrace, if present, whichever is less.
  - (b) Average Slope Condition: When the slope condition is identified as average, the setback shall be 25 feet from the edge of the SEZ or 15 feet from the edge of a terrace, if present, whichever is less.
  - (c) Poor Slope Condition: When the slope condition is identified as poor, the setback shall be 40 feet from the edge of the SEZ or 25 feet from the edge of a terrace, if present, whichever is less.

- (4) Unconfined Ephemeral Or Intermittent Stream: When an unconfined ephemeral or intermittent stream is present the setback shall be 25 feet from the edge of the SEZ.
- (5) Channel Absent: When there is an SEZ present but there is no associated channel identified, the setback shall be ten feet from the edge of the SEZ.
- (6) Lakes and Ponds: Where a lake or pond is present, the SEZ setback shall be 10 feet from the high water line or 10 feet from the edge of the SEZ, whichever is greater, except where a backshore is established in accordance with Section 55.2 in which case there shall be no SEZ setback established.

37.3.FE SEZ Documentation: Where the IPES field team identifies the existence of an SEZ on an individual parcel, it shall prepare a permanent written record or drawing applicable to that parcel showing the boundaries of the SEZ, the setback line from the SEZ and setting forth the reasons for its determination. At the time a project is reviewed applicable to a parcel evaluated under IPES as having an SEZ, the SEZ boundaries and setback shall be verified or adjusted based upon additional information then available.

Chapter 37. "Technical Appendices". Appendix K.

Appendix K. Low Chroma mottles

Throughout the keys and text of Soil Taxonomy (SCS, 1976), there are references to "mottles that have chroma of 2 or less." This refers to colors in a horizon in which parts have chroma of 2 or less, moist, and value moist of 4 or more whether or not that part is dominant in volume or whether or not it is a continuous phase surrounding spots of higher chroma. If either the minor or major part of a horizon has chroma of 1 to 2 and value, moist of 4 or more and there are spots of higher chroma, the part that has the lower chroma is included in the meaning of "mottles that have chroma of 2 or less". The part is excluded from the meaning if all the horizon has chroma of 2 or less or if no part of the horizon has chroma as low as 2.

The phrase also means that the horizon that has such mottles is saturated with water at some period of the year or is artificially drained. If the soil is periodically wet or is drained, there should be some mottles of high chroma that were caused by segregation of iron or some reddish, very dark, soft accumulations of iron and manganese.



Environmental Documentation: Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the proposed action and proposes a finding of no significant environmental effect.

Findings: Prior to amending the Code, TRPA must make certain findings. Following each finding below, is a brief rationale for making the required findings.

Chapter 6 Findings

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

Rationale: This amendment implements the Goals and Policies, the Code of Ordinances, the Regional Plan, and the 208 Water Quality Management Plan. The amendment produces a more precise and technically sound definition for identifying stream environment zones that corrects Code language deficiencies which prevents protection of certain lands exhibiting SEZ characteristics.

2. Finding: The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The amendment is designed to improve the application of TRPA policy, regarding SEZ protection, by changing Code language related to lands that exhibit SEZ characteristics, but were previously excluded from protection because they did not fit a known soil map unit description. Language changes also clarify identification of SEZs that have been disturbed and may be restorable. These changes are intended to assist TRPA in attaining the environmental thresholds.

3. Finding : Whenever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: See Findings 1 and 2 above.

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

Rationale: For the reasons set forth in the rationale above for Findings 1