

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION  
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the **Advisory Planning Commission** of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at **9:30 a.m.** on **Wednesday, June 13, 2018** 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.

June 6, 2018

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Joanne S. Marchetta". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Joanne S. Marchetta  
Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
Stateline, NV

June 13, 2018  
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. Hearing and Public Comment on the Shoreline  
Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement

**Discussion and  
Public Comment**

**Page 1**

|       |   |                                      |                       |
|-------|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|       | B. Hearing and public comment on the Kings Beach Pier Rebuild Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Impact Report, TRPA File# EIPC2018-0003 in Kings Beach, CA (Placer County APNs 090-080-016 et al.) | <b>Discussion and Public Comment</b> | <b><u>Page 35</u></b> |
| VI.   | PLANNING MATTERS  |                                      |                       |
|       | A. Development Rights Strategic Initiative Update   | <b>Informational Only</b>            | <b><u>Page 51</u></b> |
| VII.  | REPORTS   |                                      |                       |
|       | A. Executive Director   | <b>Informational Only</b>            |                       |
|       | 1) Strategic Initiatives Monthly Status Report  | <b>Informational Only</b>            | <b><u>Page 53</u></b> |
|       | B. General Counsel  | <b>Informational Only</b>            |                       |
|       | C. APC Members  | <b>Informational Only</b>            |                       |
| VIII. | PUBLIC COMMENT  |                                      |                       |
| IX.   | ADJOURNMENT   |                                      |                       |



TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
Stateline, NV

May 9, 2018

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Teshara called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Members present: Mr. Alling, Mr. Buelna, Ms. Carr, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Drew, Mr. Esswein, Mr. Ferry, Ms. Ferris, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Hymanson, Mr. Young for Ms. Krause, Mr. Larsen, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Teshara, Mr. Weavil

Members absent: Mr. Guevin, Ms. Hill, Ms. McClung, Washoe Tribe

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Teshara provided Ms. Ambler with a minor edit.  
Mr. Young moved approval of the April 11, 2018 minutes as amended.  
Mr. Larsen seconded the motion.  
Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Hymanson, Mr. Drew, and Mr. Esswein abstained.  
Motion carried.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Amendment of Resolution 82-11 for the proposed technical corrections to the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

TRPA team member Mr. Segan provided the presentation.

Mr. Segan said Resolution 82-11 is the resolution that adopted the threshold standards which are goals for environmental quality and restoration in the Basin. The Threshold Update Initiative Workplan was approved by the Governing Board in January 2018 that laid out two years of work to go through initial priorities within that threshold standard system.

May 9, 2018

Those initial priorities were identified as technical corrections to the standards, overall system on how they are presented, sharing of information, and the focus areas of vegetation (forest health), stream environment zone, air quality (vehicle miles traveled), and recreation.

Why do we need the technical corrections? This process started in the 2015 Threshold Evaluation where there was a proposed assessment of the threshold standards against best practice for the establishment of standards such as being specific, measurable, attributable to the Agency, and relevant. Part of the assessment identified 43 standards that overlapped. The definition of overlap is the functional equivalence from a regulatory perspective.

The Tahoe Science Advisory Council was asked to provide a framework to categorize overlap, review the root cause of the overlap, and recommend a possible course of action to address it in the current system and prevent it from being introduced in the future. The Science Council provided a framework that identified five different types of overlap: Complete overlap, wholly encompassed standards, competing targets, indirect overlap, and policy statements as standards. Work was done with the Science Advisory Council to apply that framework and then the application of that framework went through the stakeholders working group to assess the next steps.

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson asked if it would also identify the kind of overlap.

Mr. Segan said yes, that is correct.

(presentation continued)

Mr. Segan said there are three primary goals; maintain equivalent level of protection, reduce uncertainty and potential conflict between regulated parties and TRPA, and reduce uncertainty of duplication of effort. The overlapping standards were put into two broad categories of non-policy technical corrections where changes could be done and still meet the criteria and policy questions that would require a policy decision. Those types of overlap were not continued forward in this discussion because they require a policy decision. The low hanging fruit of the proposal summary are; numbering the individual standards, reorganization of water quality, non-degradation of wetlands, meadows, and deciduous trees, establish resolution 82-11 as a standalone document, remove outdated references, correction of typographic errors, and remove footnotes indicating modification dates.

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson asked for an example of a non-degradation standard.

Mr. Segan said it's a non-degradation standard to preserve vegetation communities and shall apply to meadows, native deciduous trees, and the wetlands.

Mr. Hymanson asked if there is a reference in the standard to a baseline condition.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 9, 2018

Mr. Segan said there is no baseline established for any of them, e.g., meadow, deciduous trees, or wetlands.

Mr. Alling referred to sequence 128, deer disturbance free zone and asked if it was correct that the threshold was going to be removed and folded into VP1 through wholly encompassed standards.

Mr. Segan said yes, that is correct.

Mr. Alling said in the original resolution 82-11 for deer, the disturbance zone is mapped areas and the influence are meadows. The mapped areas for deer habitat are not strictly meadow areas, there are other areas in the Basin that deer occupy. By removing that threshold and folding it into protection of meadows, it's missing the remaining areas that deer utilize outside the meadow areas. He disagreed with the removal of that threshold because it doesn't entirely fall under the umbrella of meadow areas to protect the deer.

Mr. Segan said the original version of Resolution 82-11, the disturbance zones of the deer areas were in meadows. In the 2012 update of the threshold standards they flip flopped this notion of disturbance and influence areas for deer. Staff reviewed archives of the adopted mylar maps to identify the influence zones for deer and there wasn't anything mapped beyond the meadows.

Mr. Alling said by folding that threshold into VP1, protection of deer is missing and does not fall into the spirit of maintaining an equivalent level of protection as required by the criteria. He recommended leaving it in and reviewing it when the update is done to the wildlife threshold.

Mr. Hymanson said 43 standards were identified as overlapping and after applying the criteria from the Science Council, it increased to 51. How many of those standards would go away with the technical corrections.

Mr. Segan said it is a reduction from 173 to 151, 22 total standards.

Mr. Hymanson asked if the remainder would follow that next bin of policy.

Mr. Segan said yes, they do with the possibility of one additional one from Mr. Alling's suggestion.

Mr. Hymanson referred to slide 16 of the presentation with the constituents that have loading standards associated with them. He asked if some of those originate from state standards.

Mr. Segan said the concentration standards originate from state standards but were not included because they were not identified as overlapping.

Mr. Hymanson asked if there is a situation where TRPA proposed to do something to a standard where the origin is from one of the two states.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 9, 2018

Mr. Segan said none of the standards will go away, they're moved to the end and combined based on the load target. Each load target lists all ambient states that it applies to the individual standards.

Mr. Hymanson said many of the load standards are an approach to achieving the higher order standard of lake clarity.

Mr. Segan agreed.

Mr. Hymanson said as part of that subsequent analysis, does it make sense to have this higher order of standard then specify the methods by which a higher standard can be achieved?

Mr. Segan said it is a guidance that has emerged from a number of outputs from the Science Council that the standards confused both the goals with how to accomplish those goals. And that the standards should focus on the ultimate goal and be supported by implementation framework that specifies individual targets to accomplish those goals.

Mr. Hymanson suggested that the degradation standards be put in the bin for more work. Perhaps they are more like policy statements, they're not specifying a reference condition or target level, they are making an aspirational statement. What is meant by degradation, because there are some things that can be controlled and some that can't.

Mr. Larsen said Attachment C and reorganizing Resolution 82-11 have helped him understand what is involved and where the starting point is.

Mr. Hymanson said the origin of the direction to develop thresholds comes from the Compact. He asked why we would go back to Resolution 82-11 to do cleanup, rather than reviewing the Compact and identifying Board direction and new technology for a new resolution to supersede 82-11.

Mr. Teshara said this gets to the fundamental failures of Pathway 2007. During Pathway 2007, there was an effort from some individuals that wanted to scrap Resolution 82-11 and start over.

Mr. Marshall said Resolution 82-11 is a vehicle for the adoption of the thresholds, it is the mechanism in which the Board takes action to satisfy their obligation under the Compact.

Mr. Hester said the working group discussed what format should the thresholds take on and where should they live. Structure and integration will be addressed by the Threshold Working Group.

Mr. Marshall said the working group will discuss the nature of the Resolution 82-11 document and see if there is something else more meaningful to both the science community, partners, public, etc. that may function better than a resolution (paper document) with amendments as part of it.

Ms. Carr referred to the Workplan-system/focus areas slide. The Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholders Working Group is instructed not to rewrite the standards but to ensure what is



ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 9, 2018

written is workable and that all appropriate parties are involved. They'll be relying on other entities that will be involved in reviewing these standards. Many hours were spent to ensure that nothing was omitted from the existing Resolution 82-11 and what is being proposed. She's comfortable that staff was careful to ensure that nothing was left out in the transition to a clearer document.

Mr. Drew said it is his understanding that there is an incremental process to make changes and we're starting with the most basic items first. He had some of the same questions as Mr. Hymanson in terms of where this is going to live and how it will be documented. It would be good to create a table that will show the steps to be taken. We're starting with the administrative clean up and incrementally will get into the details and substantive elements. There will be different levels of effort and approvals that will be needed to make changes. Maybe that is the piece that is missing because there is an effort with the stream environment zone program to develop a monitoring plan. There are parallel activities happening and it would be good to be informed to make decisions.

Mr. Young said the document Resolution 82-11 is complex. More than a technical cleanup, they need to keep in mind as the group moves forward is establishing upfront a principal of accessibility, transparency, and easier to understand format.

Mr. Teshara suggested that before the Advisory Planning Commission vote on this agenda item, it may be helpful to have the other presentations to understand the linkage between them.

Mr. Marshall said that the next two agenda items are informational updates and suggested that the Advisory Planning Commission finish this item unless there is a strong sense the group would like to hear those items first. The APC can modify the motion to direct staff to ensure that there is no loss of protection for the deer habitat threshold or can specify that the Governing Board adopt Attachment C of the staff report except for deer habitat threshold.

Mr. Plemel said he is satisfied with staff's explanation that the adopted maps do not overlap and suggested that staff review those maps going forward. He does not want a motion that changes policy.

Mr. Alling said that is why the standard should remain in place because removing the protection for deer habitat and folding it under meadows, is not adequate.

Mr. Plemel said Mr. Alling's suggestion is a policy decision and not a technical correction.

Mr. Segan said staff agreed to leave the standard in and will look at additional maps to see if there is anything else mapped as an influence zone.

Mr. Hitchcock referred to slide 25 of the presentation, Stand-alone document/Roadway and Shoreline units, numerical standards, SR1-SR4. He suggested that it should be SR1-SR3, SR4 is the built environment threshold.

Mr. Marshall said if this is a typo in terms of SR1-SR4, it won't be changed in the thresholds. Where ever there is a reference to a table, staff would just attach the table.

May 9, 2018

Mr. Weavil said it seems like we've randomly and gratuitously identified a substantive change with deer habitat, how do we ensure that there are not more of those types of items that may have been overlooked.

Ms. Carr said when she reviewed this she took the original Resolution 82-11 and one of tables prepared by staff and compared the paragraphs and origin of standards in 82-11 and looked for the information in the restructured document to ensure that nothing was omitted or if combined that no integrity was lost.

Mr. Marshall said this was also vetted with other stakeholder groups.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Larsen made a motion to recommend Governing Board Adoption of Resolution 2018-\_\_amending Exhibit A of Resolution 82-11, as shown in Attachment C, except amending Attachment C to include the deer habitat preservation as described in the currently adopted version of wildlife section of Attachment C.

Ms. Carr seconded the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. 2017 TRPA Monitoring Report Update

TRPA team member Ms. Vollmer provided the presentation.

Ms. Vollmer said all items monitored tie back to the thresholds except for bike and pedestrian which support regional trends, mode split, supporting grant applications, etc.

Stream Monitoring:

The threshold is to maintain 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat. This monitoring has been done since 2009 with 40 sites per year; 20 trend sites that are repeated every four years and 20 random sites. Bioassessment monitoring is used to collect macroinvertebrates and physical stream habitat measures to assess stream health. There are 600 plus macroinvertebrates collected at each site and are sensitive to water quality pollution, therefore, a good indicator of water quality. The macroinvertebrates are compared against pristine streams throughout California and Nevada using the California Stream Condition Index to obtain a stream score. Hundreds of measurements are taken on substrates, erosion, canopy cover, etc. to identify degraded conditions. Seventy-three percent of streams are in good or excellent condition and 27 percent are degraded based on 130 samples collected since 2009. Degraded conditions occur mostly in the South Shore and Incline Village and are where the majority of the

May 9, 2018

environmental improvement program projects are. There are also degraded streams spread out throughout the Basin that are not currently on any restoration lists.

**Stream Environment Zone Monitoring:**

Stream monitoring is done for perineal streams and stream environment zone monitoring for non-perineal streams, wetlands, and riparian areas. This threshold has restored 25 percent of degraded SEZ in urban areas and restored 100 percent of degraded SEZ in non-urban areas. A trial monitoring program began in 2016 with 40 sites per year; 20 trend sites and 20 random sites. They've recently received a grant from the Environmental Protection Agency to develop a more formal monitoring plan. The monitoring is done with the California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM) using the following to assess wetland function: Biotic structure, surrounding buffer, hydrology, and physical structure. From two years of data, 82 percent of SEZ are in good or excellent condition and 18 percent are degraded not including SEZ that have been developed. Degraded SEZ are widespread in developed and undeveloped areas and provide the opportunity for more restoration.

**Wildlife Monitoring:**

TRPA threshold monitors special status species including thresholds for Osprey, Peregrine Falcon, and Wintering Bald Eagle, etc. TRPA took over some wildlife monitoring from the U.S. Forest Service in 2010 as they lost some of their funding. There is funding for four Osprey nests, two Peregrine Falcon nests, and two for Wintering Bald Eagle. They do three lake wide boat and walking surveys on Fallen Leaf and Cascade Lakes annually. They coordinate their work with California State Parks, the Tahoe Institute for Natural Science, and the Nevada Department of Wildlife. The threshold is to maintain four nests and are well over that with 25 nesting sites. Peregrine Falcons were not found at Lake Tahoe from the 1980s to 2008. It was recommended to remove them from the threshold because it was thought that they would never be found here again. There are four sites and possibly a fifth that needs to be confirmed this year.

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson asked what the number of active Peregrine Falcon nests are in the Basin.

Ms. Vollmer said there are four.

(presentation continued)

Ms. Vollmer for the Wintering Bald Eagle they participate in a Basin wide effort organized by the Tahoe Institute for Natural Science by manning a monitoring station. They are seeing continued growth for Wintering Bald Eagle with highest number of 27 this past year.

**Air Quality Monitoring:**

There are maximum acceptable threshold levels for carbon monoxide, particulate matter, ozone, nitrous oxide, and visibility. TRPA has three air quality stations around the Lake with three others operated by local jurisdictions. TRPA partners with the Desert Research Institute, the University of California, Davis Nuclear Lab, and the National Park Service Visibility Monitoring Network. All air quality trends are improving.

May 9, 2018

Noise Monitoring:

Monitoring is done in plan areas, highways, and the shorezone. Each plan area, highway, and shorezone have a maximum allowable decibel level per TRPA thresholds. Every four years they do 140 plan areas, 30 highway segments, and 10 shorezone locations. Nearly 40 percent of the plan areas exceed the noise and 60 percent of the highway and corridor exceed noise standards, and Rubicon Point is a concern for the shorezone.

Tahoe Yellow Cress Monitoring:

TRPA is part of an inter-agency monitoring group representing over 14 organizations monitoring TYC since 1979. They participate in a lake wide count that takes place over one week every September. The threshold is to maintain 26 TYC population sites. Overall, there is an upward trend in the number of sites.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Monitoring:

Prior to 2016 monitoring was done through manual counts over one to two days by consultants. They began in-house monitoring in 2016 using automated counters. By the end of 2018, there will be over 30 counters installed by TRPA and partners around the Basin. Data is uploaded into Lake Tahoe Info about once per month. There were 1,600 people per day on the Camp Richardson bike path in the summer of 2017, over 150 people per day on one of the South Lake Tahoe bike paths in the winter of 2017. The highest daily count was 5,500 people at Lake Forest for the July 4<sup>th</sup> fireworks.

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Larsen said the 2017 Monitoring Report suggested that the main source of the Rubicon Point noise issue is the “cigarette” boats. He asked how that is being addressed.

Mr. Marshall said noise and noisy boats are a significant issue. The noise standard for boats as implemented is a drive by test. These boats are not inheritably noisy when operated in a specific way. It is not an implementable standard to prohibit “noisy” boats. Inspectors would need to be able to distinguish between boats that produce a lot of noise and boats that may be fast but have appropriate mufflers. It is not an easy task to say what type of boats should be kept off the Lake. The Shoreline Steering Committee is working on a code provision that could define what kinds of boats those are. Collectively, the marina owners don’t want to rent space to these types of boats and as part of the shoreline program there will be increased enforcement.

Mr. Young said we are getting ready to launch into a big project with the thresholds and sometimes the people being relied upon might not have the right information, for example, the experts who thought the Peregrine Falcons should have been removed as part of the threshold.

Ms. Vollmer said part of the decline of Peregrine Falcons and all raptors may have been due to the presence of the pesticide DDT.

Mr. Hymanson asked what the process is for choosing the 20 random sites for stream monitoring.

Mr. Segan said the Environmental Protection Agency helped design the sampling framework.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 9, 2018

Mr. Hymanson asked for further information on how the monitoring information is used with the environmental improvement program to help identify projects.

Mr. Segan said the hope is that the information in the monitoring report be more wide spread and integrated into project selection, specifically with the stream environment zones and restoration projects. Part of the Environmental Protection Agency grant will be to further develop the monitoring plan and to prioritize restoration sites. That grant is supported by a 14-member technical advisory committee.

Mr. Hymanson asked if the monitoring report under goes any external or independent peer review.

Mr. Segan said no. This is the first monitoring report and the next presentation will go over how they've been working towards greater transparency of information collected via the Lake Tahoe Info portal.

Mr. Hitchcock asked if the noise exceedance in plan areas were commercial.

Ms. Vollmer said she believes it is wide spread across different types of plan areas.

Mr. Ferry asked if they are monitoring the new Sunset Reach of the Upper Truckee River restoration.

Ms. Vollmer said they do not do any restoration base monitoring. They have random sampling sites, and some could be in that reach. There are also some trend sites that are along the airport reach that are monitored every four years, but nothing specifically in that reach.

Mr. Ferry asked if they have access to private properties when looking for Tahoe Yellow Cress and is there outreach done to the land owners for this species.

Ms. Vollmer said TRPA is a participant of the surveys that are organized by the Nevada Natural Heritage Program who would coordinate the outreach and access to private properties.

Mr. Ferry said the California Tahoe Conservancy plans to do a major restoration project in the marsh and encouraged TRPA to be involved in pre and post monitoring.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

B. LakeTahoeInfo.org Briefing

TRPA team members Ms. McNamara and Mr. Haefer provided the overview.

Mr. Haefer said the monitoring dash board can be found at the Lake Tahoe Info website: <https://laketahoeinfo.org/> which highlight the efforts to collect data and make it publicly available. Staff worked with consultant Sitka Technology Group to build out the program.

May 9, 2018

A project related to the monitoring program is the Tahoe open data page that stores a lot of the Geographic Information System (GIS) data and has recently been incorporated into the non-GIS data and monitoring program. It increases data transparency throughout the Basin and inter-agency collaboration. This data feeds directly into the monitoring.

Ms. McNamara said what's on the monitoring dashboard is a small subset of all the data. In the next fiscal year there will be more data sets going forward as funding becomes available for Lake Tahoe Info.

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Donohue asked what the annual budget of Lake Tahoe Info is.

Ms. McNamara said the general fund budget is between \$100-150,000 but there are other funding sources such as transportation funding, some Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA) return funding, and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) funding.

Mr. Larsen said the stormwater monitoring that is included in the dashboard is part of the Tahoe Resource Conservation District's ongoing regional stormwater monitoring program network.

Mr. Drew asked if the open source website is available through the Lake Tahoe Info website.

Mr. Haefer said it can be accessed through any of Lake Tahoe Info's monitoring pages.

(presentation continued)

Ms. McNamara said the parcel tracker links information on individual parcels. All land capability and permitting information is daylighted in the parcel tracker. The individual parcel evaluation score is now available to the public and staff has connected the parcel tracker to the BMP data base. The Environmental Improvement Program performance measures are updated automatically as BMP certificates are issued.

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Donohue asked if the BMP data can be extracted for the Total Daily Maximum Load (TMDL).

Ms. McNamara said not currently.

Mr. Larsen asked if there is a link for permits and activities done by local governments on behalf of TRPA.

Ms. McNamara said yes. The goal is not to have information entered multiple times. Staff has been working with some of the local jurisdictions and their permitting software to run reports. The parcel tracker was built to work with Accela permitting software. They will be linking to the Placer and El Dorado County systems to pull their information, so they do not have to go into a separate data base to enter the permitting information. The City of South Lake Tahoe doesn't have permitting software that is compatible at this time.

May 9, 2018

Mr. Hitchcock said the City staff manually inputs the data into Lake Tahoe Info.

Ms. McNamara said they're working on the permit wizard for the City of South Lake Tahoe which connects their permit information to the parcel tracker that TRPA can then push that information into real time.

Mr. Larsen asked what the timing is.

Mr. Kasman said under the Memorandum of Understanding for TRPA and Placer County, they have developed a report for Placer that will automatically be sent to TRPA. This will be a priority to complete, when funding is available next fiscal year.

Mr. Ferry said El Dorado County is implementing a new parcel tracking system called TRAKiT.

Mr. Kasman said a lot of the integrations that have been built are industry standard web services that will enable that communication between systems. TRAKiT has the ability for TRPA to pull information using web services.

(presentation continued)

Ms. McNamara said another enhancement is the Lake Clarity tracker. There is an online interface allowing jurisdiction to register credits. They transferred the previously developed TMDL interface to this platform. The nearshore resource allocation program is in its infancy to take the state of the knowledge about nearshore to get a summary of the findings.

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson said that as the Lake Tahoe Info is built out with the aspiration of making information more transparent, he suggested that they develop more detailed methods in documenting. These document methods could be modified separately without modifying the web pages. He also suggested that the TRPA Monitoring Report should have an independent peer review.

Mr. Hester said a science-based adaptive management structure is the strategy of the working group as they look at the next steps on structure. The conceptual model is the approach that the science council would like to take. It's very detailed and each subject has different models. The results framework is used by some when making major investments and it shows the causes and effects. The standard system is the formal system that was called for in the Compact; the threshold standards that were implemented through policies in the Regional Plan, Code of Ordinances, and regulations when looking at development on parcels and through the environmental improvement program as areas are prioritized. This is designed to have feedback to both the results framework and the conceptual models and part of that is Lake Tahoe Info. The goal is to align all the pieces on how they work together. The idea of trying to limit accessibility to data and models is a past era.

Mr. Hymanson asked if there is an effort to develop conceptual models.

Mr. Hester said yes.

Mr. Hymanson asked if that is only within TRPA.

May 9, 2018

Mr. Hester said no, staff's expectations is that the science council or different science groups will help develop those.

Mr. Segan said this design is still being discussed with the science council and will be brought to the stakeholder working group as well as vetted through the individual focus area working groups. As part of the Science Advisory Councils engagement with stream environment zones in particular, their updating a conceptual model for that as well as air quality, (vehicle miles traveled). In the future, as they are adopting new standards, this would be the framework. They would adopt a standard that is initially supported by a conceptual model that describes the influences of that system and then build the results framework, and what the consequences would be and how they maintain and attain thresholds.

Ms. Carr said its key to have the thresholds numbered.

Public Comments & Questions

None.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

No report.

1) Quarterly Report: January – March 2018

No further report.

B. General Counsel

Mr. Marshall said a hearing was held in Federal Court on the Garmong litigation. The court granted the motion to dismiss the case but with leave to amend. Because the court dismissed it on jurisdictional grounds, it did not go to the next series of procedural arguments that may have eliminated the suit against the individuals.

C. APC Members

Mr. Young said he will now be the primary representative for Washoe County and Ms. Krause will be the alternate.

Mr. Hymanson said the Tahoe Science Advisory Council will meet on May 29, at the Sierra Nevada College Campus in Incline Village from 9:00 am to 2:00 pm.

Mr. Buelna said Placer County adopted their area plan and has updated their memorandum of understanding with TRPA to take on additional responsibilities. They also released the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement joint document with the Forest Service for the base to base gondola for Alpine Meadows and Squaw Valley Ski Resorts.



ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 9, 2018

Mr. Larsen said the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board hired a new division manager, Ben Letton to replace Doug Smith who was promoted to Assistant Executive Officer.

Mr. Teshara said the environmental document on the Kings Beach State Recreation Area Master Plan and Pier have been released. Tahoe Transportation District will meet on Friday, May 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss the South Shore transit routes. There are resource constraints for funding, the hiring of drivers and the status of the fleets. There will be a Chamber Trek to Vail, Colorado on June 20<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> to learn about their challenges on affordable workforce housing.

Mr. Marshall said the Shoreline Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Code were released on May 8<sup>th</sup> for a 60-day comment period. There will be a public hearing at the Advisory Planning Commission in June.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Teshara adjourned the meeting at 12:01 p.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.*





**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](http://www.trpa.org)

Date: June 6, 2018

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Public Review Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Lake Tahoe Shoreline Plan

---

**Requested Action:** No action is required. This is an information/comment item only.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and provide comments.

**Project Description:** The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has prepared an EIS for the proposed Lake Tahoe Shoreline Plan. This document meets the environmental review requirements of the TRPA Compact, Code of Ordinances (Code), and Rules of Procedure. This presentation meets the TRPA public review requirements to provide responsible agencies and interested persons with sufficient information to make meaningful comments on the environmental analysis. The document is available at: [www.shorelineplan.org](http://www.shorelineplan.org)

The Lake Tahoe Shoreline Plan will update regulations focused on structures (marinas, piers, buoys, ramps and slips) to support water-dependent recreation along the Lake Tahoe shoreline and effective resource management to ensure environmental threshold attainment. The Shoreline Plan EIS analyzes the environmental impacts of four project alternatives, including Alternative 1, developed by the Shoreline Steering Committee and endorsed by the TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC).

**Background:** Development along the shoreline of Lake Tahoe has been the subject of decades of study and controversy. In the 1980's TRPA adopted a prohibition on new shorezone structures in fish habitat until studies were performed to determine the relative impacts of those structures on fish populations. The studies, conducted in the 1990's established that the structures in of themselves do not adversely impact fish populations. Since that time TRPA and stakeholders have struggled to replace the fish habitat prohibition with a set of ordinances that regulates structures in the shorezone to provide for recreational access and environmental protection. In 2008 TRPA adopted a shorezone ordinance that incorporated contemporary science and addressed most, but not all, stakeholder concerns. However, the EIS supporting adoption of this ordinance was challenged, and in 2010 the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals remanded the EIS back to TRPA to address deficiencies in that document. Following the court's decision in 2010, TRPA adopted a partial permitting program that limits shorezone

development to minor modifications and repairs and prohibits new structures until a revised plan and subsequent environmental analysis is adopted.

In response to the Court decision, TRPA launched a collaborative process in 2016 to develop a Shoreline Plan to enhance recreation and protect the 72 miles of Lake Tahoe's shores. TRPA and partner agencies initiated planning by engaging the Consensus Building Institute (CBI), a third-party mediation firm, to convene stakeholders and develop a consensus-based planning process. In April 2016 CBI and TRPA convened a Steering Committee to frame key issues, identify approaches, and develop policy recommendations. The Steering Committee is comprised of representatives from the California State Lands Commission, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lake Tahoe Marina Association, League to Save Lake Tahoe, Nevada Division of State Lands, Tahoe Lakefront Owner's Association, and TRPA.

TRPA also convened a Joint Fact Finding (JFF) Committee to provide scientific and technical input and recommendations on the best available information and science to use in the Shoreline Plan. The Joint Fact Finding Committee verified that there was no positive correlation between declining fish populations at Lake Tahoe and shorezone structures and that an outright prohibition of new development in fish habitat was unfounded. The JFF agreed that shorezone permitting could be allowed in areas designated as fish habitat, provided that any impacts are mitigated. The JFF also helped to identify standards of significance for other environmental impact areas such as air and water quality. This information helped inform the development of policy recommendations for the Shoreline Plan.

Over a series of meetings, the Steering Committee presented to the TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) the project scope, organizing principles, and a comprehensive set of policy proposals for consideration in the Shoreline Plan. RPIC considered, modified, and ultimately endorsed a set of proposals addressing water-dependent structures that provide access to Lake Tahoe, including marinas, ramps, buoys, and piers, as well as measures for low lake level adaptation. The policies endorsed by RPIC were advanced forward in the Shoreline Plan project description that was included in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIS, published on July 12, 2017. The Scoping period for the EIS was completed in August 2017.

TRPA, in partnership with the Shoreline Steering Committee, used the scoping comments to develop the Shoreline Plan and three EIS Alternatives that were endorsed by the RPIC in October 2017. These alternatives have been analyzed in the Draft EIS, which was released to the public on May 8, 2018.

Summary of the Shoreline Plan EIS: The Public Draft EIS identifies and assesses the anticipated environmental effects of implementing the Shoreline Plan alternatives, with a focus on significant and potentially significant impacts. The EIS aims to provide a level of detail and clarity in the environmental review that allows for meaningful comment and participation by public agencies, interest groups, and the public. Due to the programmatic nature of the

Shoreline Plan, it contains a general analysis of each resource area. The EIS is not intended to take the place of project-specific environmental review that will be needed to evaluate individual projects proposed following approval of the Shoreline Plan.

The EIS evaluates the outcomes of implementing the Shoreline Plan alternatives, including the effects of constructing and operating shoreline structures, resulting changes in boat use, and resource management programs. It analyzes the Shoreline Plan's effect on the following 13 resource areas:

- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Scenic Resources
- Fisheries and Aquatic Biological Resources
- Recreation
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
- Noise
- Land Use
- Soil Conservation
- Roadway Transportation and Circulation
- Terrestrial Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Health and Safety

Attachment A provides a summary of the environmental impacts evaluated in the EIS, the corresponding level of significance for each impact, and where applicable, recommended mitigation measures.

Public EIR/EIS Meetings and Public Workshops: The 60-day public review period began on May 8, 2018, and will end on July 9, 2018. TRPA staff distributed the notice of availability to all responsible and trustee agencies, to the California and Nevada State Clearinghouses, and to all stakeholders that have been involved or expressed interest in Shoreline Planning. The Notice was posted in the newspapers, on the TRPA website, and on Shorelineplan.org. Additionally, a mailer was distributed to all property owners in the Lake Tahoe Basin announcing availability of the EIS and providing opportunities to participate.

In addition to the opportunity to submit written comments, public hearings and workshops provide the public the opportunity to learn more about the project alternatives and to comment on the findings of the EIS. The following public workshops and hearings have been held or will be held during the public comment period:

May 23, 2018 Public Hearing, 9:30 a.m., TRPA Governing Board, North Tahoe Events Center,

8318 N Lake Blvd, Kings Beach, CA.

June 4, 2018 Public Workshop, 5:30-7:30 p.m., TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV.

June 6, 2018 Public Workshop, 5:30-7:30 p.m., North Tahoe Events Center, 8318 N Lake Blvd, Kings Beach, CA.

June 13, 2018 Public Hearing, 9:30 a.m., TRPA Advisory Planning Commission, TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV.

Contact Information: For questions regarding this item, please contact Rebecca Cremeen, Acting Senior Planner, at (775) 589-5214 or [rcremeen@trpa.org](mailto:rcremeen@trpa.org).

Attachment:

A. Summary of Impacts Table

Attachment A

Summary of Impacts Table

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation  |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                               |
| <b>4 Land Use</b>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                               |
| <p><u>Impact 4-1: Induce substantial new growth</u><br/>Regional growth is capped by the Regional Plan. The Shoreline Plan alternatives would permit development of structures within the shorezone but would not increase the capacity of the region to accommodate an increase in residents or tourists. The addition of new public access facilities (e.g., boat ramps, public slips) under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would accommodate an increase in the number of day visitors to the region; however, these additional day visitors would not lead to residential, tourist, or commercial growth because growth is capped by the Regional Plan development rights system.</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3 - LTS<br>Alt 4 - NI | No mitigation required  |                                  | No mitigation required        |
| <p><u>Impact 4-2: Consistency with applicable plans, policies, regulations, and the existing pattern of land use</u><br/>Shoreline Plan Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would result in changes to provisions in the TRPA Code that govern development within the shorezone. The provisions of these alternatives have been developed to implement the Regional Plan Goals and Policies and achieve thresholds, each striking a different balance of environmental protection and recreational access. The shorezone code provisions under all alternatives are intended to augment local TRPA plans by providing a framework for development within the shorezone that is consistent with the land use designations within each of those plans. The pattern of development allowed under each of the Shoreline Plan alternatives would be restricted not only by land use designations identified in local plans, but also by other existing provisions of the code that would remain unchanged, as well as by the requirement for compliance with environmental thresholds. All four Shoreline Plan alternatives would provide for the same types and pattern of land uses that already exist within the shorezone.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required  |                                  | No mitigation required        |
| <b>5 Fisheries and Aquatic Biological Resources</b>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                               |
| <p><u>Impact 5-1: Increased risk of AIS introduction or spread</u><br/>The increase in boat launches under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could increase the risk of AIS introductions, but this risk would not be substantial because the rigorous and effective prevention programs (including boat inspection, decontamination, outreach, and education) would continue. However, the increases in recreational boating under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would increase the risk that invasive macrophytes and Asian clams already in Lake Tahoe would</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3 - S<br>Alt 4 - B    | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 5-1a: Require marina aquatic invasive species management plans</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, and 3)<br/>TRPA will require that all marinas prepare and implement an AIS management plan within 3 years of adoption of the Shoreline Plan. The AIS management plans shall, at a minimum, (1) identify strategies to prevent the establishment of invasive macrophytes and Asian clams within the marina (e.g., improved water circulation), (2) include an AIS monitoring, early</p> |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3 -LTS<br>Alt 4 - B |



**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <p>be spread within the lake, creating new populations and increasing the abundance and distribution of AIS.</p> <p>Alternative 4 would result in no increase in boating activity and would not increase the risk of AIS introduction and spread. Alternative 4 would also require that all marinas develop and implement an AIS management plan. This would reduce the risk of AIS introductions at, or spread from, marinas.</p> |                |                             |                                 | <p>detection, and response program within the marina, which could be in partnership with resource management agencies and/or organizations, and (3) include a public education component. For marinas that already contain AIS, the AIS management plan shall identify measures to control or eradicate existing AIS and reduce the potential for spread.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 5-1b: Promote the development of AIS-resistant boats (applies to Alts 1, 2, and 3)</u><br/>                     TRPA will continue to regularly communicate with representatives of the watercraft industry, including trade associations and manufactures of watercraft or watercraft components, to promote the development and widespread commercial utilization of technologies that lower the potential for the spread of AIS. Innovations such as ballast tank filters, heated ballast water intakes in engines, and better draining ballast tanks are currently being developed by various manufacturers, but they are not yet commercially available on a widespread basis. Although many of these innovations are not yet commercially viable, they may be by the full buildout of the Shoreline Plan Alternatives. TRPA will regularly coordinate with representatives of the watercraft industry to advocate for and demonstrate a commercial interest in the continued development and adoption of such technologies. TRPA will enact policies to encourage or require the use of such technologies when they become feasible.</p> <p><u>Mitigation 5-1c: Establish a mitigation fee program to increase AIS control. (applies to Alt 2 only)</u><br/>                     TRPA will establish an AIS mitigation fee program that will fund increased levels of AIS control. The fee will be used to implement projects that reduce the abundance and distribution of Asian clam, Eurasian watermilfoil, curly-leaf pondweed, coontail and/or other AIS that may be introduced in the future and can be spread by recreational boating. The fee will be assessed on recreational boaters either during AIS inspections or at launch points. The fee per launch or boat will be the same as that proposed under Alternative 1, which will be sufficient to increase existing control efforts commensurate with the projected increase in annual boat trips under Alternative 2.</p> |                                  |                              |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance without Mitigation                              | Mitigation Measures           | Significance with Mitigation  |                 |                                  |
|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact   | LTS = Less than significant   | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
| <p><u>Impact 5-2: Loss of prime fish habitat</u><br/>                     The implementation of the Shoreline Plan has the potential to result in a net reduction in the amount of prime fish habitat, as defined by TRPA, due to placement of shorezone structures within this habitat. Alternatives 1 and 3 would require habitat replacement at a 1.5:1 ratio, resulting in no net loss in prime fish habitat. Alternative 2 would prohibit construction of structures within prime fish habitat. Alternative 4 would require habitat replacement at a ratio of 2:1, which would not cause a decrease in the amount of prime fish habitat</p>  | <p>Alt 1, 3, 4 - LTS<br/>                     Alt 2 - NI</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> |                 |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 5-3: Construction-related impacts</u><br/>                     Construction of new shorezone structures and dredging under all four Shoreline Plan alternatives could affect all species considered, except lake trout because they do not utilize nearshore habitats. Effects on species that could use nearshore habitats would be greatest on native minnow species that spawn in nearshore areas, including Lahontan Lake tui chub. Effects on special-status salmonids, including LCT and mountain whitefish, as well as other coldwater game fish species, would generally be limited to adults migrating to spawning tributaries and juveniles using nearshore areas for rearing.<br/><br/>                     All of the alternatives would produce a small amount of temporary disturbance relative to both prime fish habitat and marginal fish habitat. Additionally, based on the life history characteristics and habitat use for the species evaluated, construction-related effects would not be adverse for any fish species under any of the alternatives.</p> | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS</p>                                  | <p>No mitigation required</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> |                 |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 5-4: Permanent habitat modification</u><br/>                     Permanent habitat modification could affect all species evaluated except lake trout because they do not utilize nearshore habitats. Impacts on species that could use nearshore habitats would be greatest on native nongame fish, including Lahontan Lake tui chub. Impacts on special-status salmonids, including LCT and mountain whitefish, as well as other coldwater game fish species, would generally be limited to YOY juveniles using nearshore areas for rearing. Under all Shoreline Plan alternatives, impacts resulting from permanent habitat modification would be small relative to TRPA-designated fish habitat, including prime fish habitat. Additionally, based on the life history characteristics and habitat use for the species evaluated, impacts would be minimal for any fish species.</p>  | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS</p>                                  | <p>No mitigation required</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> |                 |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures    | Significance with Mitigation     |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant        | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
| <p><u>Impact 5-5: Recreation-related impacts</u><br/>                     Recreational activities could affect all species evaluated. Effects on species that could use nearshore habitats would be greatest on native minnow species that spawn in nearshore areas, including Lahontan Lake tui chub. Effects on special-status salmonids, including LCT and mountain whitefish, as well as other coldwater game fish species, could occur to adults that utilize open waters of the lake and to YOY juveniles using nearshore areas for rearing. Spawning and egg incubation of special-status salmonids and other coldwater game fish species would not be affected since these species spawn in tributary streams or deep in the lake where they would not be affected by increased boating or recreational angling. Effects under Alternative 2 would be greatest because it would allow the largest number of structures and two new marinas. Thus, under Alternative 2 the capacity for recreational activities such as boating and angling would be highest. Effects under Alternative 4 would be the least because it contains the least number of structures and no increases in boating, relative to baseline. Recreation-related effects under Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 would be intermediate between Alternatives 2 and 4. However, under all the alternatives, recreation-related effects resulting from increased recreational angling and/or boating would be small.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required | No mitigation required           |
| <p><b>6 Hydrology and Water Quality</b></p>   |                |                             |                                 |                        |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 6-1: Soil erosion and/or release of pollutants to Lake Tahoe from shorezone facility construction or maintenance activities, including dredging</u><br/>                     All four Shoreline Plan alternatives would allow new construction and dredging within the shorezone. Construction activities could affect water quality by accelerating soil erosion and sedimentation while also releasing pollutants. Dredging for new construction or maintenance dredging for existing facilities could affect water quality by increasing turbidity and releasing nutrients into the surrounding water. Existing state, federal, and TRPA regulations mitigate potential short-term impacts from construction activities in the shorezone. TRPA policies require the implementation and maintenance of temporary BMPs to protect water quality during maintenance dredging within the shorezone. Under Alternatives 1 and 3, TRPA would revise code standards (Section 84.15.3) to be consistent with federal standards for new dredging (nondegradation) under Section 404 of the CWA as regulated by USACE. However, the federal standards under Section 404 are mandatory for dredging in Lake Tahoe regardless of the</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4- LTS             | No mitigation required | No mitigation required           |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance without Mitigation                     | Mitigation Measures   | Significance with Mitigation                                |                 |                                  |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact                                      | LTS = Less than significant   | PS = Potentially significant                                | S = Significant | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
| <p>TRPA Code provisions and are therefore applicable to all four alternatives. Dredging activities would also need to comply with each state's Section 401 water quality certification requirements.</p>   |   |   |   |                 |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 6-2: Sediment resuspension and turbidity associated with the hydrodynamic effects of motorized boating</u></p> <p>The hydrodynamic effects from motorized boating can disturb and resuspend lakebed sediment through propeller wash and boat wake, potentially leading to increased turbidity and reductions in nearshore clarity. Hydrodynamic effects from propeller wash and boat wake are generally limited to shallower areas, with little or no effects for water depths less than 7 feet and no effects for water depths greater than 10 feet (Beachler and Hill 2003; USACE 1993). TRPA Code Section 84.17.1 requires a no-wake zone within 600 feet of the shore with a 5-mile-per-hour (mph) speed limit. Most of Lake Tahoe's shallower depths are within the existing no-wake zone, with notable exceptions being the nearshore areas adjacent to the City of South Lake Tahoe and Tahoe City.</p> <p>Lake Tahoe's nearshore presents complex environment conditions and factors that may influence nearshore clarity in an interrelated manner that varies by location and with time (Taylor 2002). In addition to natural wind effects generating water movement, wave motion, and natural littoral processes, factors influencing the observed variability in nearshore clarity may include: adjacent land-uses and urban stormwater inputs, other nonpoint pollutant inputs, boating activity, proximity to stream inputs, water depth, substrate type, and localized features of the lake bottom. Among these interrelated factors the potential contribution of boating activities to degrade nearshore clarity is difficult to isolate or quantify.</p> <p>Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are projected to generate a peak-day increase in boating activity. On peak days, increased boat use could increase wave action and turbulence generated by boat wake. The shallower portions of the nearshore outside existing no-wake zone regulations are likely more susceptible to short-term and temporary declines in clarity because of increased wave action. During summertime periods with low winds and low inputs of streamflow and stormwater runoff, Lake Tahoe waters would typically be quiescent with low wave action in the nearshore. Because Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would increase boating activity on peak days, the increased potential for boat wake to induce additional wave action in shallow nearshore areas most susceptible to elevated</p> | <p>Alt 1, 3 – LTS<br/>Alt 2 – PS<br/>Alt 4 - NI</p> | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 6-2: Study and adaptively manage the effects of boats on nearshore conditions</u> (applies to Alt 2) TRPA will coordinate with partner agencies and research organizations to complete monitoring and studies that evaluate the effects of boat activity on nearshore clarity and water quality. TRPA will then implement management actions, if needed, based on the results of the studies.</p> <p>To ensure the completion of nearshore studies, TRPA will enact a nearshore water quality mitigation fee on recreational watercraft. The fee will be assessed on all recreation watercraft, either during aquatic invasive species boat inspections or at launch points. The fee will remain in place for a period of up to ten years to fund scientific research and nearshore monitoring through a program such as the Nearshore Water Quality Network. Revenue generated from the fee will be directed towards research components of nearshore studies tasked with evaluating potential impacts of boat activity on nearshore clarity and water quality. TRPA will set the fee at an amount that is adequate to fund an assessment of recreational boating effects on nearshore water quality and clarity.</p> <p>If research concludes that the increase in boating activities anticipated under Alternative 2 would contribute to an exceedance of TRPA's nearshore numerical standard of 1 NTU, TRPA will implement management actions to avoid or offset this impairment. Such management actions could include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ expand the no-wake zone based on the scientific findings and recommendations for nearshore areas identified to be susceptible to reduced clarity from boating activities; or</li> <li>▲ enact a permanent nearshore water quality mitigation fee on recreational watercraft and use the revenue to fund compensatory mitigation projects that reduce other sources of nearshore water quality impairment.</li> </ul> | <p>Alt 1, 3, 4 – No mitigation required<br/>Alt 2 – LTS</p> |                 |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation            | Mitigation Measures  | Significance with Mitigation                         |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant               | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable                     |
| <p>turbidity would also increase; therefore, the potential frequency of exceeding the nearshore threshold turbidity standard may also increase for limited portions of the nearshore.</p>  |                |                             |  |  |  |
| <p><u>Impact 6-3: Direct entrainment or atmospheric deposition of pollutants from boat exhaust</u><br/>                     Increased boating activity is projected under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, which could lead to increased boat emissions. Alternative 4 would not increase boating activity, and therefore would not increase boat emissions. Boat engines emit oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and particulate matter (PM) during operation, which may be delivered to the lake through direct entrainment in the water column or atmospheric deposition. Total nitrogen and fine sediment particles are pollutants of concern for lake transparency and clarity, and the Lake Tahoe TMDL sets load reduction targets for these pollutants. Therefore, emissions that lead to an increase in loading for these pollutants of concern might extend the timeline needed to achieve the Lake Tahoe TMDL load reduction targets.<br/>                     The approval of additional boating facilities under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 leading to the increase in boating activity would be phased through a projected buildout date of 2040. Impact 10-1 in Chapter 10, "Air Quality," assesses potential changes in emissions from increased boating activity under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Impact 10-1 concludes that a net reduction in boating emissions, including emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and PM, would result under Alternatives 1 and 3 as the increased boating hours are offset by fleet turnover, with older boat engines replaced with cleaner and more fuel-efficient boat engines.<br/>                     Impact 10-1 in Chapter 10, "Air Quality," concludes that under Alternative 2 changes in emissions from increased boat activity will have mixed results, with a net increase in NO<sub>x</sub> and a net decrease in PM. Because Alternative 2 would create a net increase in NO<sub>x</sub> loading, and potential impacts on lake transparency and clarity from boat exhaust would be proportional to changes in atmospheric emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, this could extend the timelines needed to achieve the Lake Tahoe TMDL load reduction targets.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 3 – LTS<br>Alt 2 – PS<br>Alt 4 – NI | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 6-3: Limit the number of moorings and boat ramps to limit emissions from increased motorized watercraft activity</u> (applies to Alt 2 only)<br/>                     TRPA shall implement Mitigation Measure 10-1 as described in Chapter 10, "Air Quality," which limits the number of new moorings and boat ramps (and thus boat emissions) to the maximum number allowed under Alternative 1.</p> | Alts 1, 3, 4 – No mitigation required<br>Alt 2 – LTS |
| <p><u>Impact 6-4: Discharge of hydrocarbons or other contaminants into Lake Tahoe from boating activities and boating facilities</u><br/>                     Elevated levels of hydrocarbons or other contaminants in the lake could result from increased boating activity under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Gasoline and</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 – LTS                       | No mitigation required   | No mitigation required                               |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <p>diesel fuels contain hydrocarbon contaminants, including the group of volatile organic compounds collectively known as BTEX (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene). While also occurring in raw fuel, polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are primarily produced during the combustion process in an engine. Hydrocarbons can enter the water from boating activities via exhaust emissions, fueling spills, and other accidental spills. Most outboard engines exhaust beneath the surface of the water, and consequently, all exhaust must pass through the water column, where some hydrocarbons will remain in solution or sorb to particulates and sediments.</p>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 6-5: Interference with littoral processes from new or redeveloped shoreline structures</u><br/>                     All Shoreline Plan alternatives would allow for the addition or expansion of piers that could disrupt existing wave and current circulation patterns near the shoreline. Waves and current motion are the primary agents of littoral drift, the process by which sediment is transported and deposited in the nearshore area. Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 propose revisions to existing pier design standards in the TRPA Code (Section 84), but do not define design standards for public piers. Alternatives 2 and 3 would both allow multiple-use piers to deviate from design standards. Other structures, such as jetties, groins, breakwaters, and fences that could affect littoral processes, are generally not allowed under any of the Shoreline Plan alternatives. Alternative 1 may allow for other structures as part of a habitat restoration project or as part of a marina environmental improvement project. Alternative 2 would allow for these structures along the shoreline outside of prime fish habitat if the applicant demonstrated that the structure would not interfere with littoral processes.<br/><br/>                     Previous analysis (TRPA 2004) demonstrated that significant impacts on littoral drift processes can occur from floating piers. Because Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 do not specify design standards for floating piers such that impacts on littoral drift would be completely avoided, and because none of the Shoreline Plan alternatives define the environmental analysis procedures for assessing littoral drift processes associated with public pier applications or allowable deviations for multiple-use pier applications that include floating pier sections, design standards in their current form could allow for piers that interfere with existing littoral drift processes.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - S              | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 6-5a: Specify floating pier design standards</u> (applies to Alts 1 and 3)<br/>                     TRPA will augment the design standards summarized in Table 2-5 in Chapter 2, "Project Description," to include the following standard for floating piers:<br/>                     ▲ Floating pier sections rigidly moored to the lake bottom shall be prohibited.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 6-5b: Require littoral drift analyses and incorporate design recommendations for floating piers longer than 25 feet</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3 and 4)<br/>                     TRPA will require all new pier and pier extension applications that include floating pier sections longer than 25 feet submit a site-specific littoral drift and wave analysis. The analysis will assess the dimensions of the proposed floating pier section and the ability of waves to initiate and sustain the movement of sediment along the lake bottom under conditions of low lake level (6,223 feet), mid-lake level (6,226 feet), and high lake level (6,229 feet) Lake Tahoe Datum. The lake level condition with the greatest effect on littoral transport and backshore stability shall be used to design the floating pier section. Floating piers may only be approved if they are designed so that wave heights are not reduced by more than 50 percent and the floating pier section is no greater than 50 percent of the length of the site-specific design wavelength.</p> | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS             |                              |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures    | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial      NI = No impact      LTS = Less than significant      PS = Potentially significant      S = Significant      SU = Significant and unavoidable  |                                 |                        |                              |
| <b>7 Soil Conservation</b>  |                                 |                        |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 7-1: Increase land coverage beyond the limits allows by the Bailey land capability system</u><br/>                     All Shoreline Plan alternatives would permit the construction or expansion of structures that would create coverage in the backshore. However, all projects would be required to demonstrate their compliance with existing TRPA land coverage regulations including restoration of 1.5 times the amount of LCD 1b (i.e., backshore) coverage created by the project.</p>   | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required | No mitigation required       |
| <p><u>Impact 7-2: Increase erosion or degrade soil conditions during construction activities</u><br/>                     Implementation of all Shoreline Plan alternatives would permit construction activities in the shorezone that would create ground disturbance and loss of vegetation and would increase the potential for erosion. However, the potential for increased erosion resulting from future projects implemented under the Shoreline Plan alternatives would be reduced through compliance with county, TRPA, and LRWQCB or NDEP code requirements, permit conditions, and regulations.</p>  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required | No mitigation required       |
| <p><u>Impact 7-3: Long-term increases in shoreline erosion</u><br/>                     All Shoreline Plan alternatives would allow development of new facilities in the shorezone; however, the potential for the operation of these facilities to increase shoreline erosion would be controlled through existing TRPA regulations and permit conditions. Implementation of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in increased watercraft use on Lake Tahoe and would expand access to portions of the shoreline that are undeveloped or difficult to access without watercraft. Alternative 4 would not result in an increase in boating activity. Depending on the location of the 15 public piers allowed by Alternative 4, there could be an increase in public access to areas that are currently difficult to access (e.g., if a public pier and associated upland facilities were constructed in undeveloped parkland). Notwithstanding this potential, there is no evidence to suggest that such increased use of remote areas would occur as a result of future shorezone projects, nor that use of such areas, if more accessible, would result in long-term increases in erosion of the shoreline.</p> | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required | No mitigation required       |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   | Significance with Mitigation     |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
| <p><u>Impact 7-4: Potential for damage from liquefaction, settlement, tsunami, and seiche</u><br/>                     The Shoreline Plan alternatives would permit structures in the shorezone that could be damaged during an earthquake from liquefaction in saturated sand deposits, settlement, tsunami, and seiche. The risk from seismic shaking would be controlled through compliance with the current seismic design requirements of the California Building Standards Code and the International Building Code. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would increase the number of boats that could be exposed to inundation by tsunami or seiche; however, while such an event could be catastrophic, the probability of occurrence in any given year, or over the coming decades is very low.</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required  | No mitigation required           |
| <b>8 Recreation</b>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 8-1: Alter the quality of recreational experiences or create user conflicts</u><br/>                     Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would result in construction of new shorezone structures, with Alternative 4 structures limited to public piers. These alternatives include density and location standards for moorings and piers that would help preserve scenic areas around the lake and maintain the quality of recreation experience. Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would not result in a substantial change to quality of recreation experience. Implementation of Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 could result in public piers extending beyond the 600-foot no-wake zone, which could create potential conflicts between nonmotorized recreation (i.e., nonmotorized watercraft and swimmers) and motorized watercraft.<br/>                     Because of the substantial increase in boat launch capacity and overnight mooring provided by the number of new shorezone structures associated with Alternative 2, the increase in the number of motorized watercraft on the lake would be great enough that there would be a substantial adverse change in quality of recreation experience for people using motorized and nonmotorized, swimmers, and other beachgoers and increased potential for conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized recreationists outside the no-wake zone. Alternative 2 could also result in new multiple-use and public piers that extend beyond the no-wake zone, creating the potential for conflicts between nonmotorized recreationists and motorized watercraft.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - PS             | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 8-1a: Maintain nonmotorized navigation within the no-wake zone</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)<br/>                     TRPA will revise the pier design standards for piers that extend 600 feet or more from the high-water elevation to provide lateral nonmotorized recreation access within the 600-foot no-wake zone. Lateral nonmotorized recreation access within the 600-foot no-wake zone could be provided by either of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The pier design standards would require public piers (for Alternatives 1, 3, and 4) and multiple-use piers (for Alternative 2) to accommodate lateral nonmotorized access by limiting the pier length to within the 600-foot no-wake zone and providing at least 10 feet between the end of the pier and the no-wake zone boundary to allow nonmotorized recreationists to stay within the no-wake zone. The applicant for a new multiple-use pier that extends to within 30 feet of the no-wake zone would also be required to install one or more navigational buoys to identify the location of the no-wake zone relative to the pier; or</li> <li>▲ The pier design standards could allow exceptions for public piers (for Alternatives 1, 3, and 4) and multiple-use and public piers (for Alternative 2) that extend beyond the no-wake zone if the pier is designed to allow nonmotorized recreationists to have lateral access underneath the pier during high lake level conditions.</li> </ul> | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS             |



**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
|  |                |                             |                                 | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 8-1b: Implement Mitigation Measure 10-1 to limit the number of moorings and boat ramps</u> (applies to Alt 2 only)<br/>TRPA will implement Mitigation Measure 10-1, as described in Chapter 10, "Air Quality," which would revise the Code of Ordinances to limit the total number of new moorings (i.e., buoys, slips, and lifts) and boat ramps to the number authorized under Alternative 1. This would allow a total of 2,116 new moorings and two new boat ramps.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 8-1c: Establish buffer area around nonmotorized recreationists outside of the no-wake zone</u> (applies to Alt 2 only)<br/>TRPA will amend the no-wake zone section of the Code of Ordinances to include a 200-foot buffer between motorized watercraft in motion and nonmotorized recreationists in areas outside of no-wake zones, which is already in practice by Nevada State Parks.</p> |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 8-2: Affect access or opportunities for motorized watercraft</u><br/>Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would increase capacity for boat launching and mooring by allowing for additional boat ramps and overnight mooring structures. The design and location standards for all three of these alternatives and expansion of the no-wake zone to include all of Emerald Bay with Alternatives 1 and 3 would not substantially change opportunities for recreation activities on the lake that rely on motorized watercraft, including activities such as fishing and water skiing. Alternatives 1 and 3 also provide standards for shorezone structures to allow for boating access under a range of lake levels.</p> <p>Alternative 4 would allow for additional piers but would not provide additional launch capacity or moorings to increase access or opportunities for recreational users of the lake.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3 - B<br>Alt 4 - LTS  | No mitigation required  |                                  | No mitigation required       |
| <p><u>Impact 8-3: Change access to or along the shoreline</u><br/>Each of the proposed alternatives would result in the construction of piers that would extend into the public trust areas in the shorezone and impede, to some degree, lateral access along the shoreline in California. New public piers would be constructed for the benefit of public use; thus, pedestrians would have unrestricted access over or around the pier as they walk laterally along the shoreline. Alternative 4 would only allow new public piers to be constructed. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would also allow private piers. None of the alternatives include any design standards for private or public piers that prohibit access for the public along the</p>   |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required  |                                  | No mitigation required       |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <p>shore. TRPA and California State Lands Commission would develop a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that would provide a review process that protects public lateral access within the public trust easement in California. In Nevada, no existing public trust easement on private land is recognized; thus, this impact only assesses impacts to lateral access along the shoreline in the California portion of Lake Tahoe. Under the MOU and for all alternatives, TRPA would not be able to approve any shorezone structure that unreasonably interferes with lateral public access where it is otherwise lawfully allowed.</p>   |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 8-4: Affect the fair-share distribution of recreation capacity</u><br/>                     The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found the recreation threshold for fair-share distribution of recreation capacity to be in attainment (TRPA 2016a). The existing distribution of land ownership in the shorezone is approximately half public and half private ownership, with slightly less land in private. Each alternative would change the percent of shorezone structures that are accessible to the public to various degrees, but the distribution between public and private owners around the lake would not change substantially over baseline conditions. All of the new shorezone structures under each alternative in combination with existing shorezone structures would either maintain the same proportion of public and private structures as under baseline conditions or would result in a small increase in the proportion of public structures compared to baseline conditions. At buildout of the alternatives, publicly-accessible shorezone structures would generate between 50 and 52.5 percent, depending on alternative, of all boat trips on the lake, which is similar to baseline conditions.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required  |                                  | No mitigation required       |
| <p><b>9 Scenic Resources</b></p>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 9-1: Alter views of the shore from Lake Tahoe</u><br/>                     The effects Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 on views from Lake Tahoe would vary based on the location, intensity, and other characteristics of future projects. In some scenarios under Alternatives 1 and 3, the scenic threshold ratings would increase due to required scenic improvements in the shoreland, visible mass reductions, and redevelopment of existing shorezone structures consistent with proposed design standards. In other scenarios under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, scenic quality could be unchanged or degraded due to additional visible mass associated with new buoys, redeveloped piers that are a contrasting color, or in the case of Alternative 2, from additional visible structures in the shorezone that</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3 - S<br>Alt 4 - LTS  | <p><u>Mitigation 9-1a: Offset the visible mass of buoys</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, and 3)<br/>                     TRPA will require that all new buoys offset the visible mass associated with the buoy and boat. The average visible mass of a buoy and boat is estimated at 83 square feet. Each new buoy will require removal or screening of a minimum of 83 square feet of existing mass visible from Lake Tahoe. The visible mass of a buoy can be offset through the direct reduction of visible mass or through the payment of an in-lieu fee used to reduce visible mass, as described below.</p> <p>If a buoy applicant chooses to directly remove or screen visible mass as part of the buoy project, then the applicant would comply with the same visible</p> |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS         |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <p>are not compensated for with reductions in the visual magnitude of development in the shoreland.</p> <p>Alternative 4 would have a limited number of new shorezone structures that could be developed under Alternative 4, the project-level scenic assessment and mitigation requirements for public piers, and the prohibition of other new or expanded shoreline structures.</p> |                |                             |                                 | <p>mass offset requirements that apply to piers and other structures. The 83 square feet of visible mass associated with the buoy would be offset at the same ratios required for other shoreline structures. The offset would be required as close to the proposed buoy as possible, in the following order of priority: 1) on the same parcel in the shorezone, 2) on the same parcel in the upland area, 3) elsewhere in the shorezone within the same shoreline scenic travel unit, 4) within the same travel unit in the upland, and 5) in another nonattainment scenic travel unit.</p> <p>TRPA will also provide the option to pay an in-lieu fee to offset the additional visible mass of the buoy. TRPA will set a fee amount that is adequate to remove or visually screen 83 square feet of existing visible mass. TRPA will use the fee to acquire and remove or screen existing visible mass visible from shoreline scenic travel units that are not in attainment of threshold standards. The funds will be dedicated to projects that TRPA determines will have the greatest benefit to scenic threshold standards and will be prioritized for use in the following order: 1) in the shorezone, 2) in the shoreland, and 3) to improve background views visible from Lake Tahoe. Funds could be used to implement projects directly or through grants, contracts, or other agreements with partner organizations. TRPA could also authorize mitigation funds for projects that permanently reduce the visual magnitude of shoreland development when the project contributes to the attainment of scenic thresholds and is not otherwise required. Visible mass mitigation projects that could be funded by the in-lieu fee include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ scenic improvement projects identified in the 2018 update to the SQIP;</li> <li>▲ lakefront recreation projects with scenic improvements such as replacing dilapidated structures or relocating structures (public gathering areas and waterfront public access scenic improvements);</li> <li>▲ scenic improvement of existing rip rap and retaining walls along visible roadway cuts (e.g., recoloring of light-colored rip rap);</li> <li>▲ permanent removal of existing shorezone and shoreland structures;</li> </ul> |                                  |                              |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation        | Mitigation Measures   |   | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant           | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable                            |                              |
|   |                |                             |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ permanent screening of roadside parking areas, roadways, and infrastructure through the planting of native vegetation and creation of vegetated berms;</li> <li>▲ undergrounding of utility lines that are visible from the lake; and</li> <li>▲ improving existing shoreland structures and deed restricting those parcels such that visual magnitude of existing development is permanently reduced.</li> </ul> <p><u>Mitigation 9-1b: Establish color standards for piers</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, and 3)<br/>TRPA will modify the proposed design standards to regulate the color of piers. These standards will be enforced for all new or expanded piers. The standards will require that piers be a matte medium to dark gray. The standards will also allow TRPA to require alternate colors that TRPA determines would better blend into the background view of the project site.</p> <p><u>Mitigation 9-1c: Require visual magnitude reductions in the shoreland</u> (applies to Alt 2)<br/>TRPA will revise the TRPA Code under Alternative 2 to incorporate the same visual magnitude requirements for new or expanded shoreline structures as included in Alternative 1. These Code revisions will require that shoreland properties achieve minimum contrast ratings as part of the approval process for new piers. For new private piers, TRPA would require an initial contrast rating of 21 as part of the pier application. Following permit application submittal, applicants would have 6 months to increase their contrast rating to 25 to offset the visual impact of new or redeveloped piers. TRPA would exempt property owners from the contrast rating of 25, if it is not feasible.</p> |   |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 9-2: Alter views of Lake Tahoe from the shore</u><br/>The scenic effects on views from the shore would vary based on the location, intensity, and other characteristics of future projects. In some scenarios under Alternatives 1 and 3, the scenic threshold ratings would increase due to required scenic improvements in the shoreland, visible mass reductions, and redevelopment of existing shorezone structures consistent with design standards. In other scenarios under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, scenic quality would not substantially change, or the scenic threshold ratings could be reduced. This potential reduction in scenic threshold ratings would be due to additional visible mass associated with new buoys, and in the case of Alternative</p> |                |                             | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3 - S<br/>Alt 4 - LTS</p> | <p><u>Mitigation 9-2a: Implement Mitigation Measure 9-1a to offset the visible mass of buoys</u> (applies to Alt 1, 2, and 3).<br/>TRPA will implement Mitigation Measure 9-1a, "Offset the visible mass of buoys," as described above.</p> <p><u>Mitigation 9-2b: Implement Mitigation Measure 9-1a to require visual magnitude reductions in the shoreland</u> (applies to Alt 2 only).<br/>TRPA will implement Mitigation 9-1c: "Require visual magnitude reductions in the shoreland," as described above.</p>  | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3 - LTS<br/>Alt 4 - No mitigation required</p> |                              |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation        | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation                                |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|---|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant           | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |   |
| <p>2, because no reductions in the visual magnitude of the shoreland would be required to compensate for additional development in the shorezone.</p> <p>Alternative 4 would allow for a maximum of only 15 new public piers, which require project-level scenic assessment and mitigation. Alternative 4 would prohibit other new or expanded shoreline structures.</p>   |                |                             |  |   |                                  |   |
| <b>10 Air Quality</b>  |                |                             |  |   |                                  |   |
| <p><u>Impact 10-1: Long-term operational emissions of regional criteria air pollutants and precursors</u></p> <p>Based on estimates of increased boating activity and emissions modeling and analysis, implementation of the Shoreline Plan under Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would not result in the long-term increase in emissions of ozone precursors, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the LTAB and therefore would not result in the deterioration of ambient air quality or the exceedance of an applicable air quality standards.</p> <p>Based on estimates of increased boating activity and emissions modeling and analysis, Shoreline Plan Alternative 2 would result in a long-term increase in emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> and CO. The long-term increase in NO<sub>x</sub>, which is an ozone precursor, would contribute to the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to the CAAQS for ozone and/or an exceedance of TRPA’s 1-hour ozone threshold standard of 0.08 ppm. The long-term increase in CO would conflict with implementation of the CO maintenance plan and/or contribute to exceedances of TRPA’s 8-hour threshold standard of 6 ppm.</p> |                |                             | <p>Alt 1, 3, 4 – LTS<br/>Alt 2 – S</p> | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 10-1: Limit the number of moorings and boat ramps (Alt 2 only)</u></p> <p>TRPA will revise the Code of Ordinances to limit the total number of new moorings (i.e., buoys, slips, and lifts) and boat ramps to the number authorized under Alternative 1. This would allow a total of 2,116 new moorings and two new boat ramps.</p>  |                                  | <p>Alt 1, 3, 4 – No mitigation required<br/>Alt 2 – LTS</p> |
| <p><u>Impact 10-2: Short-term construction emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub></u></p> <p>Implementation of the Shoreline Plan under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would result in the construction of new piers, boat ramps, marinas, and/or boat houses. Given the number of new facilities that could be developed and the limited construction season in the Tahoe Region (i.e., May 1 to October 15), it is possible that a substantial amount of construction activity could occur at one time. Thus, equipment exhaust and fugitive dust emissions could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, especially considering the nonattainment status of the LTAB with respect to the CAAQS and TRPA numeric threshold standards for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>.</p>   |                |                             | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 – PS</p>             | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 10-2: Add best construction practices for emissions to the standard conditions of approval for shoreline projects (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)</u></p> <p>TRPA will revise the Standard Conditions of Approval for Shorezone Projects (TRPA Permit Attachment S) to require that minimum construction emission reduction best practices be implemented for all projects within the shorezone. The Standard Conditions of Approval for Shorezone Projects will be amended to add the following best construction practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Fugitive dust shall not exceed 40 percent opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time during project construction.</li> <li>▲ No open burning of removed vegetation shall occur during infrastructure improvements.</li> </ul> |                                  | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 – LTS</p>                                 |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
|   |                |                             |                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Idling time for all diesel-powered equipment shall not exceed 5 minutes.</li> <li>▲ Water shall be applied as needed to prevent dust impacts from extending off-site. Operational water truck(s) shall be on-site, as required, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.</li> <li>▲ Existing power sources or clean-fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators shall be used wherever feasible.</li> </ul>  |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 10-3: Exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TACs)</u><br/>Implementation of the Shoreline Plan under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would not result in the siting of new stationary sources of TACs, new sensitive receptors, or an increase in TAC emissions generated by recreational watercraft. Construction of new facilities would involve the use of off-road heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment that emits diesel PM. However, because of the short duration of construction activity at any single location and the highly dispersive properties of diesel PM, construction-related TAC emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of TACs.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required   |                                  | No mitigation required       |
| <p><u>Impact 10-4: Exposure to excessive odorous emissions</u><br/>Implementation of the Shoreline Plan under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would not result in the siting of new major sources of odors or new sensitive receptors. Neither construction nor operation of facilities that may be developed because of the Shoreline Plan would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required   |                                  | No mitigation required       |
| <b>11 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</b>   |                |                             |                                 |  |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 11-1: Greenhouse gas emissions</u><br/>Implementation of the Shoreline Plan would result in GHG emissions associated with the construction and demolition of boating facilities and on-road motor vehicle trips to and from new boating facilities. Under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, implementation of the Shoreline Plan would also result in an increase in GHG-emitting boating activity. It is not feasible to know whether the fleet of motorized boats on Lake Tahoe will become more GHG efficient and, if it does, whether the improvement in GHG efficiency would be enough to offset the GHGs associated</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - PS             | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 11-1: Develop and implement a GHG reduction policy (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)</u><br/>Within 12 months of adoption of the Shoreline Plan, TRPA will coordinate the implementation of a GHG Emission Reduction Policy through TRPA-approved plans, project permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments addressing Best Construction Practices and ongoing operational efficiencies. Until that time, TRPA will continue its existing practice to require measures developed on a project-by-project basis. The policy will require implementation of measures for the reduction</p> |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - SU          |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <p>with construction activity, the increase in on-road motor vehicle travel, and the projected increase in boating activity.</p> <p>The development and implementation of a GHG Reduction Policy, as required by Mitigation Measure 11-1, would reduce GHG emissions, but the extent of this reduction depends on participation rates, available funding, and available technology.</p> |                |                             |                                 | <p>of GHG emissions generated by demolition and construction activity in the shorezone and in associated upland areas, by on-road motor vehicles trips directly associated with the operation of boating facilities, and by ongoing operation of recreational watercraft. Where local ordinances already require GHG emission reductions consistent with the policy, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances do not adequately address GHG reduction practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities or implementation program. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <p><u>Minimize Construction-Related GHG Emissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ All diesel-powered construction equipment shall have engines that comply with Tier 4 emission standards or better.</li> <li>▲ Require all construction contractors to use renewable diesel (RD) fuel for all diesel-powered construction equipment (off-road land- and water-based). Any RD product that is considered for use by the construction contractors shall comply with California's Low Carbon Fuel Standards and be certified by the California Air Resources Board Executive Officer. RD fuel must also meet the following criteria:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▼ Be hydrogenation-derived (reaction with hydrogen at high temperatures) from 100 percent biomass material (i.e., nonpetroleum sources), such as animal fats and vegetables;</li> <li>▼ Contain no fatty acids or functionalized fatty acid esters; and</li> <li>▼ Have a chemical structure that is identical to petroleum-based diesel which ensures RD will be compatible with all existing diesel engines; it must comply with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D975 requirements for diesel fuels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▲ Use electric powered equipment instead of fossil fuel-based generators.</li> <li>▲ Purchase mitigation credits from the Climate Action Reserve's GHG Mitigation Credit Program to offset construction-generated GHG emissions.</li> </ul> <p><u>Minimize GHG Emissions Associated with On-Road Vehicle to Watercraft Facilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Provide charging stations for electric vehicles and bike lockers at parking lots that serve public piers and marinas.</li> </ul> |                                  |                              |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance with Mitigation     |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
|  |                |                             |                                 | <p><u>Minimize GHG Emissions Generated by Recreational Watercraft</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Require or incentivize businesses that rent motorized watercraft to convert their rental fleet to watercraft with electric engines.</li> <li>▲ Require or incentivize charging stations at marinas and public piers for electric-motor watercraft.</li> <li>▲ Require or incentivize the installation of charging stations for electric-motor watercraft at private piers, boat houses, and boat lifts.</li> <li>▲ Require solar panels on all marina buildings.</li> </ul> <p>This measure will apply to new construction occurring under the Shoreline Plan. TRPA will also initiate a funding program to apply these measures to existing facilities within the Tahoe Basin.</p> |                                  |
| <b>12 Noise</b>  |                |                             |                                 |  |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 12-1: Construction noise impacts</u></p> <p>Construction activities would occur under all alternatives, including the No Project Alternative. Activities associated with construction of shorezone structures, including new piers, pier modifications, marinas, or new boat ramps would generate varying levels of noise. However, all activities would be carried out in a manner consistent with TRPA’s standard permit conditions such that exposure of nearby receptors to construction-related noise is minimized and construction is limited to daytime hours. In addition, the types of activities associated with constructing new boating structures would be relatively minor, localized, temporary, and intermittent, and would not result in a substantial increase in temporary noise levels.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required   | No mitigation required           |
| <p><u>Impact 12-2: Construction vibration impacts</u></p> <p>Construction activities would occur under all alternatives. Construction activities associated with new shorezone structures, including new piers, pier modifications, marinas, and new boat ramps would generate varying levels of vibration. Pile driving would be required for pier construction/modification and marina construction, resulting in vibration levels that could potentially damage existing structures if located within 55 feet. In accordance with TRPA standard construction practices, all construction activity would take place during the day, minimizing the potential for disturbance during noise-sensitive evening and nighttime hours. However, because specific locations of pile driving activity is</p>                       |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - S              | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 12-2: Vibration reduction measures</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)</p> <p>To address potential vibration impacts associated with shorezone projects that involve pile driving activity, TRPA shall revise TRPA Permit Attachment S, “Standard Conditions of Approval for Shorezone Projects,” to incorporate the following vibration reduction measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ All construction equipment, including vibration-inducing impact equipment, on construction sites shall be operated as far away from vibration-sensitive uses as reasonably possible.</li> </ul>  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS             |



**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance without Mitigation                              | Mitigation Measures   | Significance with Mitigation  |                 |                                  |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact   | LTS = Less than significant   | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
| <p>unknown, there is a potential that existing structures could be exposed to excessive vibration levels that could result in structural damage.</p>   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Earthmoving and ground-disturbing operations shall be phased so as not to occur simultaneously in areas close to sensitive uses, to the extent feasible. The total vibration level produced could be significantly less if each vibration source is operated at separate times.</li> <li>▲ To prevent structural damage, minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures shall be established based on the proposed pile driving activities and locations, once determined. Factors to be considered include the specific nature of the vibration producing activity (e.g., type and duration of pile driving), local soil conditions, and the fragility/resiliency of the nearby structures. Established setback requirements (i.e., 55 feet) can be breached if a project-specific, site specific analysis is conducted by a qualified geotechnical engineer or ground vibration specialist that indicates that no structural damage would occur at nearby buildings or structures or provides further recommendations (e.g., alternative pile driving methods, site monitoring requirements) to avoid damaging nearby structures.</li> </ul> |                               |                 |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 12-3: Increases in operation-related watercraft noise</u><br/>                     Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in additional boating structures (e.g., slips, buoys, lifts, boat ramps) that would contribute to an overall increase in boating activity over time. Because boating is generally a daytime activity and increases in boating activity would be distributed across the lake, it would have a negligible effect on CNEL, which considers noise levels in a given location over a 24-hour period. Single-event noise levels are affected by individual boater behaviors (e.g., exceeding speed limits in the no-wake zone) and boat/engine type. Under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, TRPA would increase enforcement of the no-wake zone through additional boat crews, signage, and increased boater education, which would reduce such boater behaviors that contribute to exceedances of single-event noise standards. Further, none of the alternatives would result in a substantial increase (i.e., 3 dBA) in CNEL from increases in boating activity. With Alternative 4, no increases in boating activity would occur.</p> | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3 - LTS<br/>                     Alt 4 - NI</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p>   | <p>No mitigation required</p> |                 |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  | Significance without Mitigation                              | Mitigation Measures           | Significance with Mitigation  |                 |                                  |
|--|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact   | LTS = Less than significant   | PS = Potentially significant  | S = Significant | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
| <p><u>Impact 12-4: Increases in operational-related traffic noise</u><br/>                     Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in additional boating structures (e.g., slips, buoys, lifts, boat ramps) that would lead to an overall increase in boating activity, and commensurate increases in roadway traffic as compared to existing conditions. With Alternative 4, no increases in boating activity or additional vehicle trips would occur.</p>  | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3 - LTS<br/>                     Alt 4 - NI</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> |                 |                                  |
| <p><b>13 Roadway Transportation and Circulation</b></p>  |  |                               |                               |                 |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 13-1: Roadway and intersection operations</u><br/>                     Under Shoreline Plan Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 future development of shorezone structures would result in additional vehicular trips being added to the transportation network in the Region. It is not known at this time where any of these structures would be developed; and therefore, the addition of vehicle trips associated with the development of these alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 3) could result in an increase in delay and degradation of LOS at intersections and along roadway segments in the project area if concentrated in such a way that a large portion of the trips affect a single roadway segment or intersection. However, Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires that TRPA review any proposed project, including projects that could result in new trips such as a marina expansion or public boat ramp, to determine if it would result in a significant environmental effect. This project-level environmental review would include an evaluation of the project-generated trips and effects on LOS. Alternative 4 would not generate any new vehicle trips.</p> | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3 - LTS<br/>                     Alt 4 - NI</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> |                 |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 13-2: Vehicle miles traveled</u><br/>                     Each Shoreline Plan alternative would include ordinances that would affect the location and intensity of future shorezone structure development, which would affect travel patterns, the number of new vehicle trips generated, and VMT. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in an increase in VMT but would maintain VMT levels below the adopted TRPA threshold standard. Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Alternative 4 would not increase VMT and would maintain summer daily VMT levels below the adopted TRPA VMT threshold.</p>   | <p>Alt 1, 2, 3 - LTS<br/>                     Alt 4 - NI</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> | <p>No mitigation required</p> |                 |                                  |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <b>14 Terrestrial Biological Resources (Wildlife and Vegetation)</b>   |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 14-1: Disturbances to osprey, bald eagle, and waterfowl from construction and recreational uses</u></p> <p>Osprey, bald eagle, and waterfowl are designated by TRPA as special interest species and use the shorezone and adjacent locations for breeding and foraging. Potential effects of the Shoreline Plan alternatives on osprey and bald eagle could include construction-related disturbances to nesting activities from new piers and boat ramps, long-term increased disturbance to osprey and bald eagle and suitable habitat from boating and other recreational uses, and habitat degradation within TRPA-designated osprey and bald eagle disturbance zones. Although suitable nesting habitat for waterfowl is limited in the shorezone where new projects would be permitted (e.g., outside of TRPA-designated waterfowl population sites), construction-related activities that may occur within suitable habitat could disturb nesting attempts of waterfowl. The types of potential impacts to osprey, bald eagle, and waterfowl would be similar for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4, with some differences in magnitude based on the locations, amounts, and quality of habitats potentially affected.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - S              | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 14-1a: Avoid construction disturbances to nesting osprey and bald eagle, install interpretive signage, and prepare and implement habitat enhancement plans or other compensatory measures for unavoidable activities within TRPA-designated disturbance zones (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Surveys for nesting osprey and bald eagle will be conducted prior to construction of new shorezone facilities, to identify active nests that could be disturbed during construction. No construction activities will occur within 0.25 mile of active osprey nests and 0.5 mile of bald eagle nests during the breeding season (approximately April to August), unless surveys confirm that the birds are not nesting. A qualified biologist can amend the start and end dates of this limited operating period (LOP) with concurrence from appropriate agencies if it can be determined that breeding has not started or that fledglings have left the nest. Additionally, with concurrence from appropriate agencies, the LOP could be waived in locations where construction disturbance is not expected to increase ambient levels or disturbance to an active nest through presence of visual screening or other factors.</li> <li>▲ During project-specific planning, design, and environmental review of new shorezone facilities, avoid siting projects within TRPA-designated disturbance zones for osprey and bald eagle, to the extent feasible.</li> <li>▲ For projects and uses that may result in unavoidable increased human intrusion into the terrestrial/upland portions of TRPA osprey or bald eagle disturbance zones, signage that describes the sensitivity of the area and discourages users to leave established trails or access routes or otherwise disturb nesting osprey or bald eagle will be designed and installed.</li> <li>▲ For projects that could cause unavoidable long-term degradation of habitat within TRPA osprey or bald eagle disturbance zones, coordination with TRPA will occur to identify and implement appropriate compensatory measures that are effective and feasible for achieving TRPA's nondegradation standard for disturbance zones.</li> </ul> <p>Potential approaches to mitigating adverse effects and enhancing habitat within disturbance zones include preparation and implementation of a</p> |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS         |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
|  |                |                             |                                 | <p>habitat enhancement and management plan that includes objectives, measures, techniques, performance standards, and adaptive management to enhance osprey habitat. Habitat enhancement would be implemented within the affected TRPA osprey or bald eagle disturbance zones and/or other osprey or bald eagle disturbance zones in the Tahoe Basin where enhancement opportunities and benefits to the regional osprey or eagle population could be maximized. Coordination with TRPA would occur to determine whether more focused measures to achieve habitat enhancement as part of the project could be implemented, or whether the current project design may benefit osprey or bald eagle habitat, in lieu of a formal habitat enhancement and management plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 14-1b: Conduct preconstruction surveys for waterfowl and implement a limited operating period, if necessary (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)</u></p> <p>For construction activities that would occur in suitable habitat during the nesting season (generally April 1–August 31, depending on snowpack and other seasonal conditions), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct focused surveys for waterfowl nests no more than 14 days before construction activities are initiated each construction season. If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, the biologist shall notify TRPA. If necessary, modifications to the project design to avoid removal of occupied habitat while still achieving project objectives shall be evaluated and implemented to the extent feasible. If avoidance is not feasible or conflicts with project objectives, a limited operating period shall apply to avoid disturbances during the sensitive nesting season. Construction shall be prohibited within a minimum of 500 feet (or at a distance directed by the appropriate regulatory agency) of the nest to avoid disturbance until the nest is no longer active. These recommended buffer areas may be reduced through consultation with TRPA.</p> |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 14-2: Disturbance or loss of Tahoe yellow cress</u><br/>Tahoe yellow cress (TYC) is a sensitive plant species found only on the sandy beaches of Lake Tahoe. This species is designated as a sensitive plant and threshold indicator species by TRPA, and is state-listed as critically endangered and endangered by the states of Nevada and California, respectively. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would result in construction and operation of new</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - S              | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 14-2: Conduct preconstruction surveys, avoid potential construction impacts, and avoid potential recreation impacts to Tahoe yellow cress plants (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)</u></p>   |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS         |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <p>shorezone structures within beach habitats. Depending on the specific locations and size of individual projects in relation to TYC occurrences and suitable habitat, construction-related activities that may occur within or adjacent to beach habitat occupied by TYC could result in the direct removal of TYC plants, or other disturbances through inadvertent trampling, soil disturbance, and dust deposition. Over the long term, the additional recreation capacity for motorized watercraft, nonmotorized watercraft, anglers, swimmers, and beachgoers could increase the frequency of recreationists within occupied TYC habitat, which could result in additional trampling, degradation, or loss of existing TYC, and adversely affect current or future TYC habitat suitability. The types of potential impacts to TYC would be similar among Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4, with some differences in magnitude based on the amounts and locations of beach habitats potentially affected.</p> <p>Subsection 61.3.6 of the TRPA Code states that “all projects or activities that are likely to harm, destroy, or otherwise jeopardize sensitive plants or their habitat, shall fully mitigate their significant adverse effects. Those projects or activities that cannot fully mitigate their significant adverse effects are prohibited.”</p> <p>Additionally, in California, because TYC is listed as endangered under CESA, any take of TYC would require authorization by CDFW through a California Fish and Game Code Section 2081 incidental take permit.</p> |                |                             |                                 | <p>To avoid potential adverse effects on TYC plants resulting from construction activities and potential increased use of beaches that support TYC, the following actions shall be implemented:</p> <p>(A) During project-specific planning, design, and environmental review of new shorezone facilities, avoid siting projects within areas known to support TYC occurrences, to the extent feasible.</p> <p>(B) For any projects that could affect TYC, a qualified biologist familiar with the vegetation of the Tahoe Basin and identification of TYC shall conduct a focused preconstruction survey for TYC in all beach habitat where construction-related disturbance could occur in the vicinity of TYC populations during that year. Surveys shall be conducted between June 15 and September 30, when TYC is clearly identifiable, and shall follow <i>Survey Protocols for Tahoe Yellow Cress Annual Surveys</i> (Stanton and Pavlik 2009). Surveys shall be completed for each year that construction activities could occur in beach habitat. If no TYC stems are found during the survey, the results of the survey shall be documented in a letter report to TRPA and the TYC AMWG that shall become part of the project environmental record, and no further actions shall be required.</p> <p>(C) If TYC stems are documented during the survey in areas potentially disturbed by construction activities, the stems shall be clearly identified in the field and protected from impacts associated with construction activities. Protective measures shall include installing high-visibility fencing around known stem locations during construction. No construction-related activities shall be allowed in areas fenced for avoidance, and construction personnel shall be briefed about the presence of the stems and the need to avoid effects on the stems.</p> <p>(D) To protect TYC plants from potential long-term increased beach use and disturbance as an indirect result of increased recreation activity in the shorezone, protective fencing and educational signage about the need to avoid these areas shall be installed around all TYC clusters. In addition to beaches occupied by TYC where new shorezone facilities would be constructed and operated, other beach areas that support TYC that are likely to receive increased recreation uses as a result of the projects shall be identified and subject to these measures.</p> |                                  |                              |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
|   |                |                             |                                 | (E) Long-term fencing and signage will be periodically monitored and maintained, as necessary, to ensure that they remain effective and in good working condition. Also, because locations and concentrations of TYC could shift over time, the locations and configurations of fencing relative to TYC distribution shall be evaluated periodically. If necessary, fencing shall be moved or added in response to changes in TYC distribution to ensure that TYC plants are protected over time. The locations of TYC plants and shifts in their locations relative to fencing can be determined by surveys as part of the ongoing AMWG TYC monitoring program. The installation and maintenance of long-term protective fencing and signage will be designed to not interfere with necessary operations and maintenance activities at facilities. |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 14-3: Disturbance or loss of common terrestrial vegetation communities and wildlife habitats</u><br/>                     Common natural terrestrial habitats within the shorezone and adjacent areas consist primarily of beach and a mix of conifer forest, scattered conifer trees, and snags. Additionally, urban/developed and ruderal (disturbed) areas are distributed throughout the shorezone where existing facilities (e.g., boat ramps, marinas, buildings, trails) and lake access are present. These habitats support several common native wildlife species that use them for nesting, foraging, resting, or wintering. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 would result in construction and operation of new shorezone structures, and associated increases in recreation use, that could disturb common vegetation and wildlife. The types of potential impacts to common vegetation and wildlife communities would be similar among Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4, with some differences in magnitude based on the locations, amounts, and quality of habitats potentially affected.</p> <p>The potential disturbance or removal of terrestrial vegetation from future projects permitted under any of the Shoreline Plan alternatives would be relatively minor and not substantially reduce the quantity or quality of terrestrial vegetation communities and habitats in the region or cause a change in species distributions or diversity. Additionally, none of the alternatives are expected to increase construction-related or recreational disturbance levels in the shorezone above levels that would substantially affect most common species. Accordingly, the alternatives are not expected to substantially affect the distribution, breeding productivity, viability, or the regional population of any common wildlife species, or result in a change in species diversity.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required  |                                  | No mitigation required       |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <b>15 Public Health and Safety</b>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 15-1: Increase in watercraft accidents due to increased boating and navigational hazards</u><br/>                     Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would increase the number of annual and peak day boat trips on the lake, whereas Alternative 4 would retain boating levels consistent with existing conditions. Increased levels of boating activity would add to the factors that contribute to boating accidents, such as more watercraft, higher boating density at popular shoreline areas and lake access points, and greater potential for conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized recreation. While the additional boating activity resulting from Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would aggravate the factors that contribute to boating accidents, the 600-foot no-wake zone, improved public boating safety education programs, and compliance with California and Nevada boating safety laws would reduce the risks and associated impacts. Alternative 4 would not contribute to such factors.</p> <p>Implementation of any of the four alternatives could lead to public piers extending beyond the 600-foot no-wake zone, which could create navigational hazards and conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized watercraft and swimmers. Additionally, Alternative 2 does not include location standards limiting the length of private multiple-use piers to within the no-wake zone.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 – PS             | <p><u>Mitigation Measure 15-1a: Maintain nonmotorized navigation within the no-wake zone</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)<br/>                     TRPA will implement Mitigation Measures 8-1a and 8-1c as described in Chapter 8, “Recreation.” These mitigation measures require that TRPA revise the pier design standards for piers that extend 600 feet or more from the highwater elevation to provide lateral nonmotorized recreation access within the 600-foot no-wake zone and provide for a 200-foot buffer between motorized watercraft in motion and nonmotorized recreationists in areas outside of no-wake zones.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 15-1b: Implement Mitigation Measure 10-1 to limit the number of moorings and boat ramps</u> (applies to Alt 2 only)<br/>                     TRPA will implement Mitigation Measure 10-1, as described in Chapter 10, “Air Quality,” which would revise the Code of Ordinances to limit the total number of new moorings (i.e., buoys, slips, and lifts) and boat ramps to the number authorized under Alternative 1. This would allow a total of 2,116 new moorings and two new boat ramps.</p> |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 – LTS         |
| <p><u>Impact 15-2: Accidental release of hazardous substances</u><br/>                     Each of the Shoreline Plan alternatives would temporarily increase the regional transportation, use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials and petroleum products commonly used at construction sites (such as diesel fuel, lubricants, paints and solvents, and cement products containing strong basic or acidic chemicals), which could result in accidents or upset conditions that could create hazards to people and the environment. The replacement of older piers may require the disposal of wood treated with preservatives, which could contaminate surface water and groundwater if not properly handled and disposed. Temporary impacts could occur if construction were to affect sites of known contamination or inadvertently disturb hazardous materials or wastes in a manner that could release these materials into the environment, exposing construction workers or nearby sensitive receptors to hazardous conditions. Compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations is sufficient to ensure that any hazardous materials used during construction of future projects would</p>  |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 – LTS            | No mitigation required  |                                  | No mitigation required       |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation                   | Mitigation Measures   |   | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant                      | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable                                      |                              |
| <p>not result in adverse effects. Specific projects implemented in accordance to the adopted Shoreline Plan would be subject to permit processes and conditions pursuant to TRPA regulations and, depending upon location and whether or not there is federal discretion, CEQA and NEPA statutes and implementing regulations. Such review could include site-specific impact analysis and adoption of feasible mitigation measures that must be implemented to assure that standards of the region are met.</p> <p>With the addition of access points to the lake and the increase in navigational hazards in the form of longer piers and additional structures in the water, the Shoreline Plan alternatives could result in a long-term increase in the risk of accidental discharge of fuel and other hazardous materials into the lake. Alternative 1 would require that TRPA consult with water purveyors when evaluating applications and development of permit conditions for any proposed shoreline structure within one quarter mile of a drinking water intake, while Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 would require consultation within 600 feet. Furthermore, as described in Chapter 6, "Hydrology and Water Quality," Impact 6-4, given the rapid rate of biodegradation of hydrocarbon compounds, the non-toxic levels monitored on the lake, and current TRPA regulations pertaining to control of discharges of contaminants from boating facilities using best management practices (BMPs).</p> |                |                             |   |   |   |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 15-3: Shoreline emergency access</u><br/>Implementation of the Shoreline Plan Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 would increase boating activity. Increased boat use would aggravate many of the factors that contribute to boating accidents, leading to an increased need for emergency response services. Emergency responders' ability to access boaters and swimmers in the water could be hindered by the increase in activity in the nearshore, foreshore, and backshore. Furthermore, low water conditions during drought years and under future projected climate scenarios would present a challenge for emergency responders, as some existing lake access points are unavailable during low water conditions. Because most of the emergency responders' watercraft are located on the water, lake access is not an issue for a majority of first responders.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would incorporate low lake level adaptation strategies along with the provisions of TRPA Code Section 84.10.2, which establishes a framework to provide essential emergency access and egress to Lake Tahoe. Alternative 2</p>   |                |                             | <p>Alt 1 &amp; 2 - LTS<br/>Alt 3 &amp; 4 - PS</p> | <p><u>Mitigation 15-3: Implement low lake level adaptation strategies</u> (applies to Alts 3 and 4)<br/>TRPA will incorporate the following low lake level adaptation strategies to provide shoreline emergency access during low water conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Marina buoy fields would be able to include additional rows of lakeward anchors to accommodate low lake levels. Buoy floats could be relocated to the lakeward anchors during low lake levels without increasing the total number of buoys.</li> <li>▲ Marinas would be allowed to use temporary floating pier extensions to provide access for boats when lake levels fall below 6,225 feet LTD.</li> <li>▲ Public boat ramps could be expanded to extend farther into the lake, subject to permit conditions.</li> </ul> | <p>Alt 1 &amp; 2 - No mitigation required<br/>Alt 3 &amp; 4 - LTS</p> |                              |



**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures  | Significance with Mitigation     |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and unavoidable |
| <p>would allow for substantially greater levels of boating activity than Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would maintain existing development standards, focusing development around the natural lake rim elevation of 6,223 feet Lake Tahoe Datum (LTD). Buoy floats and anchors within buoy fields would be allowed to move farther lakeward during periods of low lake levels. Furthermore, TRPA Code Section 84.15.4 allows for temporary structures that extend beyond lake bottom elevation 6,219 feet or the pier headline during low water conditions.</p> <p>Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in different levels of boating activity—a small increase with Alternative 3, and no projected increase from existing levels with Alternative 4. Alternatives 3 and 4 would maintain existing development standards, focusing development around the natural lake rim elevation of 6,223 feet LTD. Buoy floats and anchors within buoy fields would be allowed to move farther lakeward during periods of low lake levels, but the alternatives contain no other provisions to allow modifications to facilities or structures to be useable during such conditions.</p>   |                |                             |                                 | <p>▲ New dredging could be allowed at marinas and public boat ramps, subject to permit conditions.</p> |                                  |
| <p><u>Impact 15-4: Increase demand for on-lake emergency response facilities</u><br/>Implementation of each alternative would result in new shorezone structures, creating potential for an increase in boating accidents and the accidental release of hazardous materials. This would increase the demand for emergency response services. As discussed in Impact 15-1, the 600-foot no-wake zone, improved public boating safety education programs, expanded safety/enforcement patrols, and compliance with California and Nevada boating safety laws would reduce the risk of boating accidents due to increased boating. Impacts associated with increased navigational hazards would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure 15-1a. As described in Impact 15-2, compliance with all local, state, and federal regulations is sufficient to ensure that any hazardous materials used throughout the project area during construction would not result in adverse effects. Thus, the increased demand for emergency services would likely be minor.</p> <p>Emergency response providers that act on lake-related emergencies indicate that they have adequate capacity to handle additional project-generated demand for emergency services. Furthermore, TRPA Code Section 84.10.2, which allows for the designation of up to one Essential Public Safety Facility within each county-jurisdiction plus the U.S. Coast Guard Lake Tahoe Station, would remain unchanged. In drought years, TRPA allows first responder</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required   | No mitigation required           |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts   |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial  | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <p>organizations to designate locations for temporary moorings for regional public safety purposes. This would ensure that emergency providers have adequate access points to the lake and reduce the need for construction of new lake-access facilities, the construction of which could result in adverse effects to the environment.</p>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                              |
| <b>16 Cultural Resources</b>  |                |                             |                                 |   |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 16-1: Cause the alteration of, or adversely affect a historical site, structure, object, or building</u><br/>Implementation of the four Shoreline Plan alternatives would result in development on properties that could contain known or unknown historic resources, are associated with historically-significant events or individuals, or result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a significant historical site, structure, object, or building. Because each alternative would result in some new construction, each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or destroy historic resources through implementation.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - PS             | <p><u>Mitigation 16-1: Avoid potential effects on historic resources</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)<br/>Once the exact location of the new piers, boat ramps, and any other land-based development has been determined and before commencement of earth-disturbing activities for construction, applicants shall identify and evaluate all historic-age (over 45-years in age) buildings and structures that are proposed to be removed and/or modified as part of a historic determination application with TRPA or applicable local jurisdiction. This may include preparation of an historic resource assessment and evaluation of resources to determine their eligibility for recognition under state, federal, or local criteria. If required, the assessment shall be prepared by an architectural historian, or historical architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, Professional Qualification Standards. If resources are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, or a local register are identified, an assessment of impacts on these resources shall be included in the report, as well as detailed mitigation measures to avoid impacts.</p> |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS         |
| <p><u>Impact 16-2: Cause the alteration of, or adversely affect an archaeological resource</u><br/>Implementation of the Shoreline Plan alternatives would result in development that could take place on properties that contain, be associated with, or result in adverse effects to known or unknown archaeological resources. Because each alternative would result in some new construction over the planning period, each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or destroy archaeological resources through implementation of specific projects.</p>   |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - PS             | <p><u>Mitigation 16-2: Avoid potential effects on archaeological resources</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)<br/>▲ Once the exact location of the new piers, boat ramps, dredging, or any other ground-disturbing development (excluding buoys) has been determined and before commencement of earth-disturbing activities for construction, applicants shall retain a qualified archaeologist to conduct archaeological surveys of the site as part of a historic determination application with TRPA or applicable local jurisdiction. To ensure that new or expanded facilities and uses do not adversely affect potentially buried archaeological deposits, an underwater archaeological survey shall also be conducted to identify, evaluate,</p>   |                                  | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS         |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures   |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant   | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
|  |                |                             |                                 | <p>and protect significant submerged cultural resources prior to activities that would disturb the lakebed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The applicant shall follow recommendations identified in the survey, which may include activities such as subsurface testing, designing, and implementing a Worker Environmental Awareness Program, construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist, avoidance of sites, or preservation in place.</li> <li>▲ All projects shall include the following requirements as a condition of approval: If evidence of any prehistoric or historic-era subsurface archaeological features or deposits are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities (e.g., ceramic shard, trash scatters, lithic scatters), all ground-disturbing activity in the area of the discovery shall be halted and the appropriate jurisdiction and TRPA shall be notified immediately. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained to assess the significance of the find. If the find is a prehistoric archeological site, the appropriate Native American group shall be notified. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet NRHP, NVRHP, or CRHR standards of significance, as applicable, for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, a data recovery plan shall be prepared. If the find is determined to be significant by the qualified archaeologist (i.e., because the find is determined to constitute either an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist shall work with the project applicant to avoid disturbance to the resources, and if complete avoidance is not feasible in light of project design, economics, logistics, and other factors, follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the recordation forms required by the applicable SHPO and location information to the appropriate information center.</li> </ul> |                                  |                              |
| <p><u>Impact 16-3: Degrade ethnic and cultural values</u><br/>                     Because the project could result in physical changes to historic and prehistoric sites, unique ethnic cultural values could be affected, and historic or prehistoric religious or sacred uses within the Plan area could be restricted. Consultation with the Washoe Tribe is required by TRPA regulations; however, project activities could still uncover or destroy historic or archaeological resources as identified in Impact 16-1 (historic) and Impact 16-2 (archaeological).</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - PS             | <p><u>Mitigation 16-3: Implement Mitigation Measures 16-1 and 16-2</u> (applies to Alts 1, 2, 3, and 4)<br/>                     TRPA will implement Mitigation Measure 16-1, "Avoid potential effects on historic resources," and 16-2, "Avoid potential effects on archaeological resources," as described above.</p>   | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS             |                              |

**Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

| Impacts  |                |                             | Significance without Mitigation | Mitigation Measures    |                                  | Significance with Mitigation |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| B = Beneficial   | NI = No impact | LTS = Less than significant | PS = Potentially significant    | S = Significant        | SU = Significant and unavoidable |                              |
| <b>17 Cumulative Impacts</b>   |                |                             |                                 |                        |                                  |                              |
| <p>The Shoreline Plan is a long-range plan developed to manage the amount and intensity of recreational use and development along Lake Tahoe’s shore in a manner that attains and maintains the environmental thresholds. Together, the Shoreline Plan works with the other elements of the Regional Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to regulate the total amount and type of development within the Lake Tahoe Region. Consequently, this planning framework inherently represents the cumulative condition within the Region. Because the Shoreline Plan considers the cumulative buildout of the shoreline, the analyses contained in Chapters 4 through 16 of this EIS are cumulative in nature. Similarly, the Regional Plan regulates the buildout of portions of the Region that are outside of the shoreline, and the EIS prepared for adoption of the Regional Plan evaluated the cumulative conditions of those portions of the Region.</p> <p>The cumulative analysis identifies: whether an existing significant adverse cumulative condition exists with respect to each resource, whether implementation of the Shoreline Plan alternatives in the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable plans, programs and projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact, and whether the Shoreline Plan would represent a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact. In cases in which no existing significant cumulative condition is identified, the analysis addresses whether the incremental contribution of the Shoreline Plan alternatives, combined with those of related region-wide plans, programs, and projects, would create a significant cumulative impact. For each resource topic analyzed, the cumulative analysis presented in Chapter 17 determined that there would be no adverse cumulative condition, or that the Shoreline Plan alternatives would not make a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.</p> |                |                             | Alt 1, 2, 3, 4 - LTS            | No mitigation required |                                  | No mitigation required       |

---

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: June 6, 2018

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Receipt of comment on the Draft EIR/EIS for the Kings Beach Pier Rebuild 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 Kings Beach Pier Rebuild Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2015122056). TRPA staff and representatives from Ascent Environmental (the consulting firm who prepared the Draft EIR/EIS), and California State Parks will be available following the presentation to answer questions from the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), and to record formal public comments on the Draft EIS. TRPA is only considering and approving the pier rebuild.

**Staff Recommendation:** Accept public comment on the pier portion of the document.

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

**Project Description/Background:** On May 1, 2018, TRPA and California State Parks released a Draft EIR/EIS for the Kings Beach State Recreation Area Preliminary General Plan Revision and Draft Environmental Impact Report/Kings Beach Pier Rebuild Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement 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 **June 29, 2018**. 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 Kings Beach Pier Rebuild, including certification of the Final EIR/EIS by the Governing Board, is tentatively scheduled for Fall/Winter 2018.

The proposed Kings Beach State Recreation Area (KBSRA) General Plan revision is a California State Parks-initiated update to its original General Development Plan developed in 1980. The General Plan revision includes conceptual plans for future development of and improvements to all of the property

managed as KBSRA, including the boat ramp, boat trailer parking lot, and the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) plaza parcels near the intersection of Coon Street and State Route (SR) 28 (i.e. North Lake Boulevard). The General Plan revision identifies the pier as a future project and would be constructed to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for access and to provide a public pier at KBSRA that is functional for multi-use recreational benefits at most water levels. TRPA will not adopt the KBSRA General Plan revision; however TRPA will consider certification of the Environmental Impact Statement which analyzed both the General Plan revision and the pier rebuild project. TRPA will rely upon the approved Environmental Impact Statement to support the near-term future approval of the pier rebuild project. As a funding source for the pier rebuild project, the CTC is a responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will use the environmental document in their approval process for funding the pier.

The pier rebuild project is a near-term project consistent with the General Plan revision and is a TRPA Environmental Improvement Project for improving lake access under the Recreation threshold category (EIP Project Number 04.01.01.0013). The pier will help maintain recreation threshold attainment status by providing high quality access to Lake Tahoe to the general public. The existing pier is located near the center of the Kings Beach State Recreation Area and extends to a lake bottom elevation of approximately 6,223 feet. During periods of low lake levels, this pier does not reach water and is unusable for motorized boat access. The Draft EIR/EIS analyzed four pier alternatives. The three action alternatives relocate the existing pier and extend it to a navigational depth of 6,217 feet, and so pier length varies among the alternatives. Reconstructing the pier at KBSRA so that it is accessible during varying lake levels will enhance the public access to both the state recreation area and Lake Tahoe. The pier is expected to be rebuilt within 3 years of project approval and permitting. The applicant has submitted an application for the pier to TRPA.

As discussed below, one or more of the alternatives would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic or visual quality from the pier rebuild project. Alternative 2 includes the only pier option that would not cause a significant and unavoidable environmental impact, and therefore would be environmentally superior to the other pier action alternatives.

Alternatives: The Draft EIR/EIS evaluates three project alternatives and one “no project” alternative:

*Alternative 1: No Project*

*Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Proposed Project*

*Alternative 3: Central Pier*

*Alternative 4: Western Pier*

**Attachment A: Table 5.1-1 Comparison of Existing and Pier Rebuild Alternative Details** contains a summary of the 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 biological resources; public service and utilities; and scenic resources. **Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures** summarizes impacts identified under each action alternative. This table also

identifies the significance of impacts after mitigation. Environmental impact conclusions indicate that Alternative 2 pier rebuild project includes the only pier option that would not cause a significant and unavoidable environmental impact.

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 scenic resources. All of the action alternatives have effects on views toward Lake Tahoe and on visual quality of the site. However, the pier rebuild projects in Alternatives 3 and 4 would continue to block views of the lake and bring Scenic Resource 9-2 out of attainment of the TRPA scenic threshold standard after implementation of all feasible mitigation. Therefore Alternatives 3 and 4 would have significant and unavoidable impacts on the scenic quality of views toward the lake.

Partial Shorezone Permitting Program and Proposed Shoreline Plan: The action alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS comply with the screening criteria for the Partial Permitting Program and are consistent with the specific requirements related to boating capacity, scenic quality, soil erosion, and fish habitat. Additionally, all of the action alternatives are consistent with the proposed shoreline ordinances and associated code amendments.

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

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449

CSP, Sierra District Offices  
7360 West Lake Boulevard  
Kings Beach, CA

North Tahoe Events Center  
8318 North Lake Boulevard  
Kings Beach, CA

North Tahoe Public Utility District Offices  
875 National Avenue  
Tahoe Vista, CA

Opportunities for Comment: All relevant comments received by 5:00 p.m. on June 29, 2018 will be responded to in the Final EIR/EIS. Written comments may be submitted via Fax (530) 525-3380; via Email [plan.general@parks.ca.gov](mailto:plan.general@parks.ca.gov); or may be mailed to the following address:

Marilyn Linkem, Superintendent  
California State Parks, Sierra District  
P.O. Box 266  
Tahoma, CA 96142

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

- ▲ June 13, 2018 – TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC), Board Room, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada. Meeting begins at 9:30 a.m.
- ▲ June 27, 2018 – TRPA Governing Board, North Tahoe Event Center, 8318 N. Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. Meeting begins at 9:30 a.m.

The TRPA APC and Governing Board meetings will begin at 9:30 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/).

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

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

Attachments:

Attachment A: Table 5.1-1 Comparison of Existing and Pier Rebuild Alternative Details  
Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures



Attachment A

Table 5.1-1 Comparison of Existing and Pier Rebuild Alternative Details

**Attachment A: Table 5.1-1 Comparison of Existing and Pier Rebuild Alternative Details**

| Feature  |                        | Existing Conditions | Alternative 1<br>No Project    | Alternative 2<br>Eastern Pier   | Alternative 3<br>Central Pier | Alternative 4<br>Western Pier |        |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| Pier Structure Type                                |                        | Fixed               | Fixed                          | Combined: fixed from shore to low water (6223 feet), floating from low water to navigational target (6217 feet) | Same as Alternative 2         | Same as Alternative 2         |        |
| Pier length<br>(feet)                              | Fixed section          | 207                 | Same as existing<br>conditions | 213   | 212                           | 320                           |        |
|  | Floating section       | --                  |                                | 215   | 329                           | 329                           |        |
|  | # of Floating sections | --                  |                                | 7   | 10                            | 10                            |        |
|  | Gangway                | --                  |                                | 80  | 80                            | 80                            |        |
|  | Total length           | 207                 |                                | 488   | 601                           | 704                           |        |
| Total visible mass (sq. ft.)                       |                        | 537                 |                                |   | 1,421                         | 1,403                         | 1,574  |
| Prime fish habitat affected (sq. ft.) <sup>1</sup> |                        | NA                  |                                |   | 4,930                         | NA                            | NA     |
| Piling configuration                               |                        | Double              |                                |   | Single                        | Single                        | Single |
| Number of pier pilings                             |                        | 26                  |                                |   | 27                            | 33                            | 38     |
| Total footing area of pier pilings (sq. ft.)       |                        | 71.06               |                                |   | 71                            | 88                            | 101    |
| Average deck width (feet)                          |                        | 10                  |                                | 12  | 12                            | 12                            |        |
| Deck surface area (sq. ft.)                        |                        | 3,151               |                                | 8,121   | 9,904                         | 11,220                        |        |
| Low freeboard docks (LFDs)                         |                        | NA                  | NA                             | 1   | 2                             | 2                             |        |
| Accessibility                                      |                        | ADA compliant deck  | Same as existing<br>conditions | ADA compliant deck, gangway, and LFDs<br>(including railings)   | Same as Alternative 2         | Same as Alternative 2         |        |
| Materials  |                        | Wood                | Wood                           | Steel, aluminum, stainless steel, composite   | Same as Alternative 2         | Same as Alternative 2         |        |
| Lighting   |                        | NA                  | NA                             | Navigational safety lights only   | Same as Alternative 2         | Same as Alternative 2         |        |
| Colors   |                        | Brown               | Same as existing<br>conditions | Muted; greys  | Same as Alternative 2         | Same as Alternative 2         |        |

<sup>1</sup> Pier area over feed and cover fish habitat. No portion of any of the piers overlays spawning habitat.

Source: Conservancy 2016

Attachment B

Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures

**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts   | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts   | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)   | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| NI = No Impact   | LTS = Less than Significant  | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable   |  |
| <b>5.3.2 Biological Resources</b>  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Impact 5.3.2-1: Disturbance and loss of prime fish habitat</b></p> <p>The removal of existing structures under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 may temporarily disturb TRPA-designated prime fish habitat. However, potential impacts would be minimized by implementation of project-specific best management practices (BMPs) that are required for project permits and approvals and CSP Standard and Special Project Requirements. Alternative 2 would place the rebuilt pier within prime fish (feed and cover) habitat, resulting in the loss or degradation of 4,930 square feet of prime fish habitat. Alternatives 3 and 4 would place the pier outside of, and not remove, prime fish habitat; Alternative 4 additionally includes extending the existing motorized boat ramp near, but outside of, prime fish habitat. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 could result in changes in localized watercraft activity but would not increase overall watercraft activity on Lake Tahoe and would not substantially change watercraft activity or disturbance within prime fish habitat. Taken together, the impacts to prime fish habitat under Alternatives 3 and 4 would be less than significant. However, the permanent removal or degradation of prime fish habitat under Alternative 2 would be significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.3.2-1 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level for the pier rebuild component of Alternative 2.</p> <p>Because Alternative 1 would not result in changes to the General Plan, removal of existing structures, construction of the rebuilt pier, or changes in watercraft use or resulting disturbance, this alternative would have no impact on prime fish habitat.</p> | <p><b>Guideline RES 2.1:</b> Design the pier rebuild project to avoid spawning habitat, minimize effects on feed and cover habitat, and to meet or exceed prime fish habitat mitigation requirements</p> <p><b>Guideline RES 2.2:</b> Remove the boat ramp due to conflict with the fish habitat.</p> <p><b>Guideline RES 2.3:</b> Enhance prime fish habitat on the eastern end of KBSRA.</p> | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4 = NI</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>Alt. 1 = NI<br/>Alt. 2 = S<br/>Alts. 3, 4 = LTS</p> | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 5.3.2-1: Compensate for Loss of Prime Fish Habitat</b></p> <p>This mitigation measure would apply to the pier rebuild project under Alternative 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Alternative 2 is implemented, to compensate for the removal of prime fish habitat (feed and cover) as a result of constructing the eastern pier, 7,395 square feet of in-kind feed and cover habitat shall be created or restored in the surrounding area through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Fish Habitat Replacement and Monitoring Plan. The created/restored habitat would adjoin the existing feed and cover habitat at lake bottom elevations similar to those of habitat removed or degraded by installation of the eastern pier. The plan will be developed and implemented in coordination with applicable regulatory agencies, including CDFW, Lahontan RWQCB, USACE, USFWS, and TRPA. Additionally, the plan will be coordinated and consistent with terms and conditions of other required permits. Applicable permits expected for the project include a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from USACE, Clean Water Act Section 401 Water</li> </ul> | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>Alts 1, 2, 3, 4 = NI</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>Alt. 1 = NI<br/>Alts 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> |

**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative) | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative) |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| NI = No Impact           | LTS = Less than Significant              | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable   |   |
|                          |  |  | <p>Quality Certification from Lahontan RWQCB, and a Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW.</p> <p>The Compensatory Fish Habitat Replacement and Monitoring Plan will include design, implementation, and monitoring requirements for creating/restoring 7,395 square feet of feed and cover habitat and achieving no net loss of fish habitat function, and shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identification of a specific habitat creation/restoration site that adjoins the existing feed and cover habitat in the area, and criteria for selecting the site;</li> <li>• specifications for habitat substrate type and size-class distribution, material sources, and construction/installation methods;</li> <li>• in-kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory fish habitat/substrate (using performance and success criteria) to document success;</li> <li>• monitoring protocol, including schedule and reporting requirements;</li> <li>• ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for habitat substrate condition and fish use of the</li> </ul> |   |

**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts   | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts  | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)   | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| NI = No Impact   | LTS = Less than Significant   | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable  |  |
|  |   |  | created/restored area; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>corrective measures if performance standards are not met;</li> <li>responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and</li> <li>responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Impact 5.3.2-4: Disturbance or loss of Tahoe Yellow Cress</b><br/>                     Under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, construction and operation of the pier rebuild project and future projects implemented under the General Plan revision may directly or indirectly disturb beach habitats suitable for Tahoe yellow cress (TYC). If TYC becomes established on the KBSRA beach in the future, without implementation of adequate TYC protection measures, construction activities and potential increases in beach use associated with the pier rebuild project and other projects implemented under the General Plan revision could potentially result in the disturbance or loss of TYC. However, CSP Standard and Special Project Requirements and General Plan guidelines would provide protection and prevent the take of TYC. These requirements and guidelines require monitoring of the beach area for the presence of TYC and protecting any occurrences with signage, fencing, or other measures as identified in the TYC Conservation Strategy. Because implementation of these measures is required and would identify, protect, and avoid take of TYC occurrences if they become established at KBSRA, the potential impact to TYC from the pier rebuild and General Plan revision under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would be less-than-</p> | <p><b>Guideline RES 3.1:</b> Monitor the beach area for the presence of TYC.<br/> <b>Guideline RES 3.2:</b> Protect TYC plants, if they are detected, with fencing, signage, or other protection measures as identified in the TYC Conservation Strategy.<br/> <b>Guideline RES 3.3:</b> Educate KBSRA staff in the identification of TYC and coordinate with the TYC Adaptive Management Working Group to conduct surveys for TYC at KBSRA if surveys are called for as part of the TYC Conservation Strategy.</p> | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>   | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> |

**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts  | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts   | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative)   | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative)  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| NI = No Impact  | LTS = Less than Significant  | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable   |  |
| <p>significant.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would not result in changes to the General Plan, removal of existing structures, or pier construction. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have no impact on TYC or suitable habitat.</p>   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>5.3.10 Public Services and Utilities</b>   |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Impact 5.3.10-7: Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services</b><br/>                     Fire protection and emergency services at KBSRA are provided by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD). Implementation of Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in an increase in visitation at KBSRA by up to 10 percent over existing conditions, which could result in an incremental increase in demand for fire protection and emergency services. NTFPD has indicated that the increase in visitation would not be anticipated to increase demand for fire protection and emergency services such that there would be an adverse impact on station operations or response times (Conradson, pers. comm., 2017). Furthermore, construction of the new facilities would meet fire protection and safety requirements identified in the Uniform Fire Code, Uniform Building Code, and CSP Standard Project Requirements. For these reasons, the impact on fire protection and emergency services from Alternatives 2 through 4 General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would be less than significant.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would have no impact.</p> | <p><b>Guideline OP 2.1:</b> Enter into partnerships or agreements with other regional and local agencies such as the Conservancy, TRPA, Placer County, NTPUD, North Tahoe Fire Protection District, and Placer County Sheriff to clarify management responsibilities, share resources, and more efficiently achieve goals and guidelines. Partnerships and agreements could address snow removal, interpretive programs, shared parking, emergency response, and/or other operational needs.</p> | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>  | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> |
| <b>5.3.12 Scenic Resources</b>  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Impact 5.3.12-1: Effects on views toward Lake Tahoe and the visual quality of the site</b><br/>                     Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in no changes at KBSRA and therefore no impact to views toward Lake Tahoe or the visual quality of the site. Alternative 2 would affect visual conditions by modifying man-made features visible from SR 28 and altering views</p>   | <p><b>Guideline RES 10.1:</b> Locate and design structures to minimize their visible mass and potential to detract from scenic views from within KBSRA.</p> <p><b>Guideline RES 10.2:</b> Minimize the visibility of upland facilities from Lake</p>   | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3 = LTS<br/>                     Alt. 4 = S</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI</p>             | <p><b>Mitigation Measure 5.3.12-1a: Redesign the pier as a floating pier</b><br/>                     This Mitigation Measure applies to Alternatives 3 and 4. CSP and the Conservancy will redesign the central and western piers as low-profile floating piers that minimize their</p> | <p>General Plan Revision<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alts. 2, 3, 4 = LTS</p> <p>Pier Rebuild<br/>                     Alt. 1 = NI<br/>                     Alt. 2 = LTS</p>        |

**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts   | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts  | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative) | Mitigation Measures   | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative) |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| NI = No Impact   | LTS = Less than Significant   | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable  |   |
| <p>of Lake Tahoe from SR 28. These visual changes would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site, views from SR 28, views of Lake Tahoe or scenic vistas. Nor would the visual changes reduce the TRPA scenic quality ratings for the applicable roadway travel units, scenic resources, or for the recreation area. Thus, Alternative 2 would have a less-than-significant impact. The upland features of the General Plan revision in Alternative 3 would have similar effects on scenic and visual quality as Alternative 2, which would be less than significant. The upland features of the General Plan revision in Alternative 4 include shade structures that would degrade an existing view of Lake Tahoe and would reduce the TRPA scenic threshold score for Scenic Resource 20-5 resulting in a significant impact. However, after implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.3.12-1b, the impact of the upland features of the General Plan revision in Alternative 4 would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The pier rebuild project in Alternatives 3 and 4 would block views of Lake Tahoe from the beach, including from TRPA-designated Scenic Resource 9-2, which would bring that resource out of attainment of its scenic threshold standard. This would be a significant impact for Alternatives 3 and 4. After implementation of all feasible mitigation, the pier rebuild project in Alternatives 3 and 4 would continue to block views of the lake and bring Scenic Resource 9-2 out of attainment of the TRPA scenic threshold standard. Therefore, the pier rebuild project in Alternatives 3 and 4 would have a significant and unavoidable impact on the scenic quality of views toward the lake.</p> | <p>Tahoe by designing new or relocated facilities in locations that are screened from views, using materials and colors that blend with the natural background, and/or incorporating vegetative screening to obscure views of human-made facilities from the lake.</p> <p><b>Guideline RES 10.3:</b> Locate and design new facilities and improvements to minimize encroachment into views of Lake Tahoe from State Route 28. Preserve views of Lake Tahoe from TRPA-designated scenic resource 20-5, on SR 28 near the west side of KBSRA.</p> <p><b>Guideline RES 11.1:</b> Incorporate the following design guidelines in new or redeveloped facilities in KBSRA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Buildings shall be constructed of wood, stone, or similar natural or natural-looking materials. Reflective materials, smooth surfaces, or brightly colored materials shall not be used, except where necessary for public safety.</li> <li>◆ Facilities shall be dark earth-tone colors that blend with the natural environment and minimize the visibility of facilities. Lighter earth-tone colors can be used on portions of facilities to provide architectural detail and visual interest.</li> <li>◆ The architectural design of facilities should reflect the natural mountain environment. Roofs should be sloped, and buildings should include articulation and architectural details</li> </ul> | <p>Alt. 2 = LTS<br/>Alts. 3, 4 = S</p>                   | <p>visibility from the beach. The redesigned piers shall maintain the following elements of the existing design that reduce its visual prominence: (1) minimize the visibility of pilings by including fewest number, smallest diameter, and shortest pilings feasible; and (2) the pier decking, floats, pilings, and other elements shall be colored a muted shade of medium to dark grey that allows the pier to visually blend into the water. In addition to maintaining these elements of the existing design, the redesigned pier shall comply with the following design criteria to the extent feasible without jeopardizing public safety or the structural integrity of the pier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ the entire pier shall be designed as a floating pier with no fixed sections elevated above the beach or water surface;</li> <li>◆ no railings or other non-structural elements shall be included above the pier deck; and</li> <li>◆ the floating deck shall be designed to minimize the distance between the water surface and the top of the pier decking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 5.3.12-1b: Redesign shade structures as picnic sites.</b><br/>This Mitigation Measure applies to Alternative 4<br/>CSP will redesign the four shade structures proposed between the</p> | <p>Alts. 3, 4 = SU</p>                                  |



**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts   | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative) | Mitigation Measures  | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative) |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| NI = No Impact           | LTS = Less than Significant  | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable   |   |
|                          | <p>and not exceed the height of the forest canopy.</p> <p><b>Guideline RES II.2:</b> Develop outdoor lighting to be part of the architecture and site design, maintain the operational efficiency of the site, avoid light pollution, and provide security. Outdoor lighting, at a minimum, shall comply with the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Limit new or existing sources of exterior lighting and reflective materials to the minimum amount necessary for public safety, navigation, and operations.</li> <li>◆ All overhead lighting fixtures shall be fully shielded and directed downward to prevent light pollution.</li> <li>◆ Exterior lighting should use the lowest wattage necessary for the application.</li> <li>◆ Lighting should use yellow spectrum luminaires, such as low-pressure sodium or narrow band amber Light-Emitting Diode (LED) and avoid bright white light sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Guideline RES II.3:</b> Install and maintain landscaping to enhance scenic views into and from KBSRA, and as a method for screening existing or planned buildings and infrastructure. Landscape design shall comply with the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Use TRPA recommended list for native and adapted plant species.</li> </ul> |  | <p>parking lot and beach on the west side of KBSRA to minimize new obstructions to views of Lake Tahoe from the main vehicular entry (Viewpoint 5) and from Scenic Resource 20-5, located on SR 28 directly north of the proposed shade structures. The structures will be redesigned as unshaded picnic sites. The redesigned structures will include no permanent roofs, walls, posts, or other structural elements that extend above four feet in height.</p> |   |

**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts  | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative) | Mitigation Measures              | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative) |
|--------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---|
| NI = No Impact           | LTS = Less than Significant   | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |   |
|                          | <p>Non-native plants may be used as accent plantings but are restricted to borders, entryways, flower beds, and other similar locations. Use locally native species where feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Existing trees and natural features should be preserved and incorporated into landscape improvements</li> <li>◆ Incorporate water conservation measures into the landscape. Water conservation measures could include the use of drought tolerant plants, low volume irrigation, mulch layer over landscape beds (but not large exposed tree roots) to slow evaporation, and soil amendment with compost and clay to increase water retention.</li> </ul> <p><b>Guideline RES 11.4:</b> Install and maintain signage to provide adequate public information in a manner that does not detract from the aesthetics or the scenic quality of the park. Signage should comply with the following guidelines, where feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Consolidate signage onto kiosks or similar structures to avoid visual clutter.</li> <li>◆ Signs should be dark brown or other earth-tones and avoid reflective materials.</li> <li>◆ Coordinate wayfinding signage with local and regional agencies to establish a consistent visual</li> </ul> |  |                                  |   |

**Attachment B: Table ES-1 Summary of Impacts, Guidelines, and Mitigation Measures**

| Resources Topics/Impacts | Guidelines that Address Resource Impacts | Level of Significance before Mitigation (by Alternative) | Mitigation Measures              | Level of Significance after Mitigation (by Alternative) |
|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|
| NI = No Impact           | LTS = Less than Significant              | S = Significant  | SU = Significant and Unavoidable |   |
|                          | character.                               |  |                                  |   |





**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](http://www.trpa.org)

---

## MEMORANDUM

Date: June 6, 2018  
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission  
From: TRPA Staff  
Subject: Development Rights Strategic Initiative Status Report

---

**Requested Action:**

No action is required. This is an informational item intended to provide the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) a status report and opportunity for input on the recommendations.

**Background:**

At the direction of the TRPA Governing Board, staff launched a multi-year initiative in 2015 to consider comprehensive changes to the existing development rights system to ensure it is working for the community needs of today and helping to meet the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan Goals. The Governing Board approved a Work Program and appointed a Working Group for the initiative. The APC recommended, and the Governing Board approved, local government staff members from El Dorado and Placer counties as their representatives to the Working Group.

The recommendations selected by the Working Group include:

- (1) establish exchange rates between commercial floor area (CFA), tourist accommodation units (TAU), and residential units of use (RUU);
- (2) eliminate local jurisdictional approval of development right transfers;
- (3) partner with local land banks in their efforts to increase the supply of development rights and accelerate the goals of the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan;
- (4) implement process improvements to streamline the development right system (including banking and transfer activities) and make the system more user-friendly; and,
- (5) expand eligibility criteria for residential bonus units to encourage “achievable” housing.

The approval and adoption of the recommendations (including any necessary Regional Plan and Code of Ordinance amendments) and the expanded Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) is scheduled for TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) September 12, Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) September 26, and the Governing Board October 24, 2018.

Staff will present more detail on the recommendations and schedule at your June 13 meeting.

**Contact Information:**

If you have questions regarding this item, please contact Jennifer Self, Senior Planner, at (775) 589-5261 or [jself@trpa.org](mailto:jself@trpa.org), or John Hester, Chief Operating Officer, at (775) 589-5219 or [jhester@trpa.org](mailto:jhester@trpa.org).



# Strategic Initiatives Monthly Status Report

May 2018

| Strategic Initiative  | Status   |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1. Development Rights | <p>Recent Milestones Reached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Technical Code Team (TCT) prepared draft code for exchange rates, eliminating local jurisdictional transfer approval, and transfer/banking process improvements (severing from the sending site). The TCT also identified specific topics related to the draft code provisions for DRWG clarification.</li> <li>2. Prepared response to questions from Attorney General’s Office Development Rights Working Group (DRWG) member and made slight changes/improvements to the proposed recommendations as a result.</li> <li>3. Prepared recommendations for May DRWG meeting including providing support for expanded land bank capabilities to implement the Regional Plan and raising the income levels at which bonus units and allocations can be used to support local achievable housing.</li> </ol> <p>Upcoming Milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TCT to prepare final draft of Code to reflect DRWG direction at May meeting. The final draft will be presented to the DRWG in August for recommendation to the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC), and Governing Board (GB).</li> <li>2. Staff and consultants to prepare IEC for DRWG consideration and recommendation to the APC, RPIC, and GB in August.</li> <li>3. Staff and consultants to prepare and present final package of Plan and Code amendments, IEC, and other related items for formal public hearing and approval process through the APC, RPIC, and GB during September through November.</li> </ol> |
| 2. Shoreline          | <p>Recent Milestones Reached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TRPA staff presented summary of draft code amendments-RPIC approved release of draft amendments for public review</li> <li>2. Shoreline Plan Public Review Draft EIS and Draft Code Amendments Complete</li> <li>3. 60-day public comment period May 8-July 9</li> </ol> <p>Upcoming Milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RPIC Code Workshop-May 22</li> <li>2. GB Hearing on Draft EIS-May 23</li> <li>3. APC Hearing on Draft EIS-June 13</li> <li>4. Public Workshops -June 4 &amp; June 6</li> </ol>  |
| 3. Transportation     | <p>Recent Milestones Reached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Released Regional Grant Program Cycle 2 recommendations; all 12 eligible applications were awarded funding totaling over \$6.6 million.</li> <li>2. Development of the draft 2019 FTIP; drafting narrative section</li> <li>3. Onboarded new Travel Management Coordinator, Rich Looney</li> <li>4. Final Safety Plan Recommendations for crash data collection and design volumes, drafting MOU and Charter, and began one-on one meeting with State DOTs.</li> </ol>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>5. Design and mockup completed for refresh of Linking Tahoe web page, highlighting all Tahoe Transportation Options</p> <p>6. Travel Survey – Finalized schedule for our summer travel survey</p> <p>7. Published transportation data (Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian, Transit ridership, and Traffic volumes) to LT-Info<br/>(<a href="https://transportation.laketahoeinfo.org/MeasuresDashboard/Index">https://transportation.laketahoeinfo.org/MeasuresDashboard/Index</a>)</p> <hr/> <p>Upcoming Milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Participate in US 50 Recreation Travel Hot Spot Transportation Management Study</li> <li>2. Supporting Bi-State Transportation Consultation working group</li> <li>3. Regional Grant Program Cycle 2 Programming of Projects</li> <li>4. Release RFP for assistance on development of Performance Based Planning within the Transportation Program</li> <li>5. Identify top 8 priority locations for HSIP grant production and work towards alignment for MOU and Charter</li> <li>6. Prepare to launch linkingtahoe.com and brochure in early June.</li> <li>7. Development of the draft 2019 FTIP; project update</li> <li>8. 2017 FTIP administrative modification; funding update</li> <li>9. Continue to build out our traffic volume monitoring program and published live data to LT-Info.</li> </ol> |
| <p>4. Forest Ecosystem Health</p>                          | <p>Recent Milestones Reached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New Forest Ecosystem Health Program Manager (Christina Restaino)</li> </ol> <hr/> <p>Upcoming Milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The LTW Science Team will complete modeling of varied future scenarios to inform management strategies for Tahoe’s west shore.</li> <li>2. TRPA Forest Ecosystem Health Program Manager has begun the collaborative effort to develop new vegetation thresholds.</li> </ol>   |
| <p>5. Stormwater Management Operations and Maintenance</p> | <p>Recent Milestones Reached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TRPA Stormwater Program Manager Shay Navarro, participated in a peer-to-peer learning exchange in Washington, DC with other government stormwater professionals April 29-May 3. Topics addressed included green stormwater infrastructure, nature-based solutions, funding and maintenance.</li> </ol> <hr/> <p>Upcoming Milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May CA Integrated Regional Watershed Management meeting to review rate and rank current round of funding requests, including TRPA’s project.</li> <li>2. June Tahoe RCD meeting scheduled to discuss possible strategies and next steps for securing dedicated stormwater funding.</li> <li>3. August NDEP 319h grant application funding from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection.</li> </ol>   |
| <p>6. Aquatic Invasive Species Control</p>                 | <p>Recent Milestones Reached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can now invoice against US Army Corps Agreement for \$1.3M.</li> <li>2. TRPA made the determination that the Tahoe Keys proposal will need additional analysis and that an EIS is necessary.</li> </ol> <hr/> <p>Upcoming Milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TRPA and USFWS have been making progress on finalizing the AIS funds within LTRA</li> </ol>   |



|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
|                             | <p>2. TRPA and Tahoe RCD will be working on a joint RFP to allow both entities to choose from an approved vendor list for control work.</p>  |
| <p>7. Thresholds Update</p> | <p>Recent Milestones Reached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. April 2018 - Stakeholders working group recommends bringing the proposed reorganization and non-policy technical corrections of the threshold standards (resolution 82-11) to the APC.</li> <li>2. May 2018 – APC recommends bringing the proposed reorganization and non-policy technical corrections of the threshold standards (resolution 82-11) to the GB.</li> <li>3. May 2018 – Science Advisory Council completed Topic Briefs on the environmental impacts of recreation</li> </ol> <hr/> <p>Upcoming Milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. May 2018 – GB consideration of the proposed reorganization and non-policy technical corrections of the threshold standards (resolution 82-11)</li> <li>2. May 2018 – Sustainable recreation workshop</li> <li>3. June 2018 - Stakeholders working group consideration of threshold standard system structure and vegetation preservation standards</li> </ol> |

