

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, July 13, 2016** at the **TRPA Offices**, located at **128 Market Street, Stateline, NV**. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

July 6, 2016

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Joanne S. Marchetta", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Joanne S. Marchetta  
Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
Stateline, NV

July 13, 2016  
9:30 a.m.

---

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item listed or not listed on the agenda may do so at this time. TRPA encourages public comment on items on the agenda to be presented at the time those agenda items are heard. Individuals or groups commenting on items listed on the agenda will be permitted to comment either at this time or when the matter is heard, but not both.

All public comments should be as brief and concise as possible so that all who wish to speak may do so; testimony should not be repeated. The Chair shall have the discretion to set appropriate time allotments for individual speakers (3 minutes for individuals and 5 minutes for group representatives as well as for the total time allotted to oral public comment for a specific agenda item). No extra time for speakers will be permitted by the ceding of time to others. Written comments of any length are always welcome. So that names may be accurately recorded in the minutes, persons who wish to comment are requested to sign in by Agenda Item on the sheets available at each meeting. In the interest of efficient meeting management, the Chair reserves the right to limit the duration of each public comment period to a total of 2 hours. In such an instance, names will be selected from the available sign-in sheet. Any individual or organization that is not selected or otherwise unable to present public comments during this period is encouraged to submit comments in writing to the Advisory Planning Commission. All such comments will be included as part of the public record.

*NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.*

- IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- V. PUBLIC HEARINGS
  - A. Code Amendments for essential Public Safety Facilities within the Shorezone to accommodate regional emergency

**Recommendation Page 1**

response access and egress needs

B. Receipt of comment on the Draft EIR/EIS  
for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan  
and Tahoe City Lodge Project

**No Action/  
Public Comment**

**Page 45**

VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

**Informational Only**

B. General Counsel

**Informational Only**

C. APC Members

**Informational Only**

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

VIII. ADJOURNMENT



TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
Stateline, NV

May 11, 2016

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Teshara called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

Members present: Mr. Donohue, Mr. Mortimer, Mr. Kuchnicki for Ms. Carr,  
Mr. Hymanson, Mr. Larsen, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Guevin, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Plemel,  
Ms. Moss, Mr. Teshara, Mr. Weavil, Ms. Krause

Members absent: Mr. Drew, Mr. Esswein, Ms. Hill, Mr. Riley, Mr. Thompson,  
Mr. Trout

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Larsen moved approval.  
Mr. Donohue seconded the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Teshara said he provided his minor edits to Ms. Ambler.  
Mr. Larsen moved approval of the April 13, 2016 minutes as amended.  
Mr. Hymanson seconded the motion.  
Ms. Moss abstained.  
Motion carried.

V. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Update on the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program

TRPA team member Mr. Zabaglo provided an overview of the Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) program.

## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

The Aquatic Invasive Species program consists of three elements; prevention program (boat inspection program), early detection/rapid response, and the control program. There are over 40 public and private partners in the program.

### Highlights from 2015:

- Funding from California and Nevada for the prevention program
- Decontamination rates are down
- Shared station with the Town of Truckee
- Fee schedule of 50/50 split (fees and public funding) is working
- No new invasions

There were approximately 6,800 inspections at four stations for 2015. It is on par with 2014 and down slightly from the previous year, primarily due to the drought and poor weather in May and June of last year. Decontamination's are approximately 35 to 37 percent of the inspections, down from 50 percent. Forty boats were intercepted that were harboring some type of invasive species. This past year, only one boat from Lake Mead was found with mussels, unlike the past where there was more than one dozen.

Samples are taken from the lake along with visual observations throughout the summer months to check for any new introduction of invasive species and veligers (microscopic juvenile mussels) as part of the early detection/rapid response program.

As part of the control program in 2015, the Implementation Plan was developed by researchers at the University of Reno, Nevada in collaboration with the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Coordination Committee.

### AIS Projects conducted in 2015:

- Truckee River near Tahoe City and the lakeside of the dam
- Lakeside Beach (Lakeside Marina) on the South Shore
- Crystal Bay Condominiums
- Warm water fish removal in the Tahoe Keys channels and lagoons
- Asian Clam monitoring in Emerald Bay

There is coordination with the Tahoe Keys Property Owners' Association on the Integrated Weed Management Plan for weed control. The control strategic initiative is to seek funding as the program did with long term stable funding for prevention. Partners have received funding through the California Tahoe Conservancy, California Prop 1, and Senate Bill 630 for additional weed control work being implemented this season.

There is approximately an \$11-million-dollar unfunded need for the control program.

In April, the Governing Board approved the staff proposed fee schedule to keep the fees the same as 2015.

### Public Outreach:

- AIS Forum annual meeting will be held at the Tahoe Environmental Research Center on

## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

June 14, 2016

- Tahoe Keepers (non-motorized stewardship initiative) has over 3,100 people that participate in the program

### Leadership:

- Coordination with local and western states partners
- Model regulations and legislation from other states
- Washington, DC visits with the western partners
- Member of the Western Regional Panel (the Building Consensus effort is a subset of this panel)
- Partnerships with the boat industry
- AIS Task Force

Work will continue to be done on the control strategic initiative to find funding for the long term. The five-year action list will further flush out what the implementation plan identified as high priority sites. There will be more effort in developing a better strategy for Curly-leaf pondweed and establishing a more consistent monitoring plan; surveillance monitoring and effectiveness monitoring to better inform the implementation plan. The long term (5-10 year) goal is to be weed free in the open water environment.

This year there will be more work done for process improvements for the prevention program. The new Apple and Android software application will allow for real time information and less data entry. It is being tested at selected ramps through this Spring and will be implemented at all ramps for the Summer season. In 2017, that application will begin to be used at the inspection stations. There is a partnership with the Town of Truckee to apply for grant funding from the California Department of Boating and Waterways Quagga Mussel prevention grant to make the Truckee station permanent.

Presentation can be viewed at:

<http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-V.A-AIS.pdf>

### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson asked if the program has secure funding for other elements beyond prevention.

Mr. Zabaglo said TRPA's Governing Board identified funding for the control strategic initiative as a priority to obtain long term stable funding. There are other funding sources that they are actively seeking such as SB630. There is not a "pot of money" like they had with SNPLMA that provided that long term funding.

Mr. Hymanson asked if the base budget would then fluctuate for these other program elements.

Mr. Zabaglo said that is correct.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

Mr. Hymanson encouraged the AIS Coordinating Committee to explore a mechanism where partners could provide small funding to one of the agencies which could then go through the exercise of prequalifying competent entities that could do the work. Then when a situation comes up, there could be a rapid response. This would benefit the rapid response program.

Mr. Zabaglo agreed with Mr. Hymanson.

Mr. Hymanson said he understands the motivation to get permanent structures for the inspection stations, but he cautioned them to not end up in the same situation as State Parks where they inherited items that they did not have funding to operate or maintain. He recommended adding one more inspection station at the entrance of the Tahoe Keys Marina. There are ongoing invasions; the species that are in the lake are being spread to new locations, such as the Asian clams in Sand Harbor. The evidence shows that there is a high probability that the source of the weeds in Emerald Bay is from the Tahoe Keys and other locations in the south part of the lake.

Mr. Zabaglo said the Tahoe Keys Property Owners' Association will be implementing "backup stations" this summer. These stations will be placed around the Tahoe Keys lagoon areas before you get to the Lake proper. Hopefully this will help with getting the weeds off of props before entering the lake. TRPA's boat crew and volunteers also help educate with that effort.

Mr. Donohue asked how many stickers are provided to boaters on an annual basis.

Mr. Zabaglo said there are three types of stickers; the Tahoe Only, 7,000-8,000 per season, the Tahoe In and Out, 6,800-7,000 per season, and the Seven Day Pass, 2,000 per season. It is approximately 15,000 total stickers per season.

Mr. Donohue said he likes where the program is going and feels some permanent stations would be helpful in the long run. He suggested they determine what the long term and replacement costs are because there cannot be a rapid response if there are contracting and grant funding issues. He suggested that the fee structure be reviewed and that he was unaware that this recently went to the Governing Board. For example, if there was a one-dollar upcharge per sticker, that money may be able to be used for small rapid response projects and have it available instead of soliciting through the license plate program for a grant. He believes that any funding left over from what was received from California and Nevada will revert to general fund money.

Mr. Zabaglo said they will use all the money received from the states for prevention.

Mr. Donohue said there are more programmatic costs that the program needs to get their arms around and they should look at other ways to fund the program. The sticker program is cheap for the services provided.

Mr. Guevin asked when the public forum was going to be held and if an invitation could be sent out.



ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

Mr. Hymanson agreed that adding one-dollar to the boat inspection fee would help with establishing stable funding.

Mr. Hester said that the TIE Steering Committee has been discussing this.

Mr. Teshara said the program is maturing and we need to think about what the future is for the program. There needs to be an understanding that the eradication or removal of existing is also important. Building in capital costs is important. He asked if there is public outreach so people know that they need to go to the inspection station at the Truckee Airport before proceeding to Donner Lake.

Mr. Zabaglo said last year they were doing inspections at the ramp, this year the inspections are only being done at the shared station. Gates will be installed to ensure that only inspected boats are launching. There has been outreach done to educate boaters that they will need to go to the Truckee station prior to launching at Donner Lake.

Mr. Teshara asked if there is any concern about other types of "Tahoe Keeper" crafts on the Truckee River.

Mr. Zabaglo said staff coordinates with the rafting companies that provide tours on the Truckee River. Another element of the Tahoe Keepers program is the keeper fleet which are concessionaires that rent equipment for river use.

Mr. Hymanson said on a busy weekend there is every conceivable type of floating device on the river. It is both an AIS and human health issue. He wants to see something incorporated into the Caltrans roundabout project for the bypass project that would provide services that could move all that public rafting equipment because currently people have to cross the highway.

Mr. Guevin said there needs to be a plan to make the program sustainable. Last 4th of July holiday with all of the boating activity he saw a lot of weeds floating on the lake surface and asked if this could be studied to see how this might be controlled on high impact boating days.

Mr. Zabaglo said that could be reviewed.

Mr. Teshara said as a result of the work being done in Washington, DC, the US Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that they are doubling their funding from \$1 million to \$2 million dollars, what is the purpose of that funding and how is it applied for?

Mr. Zabaglo said it is funding from the US Fish and Wildlife Service for entities that have state or interstate management plans. There is 42 state or interstate management plans including TRPA. Ours was approved in 2009 with a revision approved in 2014. It was authorized at \$4 million dollars, but only appropriated for \$1 million and recently increased to \$2 million. This took the funding from a \$25,000 equal split amongst the 42 plans and now is close to \$50,000. The preliminary application was submitted last month; the funding will be used to complement the Tahoe Keys Property Owners' Association efforts.

## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

Mr. Teshara asked if they are only planning funds, or can the funds also be used for work?

Mr. Zabaglo said the funds can be used for anything identified within the management plan. In the past, the funds (approximately \$25,000) had been used for winter operations for prevention. It pays for inspectors to monitor two boat ramps at Cave Rock and the Tahoe City Public Utility District ramp at Lake Forest. With stable funding in place, the funding will be directed towards control.

Mr. Teshara asked if there is anything others can do to help advocate for the entire \$4 million.

Mr. Zabaglo said the task force cannot lobby for funding. The \$2-million-dollar appropriation was in the President's budget. One of the focuses is to bolster partnerships with the regional director level of the US Fish and Wildlife Service. There is opportunity to identify other impacts particularly from a US Fish and Wildlife perspective, being able to highlight the habitat loss or restoration is going to be a mechanism for this.

Mr. Teshara suggested that this should be something that the Lake Tahoe Partnership should put on their radar screen to help advocate.

Mr. Zabaglo said another avenue to work through is the Western Governors Association. The new chair Governor Mead from Wyoming has a significant background in habitat protection, so that is another area to focus on as well.

Mr. Teshara suggested that there needs to be something before you get into the subdivision at the Tahoe Keys because the Keys is where the problems have been most significant because it tends to be an aquarium dumping. This should be another part of the education and outreach.

### Public Comments & Questions

None

#### B. Shoreline Planning Initiative Briefing on Stakeholder Assessment and Work Program

Ms. McMahon said the purpose of the shoreline planning initiative is to develop policies and code that will address access to Lake Tahoe.

Consensus Building Institute (CBI), Senior Mediator, Gina Bartlett provided an overview of the Stakeholder Assessment.

Ms. Bartlett conducted 21 confidential interviews with 34 people.

Key themes from the interviews:

Recreational access

- Access and Lake Tahoe Experience

## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

- System for boating; how can motorized and non-motorized access the Lake
- High public use
- Balance access and the environment

### Boating: Motorized and Non-Motorized

- Address overall use and not just in terms of piers and buoys
- Lack of clarity or differing viewpoints/unsure about motorized boating science
- User conflicts between motorized and non-motorized

### Marinas

- Marina owners view themselves as stewards of the Lake/there business is dependent on the Lake
- Marina owners have concerns about low lake level adaptation/potential dredging, and moving buoy fields
- Concern over illegal buoys

### Structures

- Affect the ability of users to access the Lake; people are interested in anything from sitting on a dock, paddle boarding, kayaking, boating, etc.
- Provide boating access (marinas, slips, and ramps, piers, and buoys)
- Revisit ordinances related to scenic resources
- Consider extending piers and more public piers
- Create opportunity for recreational structures for private landowners, lack of enforcement around consistency with existing approval processes and permits, especially for buoys

### Low Lake Level Adaptation

- Limit launch access points, creating crowding, lines, and parking constraints
- Buoy fields
- Pier extensions
- Dredging to deepen channels

### Public Health and Safety

- First responder's emergency response time
- Low lake levels are limiting first responders in getting off the lake
- New policy may be necessary to support public health and safety

### Adaptive Management Resource Strategy

- Recommended in interviews
- Manage according to resource condition
- Avoids social interpretation of carrying capacity
- Bi-State Compact environmental threshold carrying capacity

### Interviewee Process Recommendations

- Continue TRPA partial permitting during planning

## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

- Opportunity to streamline approvals & permitting
- Focused dialogue punctuated by strong stakeholder engagement
- Vet with the Regional Plan Implementation Committee
- Broad public Information sharing
- Sound scientific & technical Foundation
- Conditions are ripe

### Process recommendations:

- Entities contribute towards the same outcome to develop consensus recommendations on the policies and code
- Staff to do preliminary work to inform discussions
- Shoreline Steering Committee's primary goal is to frame the questions; Joint Fact Finding Committee works on the technical approach/committee made up of staff and scientist in the region
- Recommendation for a stakeholder advisory forum/larger public body to shape the process and vet the ideas
- Policy guidance by the Governing Board and the Regional Plan Implementation Committee

All of the committees and work groups are underway. The goal this spring and summer is to touch on all of the major policy areas and carry out as much of the joint fact finding work. Next steps are public engagement with Fresh Tracks. A website specifically for the shoreline process is being developed. There will be regular updates provided at particular milestones and as needed.

TRPA team member Ms. McMahon provided an overview of the work program

Phase 1: Project assessment and collaborative process design (January 2016 – April 2016)

Phase 2 Collect and establish baseline information through joint fact finding and develop policies, code, and environmental alternatives (May 2016 – December 2016)

Phase 3: Environmental review process (DEIS & EIS) (January 2017 – June 2018)

It was the consensus of the interviewees that TRPA continue to operate under the partial permitting program. There was a meeting held with the key shoreline permitting agencies; TRPA, Army Corp of Engineers, California and Nevada State Lands, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection. Those agencies also recommended to continue to operate under the partial permitting program. TRPA will continue to accept applications for maintenance, repair, reconstruction, modification, and expansion of existing shoreline structures, but will not accept applications that increase boating capacity during the planning process.

Presentation can be viewed at:

[http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-V.B-Shoreline-APC\\_5\\_11\\_2016.pdf](http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-V.B-Shoreline-APC_5_11_2016.pdf)

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson asked who is doing the new science work.

Ms. McMahon said Dr. Sudeep Chandra, University of Nevada, Reno and Dr. Geoff Schladow from the UC California, Davis will participate in the Joint Fact Finding Committee to gather information to inform the shoreline planning initiative. One of the items to be reviewed is the boating impacts because during the stakeholder assessments some said that boats don't have an impact while others said they had a huge impact. They are also working with the members of the Nearshore Agency Working Group and will use the available information to move forward with the Environmental Impact Statement.

Ms. Bartlett said there is information also to be determined, because there has only been one conversation with Joint Fact Finding Committee and Dr. Schladow and Dr. Chandra were not in attendance. However, they are still framing up the issues and determining what is available and if anything else is needed.

Mr. Hymanson asked if they had funding to support scientific investigations.

Ms. Marchetta said it is important to understand with the timeline for the shoreline planning initiative, we are going to be relying upon best available existing science. We are not anticipating doing new studies or scientific research or areas of inquiry. We will integrate this with the ongoing nearshore information, but it is recognized that there are areas of ongoing science inquiry that still needs to be built out. We will use what we have, make decisions, and then rely upon adaptive management as we go.

Mr. Hymanson asked what TRPA's permitting process does that is different than the review and permitting from any of the other agencies.

Ms. McMahon said TRPA reviews applications pursuant to the adopted shoreline regulations. For example, Lahontan reviews projects per their Basin plan, California and Nevada State lands review projects per applicable state law, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Nevada Department of Wildlife also all have their own regulations. TRPA and Lahontan have a Memorandum of Understanding which delegates maintenance dredging at marinas to Lahontan.

Mr. Hester said the Shoreline Review Committee meets monthly to coordinate the permitting activities and issues.

Mr. Hymanson assumes that there is overlap with the work that is performed by the agencies and suggested an analysis be done to compare the work that TRPA performs versus the other agencies.

Mr. Hester said staff will do this through this process or through their ongoing continuous improvement projects.

Mr. Teshara agreed with Mr. Hymanson's suggestion. It would reveal if there were

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

duplications and the public would better understand how the results were determined.

Mr. Donohue said Nevada has a good handle on illegal buoys and do not have that many. Division of State Lands, the Nevada Department of Wildlife and TRPA have a Memorandum of Understanding to address this issue. There may be some opportunity to go after the low hanging fruit of illegal buoys off of public lands.

Mr. Teshara asked if there are some sideboards in place for this process so we don't end up with a Christmas tree with too many ornaments.

Ms. McMahon said staff has been working with the Shoreline Steering Committee to develop a scope of work. This will be presented to the committee tomorrow and eventually will go to the Governing Board and out to the public so the sideboards are clear. It was important to bring everyone in early in the process to discuss the issues and work through them as they move forward. Generally, an EIS takes 1.5 years to prepare.

Mr. Teshara said it seems to be a reoccurring theme of not knowing where the source of funding is coming from for the EIS. The Lake Tahoe Partnership is willing to get engaged to help find funding sources. One source mentioned has been the Army Corps because of their participation in "shoreline" items in the past.

Public Comments & Questions

None

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Notice of Preparation and Scoping of the Environmental Impact Report for the Lake Tahoe Community College Master Plan and Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Lake Tahoe Community College University Center Project

TRPA team member Ms. Avance said a joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement is being prepared for the Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC) Master Plan and University Center project. The scoping period will end on May 16, 2016. These environmental documents are serving two purposes; the programmatic EIR for the Master Plan generated by LTCC under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will also be a joint project specific EIR/EIS for the proposed University Center project. In the future, TRPA will consider the certification of only the specific project portion for the University Center. Staff will use the cumulative impacts studied under the master plan for projects going forward.

Mr. Brueck, Hauge Brueck provided an overview of the University Center project and parking lot and environmental review process.

The master plan has been developed over the past few years and will guide the development for the next 10-15 years. The University Center project is privately funded and

## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

will facilitate access to a four-year education through a partnership with either a California State University or a University of California that will be identified through Lake Tahoe Community College.

Objectives of the Facilities Master Plan:

- Provides vision for future Campus development
- Ensures that physical improvements serve needs of the College community and supports the strategic vision
- Enables the institution to realize its goals
- Provides an effective place to work and study
- Welcomes neighbors and partners

The next steps are to prepare the Environmental Impact Report for the Facilities Master Plan for certification, prepare the Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement for the University Center Project at a site specific level which will allow the LTCC to move forward with permitting after the environmental documentation is complete. Cumulative impacts will be studied at a program level for the entire Facilities Master Plan.

Key issues to be studied in the EIR/EIS:

- Water Quality and Hydrology
- Biological Resources
- Scenic Resources
- Land Use
- Recreation
- Geology and Soils (e.g., Land Capability/Coverage)
- Cultural Resources
  
- Population and Housing
- Transportation and Parking
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change
- Noise
- Cumulative Impacts

Alternatives to be evaluated:

- No Project Alternative
- Action Alternatives that may include:
  - Modified facility locations
  - Additional residential student living solutions
  - Operational details

Schedule:

## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

Notice of Preparation published – April 15, 2016

Public scoping period – April 15-May 16, 2016

Public scoping meetings – May 10, 2016 (LTCC Board) & May 11, 2016 (TRPA APC)

Draft EIR/EIS released, public hearings, 60-day review period – October/November 2016

Final EIR/EIS issued (response to comments) – early 2017

Project approval/certification hearings – Spring 2017

Presentation can be viewed at:

[http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-VI.A-LTCC\\_Scoping\\_Presentation\\_Final.pdf](http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-VI.A-LTCC_Scoping_Presentation_Final.pdf)

### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Donohue asked for further information about the proposed renewable energy structure.

Al Frangione, Lake Tahoe Community College said it originated as a solar generating facility. They are in the process of reviewing all options and seeing how they can tie it into their science programs. The goal of the facility is that its functional capacity will control all of the maintenance and operations equipment for the college and showcase for other alternative types of energy generating possibilities.

Mr. Donohue questioned whether that was the practical location and if it was large enough.

Ms. Moss asked if there are provisions in the code to allow small service uses, such as a coffee shop or deli, to keep people on site if they are planning for student housing.

Mr. Brueck, Hauge Brueck said there is currently a cafeteria that is open during campus hours and hours could be extended as necessary. There is also a project in the facilities master plan to improve the student commons area. If there is the multi-person housing that the code would allow, there would be some accessory use to residential that could be provided to the students living there in addition to the actual student living facility rather than the adjacent buildings

Mr. Lefevre said the Forest Service is concerned about the ingress, egress, wayfinding and signage for their staff and the public. As an occasional student of the college, parking is problematic.

Mr. Kuchnicki asked if the University Center project will be Leed certified.

Al Frangione, Lake Tahoe Community College said they are looking at being Leed equivalent on the University Center. The dollar thresholds that would have to be expended to achieve some of the Leed certifications didn't make sense and LTCC would rather reallocate those dollars back into the project. However, they will follow at least a Leed silver standard and apply that to the buildings without going through that process. Future projects such as the residential center and public safety training center will be analyzed for any Leed standards.



## ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 11, 2016

Mr. Hitchcock said for the consistency analysis, the Bijou and Tahoe Community Plan still applies. The City of South Lake Tahoe intends to start on the area planning process for this area in the fall.

Mr. Brueck, Hauge Brueck said while the community plan allows for multi-family housing, it currently doesn't allow for multi-person dwellings in the campus area. They will be working with college on what type of units they will be providing and coordinated with the City and TRPA on whether that "use" needs to be considered.

Mr. Teshara said this scoping hearing is being done towards the conclusion of the scoping process. He said the public is not getting a reasonable chance to help define the alternatives. It seems to be more agency oriented than a community oriented drill. In the future, he would like to see the notice of preparation process give the public more of a chance to suggest alternatives. He suggested that they provide maps and visuals when they go out to the community so people see all of the mobility parts such as trail connections, and if there are any alternatives for the trail connections. Trails fall into both recreation and transportation. He asked what are the challenges in doing a programmatic environmental document for a master plan that may include some type of alternative energy facility and how do you address it if it was not contemplated correctly in the programmatic analysis?

Mr. Brueck, Hauge Brueck said with the concept being general, if the college comes back with something that is requires more storage or traffic generation then there would have to be a project specific study. That facility is part of a five to ten-year plan and college is providing information on this as part of the first five years of the facility master plan.

Ms. Avance said the programmatic environmental document is not being approved by TRPA. Each project application submitted will be reviewed for either an Initial Environmental Checklist, an Environmental Assessment or whatever of the level of environmental review is required at that time. TRPA will be able to use of the cumulative impacts analysis but beyond that they are standalone projects.

Mr. Hitchcock asked if it was correct that TRPA will certify the EIR/EIS.

Mr. Marshall said TRPA will certify for the project.

Mr. Teshara said next year, construction will start on the Al Tahoe Boulevard safety and mobility enhancement project which a portion will run up to the college. He asked if that will be shown in the plans.

Mr. Brueck, Hauge Brueck said they are aware of some of the cumulative impacts such as the safety and mobility enhancement, LTCC's soccer field reconstruction and main parking lot, the City of South Lake Tahoe's construction of two new turf fields, and the Lake Tahoe Wildlife Care facility on Al Tahoe Boulevard.

### Public Comments & Questions

None

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Mr. Hester said the Current Planning Department is at 100 percent for all performance measures.

1) 2016 First Quarter Report, January – March

No report.

2) Strategic Initiatives Monthly Status Report

No report.

B. General Counsel

None report.

C. APC Members

Mr. Hitchcock said the City of South Lake Tahoe's new Development Services Director, Kevin Fabino, started on Monday.

Mr. Lefevre said Barbara Drake will serve as the interim Deputy Forest Supervisor for a four-month detail. The Forest Service is working on filling the position permanently.

Mr. Hymanson said the Tahoe Science Advisory Council had its first meeting May 10, 2016. They do not have a full roster yet. Most members have been appointed by their institutions or entities, there are a couple positions that are University of California has not yet appointed and the council is also waiting for a second member from the Pacific Southwest Research station. Yesterday's meeting focused on the orientation process, understanding the road ahead, and discussing the first project which to look at a subset of the TRPA threshold standards from a technical perspective. The Executive Committee meeting is August 29, 2016.

Mr. Guevin said June is the Wildfire Awareness month. There is a new campaign for Tahoe called "Think first." Fire Chief Sharit will retire on June 30, 2016. He said in north Tahoe there is a lot of development along the Lake that does not have established water systems, so there is no fire water to provide fire flow for those new developments or split lots. These areas are not eligible for federal funding; they are private water systems which they are trying to avoid. It is a concern because if there is a fire in those areas will affect the lake. Some of the fire districts are looking at a fire boat program, which might answer some of these concerns. It is similar to a program at Fallen Leaf Lake; that has a fireboat that pumps about 1,500 gallons per minute. Tahoe Douglas District is going to have a fire engineer review this, otherwise they would have to do individual pumps for each home which is costly.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION  
May 11, 2016

Mr. Larsen said the Lahontan Water Board is meeting both today and tomorrow. He will be providing an update on the TMDL effort.

Mr. Teshara said there has been a comprehensive transportation corridor planning process for all of the highways around the lake and the connection between Tahoe; Interstate 80 and Highway 50. There will be two public meetings; May 17, 5:00pm-7:00 pm at the North Tahoe Event Center and one on May 24, 5:00pm-7:00pm at the Lake Tahoe Resort Hotel. The Tahoe Transportation District Board is meeting on Friday, May 13. The Board will be considering the adoption of Project Principles for the US Highway 50 Community Revitalization Project.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Teshara adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board

*The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review*



MEMORANDUM

Date: July 6, 2016  
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission  
From: TRPA Staff  
Subject: Code amendments for Essential Public Safety Facilities within the Shorezone to accommodate regional emergency response access and egress needs

---

**Requested Action:** Discussion and recommendation that Governing Board (GB) approve the required findings and proposed Code amendments.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) recommend that Governing Board approve the required findings and proposed Code amendments.

**Required Motions:** In order to recommend approval of the proposed Code amendments, the APC must make the following motions, based on this staff summary and the evidence in the record:

- 1) A motion to recommend Governing Board approval of the required findings (see Attachment A), including a finding of no significant effect; and
- 2) A motion to recommend Governing Board approval of the proposed Code amendments (see Attachment B).

**Project Description/Background:** TRPA has been struggling to address the needs of law enforcement, fire, and Coast Guard emergency first responders for suitable and reliable lake access for almost a decade. As an example, because the Coast Guard pier cannot meet the single-use Shorezone structure development standards, the Agency has been unable to process the Coast Guard's repeated pier expansion applications despite ongoing discussions throughout the past decade. Other first responders, too, have had to find temporary and often less than ideal mooring facilities to safely and adequately store and use emergency response boats in low-water years. Over the last 4 years, the Washoe Sheriff's Office has lost two Sheriff's vessels when they sank on buoys because no deep water permanent location had been identified. As the drought continues, TRPA seeks a more permanent response to access and egress needs of emergency first responders.

Throughout a series of TRPA-hosted Public Health and Safety meetings over the past two boating seasons, first responders expressed an increased concern about Lake access and egress for emergency response and public safety from prolonged drought. These informational briefings focused on the region's need for short- and long-term public safety facilities in order to maintain acceptable emergency response level of service during low-water years, including for fire suppression, rescue, and hazardous materials spills.

Regional Plan Policy PS-4.2 encourages TRPA coordination with emergency services providers to identify possible deficiencies associated with demands and needs. Emergency service providers have identified Lake access and egress demands associated with prolonged drought, which is expected to continue into the future.

Consistent with Regional Plan Policy PS-4.2, in order to meet those demands and maintain acceptable level of service, TRPA staff, in coordination with emergency service providers, have drafted the proposed Code amendments. The proposed Code amendments (Attachment B) define policies for designation and design of up to five Essential Public Safety Facilities within the Shorezone of Lake Tahoe. As proposed, Essential Public Safety Facilities will be limited to one per each of El Dorado, Placer, Washoe, and Douglas Counties, and the U.S. Coast Guard. The U.S. Coast Guard already has a station in Placer County, California, and most first responders on the California side of the Lake have expressed an interest in continuing to use existing facilities (i.e. marinas) long-term. The critical unmet need identified by first responders is in the eastern portion of Lake Tahoe, within Washoe and Douglas Counties, where few facilities exist that can provide permanent access and egress when Lake levels are low. Thus, it is likely that as a result of the proposed Code amendments, fewer than the maximum of 5 facilities Lake-wide would occur.

Deviations from design and location standards are currently allowed for multiple-use structures under existing Code. The proposed Code amendments serve to extend the same deviation allowances to designated Essential Public Safety Facilities so structures can meet the long-term operational and safety needs of emergency responders. The primary anticipated design features are additional length to reach navigable water in drought conditions, a second boatlift to accommodate both sheriff and fire, and pier head modification to facilitate ingress and egress.

Throughout development of the proposed Code amendments, TRPA ensured that the effort to address public health and safety needs would not conflict or interfere with the Shoreline Planning initiative. TRPA staff, in coordination with first responders and the Shoreline Steering Committee, identified the needs of first responders and tailored the scope of this initiative over a several year planning process in direct response to those needs. During that time, the scope was refined and narrowed such that the proposed Code amendments and their implications are separate and distinct from the recreational boating policies being considered and analyzed as part of the Shoreline Planning initiative. The needs being addressed by the proposed Code amendments are time-sensitive and thus, necessitated their being brought forward for adoption on a separate, accelerated track from the Shoreline Planning Initiative. TRPA staff presented public health and safety background and needs to the Governing Board in April 2016 and received direction to pursue Code amendments independently due to the urgent need and separate scope from the larger shoreline recreational boating access planning effort.

In addition, TRPA worked with first responders to geographically distribute the designated Essential Public Safety Facilities to each quadrant of the Lake and consolidate the facilities into one non-federal facility per county. Such a consolidation minimizes the number of structures as well as any needed deviations, such as additional length or other design features, to maintain safe, navigable depth.

The proposed Code amendments also address the potential for the conversion from public to private ownership of the designated facility. Should the designated facility ever stop being used for public health and safety purposes, any portion of the structure that was allowed to deviate from general

location, design, or construction standards pursuant to these Code amendments would be required to come into conformance with applicable design standards. If the deviated structure remains in public ownership, operating primarily for public health and safety, it may remain as built. If ownership or use of the structure is transferred to private, single use, then it must be brought into conformance with applicable standards.

Finally, TRPA staff prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) (see Attachment C: Initial Determination of Environmental Impact Checklist) assessing potential environmental impacts from the proposed Code amendments. No significant, unmitigable impacts were identified as a result of the limited nature of the proposal and the required design criteria.

Regional Plan Compliance: The proposed project complies with all requirements of the TRPA Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements, and Code of Ordinances, including all required findings in Code Sections 3.3, 4.4, and 4.6. See Attachment A: Required Findings/Rationale for additional information.

Contact Information: If you have any questions, please contact: Lucia Maloney, Senior Planner, at [lmaloney@trpa.org](mailto:lmaloney@trpa.org) or (775) 589-5324.

Attachments:

- A. Required Findings/Rationale
- B. Proposed Code amendments
- C. Initial Determination of Environmental Impact Checklist

Attachment A

Required Findings/Rationale



## Required Findings/Rationale

### TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 3.3 – Determination of need to prepare Environmental Impact Statement

1. Finding: TRPA finds that the Code amendments could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect has/shall been prepared in accordance with Rules of Procedure Section 6.6.

Rationale: An Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) has been prepared to evaluate the effects of the proposed Code amendments (see Attachment C). The IEC found that the proposed Code amendments would not have a significant effect on the environment.

The proposed Code amendments are consistent with, and will implement threshold attainment strategies in the 2012 Regional Plan. Additionally, any future projects seeking to use the proposed Code amendments will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to ensure no significant effects on the environment and no cumulative impacts were identified.

### TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 4.4 – Threshold Related Findings

1. Finding: The project (Code amendments) 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: The proposed Code amendments complement the Regional Plan and its objectives, and support the achievement and maintenance of Thresholds. Development of the Code amendments is consistent with Regional Plan policy PS-4.2, which encourages TRPA coordination with emergency services providers to identify possible deficiencies associated with demands and needs. Emergency service providers have identified Lake access and egress demands associated with prolonged low lake levels, which are expected to continue into the future. Consistent with Regional Plan Policy PS-4.2, in order to meet those demands and maintain acceptable level of service, TRPA staff, in coordination with emergency service providers, have drafted the proposed Code amendments.

The Code amendments will not negatively impact any compliance measures, including Water Quality/SEZ, Air Quality/ Transportation, Noise, and/or Scenic compliance measures. Therefore, the amendments are consistent with the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, other TRPA plans and programs.

2. Finding: The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

Rationale: The findings for adoption of the Regional Plan demonstrated that implementation of the Regional Plan would not cause Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities to be exceeded. The Code amendments are consistent with the 2012 Regional Plan and with the assumptions and analysis supporting the 2012 Regional Plan Update EIS and Threshold findings. As confirmed in the attached IEC, the amendments will not cause environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

The proposed Code amendments are intended to accelerate threshold attainment through directly responding to identified long-term needs for maintaining adequate level of service in and around the Lake for emergency response, including for fire suppression, rescue, and hazardous materials spills.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state, or local air and water quality standards apply for the region, the strictest standards shall be attained, maintained, or exceeded pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

Rationale: The proposed Code amendments would not affect any state, federal, or local standards. The amendments are intended to attain and maintain adopted policies and standards, as described above.

TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 4.6 – Findings Necessary to Amend or Adopt TRPA Ordinances, Rules, or Other TRPA Plans and Programs

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

Rationale: The proposed amendments to the Code of Ordinances will implement the Regional Plan and are consistent with Policy PS-4.2 as described above. Specifically, the Code provisions are in direct response to long-term needs identified by emergency responders and are both targeted to ensure continued level of service, and narrow to ensure the minimum necessary environmental effect of meeting those needs.

The Regional Plan as amended by the proposed amendments and in combination with other regulatory and implementation programs, will attain and maintain thresholds.

Attachment B  
Proposed Code Amendments

Proposed Code Amendments

**84.10. SAFETY AND NAVIGATION DEVICES PUBLIC SAFETY**

**84.10.1 Safety and Navigation Devices**

New safety and navigational structures may be permitted only upon the recommendation of the Army Corps of Engineers or the U.S. Coast Guard.

**84.10.2. Essential Public Safety Facilities**

Essential Public Safety facilities within the Shorezone provide lake access and egress for public safety and emergency response.

- A. One Essential Public Safety Facility in the Shorezone may be designated within each of El Dorado, Placer, Washoe, and Douglas Counties, and one for the U.S. Coast Guard.
- B. Essential Public Safety Facilities in the Shorezone shall comply with the location, design and construction standards set forth in subsections 84.5.1 and 84.5.2 for piers, subsections 84.6.1 and 84.6.2 for boat ramps, subsection 84.7.1 for mooring buoys, and subsections 84.8.1 and 84.8.2 for floating docks and platforms; except that a facility recognized by TRPA as an Essential Public Safety Facility pursuant to this subsection may deviate from location, design and construction standards set forth in the following subparagraphs, when necessary for functionality: 84.5.1.A, 84.5.1.D, 84.5.1.E, 84.5.2.A, 84.6.1.A, 84.6.1.C, 84.6.2.A, 84.7.1.A, 84.7.1.C, 84.8.1.A, 84.8.1.D, and 84.8.2.A.
- C. If an Essential Public Safety Facility ceases to be used for public safety, any portion of the structure allowed to deviate from general location, design or construction standards pursuant to this subsection must be removed or brought into conformance with development standards.

Attachment C

Initial Determination of Environmental Impact Checklist



**Mail**  
PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

**Location**  
128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**  
Phone: 775-588-4547  
Fax: 775-588-4527  
www.trpa.org

---

## INITIAL DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

---

**Project Name: Code Amendments for Essential Public Safety Facilities within the Shorezone to accommodate regional emergency response access and egress needs**

Proposed amendments to Chapter 84 of the Code of Ordinances to respond to long-term access and egress needs of Regional First Responders by allowing the designation of, and defining the requirements for, Essential Public Safety Facilities within the Shorezone of Lake Tahoe.

**Project Description:**

TRPA staff has coordinated and hosted Public Health and Safety meetings with first responders over the past two boating seasons in response to increased concern about prolonged drought and its impacts on Lake access and egress for emergency response and public safety. These informational briefings were formatted as an open dialogue about the region's need for short- and long-term public safety facilities to maintain acceptable emergency response level of service, including for fire suppression, rescue, and hazardous materials spills. The proposed Code amendments are narrowly scoped and were intentionally developed to be directly responsive to service needs such that emergency response level of service is maintained in both the short- and long-term.

Regional Plan Policy PS-4.2 encourages TRPA coordination with emergency services providers to identify possible deficiencies associated with demands and needs. Emergency service providers have identified Lake access and egress demands associated with prolonged low lake levels, which are expected to continue into the future. Consistent with Regional Plan Policy PS-4.2, in order to meet those demands and maintain acceptable level of service, TRPA staff, in coordination with emergency service providers, have drafted the proposed Code amendments.

The proposed Code amendments allow for designation and construction of Essential Public Safety Facilities within the Shorezone of Lake Tahoe. Deviations from certain design and location standards are allowed for multiple-use structures under existing Code; the proposed Code amendments serve to

extend the same deviation allowances to designated Essential Public Safety Facilities. The proposed Code amendments are contained within Attachment B.

As proposed, Essential Public Safety Facilities will be limited to one per each of El Dorado, Placer, Washoe, and Douglas Counties, and the U.S. Coast Guard, for a total of 5 facilities (with the existing Coast Guard facility counting as one of the five). The proposed Code amendments would allow for Essential Public Safety Facilities to deviate from design and location standards in order to meet the long-term operational and safety needs of emergency responders. The design allowances can effect, for example: pier length, pier head width, and the number of boatlifts.

Under the proposed Code amendments, all Essential Public Safety Facilities would be subject to the provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and the mitigation requirements included in the Partial Permitting Program ([www.trpa.org/programs/shorezone](http://www.trpa.org/programs/shorezone)) adopted by the TRPA Governing Board in June 2011 (Res. 2011-09) and revised in March 2014 (Res. 2014-04). Criteria (boating, scenic, fish habitat, and soil) have been established under the Partial Permitting Program that would ensure the mitigation of impacts associated with any future Shorezone development seeking to utilize the proposed Code amendments. Furthermore, all future Essential Public Safety Facilities using the proposed Code amendments will be evaluated pursuant to Chapter 3: *Environmental Review* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and in California, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Applicable design criteria require:

1. No increase in littoral drift impacts or increase in erosion.
2. Pier projects which include impacts to littoral drift must apply mitigation on the structure itself.
3. All other shorezone structure projects which include impacts to littoral drift must apply mitigation on either the structure or within the parcel/project area.
4. Proposed mitigations must be consistent with methods and tools outlined in the draft TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices (BMP Handbook).
5. No net increase in the total area of Prime Fish Habitat (incl. spawning, feeding, or escape-cover) disturbance.

6. Any potential impacts to Prime Fish Habitat shall be mitigated onsite by replacing each square foot of the impacted habitat on a 1:1.5 basis using one of the following methods, or a combination thereof, as determined appropriate by TRPA:

(a) Replacement on the same parcel or project area "in-kind" with similar habitat which previously existed. Such replacement must replace the function and value of the habitat to an equal or greater extent.

(b) Construction of complimentary habitat adjoining the remaining habitat on-site, where it can be demonstrated that the complimentary habitat will restore or enhance the habitat by substantially increasing the function and value.

7. No net increase in visual mass.

8. Projects which propose an increase in visual mass must employ either of the following methods of scenic mitigation:

a) Each square foot of additional visible mass shall be mitigated on a 1:1 basis in shoreline travel units in attainment with scenic thresholds and on a 1:1.5 basis in shoreline travel units not in attainment with scenic thresholds. Notwithstanding the foregoing, each square foot of visible mass from an additional boat lift shall be mitigated on a 1:1.5 basis. Mitigation of visible mass shall occur first in the shorezone of the project area until all feasible mitigation opportunities are exhausted. Mitigation shall then occur in the shoreland portion of the project area as necessary to satisfy all required mitigation.

b) If there are not opportunities for onsite mitigation of visual mass impacts in the shorezone or shoreland of the parcel or project area, applicants may consult with a TRPA shorezone planner and mitigation options will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Under the proposed Code amendments, a maximum of five Essential Public Safety Facilities could be permitted. To be conservative, the environmental analysis assumed a maximum of two moorings (e.g. fire and sheriff) per Essential Public Safety Facility, for a maximum of 10 additional moorings Lake-wide. However, the U.S. Coast Guard already has a station in Placer County, California, and most first



responders on the California side of the Lake have expressed an interest in continuing to use existing facilities (e.g. marinas) long-term. The critical need identified by first responders is in the eastern portion of Lake Tahoe, within Washoe and Douglas Counties, where few facilities exist that provide permanent access and egress when Lake levels are low. Thus, it is likely that the proposed Code amendment add no more than two to four facilities Lake-wide.

For a number of reasons, this environmental analysis primarily examines the programmatic level impacts associated with the Code amendments. First, the action under consideration is only approval of the program allowance; no individual project will be considered for approval. Second, the possible location of each individual Essential Public Safety Facility is unknown, therefore site-specific impacts would be speculative. Third, as mentioned above, each Essential Public Safety Facility will undergo separate environmental review and approval and must meet applicable design and mitigation criteria. Finally, while this environmental analysis considers program-level impacts, the program spreads the new potential shorezone facilities around the lake by design. Each quadrant of the lake can receive only one new facility – the U.S. Coast Guard indicates it does not intend to move its existing facility. As a result, some potential impacts, e.g., scenic, will not aggregate and will be assessed based on the efficacy of design requirements to address project-level impacts generally. Other potential impacts, e.g. water quality, are examined cumulatively as well.

The following questionnaire will be completed by the applicant based on evidence submitted with the application. All "Yes" and "No, With Mitigation" answers will require further written comments.

**I. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

**1. Land**

Will the proposal result in:

a. Compaction or covering of the soil beyond the limits allowed in the land capability or Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. A change in the topography or ground surface relief features of site inconsistent with the natural surrounding conditions?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

c. Unstable soil conditions during or after completion of the proposal?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

d. Changes in the undisturbed soil or native geologic substructures or grading in excess of 5 feet?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- e. The continuation of or increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?
- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient
- f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sand, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion, including natural littoral processes, which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?
- Under applicable design criteria, new Essential Public Safety Facilities cannot affect littoral drift.
- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient
- g. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, or similar hazards?
- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**2. Air Quality**

Will the proposal result in:

- a. Substantial air pollutant emissions?

The proposed Code amendments will ensure continued and acceptable level of service for emergency response in and around Lake Tahoe. During low-lake level conditions and when a functional mooring facility cannot be located, emergency responders must drive to the nearest functional boat launch facility for each incident requiring response. In addition to the induced vehicle trips for purposes of launching vessels, it has been reported that in some instances the nearest functional launching facility is far from the organization’s primary jurisdictional coverage area, inducing longer distance vessel trips and delaying response. For these reasons, the Code

**Mail**

PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

**Location**

128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**

Phone: 775-588-4547  
Fax: 775-588-4527  
www.trpa.org

amendments are expected to result in conditions that may have somewhat beneficial impacts to air pollutant emissions through reduced vehicle and vessel emissions for emergency response.

The addition of 10 moorings represents a maximum increase in annual Lake Tahoe boating day trips of 0.1% from estimated 2009 levels, an insignificant cumulative boating impact. Additionally, these impacts are likely overstated because of the following:

- 2009 Annual Day Trips were estimated by applying a 1.5% increase in population per year factor to 2004 annual day trips. Actual usage data collected during the 2009 watercraft season indicated 13% fewer trips than the 2004 baseline figure estimates, however, to be conservative and for consistency with the 2010 Annual Shorezone Report methodology, the 2009 estimates were used.
- The 2010 Annual Shorezone Report air quality analysis assumed a boating day trip duration of 3.77 hours as was used in the 2004 Shorezone EIS. Actual usage data collected during the 2009 watercraft season suggested that the average trip consisted of lower hours of engine operation, however, TRPA used the higher estimate to ensure a more conservative approach and for consistency with the 2010 Annual Shorezone Report.
- The 2010 Shorezone Annual Report utilized the same assumptions for fleet mix, engine star ratings, and engine horsepower data as were used in the 2004 Shorezone EIS. Historically, marine engines (outboards or inboards, gasoline or diesel powered) have not had to comply with the emissions regulations for automobiles. However, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted emission standards for new 2001 and later year outboard spark-ignition marine engines and adopted inboard emissions controls effective with the 2003 model year. These engines must meet U.S. EPA 2006 emission levels for hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen, which represents approximately 75 percent reduction in emissions over uncontrolled levels (California Air Resources Board, 1998). Since exhaust pollutants directly correspond with these factors, and since industry standards have continued to make vessel design improvements resulting in a newer, cleaner fleet mix, the impacts associated with these factors are likely overstated.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. Deterioration of ambient (existing) air quality?

The proposed Code amendments will ensure continued and acceptable level of service for emergency response in and around Lake Tahoe. During low-lake level conditions and when a functional mooring facility cannot be located, emergency responders must drive to the nearest functional boat launch facility for each incident requiring response. In addition to the induced vehicle trips for purposes of launching vessels, it has been reported that in some instances the nearest functional launching facility is far from the organization’s primary jurisdictional coverage area, inducing longer distance vessel trips and delaying response. For these reasons, the Code amendments are expected to result in conditions that may have somewhat beneficial impacts to ambient air quality through reduced vehicle and vessel emissions for emergency response.

A maximum of 10 moorings can be expected to result from the proposed Code amendments, which represents a maximum increase in annual boating day trips of 0.1% from estimated 2009 levels, an insignificant cumulative boating impact on ambient air quality.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

c. The creation of objectionable odors?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

d. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

e. Increased use of diesel fuel?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**3. Water Quality**

Will the proposal result in:

a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff so that a 20 yr. 1 hr. storm runoff (approximately 1 inch per hour) cannot be contained on the site?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

c. Alterations to the course or flow of 100-year flood waters?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?

- Yes                       No

No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?

A maximum of 10 moorings can be expected to result from the proposed Code amendments, which represents a maximum increase in annual boating day trips of 0.1% from estimated 2009 levels; a negligible and insignificant cumulative boating impact to surface water quality.

Yes       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground water?

Yes       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- g. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?

Yes       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- h. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?

Yes       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding and/or wave action from 100-year storm occurrence or seiches?

- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

j. The potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or any alteration of groundwater quality?

The proposed Code amendments do not in and of themselves result in a potential discharge of contaminants to the groundwater or alter groundwater quality in any way. Any projects resulting from the proposed Code amendments would be analyzed on a project-by-project basis and would be required to comply with the following:

- Best practical control technology shall be employed to prevent earthen materials from being re-suspended as a result of pier construction, and from being transported to adjacent lake waters.
- The discharge of petroleum products, demolition waste and litter (including sawdust), or earthen materials to the surface waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin is prohibited. All demolition materials shall be removed from the project and deposited only at approved points of disposal.
- No containers of fuel or hazardous materials may be stored on the pier or shoreline.

- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**4. Vegetation**

Will the proposal result in:

a. Removal of native vegetation in excess of the area utilized for the actual development permitted by the land capability/IPES system?

- Yes                       No



- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |
|   |  |  |
| b. Removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation associated with critical wildlife habitat, either through direct removal or indirect lowering of the groundwater table? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |
|   |  |  |
| c. Introduction of new vegetation that will require excessive fertilizer or water, or will provide a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |
|   |  |  |
| d. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, micro flora and aquatic plants)?            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |
|   |  |  |
| e. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

Future new facilities resulting from adoption of the proposed Code amendments could potentially affect Tahoe Yellow Cress (*Rorippa subumbellata* Roll.), a rare plant that only occurs on the shores of Lake Tahoe in California and Nevada. However, TRPA Code, Section 61.3.6: Sensitive and Uncommon Plant Protection and Fire Hazard Reduction, designates Tahoe Yellow Cress as a sensitive plant species and sets forth standards for its protection. The Code requires projects and activities in the vicinity of sensitive plants or their associated habitat be regulated to preserve sensitive plants and their

habitat. All projects or activities that are likely to harm, destroy, or otherwise jeopardize sensitive plants or their habitat must fully mitigate their significant adverse effects. Projects and activities that cannot fully mitigate their significant adverse effects are prohibited. Measures to protect sensitive plants and their habitat include, but are not limited to:

- (i) Fencing to enclose individual populations or habitat;
- (ii) Restrictions on access or intensity of use;
- (iii) Modifications to project design as necessary to avoid adverse impacts;
- (iv) Dedication of open space to include entire areas of suitable habitat; or
- (v) Restoration of disturbed habitat.

Thus, existing Code requirements will preclude any future activity that could possibly adversely affect Tahoe Yellow Cress.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

f. Removal of stream bank and/or backshore vegetation, including woody vegetation such as willows?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

g. Removal of any native live, dead or dying trees 30 inches or greater in diameter at breast height (dbh) within TRPA's Conservation or Recreation land use classifications?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

h. A change in the natural functioning of an old growth ecosystem?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

**5. Wildlife**

Will the proposal result in:

- a. Change in the diversity or distribution of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, insects, mammals, amphibians or microfauna)?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- b. Reduction of the number of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- c. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- d. Deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality?

The proposed Code amendments do not alter existing restrictions on development within fish habitat or requirements that habitat be replaced at ratios that preclude fish habitat deterioration.

- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**6. Noise**

Will the proposal result in:

- a. Increases in existing Community Noise Equivalency Levels (CNEL) beyond those permitted in the applicable Area Plan, Plan Area Statement, Community Plan or Master Plan?

Excessive noise can have a significant adverse effect on people and wildlife, including potential impacts to public health, safety, welfare and disruption of recreational enjoyment. Loud noise can also prevent a boat operator from hearing signals and warnings from other boats.

Motorized watercraft are a key source of noise in the Shorezone of Lake Tahoe. In order to control excessive noise from watercraft, TRPA Code Section 68.3.1.C establishes the maximum allowable levels of noise for watercraft operating on Lake Tahoe. Those TRPA requirements are consistent with established maximum noise levels for the State of California (CA Harbors and Navigation Code, Section 654.05) and State of Nevada (NRS 488.460), and include:

- 68.3.1.C Watercraft. Watercraft shall meet each of the following separate threshold measurement standards:*
- 1. Certification by the manufacturer or by TRPA approved field test agent that the watercraft passes the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) test J34 or SAE-J34, Pass by Test, 82.0 dBA to be measured at 50 feet with the engine at 3,000 RPM;*
  - 2. Field test measurements that the watercraft passes the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) test J1970 or SAE-J1970, Shoreline Test, 75 dBA; and*
  - 3. Field test measurements that the watercraft passes the Society of Automotive Engineers test J2005, Stationary Test, 88 dBA if watercraft manufactured on or after January 1, 1993 and 90 dBA if watercraft manufactured before January 1, 1993.*

While most boats are manufactured with muffler systems which direct their exhaust through the water, some dispel

their exhaust into the air, which can create more noise. Research conducted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, law enforcement agencies and the boating industry has identified that the primary source of watercraft related noise is exhaust noise. TRPA has set a 600-Foot No-Wake Zone around the shoreline of Lake Tahoe to minimize the noise impacts of motorized watercraft on residents, visitors and wildlife.

The proposed Code amendments would not change the implementation or enforcement of the Code sections or No-Wake Zone described above. Thus, existing Code requirements will preclude any future activity that could possibly have adverse effects on noise.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

c. Single event noise levels greater than those set forth in the TRPA Noise Environmental Threshold?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

d. The placement of residential or tourist accommodation uses in areas where the existing CNEL exceeds 60 dBA or is otherwise incompatible?

- |                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|------------------------------|--|

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>e. The placement of uses that would generate an incompatible noise level in close proximity to existing residential or tourist accommodation uses?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation</p>                                     | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient</p>   |
| <p>f. Exposure of existing structures to levels of ground vibration that could result in structural damage?</p>   | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient</p> |
| <p></p>   | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient</p> |

**7. Light and Glare**

Will the proposal:

- a. Include new or modified sources of exterior lighting?

Exterior lighting on any project resulting from the proposed Code amendments would be required to be the minimum necessary to provide for safe navigation and visibility. Any exterior lighting would be required to comply with TRPA Code Section 36.8 and TRPA Design Review Guidelines, and would be required to be low-level, down-cast, low illumination lighting or the minimum to provide for public health and safety.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient</p> |
|---|---|

- b. Create new illumination which is more substantial than other lighting, if any, within the surrounding area?

Exterior lighting on any project resulting from the proposed Code amendments would be required to be the minimum necessary to provide for safe navigation and visibility. Any exterior lighting would be required to comply with TRPA Code Section 36.8 and TRPA Design Review Guidelines, and would

be required to be low-level, down-cast, low illumination lighting or the minimum to provide for public health and safety.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

c. Cause light from exterior sources to be cast off -site or onto public lands?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

. Create new sources of glare through the siting of the improvements or through the use of reflective materials?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

**8. Land Use**

Will the proposal:

a. Include uses which are not listed as permissible uses in the applicable Plan Area Statement, adopted Community Plan, or Master Plan?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. Expand or intensify an existing non-conforming use?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

**9. Natural Resources**

Will the proposal result in:

- a. A substantial increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?

- Yes                       No  
  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- b. Substantial depletion of any non-renewable natural resource?

- Yes                       No  
  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**10. Risk of Upset**

Will the proposal:

- a. Involve a risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation in the event of an accident or upset conditions?

- Yes                       No  
  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- b. Involve possible interference with an emergency evacuation plan?

- Yes                       No  
  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient



### 11. Population

Will the proposal:

- a. Alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population planned for the Region?

Yes                       No  
 No, With                 Data  
Mitigation                Insufficient

- b. Include or result in the temporary or permanent displacement of residents?

Yes                       No  
 No, With                 Data  
Mitigation                Insufficient

### 12. Housing

Will the proposal:

- a. Affect existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing?

To determine if the proposal will affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing, please answer the following questions:

- (1) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region?

Yes                       No  
 No, With                 Data  
Mitigation                Insufficient

(2) Will the proposal decrease the amount of housing in the Tahoe Region historically or currently being rented at rates affordable by lower and very-low-income households?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

Number of Existing Dwelling Units: \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of Proposed Dwelling Units: \_\_\_\_\_

b. Will the proposal result in the loss of housing for lower-income and very-low-income households?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**13. Transportation/Circulation**

Will the proposal result in:

a. Generation of 100 or more new Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE)?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

b. Changes to existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including highway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities?

- Yes                       No

d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?

No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

Yes       No

No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?

Yes       No

No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?

Yes       No

No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**14. Public Services**

Will the proposal have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas?

a. Fire protection?

Yes       No

No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient



**Mail**  
 PO Box 5310  
 Stateline, NV 89449-5310

**Location**  
 128 Market Street  
 Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**  
 Phone: 775-588-4547  
 Fax: 775-588-4527  
 www.trpa.org

b. Police protection?

- Yes                     No
- No, With Mitigation     Data Insufficient

c. Schools?

- Yes                     No
- No, With Mitigation     Data Insufficient

d. Parks or other recreational facilities?

- Yes                     No
- No, With Mitigation     Data Insufficient

e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

- Yes                     No
- No, With Mitigation     Data Insufficient

f. Other governmental services?

- Yes                     No
- No, With Mitigation     Data Insufficient

**15. Energy**

Will the proposal result in:

a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

**16. Utilities**

Except for planned improvements, will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. Communication systems?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

c. Utilize additional water which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

d. Utilize additional sewage treatment capacity which amount will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

e. Storm water drainage?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

f. Solid waste and disposal?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

**17. Human Health**

Will the proposal result in:

a. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**18. Scenic Resources/Community Design**

Will the proposal:

a. Be visible from any state or federal highway, Pioneer Trail or from Lake Tahoe?

An Essential Public Safety Facility that provides access to Lake Tahoe will, by its nature and purpose, be visible from Lake Tahoe. Any future facility utilizing the proposed Code amendments would be required to conform with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Partial Permitting Program, and the TRPA Design Review Guidelines.

All new development proposed under the amended Code would be reviewed pursuant to Chapter 3: *Environmental Document* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and in California, CEQA. Project-level environmental reviews would evaluate the specific location, design, and other characteristics of a proposed project to determine if the project would degrade the visual character or quality of the site, decrease the TRPA scenic threshold ratings, or have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, damage scenic resources within a scenic highway, or degrade views of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vistas. This project-level review would provide an additional mechanism to evaluate and reduce the adverse visual effects of individual projects that could be approved under the amended Code.

Pursuant to the mitigation requirements included in the Partial Permitting Program for Scenic Quality, each square foot of additional visible mass would be mitigated on a 1:1 basis in shoreline travel units in attainment with scenic thresholds and on a 1:1.5 basis in shoreline travel units not in attainment with scenic thresholds. Additionally, any new facility would be required to use materials and colors that are earthtone and blend into the natural surroundings. Each Essential Public Safety Facility will be mitigated on a project-by-project basis. Given the mitigation requirements, a net benefit to scenic

conditions within shoreline travel units could occur, which could benefit Lake Tahoe scenic conditions.

- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- b. Be visible from any public recreation area or TRPA designated bicycle trail?

Any future facility utilizing the proposed Code amendments would be required to conform with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Partial Permitting Program, and the TRPA Design Review Guidelines.

All new development proposed under the amended Code would be reviewed pursuant to Chapter 3: *Environmental Document* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and in California, CEQA. Project-level environmental reviews would evaluate the specific location, design, and other characteristics of a proposed project to determine if the project would degrade the visual character or quality of the site, decrease the TRPA scenic threshold ratings, or have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, damage scenic resources within a scenic highway, or degrade views of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vistas. This project-level review would provide an additional mechanism to evaluate and reduce the adverse visual effects of individual projects that could be approved under the amended Code.

TRPA specifies views from each designated Recreation Area in the TRPA Lake Tahoe Scenic Resource Evaluation. Any future facility utilizing the proposed Code amendments that may have a potential impact to one of the specified views within a Recreation Area would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to ensure the facility yields a less-than-significant impact.

- Yes                       No  
 No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

- c. Block or modify an existing view of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vista seen from a public road or other public area?



Any future facility utilizing the proposed Code amendments would be required to conform with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Partial Permitting Program, and the TRPA Design Review Guidelines.

All new development proposed under the amended Code would be reviewed pursuant to Chapter 3: *Environmental Document* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and in California, CEQA. Project-level environmental reviews would evaluate the specific location, design, and other characteristics of a proposed project to determine if the project would degrade the visual character or quality of the site, decrease the TRPA scenic threshold ratings, or have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, damage scenic resources within a scenic highway, or degrade views of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vistas. This project-level review would provide an additional mechanism to evaluate and reduce the adverse visual effects of individual projects that could be approved under the amended Code.

TRPA specifies views of specific resources from public roads and public areas in the Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Inventory. Any future facility utilizing the proposed Code amendments that might have a potential impact to one of the views within designated roadway units would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to ensure the facility yields a less-than-significant impact.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- d. Be inconsistent with the height and design standards required by the applicable ordinance or Community Plan?

Any future facility utilizing the proposed Code amendments would be required to conform with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Partial Permitting Program, and the TRPA Design Review Guidelines.

All new development proposed under the amended Code would be reviewed pursuant to Chapter 3: *Environmental Document* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and in California, CEQA. Project-level environmental reviews would evaluate the specific location, design, and other characteristics of a

proposed project to determine if the project would degrade the visual character or quality of the site, decrease the TRPA scenic threshold ratings, or have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, damage scenic resources within a scenic highway, or degrade views of Lake Tahoe or other scenic vistas. This project-level review would provide an additional mechanism to evaluate and reduce the adverse visual effects of individual projects that could be approved under the amended Code.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- e. Be inconsistent with the TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) or Design Review Guidelines?

Refer to b and c above.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

**19. Recreation**

Does the proposal:

- a. Create additional demand for recreation facilities?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- b. Create additional recreation capacity?

Designation of an Essential Public Safety Facility within the Shorezone and deviation from location and design standards under the amended Code have the potential to facilitate emergency response vessels that are temporarily moored elsewhere to be moved to newly designated Essential Public

Safety Facilities. This would have the maximum effect of making up to 10 moorings available for public use. This conservatively assumes up to 2 vessels per each of the maximum 5 facilities. Prior TRPA counts reveal 4,479 existing buoys, 425 boat lifts, and 2,745 existing slips for a total of 7,649 existing moorings. Since the Code amendments could result in a maximum of 10 moorings that become available for public use out of 7,649, (0.13% of total existing moorings), this additional capacity is considered less than significant.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

c. Have the potential to create conflicts between recreation uses, either existing or proposed?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

d. Result in a decrease or loss of public access to any lake, waterway, or public lands?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

**20. Archaeological/Historical**

a. Will the proposal result in an alteration of or adverse physical or aesthetic effect to a significant archaeological or historical site, structure, object or building?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

b. Is the proposed project located on a property with any known cultural, historical, and/or archaeological resources, including

resources on TRPA or other regulatory official maps or records?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

c. Is the property associated with any historically significant events and/or sites or persons?

- Yes                          No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

d. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

- Yes                          No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

e. Will the proposal restrict historic or pre-historic religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

- Yes                          No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

**21. Findings of Significance.**

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory?

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

- Yes                       No
- No, With Mitigation       Data Insufficient

c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?)

Designation of an Essential Public Safety Facility within the Shorezone and deviation from location and design standards under the amended Code have the potential to facilitate emergency response vessels that are temporarily moored elsewhere to be moved to newly designated Essential Public Safety Facilities. This would have the maximum effect of making up to 10 moorings available for public use. This conservatively assumes up to 2 vessels per each of the maximum 5 facilities. Prior TRPA monitoring and modeling efforts indicate approximately 7,649 existing moorings (buoys, slips and boat lifts) on Lake Tahoe. A maximum of 10 moorings might become available for public use under the program, a 0.13% increase in total existing moorings. In addition, the 10 moorings that can be expected to result from the proposed

Code amendments, could potentially increase the Lake’s total annual boating day trips by 0.1% from estimated 2009 levels; a negligible and insignificant cumulative boating impact.

Due to the proposed Code provision that limits designation of Essential Public Safety Facilities to 1 within each of four counties plus the U.S. Coast Guard, and existing offsetting visible mass requirements, there would not be a cumulative scenic impact within any single scenic unit.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |

- d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Insufficient |



**Mail**  
PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

**Location**  
128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**  
Phone: 775-588-4547  
Fax: 775-588-4527  
www.trpa.org

**Determination:**

On the basis of this evaluation:

a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

Yes       No

b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures.

Yes       No

c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedure

Yes       No



Signature of Evaluator

Lucia Maloney, Senior Planner

Date July 5, 2016







**Mail**  
PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

**Location**  
128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**  
Phone: 775-588-4547  
Fax: 775-588-4527  
www.trpa.org

---

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 6, 2016  
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission  
From: TRPA Staff  
Subject: Receipt of comment on the Draft EIR/EIS for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project

---

Requested Action: This an informational item only. No action is required at this time.

Staff will provide a summary presentation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project (State Clearinghouse No. 2014072039). TRPA staff and representatives from Ascent Environmental (the consulting firm who prepared the Draft EIR/EIS), Placer County, and Kila Tahoe, LLC, will be available following the presentation to answer questions from the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), and to record formal public comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.

Staff Recommendation: Accept public comment.

Required Motions: This is an informational item only; no motion is required.

Project Description/Background: On June 15, 2016, TRPA and Placer County released a Draft EIR/EIS for the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan (PCTBAP) and Tahoe City Lodge project pursuant to Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS will be accepted until **August 15, 2016**. The purpose of the comment period is to gather input from the APC and public on the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS in terms of the range of alternatives, identified impacts, and proposed mitigation measures. At the conclusion of the comment period a Final EIR/EIS will be prepared and will include responses to all relevant comments received during the comment period. TRPA action on the PCTBAP and Tahoe City Lodge, including certification of the Final EIR/EIS by the Governing Board, is tentatively scheduled for January 2017.

The proposed Area Plan is a Placer County-initiated update to its land use regulations that apply in the Tahoe Basin. It will update the existing Community Plans, General Plans, Plan Area Statements, maps, and regulations in the Placer County portion of the Tahoe Basin and is being developed to implement the TRPA Regional Plan. Proposed amendments to existing plans, maps, and regulations are primarily focused within the TRPA-designated Town Centers in Tahoe City and Kings Beach. The proposed Area Plan contemplates one near-term redevelopment project, the Tahoe City Lodge, and one environmental redevelopment design concept, the Kings Beach Center, both identified as opportunities to incentivize and facilitate redevelopment in these areas. The Kings Beach Center design concept is a conceptual mixed-use redevelopment design on parcels owned by Placer County.

The proposed Tahoe City Lodge project would redevelop an existing commercial complex into a 118-unit lodge that would include a mix of hotel rooms and 1- and 2-bedroom suites, hotel amenities, and parking, as well as redevelopment of the existing clubhouse building, new shared-use parking at the Tahoe City Golf Course, and restoration of 1.7 acres of SEZ restoration. While the DEIS analyzes the impacts for both the PCTBAP and the Tahoe City Lodge, the Tahoe City Lodge will go through an independent project review and approval process.

The proposed Area Plan is intended to implement and conform to the TRPA Regional Plan and the TRPA/Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, adopted on December 12, 2012. The Area Plan will satisfy California's comprehensive long-term General Plan requirements, and will serve as the General Plan for the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County. The proposed Area Plan contains policies that concentrate development and enhance mobility within the Kings Beach and Tahoe City Town Centers, ensure transit is a viable alternative to automobile travel, and encourage environmentally beneficial redevelopment and restoration of sensitive land. The proposed Tahoe City Lodge project is an example of the kind of project that can be achieved through implementation of an adopted Area Plan.

As discussed below, one or more of the alternatives would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation, air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change, and noise. However, the action alternatives, including Alternative 1: *Proposed Area Plan/Proposed Lodge*, are environmentally superior to Alternative 4: *No Project*. The potential environmental effects or benefits that would result from implementation of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are roughly equivalent

Alternatives: The Draft EIR/EIS evaluates four project alternatives:

*Alternative 1:* Proposed Area Plan/Proposed Lodge

*Alternative 2:* Area Plan with no Substitute Standards/Reduced Scale Lodge

*Alternative 3:* Reduced Intensity Area Plan/Reduced Height Lodge

*Alternative 4:* No Project/No Project

**Attachment A: Table 3-8 Alternatives Comparison** contains a summary of the Area Plan policies/programs and Tahoe City Lodge project components for each of the four alternatives analyzed in the draft EIR/EIS.

Significant Environmental Effects: The Draft EIR/EIS identified significant or potentially significant effects of one or more of the four alternatives evaluated with respect to cultural and historic resources; scenic resources; transportation and circulation; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions and climate change; noise; geology, soils, land capability, and coverage; hydrology and water quality; and hazards, hazardous materials, and risk of upset. **Attachment B: Table 20-1 Summary of Significant Impacts Before and After Mitigation** summarizes impacts identified under each action alternative. The significance of impacts after mitigation is also identified. Environmental impact conclusions indicate that Area Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would have roughly equal environmental effects, and each would provide more environmental benefit than Alternative 4 (no project).

Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: Most adverse effects could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. However, even with the application of feasible mitigation measures, implementation of one or more of the alternatives would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, and noise. These impacts are summarized below.

*Transportation and Circulation:* Roadway and intersection traffic congestion would increase for all alternatives on State Route (SR) 28 in Tahoe City east of the Wye and at the SR 28/Grove Street intersection. Although all alternatives would create a significant and unavoidable impact, the projected increase in vehicle congestion would be less for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 than it would be for Alternative 4 (no project) because of increased mobility options, such as increased public transit services, provided with the action alternatives.

*Air Quality:* All alternatives (including Alternative 4) would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, GHG, and traffic. Construction resulting from any alternative would result in short-term ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions that cannot be fully mitigated and would have a significant and unavoidable impact. This is consistent with the air quality analysis included in the Regional Plan Update (RPU) EIS. All long-term or other air quality impacts would be less-than-significant or would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

*Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change:* GHG emissions resulting from construction activities could be substantial over the build-out period of the Area Plan and Regional Plan. The construction related GHG emissions would be greater than the potential reduction in GHG emissions created by the redevelopment land use patterns prescribed by the four alternatives, and would result in a significant impact that cannot be sufficiently mitigated. This finding is consistent with the RPU EIS analysis for GHGs.

*Noise:* Lodge Alternative 4 (no project) would result in an increase in traffic noise levels along affected highway transportation corridors. Lodge Alternative 4 would also expose the outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive land uses to traffic noise levels that exceed applicable Placer County standards. Because mitigation cannot be required of a no-action alternative, this impact would be significant and unavoidable for the purposes of TRPA and CEQA environmental review at the project level for Alternative 4.

Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS: Copies of the Draft EIR/EIS are available for download at <http://www.trpa.org/document/projects-plans/>.

Hard copies of the document can also be viewed during normal business hours at the following locations:

Placer County Library  
Kings Beach Branch  
301 Secline Street  
Kings Beach, CA 96143  
(530) 546-2021

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449  
(775) 588-4547

Placer County Library  
Tahoe City Branch  
740 N. Lake Blvd.  
Tahoe City, CA 96145  
(530) 583-3382

Placer County Community Development  
Resource Agency  
Tahoe City Office  
775 N. Lake Blvd.  
Tahoe City, CA, 96145  
(530) 573-3185

Placer County Community Development  
Resource Agency  
Auburn Office  
3091 County Center Dr.  
Auburn, CA 95603  
(530) 745-3000

Opportunities for Comment: All relevant comments received by 5:00 p.m. on August 15, 2016 will be responded to in the Final EIR/EIS. Written comments may be submitted via Fax (530) 745-3080; via Email [cdraecs@placer.ca.gov](mailto:cdraecs@placer.ca.gov); or may be mailed to the following address:

Placer County Community Development Resource Agency  
Environmental Coordination Services  
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190  
Auburn, CA 95603

In addition, several public meetings and hearings will be held during the public review period to receive comments on the Draft EIR/EIS. These include:

- ▲ July 13, 2016 – TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC), Board Room, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada. Meeting begins at 9:30 a.m.
- ▲ July 27, 2016 – TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC), North Tahoe Event Center, 8318 N. Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. Meeting begins at 9:30 a.m.
- ▲ July 27, 2016 – TRPA Governing Board, North Tahoe Event Center, 8318 N. Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. Meeting begins at 9:30 a.m.
- ▲ July 28, 2016 – Placer County Planning Commission, North Tahoe Event Center, 8318 N. Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. Meeting begins at 10:00 a.m.
- ▲ August 11, 2016 – Placer County North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council, North Lake Tahoe Event Center, 8318 N. Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. Meeting begins at 6:00 p.m.

The TRPA APC, RPIC, and Governing Board meetings will begin at 9:30 a.m. and the Placer County Planning Commission meeting will begin at 10:00 a.m.; however, the proposed project is not time certain for any of these meetings. Please refer to the meeting agendas at the following links up to 1 week prior to the meetings for updated information: [www.trpa.org/calendar/](http://www.trpa.org/calendar/) and [www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/pchearings](http://www.placer.ca.gov/departments/communitydevelopment/planning/pchearings).

Contact Information: If you have any questions, or wish to submit comments regarding this agenda item, please contact:

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan:

Lucia Maloney, Senior Planner: [lmaloney@trpa.org](mailto:lmaloney@trpa.org), (775) 589-5324;

Tahoe City Lodge project:

Tiffany Good, Senior Planner: [tgood@trpa.org](mailto:tgood@trpa.org), (775) 589-5283.

Attachments:

- A. Table 3-8 Alternatives Comparison
- B. Table 20-1 Summary of Significant Impacts Before and After Mitigation

Attachment A

Table 3-8 Alternatives Comparison

**ATTACHMENT A: Table 3-8 - Alternatives Comparison**

	Alternative 1 Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge	Alternative 2 Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/Reduced Scale Lodge	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge	Alternative 4 No Project
<b>AREA PLAN</b>				
Coverage Limits in Town Centers (Max Transferred Coverage)	Up to 50% within 300 feet of the lake; up to 70% elsewhere	Same as Alternative 1	50% max on all parcels	Up to 70% on vacant parcels; up to 50% on redeveloped parcels
Height Limits in Town Centers (Max Height)	56 feet in core areas 46 feet in transition areas (subject to special plan area and scenic limits)	Same as Alternative 1	Tahoe City Town Center: Similar to Alternative 1, except height limited to 46 feet lake side of SR 28 Kings Beach Town Center: 48 feet mountain side of SR 28 36 feet lake side of SR 28 California North Stateline Town Center: 48 feet mountain side of SR 28 36 feet on lake side of SR 28; CalNeva at 48 feet	42 feet
Max Number of Stories	<u>Inside Town Centers</u> 4 stories in core areas, 3 stories in transition areas <u>Outside Town Centers</u> Number of stories controlled by height limits	Same as Alternative 1	<u>Inside Town Centers</u> Tahoe City Town Center: 3 stories Kings Beach/California North Stateline Town Centers: Number of stories controlled by height limits <u>Outside Town Centers</u> West Shore Village Centers: 2 stories for Sunnyside and Tahoma 2 stories for Homewood, except 3 stories in specific areas Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay: 3 stories mountain side of SR 28	Number of stories controlled by height limits

**ATTACHMENT A: Table 3-8 - Alternatives Comparison**

	Alternative 1 Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge	Alternative 2 Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/Reduced Scale Lodge	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge	Alternative 4 No Project			
			2 stories lake side of SR 28				
Density Limits in Town Centers	Tourist: 40 units/acre Residential: 25 units/acre (subject to special plan area limits)	Tourist: 40 units/acre Residential: 25 units/acre	Similar to Alternative 1, except residential density can be increased up to 25% for affordable housing	Tourist: 15-40 units/acre Residential: 15 units/acre			
<b>MAP DESIGNATIONS</b>							
Tahoe City Town Center Boundary Change	Yes	No	Yes	No			
Updated Uses in Mixed-Use Areas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No			
New Special Planning Areas	Yes	No	Yes (with additional environmental performance standards)	No			
CFA Conversion to TAUs	Yes (with limitations; max 400 units)	No	Yes (Similar to Alternative 1, except limited to max 200 units and size of TAU)	No			
Non-contiguous project areas	Yes	No	Yes	No			
Secondary Housing on < 1 acre	Market rate within 0.25 mile of transit subject to limitations (requires allocation + dev right)	Deed-restricted affordable allowed with proposed TRPA-certified housing program (TRPA bonus unit incentive applies)	Market rate allowed wherever residential is allowed (requires allocation + dev right)	Not allowed (county does not have a TRPA-certified housing program)			
<b>TAHOE CITY LODGE</b>							
Uses on Lodge Property	Hotel rooms	40 units	Hotel rooms	20 units	Retain and rehabilitate the center under existing rules. No additional CFA; existing CFA verified at 26,304 sf. Increase in occupancy rates through renovation.		
	1-bedroom suites	31 units	1-bedroom suites	16 units			
	2-bedroom suites	47 units	2-bedroom suites	20 units			
	Total	118 units	Total	56 units			
	Restaurant and kitchen	3,981 sf	Restaurant and kitchen	2,625 sf		Restaurant and kitchen	2,625
	Food and beverage deck	1,163 sf					
	Lobby	636 sf	Lobby	1,762 sf		Lobby	1,762
	Terrace/pool/bar (Roof Top)	6,587 sf	Terrace/pool/bar (Roof Top)	1,304 sf		Terrace/pool/bar (Roof Top)	-
Number of buildings / Number of stories	3 buildings / all buildings are 4 stories, except the building fronting SR 28 is set back relative to other stories	2 buildings / both buildings are 4 stories, except the portion of the building fronting SR 28 is 3 stories	1 building / entire building is 3 stories	Existing buildings are 2 stories			



**ATTACHMENT A: Table 3-8 - Alternatives Comparison**

	Alternative 1 Proposed Area Plan/ Proposed Lodge	Alternative 2 Area Plan with No Substitute Standards/Reduced Scale Lodge	Alternative 3 Reduced Intensity Area Plan/ Reduced Height Lodge	Alternative 4 No Project
<b>TAHOE CITY GOLF COURSE CLUBHOUSE</b>				
Relocation and expansion?	Yes	No	Yes	No
Clubhouse size	6,738 sf	Same as Alternative 4	Same as Alternative 1	2,880 sf
Source: Placer County 2015				

Attachment B

Table 20-1 Summary of Significant Impacts Before and After Mitigation

**ATTACHMENT B: Table 20-1 - Summary of Significant Impacts Before and After Mitigation**

Environmental Topic	Project-Level/ Cumulative	Area Plan								Tahoe City Lodge							
		Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3		Alternative 4		Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3		Alternative 4	
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After <sup>1</sup>	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After <sup>1</sup>
Air Quality	Project	2S	0	2S	0	2S	0	2S	2SU	1S	0	0	0	1S	0	0	0
Biological Resources	Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cultural and Historic Resources	Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2PS	0	2PS	0	2PS	0	0	0
Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage	Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3PS	0	2PS	0	3PS	0	0	0
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change	Project	1PS	1SU	1PS	1SU	1PS	1SU	1PS	1SU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hydrology and Water Quality	Project	1B	1B	1B	1B	0	0	0	0	3PS	0	3PS	0	3PS	0	0	0
Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset	Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2PS	0	2PS	0	2PS	0	0	0
Land Use	Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Noise and Vibration	Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2S	0	1S	0	2S	0	1S	1SU
Population and Housing	Project	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Services and Utilities	Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recreation	Project	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B	1B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scenic Resources	Project	1PS 1B	1B	1B	1B	1PS 1B	1B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Circulation	Project	1PS 2S 2B	2SU 2B	1PS 2S 1B	2SU 1B	1PS 2S 2B	2SU 2B	1PS 2S	3SU	1S	1SU	1S 4B	4B	1S	1SU	2S	2SU
	Cumulative	3S	2SU	3S	2SU	3S	2SU	4S	4SU	1S	1SU	1S	1SU	1S	1SU	2S	2SU
<b>Total</b>	<b>Project + Cumulative</b>	<b>3PS 7S 6B</b>	<b>5SU 6B</b>	<b>2PS 7S 5B</b>	<b>5SU 5B</b>	<b>3PS 7S 5B</b>	<b>5SU 5B</b>	<b>2PS 8S 1B</b>	<b>10SU 1B</b>	<b>10PS 5S</b>	<b>2SU</b>	<b>9PS 3S 4B</b>	<b>1SU 4B</b>	<b>10PS 5S</b>	<b>2SU</b>	<b>5S</b>	<b>5SU</b>

Note: PS = Potentially Significant Impact, S = Significant Impact, B = Beneficial Impact, 0 = No Significant Impacts; SU = Significant and Unavoidable Impact

<sup>1</sup> There is no mechanism for enforcement of mitigation measures for the no-action alternatives, therefore the potential impacts identified remain unmitigated. Impacts shown as Significant and Unavoidable for Alternative 4 were indicated as such by the environmental analysis for that specific impact.

