

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, May 9, 2012** 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.

May 2, 2012



Joanne S. Marchetta  
Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV

May 9, 2012  
9:30 a.m.

---

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

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 HEARING

- A. Public Comment on the Edgewood Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Edgewood Lodge and Golf Course Improvement Project, Edgewood Companies, 180 Lake Parkway in Douglas County, NV, APNs 1318-27-001-001, 1318-27-001-002, 1318-27-001-003, and 1318-27-001-004

**Page 1**

VI. REPORTS

- A. Executive Director
- B. General Counsel
- C. APC Members

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

VIII. ADJOURNMENT



TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
Stateline, NV

January 11, 2012

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Advisory Planning Commission Chair Mr. Donohue called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Buelna, Mr. Donohue, Ms. Garcia, Mr. Greene, Ms. Huggins, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Krause, Mr. Loftis, Mr. Maurer, Ms. McMahon, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Riley, Ms. Roverud

Members Absent: Mr. Gaskin, Mr. LeFevre, Mr. Smith, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Upton

Mr. Grego and Mr. Teshara sat in the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Merchant moved approval.  
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Maurer moved approval.  
Mr. Loftis, Ms. Garcia, Ms. Roverud abstained.  
Motion carried.

V. PLANNING MATTERS

A. AIS Program Report

Staff member Ted Thayer presented the AIS program report for 2011.

### Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Greene asked if any invasive species were found on non-motorized watercraft. He asked about the inspection station for boats coming from Reno. What do you think the long term outlook will be for removing the unwanted fish from the Lake? He also asked for the outlook for clams and weeds.

Mr. Thayer said no invasive species were found on non-motorized watercraft. Mr. Thayer said at the start of the season we had planned to have a station in Incline Village, but unfortunately we couldn't find a host. We found people coming from Reno were using the Spooner or the Northstar inspection stations. We believe it is promising for removal of fish in the long term. With another year of effort, we should be down to maintaining a low population of these fish. We are concerned about the small mouth bass which is harder to control. The weeds are fairly promising and the plan is to go after the nearshore weeds. In the past we have focused on the marinas, but this year we are hoping to focus on the nearshore. Some work was done in 2010 at the dam in California and this year there were no weeds in that area. The outlook for clams is still unclear whether we will be able to do anything more than simply decrease population density. It is very widespread throughout the Lake and very expensive to treat.

Mr. Teshara asked if the fee established recently in Nevada will have any public confusion with a fee in Nevada and one in Tahoe.

Mr. Thayer said that fee is scheduled to be implemented by 2013. We are working with the Nevada Department of Wildlife on what this fee would look like. We don't expect to have any issues.

Mr. Teshara asked if we have released an RFP for the long term funding plan. What is the funding source for the funding plan?

Mr. Thayer said yes. We are in the process of selection and award. We look forward to having a firm help us produce this finance plan. We have applied for Nevada Division of State Lands license plate funds and we could fund this partly out of boating fees. We also are looking at Southern Nevada Public Lands Management funds.

Mr. Loftis said he has heard there is a need for permanent locations for inspection stations. How does this relate to more solid funding?

Mr. Thayer said we have been looking to establish permanent locations in the Basin for some time. We think that likely the Meyers station will be fairly permanent. The Spooner Summit location is somewhat in question and we are working with the Nevada Department of Transportation to explore a long term

agreement. Homewood is fairly set, but Northstar and Alpine Meadows are still short term. We definitely want to have long term inspection stations. We are exploring opportunities to share these stations with the Truckee program, before we attempt to make all sites permanent.

Mr. Donohue said his department, as part of commenting on the Douglas County proposed land bill, has asked them to look at lands that might be suitable for inspection stations, as well as potential transportation facility needs. How close are you working with the water purveyors, as well as private property owners that have intake lines in the Lake, to ensure that their intake lines aren't compromised. Also are they are planning ahead if there ever were issues associated with invasive species?

Mr. Thayer said the water purveyors have provided some of the startup funds to get the program underway. We keep them advised on what we are doing on our control programs. They come to the meetings and are part of the process, so we are not compromising their delivery by our control projects.

Public Comment:

Elizabeth Hale asked if the extended warmer weather is affecting doing field work.

Mr. Thayer said TRCD is operating at Cave Rock and Lake Forest and inspections are ongoing at Sand Harbor on the weekends. We have seen an increase in boats coming into the lake with the extension of warm weather.

B. Review and Discussion of Proposed 2012 Watercraft Inspection Fees

Staff member Dennis Zabaglo presented the proposed Watercraft Inspection Fees for 2012.

Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Grego asked if we had thought about reducing the category of boats for charges, which would take less administrative effort.

Mr. Zabaglo said the administration of this is not difficult. The reason is that the Governing Board wanted our fees to be equitable. A bigger boat takes more to inspect and we want to make sure that they are paying for that service.

Ms. Merchant said that with 26% of the boaters that are not clean, it seems more equitable if you would increase the fees for decontamination considering the work effort associated with this. She asked if there has been any analysis on

how much it costs to clean a boat. What happens to the program if everyone shows up clean? Can we look at this in the future, if things change. When do you believe outside funding will not be available?

Mr. Zabaglo said there is a slight increase across the board, except for Tahoe In and Out boats, which is 10%. There is a \$20 decontamination fee for those boaters who do not come Clean, Drain and Dry. He said the typical decontamination takes approximately half hour. We have not looked into the actual cost of this, but we could. We would have to explore this to see what those numbers really are. This gives us time to explore additional funding opportunities. We have received funding from other sources in the past, so there are other options to explore.

Mr. Teshara highlighted the importance of marina participation and support. Are you doing any surveys of the boating public to get feedback on the program? The statistics that he has seen is that there has been a decrease in boating activity, as it is expensive to maintain a boat. Have you identified any correlation between the program and the level of boating activity?

Mr. Zabaglo said yes there has been a survey done recently. A lot of the marinas have actually seen an increase in launches this season over last. Over the last two seasons, it has been flat as far as the number of boats that visited Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Riley said he thinks we are undercharging. Have you checked with other lakes to see what they are charging?

Mr. Zabaglo said most programs don't charge at the level that we do, however our program is much more robust.

Mr. Jepsen asked how you verify that a boat is Clean, Drain and Dry when they come here.

Mr. Zabaglo said the inspectors do an inspection of the vessel to make sure it is dry. These inspectors are very thoroughly trained.

Ms. Roverud said an important component to this, is not only the fee management, but the reduction in time associated with decontaminations.

Mr. Greene asked if we are working with boat manufacturers to make the engines more easily accessible. What was the response?

Mr. Zabaglo said we have had several conversations with them to discuss these complicated issues and will continue to work with them to find a solution.



Mr. Donohue said he has a concern that the subsidy that has made this program work could go away. We should be looking at the true value of the cost of the program, so we don't get into the same situation as we did with excess mitigation fees, where they were kept too low and when it was recognized, it was almost too late.

Public Comment:

Elizabeth Hale asked how the water is paid for that is used for this program.

Mr. Zabaglo said TRPA pays for the water and we recycle the water as much as possible.

Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Maurer asked what happens with the water that is used after decontamination.

Mr. Zabaglo said when the water can't be used anymore, we have an agreement with the Douglas County Sewer District to hold it where it eventually evaporates. We are not charged for this service.

C. Regional Transportation Overview

Staff member Nick Haven presented an overview of the Regional Transportation Program.

Carl Hasty, Tahoe Transportation District presented the implementation side of the Regional Transportation System and the projects that they are working on.

Mike Bradford presented the South Shore Vision.

Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Teshara said a lot of the structure that was presented today didn't exist until about 10-15 years ago, including the MPO. This program is based on a lot of partnerships and has come together very well, so we can see how to put this into practice. He is concerned that there are things going on in Washington that could jeopardize the institution that we have put together, including funding opportunities.

Mr. Donohue said walking from the Horizon to the Gondola in the winter, is a little chilly. Do you have plans for a trolley that could take people back and forth?

Mr. Bradford said there has been discussion of a ground based transit, but currently this is not in the plan. We have looked at other resorts like Park City, Utah who has a transit system that does this efficiently. Through the transportation district, that is the kind of solution that we are looking for.

Public Comment:

Ron Treabess, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association supports the value in the Regional Transportation Planning efforts on a long-term vision. As one of the partners on the North Shore trying to increase and improve various transportation elements within TART; it is important to be part and in concert with the regional transportation efforts.

Mr. Teshara recognized Mr. Treabess as one of the new members of the Tahoe Transportation District Board, replacing Ron McIntyre who has stepped down.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Notice of Preparation and Determination of Scope for Route 89  
Realignment/Fanny Bridge

Alfred Knotts, Tahoe Transportation District presented the scope for Route 89 Realignment/Fanny Bridge.

Curtis Alling, Ascent Environmental summarized the environmental process and what will be studied in the environmental document.

Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Greene asked if there will be an economic analysis of the effects on the businesses in the area. Will this include buying out these businesses, if you close this section of road?

Mr. Knotts said yes. We will prepare a community impact assessment. This will be part of the environmental analysis regarding right-of-way requirements for the project.

Ms. Merchant asked that the business impacts be considered, especially in regard to the relocation of the existing highway alignment, whether the road is closed or remains open. In Alternative 6 and maybe 6A with the really wide 5-

lane bridge where if you can't go east toward the dam and you go west toward the businesses, it would seem like that is encroaching on their properties. The level of service is driving this and is the purpose and need of the project even though she hears the community say it is only 6 weeks out of the year that this is a problem. Should this continue to be a key driver throughout the Alternatives to fix the level of service?

Mr. Knotts said as part of the state highway system, it has to operate within a 20 year horizon of acceptable level of service, which is defined by A, B, C, D and F levels. If old Highway 89 becomes a Placer County or a local road, then state standards don't necessarily apply. To get state funding, it does need to be part of the criteria and it needs to operate at acceptable levels.

Ms. Merchant said she believes there are exceptions to this in certain circumstances. She would like to see if that can be considered as another alternative; fix Fanny Bridge so it is still operable. Maybe you look for some other non-realignment fixes that don't have anything to do with realignment and fix the existing bridge without expanding it. Maybe you could ask for an exception for the level of service and fix the bridge in its current width. She asked in Alternative 2 & 3 where the road would stop.

Mr. Knotts said this is all conceptual designs. It depends on road profile, cut and fill and other design standards. The design was extended to accommodate those existing businesses.

Mr. Riley said the point that was brought up by the local agency that handles the sewer lines is something that has to be addressed during construction, as this could be a real disaster.

Mr. Grego asked if staff anticipated an issue with this alternative. Has there been any review of what realignment of the sewer line would take or what the impacts would be.

Mr. Knotts said that is part of the process. We get all scoping comments and then these comments will be analyzed in the environmental document.

Ms. Huggins said speaking on behalf of fire protection she would have a great concern closing Fanny Bridge. The worse thing that could happen when you are driving an engine through a pedestrian and bicycle area is only one way in and out. She suggested getting the call volume from North Tahoe Fire to find out how many times they go over the bridge. CalFire is not in support of closing Fanny Bridge.

Ms. Roverud said as the project design moves forward, it would be good to have more information about what kind of complete streets components might be included in these different alternatives, including sidewalks, lighting, ADA, bike lanes, bike trails, landscaping, etc. Also an analysis of constraints associated with any of these alternatives that would make any of these components infeasible.

Mr. Greene said he has concerns with the connection of the bike path on the east side of Highway 89. He can't figure out how you would get over the portion of the road heading toward Truckee, especially if you close the Fanny Bridge road. He would suggest that you take a real close look at this, because a lot of people use this bike trail.

Mr. Donohue said there were a few public comments regarding noticing. He asked that we ensure that we reach out to those folks that are affected.

Public Comment:

Roger Kahn is concerned that as a business owner he was not contacted to discuss this project and how it impacts his property. He would hope that we can keep the old road open, which impacts a lot of businesses in the area.

Leigh Cullen thinks with the additional two other alternatives, which makes the document more complete. She would ask as you work with Caltrans on the alternative 5-lane highway over the bridge, that we see what kind of design exception could be considered for this area. She would encourage that we look at keeping the old road open.

Richard Courcier said his family owns all the property next to the bridge. He is concerned that the old road will be closed which will impact their business. Why do most of the plans have this road closed? He suggests that we cut down the number of cross-walks or add a signal light to prevent some of the congestion. The signal light could be used in July & August only, because the other 10 months we don't need it. The traffic problem used to be from Memorial Day to Labor Day and it is not a problem anymore, because schools are going back earlier. Our businesses are dropping in half starting August 17. The problem is only this 6-week period and to have to live with a by-pass bridge for 365 days a year for a 6-week problem, he believes this could be addressed.

Jim Sadak said anywhere you have a three-lane roadway merging into one-lane is a problem, no matter where you live. The backup occurs at this area and he doesn't believe the round-a-bouts will work at any of the locations, if this problem is not fixed.

Scott Zumwalt, General Manager of the Bridge Tender said he would like to see an economic study on surrounding businesses. The residents feel that you have to keep Fanny Bridge open.

Elizabeth Hale said that part of the push to fix this intersection is because of the development at Homewood, who is contributing to this project. What happens if there is a slow down on the Homewood project? Traffic studies should be also be done by another company. We don't feel that the company that is usually used for these studies presents accurate results.

Sherina Kraul, Vice President of Bank of the West said they are very concerned about the closing of Fanny Bridge. It would be devastating for all the businesses near the bridge. They have had no communication from anyone on this project.

Ulla Park said she is concerned with the proposal near the Bridge Tender. She would like to know the vision for signage for the street in Alternative 1, if the street is kept open, as many businesses will be affected.

Marsha Biel, General Manager Tahoe/Truckee Sanitation Agency said they are concerned with their underground pipes at the Caltrans Maintenance yard location where one of the Alternatives is scheduled to be built.

Jeff Smith, Ch2M Hill explained the problems with the roundabout, that is part of one of the Alternatives at the Caltrans Maintenance yard.

## VII. REPORTS

### A. Executive Director

Mr. Hester gave the Executive Director's report.

### B. General Counsel

No report.

### C. APC Members

Mr. Loftis said the water supply outlook is out. The forecast for December is at an average of 2%. Water year-to-date is at 32% of average and snow water equivalent in the snow pack is 9%.

Mr. Maurer asked for the APC to receive a brief report on what the Regional Plan Update Committee is doing.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Elizabeth Hale asked if the Brown Act pertains to TRPA.

Mr. Lichtig said TRPA is not subject to the Brown Act, but subject to the Nevada meeting law.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Donohue adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Judy Nikkel", is centered on a light gray rectangular background.

Judy Nikkel  
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

*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 at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.*

---

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: May 2, 2012

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Edgewood Lodge and Golf Course Improvement Project, Edgewood Companies, 180 Lake Parkway in Douglas County, NV, APNs 1318-27-001-001, 1318-27-001-002, 1318-27-001-003, and 1318-27-001-004

---

**Requested Action:** No action is required at this time. Staff requests that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) offer comments and solicit public comments on the Edgewood Lodge Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). A copy of the document was mailed to the Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board members on April 19, 2012. A presentation on the project and DEIS will be given at the APC meeting.

**Background/Project Description:** As part of its environmental review process, TRPA prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) informing responsible agencies and the public that the project could have a significant effect on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be prepared in accordance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedure. The NOP was circulated on June 3, 2009, and TRPA solicited comments on the scope of the EIS at public meetings held in Stateline Nevada before the Governing Board on June 25, and before the APC on July 7, 2009.

The proposed project includes construction of a new hotel and associated facilities at the Edgewood Golf Course and multiple environmental improvements within the project area. The project area consists of four contiguous parcels comprising approximately 225 acres in Stateline, Nevada. The primary land use is recreation associated with the Edgewood Golf Course which is located between Lake Tahoe and U.S. Highway 50. A portion of the project area extends from the golf course, east across U.S. Highway 50 to a pond located on the historic "Friday's Station" property. Offsite parking is proposed on an existing parking lot located across Lake Parkway and adjacent to the Horizon Hotel Casino.

Surrounding land uses include mixed-residential, recreation, and commercial to the north; vacant land and hotel-casinos to the east; single family residential to the south; and Lake Tahoe to the west. The project area is visible from Lake Tahoe and U.S. Highway 50, which are both TRPA scenic travel routes. Edgewood Creek and a series of man-made golf course

ponds and water features are located near the center of the project area. The proposed hotel complex would be located more than 300 feet from the shoreline of Lake Tahoe.

All development alternatives include the relocation of various golf course fairways and construction of water quality improvements in accordance with TRPA Best Management Practices (BMPs). The development alternatives also include expansion of the existing golf course club house located near Lake Tahoe, and construction of various accessory facilities such as: a spa wellness center, banquet and meeting space, hotel lobby, a hotel restaurant, an outside swimming pool, parking areas, administrative space, pathways, exterior lighting, modifications to an existing water pump house, and the relocation of an existing multiple-use pier in Lake Tahoe. The project also proposes designation of a new 556 feet-long public beach, which will be available for public use when special events are not planned, and would be accessible via a paved pedestrian/bicycle path adjacent to the main entrance driveway.

The DEIS analyzes the environmental impacts associated with implementing Alternative 1, the applicant's proposed project. Two separate development alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3), and a "no project" alternative (Alternative 4), are also studied in the DEIS. The alternatives are summarized in Section 1.3 of the DEIS and described in detail in Chapters 3 and 4 of the document. The design of the hotel, particularly the number of rooms and building lay-outs, is the primary differentiating factor between the development alternatives, as follows.

- Alternative 1: 194 Hotel Units
- Alternative 2: 230 Hotel Units (including 107 interval ownership units)
- Alternative 3: 250 Hotel Units (including 123 interval ownership units)
- Alternative 4: The "No Project" alternative

Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 also include five projects intended to result in threshold gain that are not requirements of the Regional Plan for new or modified development. Alternative 1 also includes a TRPA staff-initiated amendment to Agency building height regulations to allow greater building articulation for the proposed main lodge. Please see Chapter 3 of the DEIS for a complete description of Alternative 1 project components.

Discussion: The affected environment and environmental consequences of the project alternatives are analyzed in Chapter 5 of the DEIS. Table 1.1, in Chapter 1 of the DEIS, is a summary of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the proposed project and alternatives. Chapter 6 of the DEIS includes the TRPA-mandated environmental analysis required in the TRPA Compact and Regional Plan. All chapters, including the technical appendices for the document, are found in the CD located in the back of the DEIS.



The cumulative impacts associated with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the proposed project are discussed and analyzed in Section 5.15 of the document (starting on page 5.15-1). For purposes of this analysis, these projects are those that have occurred or are reasonably planned to occur within the Douglas County and South Lake Tahoe portions of the Tahoe Basin.

Comment Period: In accordance with Article 6.13(b) of the TRPA Rules of Procedure, the comment period for the DEIS commenced on April 19, 2012 and will conclude on June 18, 2012. The purpose of the sixty-day comment period is to gather input from the public regarding the adequacy of the DEIS in terms of identified impacts and proposed mitigation measures that are addressed in the environmental document. Copies of the DEIS were mailed or delivered to APC and Governing Board members, the California and Nevada state clearinghouses, and other interested parties on April 19, 2012. At the conclusion of the comment period a final EIS will be prepared that will include responses to all written comments received during the comment period, and may include responses to oral or late comments per Article 6.14, TRPA Rules of Procedure. TRPA action on the project, including certification of the Final EIS by the Governing Board, is tentatively scheduled for September 2012.

Representatives from Ascent Environmental (the consulting firm who prepared the DEIS), and Edgewood Companies, will be present at the APC meeting to answer any questions.

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

Theresa Avance, AICP, Senior Planner  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449  
Email: [tavance@trpa.org](mailto:tavance@trpa.org)  
(775) 589-5224