

**MINUTE ITEM**  
This Calendar Item No. 37  
was approved as Minute Item  
No. 37 by the State Lands  
Commission by a vote of 3  
to 0 at its 2/10/89  
meeting.

CALENDAR ITEM

37

07/10/89  
W 24041 PRC 7315  
J. Ludlow

A 7  
S 1

APPROVAL OF A RECREATIONAL PIER PERMIT

APPLICANT: Emile L. and Jean L. Labadie  
183 Indian Road  
Piedmont, California 93610

AREA, TYPE LAND AND LOCATION: A parcel of submerged land in Lake Tahoe,  
El Dorado County.

LAND USE: Reconstruction, use, and maintenance of an  
existing pier and construction of a new  
boatlift.

TERMS OF PROPOSED LEASE:  
Initial period: Five-years beginning July 10,  
1989.

CONSIDERATION: Rent-free, pursuant to Section 6503.5 of the  
P.R.C.

APPLICANT STATUS: Applicant is owner of upland.

PREREQUISITE CONDITIONS, FEES AND EXPENSES:  
Filing fee and processing costs have been  
received.

STATUTORY AND OTHER REFERENCES:  
A. P.R.C.: Div. 6, Parts 1 and 2; Div. 13.  
B. Cal. Code Regs.: Title 2, Div. 3;  
Title 14, Div. 6.

AB 884: 11/01/89.

MINUTE ITEM  
58  
mail etunim es bevoiggs asv  
mail etunim es bevoiggs asv  
mail etunim es bevoiggs asv  
mail etunim es bevoiggs asv

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 37 (CONT'D)

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:

1. Pursuant to the Commission's delegation of authority and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. 15025), the staff has prepared a Proposed Negative Declaration identified as EIR ND 459, State Clearinghouse No. 89022702. Such Proposed Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

Based upon the Initial Study, the Proposed Negative Declaration, and the comments received in response thereto, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment. (14 Cal. Code Regs. 15074(b))

2. In order to determine the other potential trust uses in the area of the proposed project, the staff contacted representatives of the following agencies: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Department of Fish and Game, County of El Dorado, and the Tahoe Conservancy. None of these agencies expressed a concern that the proposed project would have a significant effect on trust uses in the area. The agencies did not identify any trust needs which were not being met by existing facilities in the area. Identified trust uses in this area would include swimming, boating, walking along the beach, and views of the lake.

3. This activity involves lands identified as possessing significant environmental values pursuant to P.R.C. 6370, et seq. Based upon the staff's consultation with the persons nominating such lands and through the CEQA review process, it is the staff's opinion that the project, as proposed, is consistent with its use classification.

4. All permits covering structures in Lake Tahoe will include a condition subsequent that if any structure authorized is found to be in nonconformance with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's shorezone ordinance and if any alterations, repairs, or removal required pursuant to said ordinance are not accomplished within the designated time period, then the permit will be automatically terminated, effective upon notice by the State, and the site shall be cleared pursuant to the terms thereof.
5. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency has conditioned their permit that all vegetation be protected with fencing around the entire construction site; however, this project, as proposed to the Commission, will be conducted entirely from a barge in the lake. No activity is proposed on the shorezone. The entire pier rests on large boulders and no materials will be stored or placed on the upland.

APPROVALS OBTAINED:

El Dorado County, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

FURTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED:

United States Army Corps of Engineers (GP-16).

EXHIBITS:

- A. Land Description.
- B. Location Map.
- C. El Dorado County Letter of Approval.
- D. Negative Declaration.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. CERTIFY THAT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION, EIR NO 459, STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 89022702, WAS PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE CEQA AND THAT THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN.
2. DETERMINE THAT THE PROJECT, AS APPROVED, WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.
3. AUTHORIZE ISSUANCE TO EMILE L. AND JEAN L. LABADIE OF A FIVE-YEAR RECREATIONAL PIER PERMIT, BEGINNING JULY 10, 1989; IN CONSIDERATION OF THE RECONSTRUCTION, USE, AND MAINTENANCE OF AN EXISTING PIER AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BOATLIFT ON THE LAND DESCRIBED ON EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED AND BY REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.

EXHIBIT "A"


W 24041

EXHIBIT "A"

LAND DESCRIPTI


BOTTOM EL. 6219.0  
DECK EL. 6231.0

BOTTOM EL. 6220.2  
DECK EL. 6231.0



EXISTING PIER

PROPOSED PIER



SECTION (NTS)

PROJECT ADDRESS:  
8227 KENLET DRIVE  
MEEKS BAY  
A.P.N. 16-051-51  
EL DORADO COUNTY, CA.

BRISCO ENTERPRISES (916) 583-6882

Post Office Box 7488  
Tahoe City, California 95730

SCALE 1" = 10'	APPROVED BY JMS	DRAWN BY
DATE AUG. 87		REVISED
LABADIE PIER REPAIR		DRAWING NUMBER
		7-105

CALENDAR PAGE	551
MINUTE PAGE	2277

PREPARED MAY 22, 1989 BY BIU 1.

EXHIBIT "A"




EXHIBIT "B"  
W 24041



CALENDAR PAGE 552  
MINUTE PAGE 2278

80788008

EXHIBIT "C"

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - STATE LANDS COMMISSION  
STATE LANDS COMMISSION  
1807 13TH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

Date 12-15-88

File Ref: W 24041

Ms. Judy Ludlow  
California State Lands Commission  
1807 13th Street  
Sacramento, California 95814

RECEIVED

DEC 15 1988

EL DORADO CO. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT.  
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE

Subject: Building Permit for Pier

Name: Emile Labadie

Address: 183 Indian Road  
Piedmont, CA 94610

Tahoe Address: 8227 Kehlet Drive

County Assessor's Parcel No. 016-051-511

Dear Ms. Ludlow:

The County of El Dorado has received notice of the above-referenced project in Lake Tahoe and has no objection to the pier repair/construction or to the issuance of the State Lands Commission's permit.

If you have any questions, you may reach me at (916) 573-3145.

Sincerely,

El Dorado County  
Building Division



JOHN S. WALKER  
Building Inspector III

cc: Jan Brisco  
P.O. Box 7468  
Tahoe City, CA 95730

66311

88 DEC 19 PM 12:21

CALENDAR PAGE 553  
MINUTE PAGE 2279

89022702

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - STATE LANDS COMMISSION

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Governor

STATE LANDS COMMISSION  
1807 13TH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

EXHIBIT "D"



PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

EIR NO. 459

File Ref.: W 24041

SCH#:

Project Title: LABADIE PIER RECONSTRUCTION

Project Proponent: Emile L. & Jean L. Labadie

Project Location: In Lake Tahoe adjacent to 8227 Kehlet Drive, Meeks Bay Vista, El Dorado County.

Project Description: The project will involve pier reconstruction which will include a new boat lift. The new pier area would be increased by 49.2 square feet (from 472.8 sq. ft. to 522 sq. ft.).

Contact Person: TED T. FUKUSHIMA Telephone: (916)322-7813

This document is prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 21000 et seq., Public Resources Code), the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15000 et seq., Title 14, California Code Regulations), and the State Lands Commission regulations (Section 2901 et seq., Title 2, California Code Regulations).

Based upon the attached Initial Study, it has been found that:

- the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- mitigation measures included in the project will avoid potentially significant effects.


CALENDAR PAGE	554
MINUTE PAGE	2280

1010235-8883

#14

SEE GEODESIC DECK  
1010235-8883

# LAKE TAHOE




W 24041



CALENDAR PAGE	555
MINUTE PAGE	2381


BOTTOM EL. 6219.0  
DECK EL. 6231.0

BOTTOM EL. 6220.2  
DECK EL. 6231.0



EXISTING PIER

PROPOSED PIER



SECTION (NTS)

PROJECT ADDRESS:  
8227 KEHLET DRIVE  
MEEKS BAY  
A.P.N. 16-051-51  
EL DORADO COUNTY, CA.

BRISCO ENTERPRISES (916) 583-6882

Post Office Box 7466  
Tahoe City, California 95790

SCALE 1"=10'  
DATE AUG. 87  
APPROVED BY JMB

DRAWN BY  
REVISED

LABADIE PIER REPAIR

DWG NUMBER  
975

CALENDAR PAGE 556  
MINUTE PAGE 2282

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FORM - Part I**

(To be completed by applicant)

FORM 69.3(11/82)

**A. GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. Name, address, and telephone number:

a. Applicant

Emile L. & Jean L. Labadie

183 Indian Road

Piedmont, CA 94610

( 415 ) 652-8060

b. Contact person if other than applicant:

Jan Brisco - Brisco Enterprises

P.O. Box 7468

Tahoe City, CA 95730

( 916 ) 583-6882

2. a. Project location: (Please reference to nearest town or community and include county)

8227 Kehlet Drive, El Dorado County APN 16-051-51

Meeks Bay Vista, Lake Tahoe

b. Assessor's parcel number: 16-051-51

3. Existing zoning of project site: Residential

4. Existing land use of project site: Private recreation/residential

5. Proposed use of site: same

6. Other permits required: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

1. For building construction projects, complete "ATTACHMENT A".

2. For non-building construction projects: Describe fully, the proposed activity, its purpose and intended use, e.g. for proposed mineral prospecting permits, include the number of test holes, size of holes, amount of material to be excavated, maximum surface area of disturbance, hole locations, depth of holes, etc. Attach plans or other drawings as necessary.

CALENDAR PAGE

557

MINUTE PAGE

2283

C. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1. Describe the project site as it exists before the project, including information on topography, soil stability, plants and animals and any cultural, historical, or scenic aspects. Describe any existing structures on the site, and the use of the structures.
2. Describe the surrounding properties, including information on plants and animals and any cultural, historical, or scenic aspects. Indicate the type of land use (residential, commercial, etc.), intensity of land use (one-family, apartment houses, shops, department stores, etc.), and scale of development (height, frontage, set-back, rear yard, etc.).

D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Answer the following questions by placing a check in the appropriate box. Discuss all items checked "yes" or "maybe". (Attach additional sheets as necessary)

Will the project involve:	YES	MAYBE	NO
1. a change in existing features of any bays, tidelands, beaches, lakes, or hills, or substantial alteration of ground contours? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. a change in scenic views or vistas from existing residential areas or public lands or roads? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. a change in pattern, scale, or character of the general area of project? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. a significant effect on plant or animal life? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. significant amounts of solid waste or litter? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. a change in dust, ash, smoke, fumes, or odors in the vicinity? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. a change in ocean, bay, lake, stream, or ground water quality or quantity, or alteration of existing drainage patterns? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. a change in existing noise or vibration levels in the vicinity? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. construction on filled land or on slope of 10 percent or more? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. use or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, such as toxic or radioactive substances, flammables, or explosives? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. a change in demand for municipal services (police, fire, water, sewage, etc.)? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. an increase in fossil fuel consumption (electricity, oil, natural gas, etc.)? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. a larger project or a series of projects? .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

E. CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best of my ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date: 1/12/78

Signed: Jan Brisco  
Jan Brisco - Agent

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST - PART II

Form 13.20 (7/82)

File Ref: 24041

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Applicant: Emile L. & Jean L. Labadie
183 Indian Road
Piedmont, CA 94610

B. Checklist Date: 2 / 27 / 89

C. Contact Person: TED T. FUKUSHIMA
Telephone: ( 916 ) 322-7813

D. Purpose: Permit for the continued use and maintenance of an existing pier.

E. Location: In Lake Tahoe adjacent to 8227 Kehlet Drive, Meeks Bay Vista, El Dorado County.

F. Description: The project will involve a pier reconstruction which will include a new boat lift. The new pier area would be increased by 49.2 square feet (from 472.8 sq. ft. to 522 sq. ft.).

G. Persons Contacted: [Blank lines for contact information]

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (Explain all "yes" and "maybe" answers)

Table with 3 columns: Question, Yes, Maybe. Rows include: Earth impacts (unstable earth, soil disruptions, topography changes, unique geologic features, erosion), and geologic hazards (beach sands, mudslides, earthquakes).

CALENDAR PAGE 559
MINUTE PAGE 2285

**B. Air.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Substantial air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?
- 2. The creation of objectionable odors?
- 3. Alteration of air movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?

**C. Water.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Changes in the currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?
- 2. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?
- 3. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?
- 4. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?
- 5. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?
- 6. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?
- 7. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?
- 8. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?
- 9. Exposure of people or property to water-related hazards such as flooding or tidal waves?
- 10. Significant changes in the temperature, flow or chemical content of surface thermal springs?

**D. Plant Life.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?
- 2. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of plants?
- 3. Introduction of new species of plants into an area, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?
- 4. Reduction in acreage of any agricultural crop?

**E. Animal Life.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (birds, land animals including reptiles, fish and shellfish, benthic organisms, or insects)?
- 2. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare or endangered species of animals?
- 3. Introduction of new species of animals into an area, or result in a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?
- 4. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?

**F. Noise.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Increase in existing noise levels?
- 2. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

**G. Light and Glare.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. The production of new light or glare?

**H. Land Use.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. A substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

**I. Natural Resources.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?
- 2. Substantial depletion of any nonrenewable resources?

**J. Risk of Upset.** Does the proposal result in:

environmental impacts)

Yes Maybe No

- 1. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?
- 2. Possible interference with emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?

**K. Population.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. The alteration, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of the area?

**L. Housing.** Will the proposal result in:

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

**M. Transportation/Circulation.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?
- 2. Affecting existing parking facilities, or create a demand for new parking?
- 3. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems?
- 4. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?
- 5. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic?
- 6. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians?

**N. Public Services.** Will the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:

- 1. Fire protection?
- 2. Police protection?
- 3. Schools?
- 4. Parks and other recreational facilities?
- 5. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
- 6. Other governmental services?

**O. Energy.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?
- 2. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources?

**P. Utilities.** Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- 1. Power or natural gas?
- 2. Communication systems?
- 3. Water?
- 4. Sewer or septic tanks?
- 5. Storm water drainage?
- 6. Solid waste and disposal?

**Q. Human Health.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)?
- 2. Exposure of people to potential health hazards?

**R. Aesthetics.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

**S. Recreation.** Will the proposal result in:

- 1. An impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities?

CALENDAR PAGE	561	ix
MINUTE PAGE	2287	

**T. Cultural Resources.**

Yes Maybe No

- 1. Will the proposal result in the alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archeological site?
- 2. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?
- 3. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?
- 4. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

**U. Mandatory Findings of Significance.**

- 1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- 2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?
- 3. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?
- 4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

**III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (See Comments Attached)**

**IV. PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Date: 2 / 27 / 89

*John J. Subashante*  
 For the State Lands Commission  
 562  
 2288  
 MINUTE PAGE

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

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

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


(702) 588-4547

PROJECT TYPE Pier Expansion with Boat Lift APN 16-051-51  
PERMITTEE(S) Emile Labadie  
COUNTY/LOCATION El Dorado County, 8227 Kehlet

Having made the findings required by Agency ordinances and rules, TRPA approved the project on October 24, 1988, subject to the standard conditions of approval attached hereto (Attachment S) and the special conditions on the back of this permit.

This permit shall expire on October 24, 1991 without further notice unless the construction has commenced prior to this date and diligently pursued thereafter. Commencement of construction consists of pouring concrete for a foundation and does not include grading, installation of utilities or landscaping. Diligent pursuit is defined as completion of the project within the approved construction schedule. The expiration date shall not be extended unless the project is determined by TRPA to be the subject of legal action which delayed or rendered impossible the diligent pursuit of the permit.

NO CONSTRUCTION OR GRADING SHALL COMMENCE UNTIL THE PERMITTEE OBTAINS A COUNTY/CITY BUILDING PERMIT. THE COUNTY/CITY PERMIT AND THE TRPA PERMIT ARE INDEPENDENT OF EACH OTHER AND MAY HAVE DIFFERENT EXPIRATION DATES AND RULES REGARDING EXTENSIONS. NO CONSTRUCTION OR GRADING SHALL COMMENCE UNTIL ALL PRE-CONSTRUCTION CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL ARE SATISFIED AS EVIDENCED BY TRPA'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ON THE BACK OF THIS PERMIT. IN ADDITION, NO CONSTRUCTION OR GRADING SHALL COMMENCE UNTIL TRPA RECEIVES A COPY OF THIS PERMIT UPON WHICH THE PERMITTEE(S) HAS ACKNOWLEDGED RECEIPT OF THE PERMIT AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONTENTS OF THE PERMIT AND A TRPA PRE-GRADING INSPECTION HAS BEEN CONDUCTED. TRPA'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IS NECESSARY TO OBTAIN A COUNTY BUILDING PERMIT.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TRPA Executive Director/Designee

10-25-88  
Date

PERMITTEE'S ACCEPTANCE: I have read the permit and the conditions of approval and understand and accept them. I also understand that I am responsible for compliance with all the conditions of the permit and am responsible for my agents' and employees' compliance with the permit conditions. I also understand that if the property is sold, I remain liable for the permit conditions until or unless the new owner acknowledges the transfer of the permit and notifies TRPA in writing of such acceptance.

Signature of Permittee(s) Emile Labadie Date \_\_\_\_\_

PERMIT CONTINUED ON BACK

CALENDAR PAGE	<u>563</u>
MINUTE PAGE	<u>2289</u>

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ENGINEER

APN 16-142-27 and 28

RECEIVED 2008  
COUNTY ENGINEER

Excess Coverage Mitigation Fee: Amount \*\* \_\_\_\_\_ Paid \_\_\_\_\_ Receipt No. \_\_\_\_\_

Water Quality Mitigation Fee: Amount \$7,090 Paid \_\_\_\_\_ Receipt No. \_\_\_\_\_

Security Posted: Amount \$750 Posted \_\_\_\_\_ Receipt No. \_\_\_\_\_

Required plans determined to be in conformance with approval: Date \_\_\_\_\_

TRPA ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The applicant has complied with all pre-construction conditions of approval as of this date and is eligible for a county building permit:

\_\_\_\_\_  
TRPA Executive Director/Designee Date

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. The site plan shall be revised to show:
  - a. Infiltration trench sized 12" x 12" and filled with 3/4" to 1 1/2" drainrock, for paved drive at drainage points (see enclosed plan section).
  - b. Infiltration trench sized 12" x 8" for cantilevered single family dwelling addition.
  - c. Revegetation of the area where concrete patio is to be removed.
  - d. Identify and list new coverage for single family dwelling addition.
  - e. Coverage removed in the amount of 208 square feet.
  - f. Identify and list new coverage for single family dwelling addition.
2. Submit a plan detail (side profile) of proposed boat lift with dimensions and height of lift relative to pier deck.
3. The security required under Standard Condition A.3 of Attachment S shall be \$750. Please see Attachment J, Security Procedures.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

CALENDAR PAGE	564
MINUTE PAGE	2290

SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)

APN 16-051-51

4. The applicant shall mitigate excess land coverage on this property in a manner consistent with Chapter 20 of the Code. This condition may be satisfied by the submittal of an excess coverage mitigation fee calculated in the following manner.

Cost of Project x 0.05 (TRPA Reduction Factor) x Excess Coverage Percentage.

The excess coverage percentage equals the existing land coverage percentage minus (42%) the allowable coverage percentage (1%). The project cost estimate shall be the same for each land capability district; and

Please provide a written cost estimate for pier expansion and building addition by your contractor, architect or engineer. In no case shall the mitigation fee be less than \$100. Also, if you choose, existing land coverage may be removed in lieu of payment of an excess land coverage mitigation fee. To calculate this land coverage reduction amount, divide the amount of the mitigation fee by \$5 per square foot. If you choose this option it will be necessary for you to revise your site plan and land coverage calculations to account for the coverage removal.

5. The adequacy of all required BMPs as shown on the final construction plans shall be confirmed at the time of the TRPA pre-grading inspection. Any required modifications, as determined by TRPA, shall be incorporated into the project permit at that time.
6. This approval is based on the permittee's representation that all plans and information contained in the subject application are true and correct. Should any information or representation submitted in connection with the project application be incorrect or untrue, TRPA may rescind this approval, or take other appropriate action.
7. The use of wood preservatives on wood in contact with the water is prohibited and extreme care shall be taken to insure that wood preservatives are not introduced into Lake Tahoe. Spray painting and the use of tributyltin is prohibited.
8. Disturbance of the lake bed materials shall be kept to the minimum necessary for project construction.
9. Best practical control technology shall be employed to prevent earthen materials to be resuspended as a result of pier construction and from being transported to adjacent lake waters. The applicant shall install a turbidity screen around the entire construction site (in the water) prior to construction. This screen may be removed upon project completion only upon a satisfactory inspection by TRPA to insure that all suspended materials have settled.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

CALENDAR PAGE	565
MINUTE PAGE	2291