

MINUTE ITEM

This Calendar Item No. 20
was approved as Minute Item
No. 20 by the State Lands
Commission by a vote of 3
to 0 at its 08/30/89
meeting.

CALENDAR ITEM

A 7
S 1

20

08/30/89
W 1124.207 PRC 7330
J. Ludlow

APPROVAL OF A FIVE-YEAR RECREATIONAL PIER PERMIT

APPLICANT: Jean R. Minasian, Paul Minasian, Malcolm
Minasian and Regina Minasian Ambrose
20211 Patio Drive, Suite 215
Castro Valley, California 94546

AREA, TYPE LAND AND LOCATION:
A submerged parcel of land in Lake Tahoe at
Carnelian Bay, Placer County.

LAND USE: Reconstruction and thirty-five-foot extension
of an existing pier, including the addition of
a low-level boat lift.

TERMS OF PROPOSED PERMIT:
Initial period: Five years beginning
August 30, 1989.

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

BASIS FOR CONSIDERATION:
Pursuant to 2 Cal. Code Regs. 2003.

APPLICANT STATUS:
Applicant is owner of upland.

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

(ADDED pgs. 260-260.17)

CALENDAR PAGE	260
MINUTE PAGE	2873

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 20 (CONT'D)

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: 01/23/90.

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 456, State Clearinghouse No. 89021301. 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. The existing rock crib pier is located landward of the 6,223-foot low water mark and, therefore, outside the State's leasing jurisdiction. The extension will continue waterward of the low water mark onto the State's land. The existing rock cribbing will be removed and replaced with steel pilings.
3. The Department of Fish and Game, Endangered Species Office, has determined that the portion of the project located within the shorezone will not significantly impact the *Rorippa subumbellata* or its habitat. This determination is attached as Exhibit "E".
4. The reconstruction and extension of the existing pier will be done from a barge with pile driver. All construction wastes will be collected onto the barge and disposed of at the nearest dumpster/sanitary landfill site.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 20 (CONT'D)

5. Materials will be neither stored nor placed above the low water line of the subject property. This procedure will prevent any disturbance to what may be considered Tahoe Yellow Cress (Rorippa) habitat.
6. 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 Placer, 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 20 (CONT'D)

APPROVALS OBTAINED:

Placer County, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Department of Fish and Games, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, and United States Army Corps of Engineers (GPO16).

FURTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED:



None.

EXHIBITS:

- A. Land Description.
- B. Location Map.
- C. Placer County Letter of Approval.
- D. Negative Declaration.
- E. Determination of No Jeopardy/Department of Fish and Game.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:


1. CERTIFY THAT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION, EIR ND 456, STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 89021301, 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 JEAN R. MINASIAN, ET AL OF A FIVE-YEAR RECREATIONAL PIER PERMIT, BEGINNING AUGUST 30, 1989; FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION AND 35-FOOT EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING PIER AND ADDITION OF A LOW-LEVEL BOAT LIFT ON THE LAND DESCRIBED ON EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED AND BY REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.



NOTES:

Proposed extension does not exceed TRPA headline or 6219 elevation.

All existing wood piles to be replaced with steel pilings. Size to be determined by pier contractor. 2 x 6 decking to be replaced as needed.



PROPOSED PIER REPAIR

Purpose: Private Recreational Use

Owner: Ken Ambrose
5826 North Lake Blvd.
A.P.N. 115-020-11

Placer County
Sheet 1 of 1

May, 1988
Job No. 88112

ADJOINING PROPERTIES:
WEST 115-020-12
EAST 115-020-10

Prepared on 8/1/88 by Sandy LeBlond

MINUTE PAGE 2577




EXHIBIT "b"
W 1124.207



EXHIBIT "C"

Date August 1, 1989

File Ref: W 1124.207

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

Subject: Building Permit for Pier (Pier reconstruction and extensior

Name: Jean R. Minasian, etal

Address c/o Kenneth Ambrose

20211 Patio Drive, Suite 215

Castro Valley, CA 94546 :

Placer County Assessor's Parcel No. 115-020-11

Upland Address: 5826 North Lake Boulevard

Dear Ms. Ludlow:

The County of Placer 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) ~~823-4670~~ ⁸⁸⁹⁻⁷⁵⁸⁴

Sincerely,

Erick L. Erickson

ERICK ERICKSON
Associate Civil Engineer

RECEIVED
AUG 3 1989

CALENDAR PAGE 260
DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS
MINUTE PAGE

STATE LANDS COMMISSION
1807 13TH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

EXHIBIT "D"PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

EIR ND 456

File Ref.: W 1124.207

SCH#: 89021301

Project Title: Ambrose Pier Repair/Extension

Project Proponent: Ken Ambrose

Project Location: Lake Tahoe, at Carnelian Bay, adjacent to 5826 N. Lake Blvd., Oak Creek subdivision, Placer County

Project Description: Reconstruction of 50-foot private, recreational pier; replacement of wooden pilings with steel pilings; extension of pier (35' x 6.7') with a catwalk (32' x 3'); removal of 2 existing boat hoists and installation of a low-level boat lift; and removal of a 7' x 8' rock crib.

Contact Person: Dan Cohen Telephone: (916) 324-8497

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 Administrative Code), and the State Lands Commission regulations (Section 2901 et seq., Title 2, California Administrative Code).

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	260	7
MINUTE PAGE	2930	

Form 13.17 (2/88)

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

Ken Ambrose

20211 Patio Drive, Suite 215

Castro Valley, CA 94546

(415) 537-0486

b. Contact person if other than applicant:

Leah Kaufman/K.B. Foster Civil Eng.

P.O. Box 146

Carnelian Bay, CA 95711

(916) 546-3381

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

Carnelian Bay, Placer County

5286 Northlake Boulevard

b. Assessor's parcel number: Placer County APN 115-020-11

3. Existing zoning of project site: Tr-1/LDR

4. Existing land use of project site: Single Family Dwelling

5. Proposed use of site: Single Family Dwelling

6. Other permits required: TRPA, Lahontan, Army Corps, Fish & Game

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 260⁸
MINUTE PAGE 238ⁱ

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: 2/6/89

Signed: [Signature] for K. Brubaker

PROJECT DESCRIPTION



The applicant is proposing to add 35 feet to an existing rock crib and wood piling pier that is in poor condition. The pier is located in Carnelian Bay, California off Highway 28. The existing rock cribbing will be removed and replaced with steel pilings as shown on the accompanying drawing. Currently the pier does not extend into State Lands jurisdiction or exceed the 6223 elevation so is non-functional when the water is low. The proposed extension would not exceed the TRPA pier headline or the 6219 elevation. (in this area the pier headline and the 6219 elevation are approximately the same)

The lot is approximately 14,000 sf (one third acre) and is fairly level (0-5% slope). Near the lake the property slopes down at approximately 20% from an existing retaining wall to rock cobble slope protection on the shore. The beach is composed of small rocks, cobbles, and small boulders. Soils are stable and vegetation is minimal in this area. The property adjacent to the residence is landscaped with native shrubs and white fir and jeffrey pine trees ranging in size from 8" to 38". Animal life is primarily small rodents due to the proximity of the highway and development in the area. The neighboring residences are all single family dwellings that exhibit the same terrain and land features as described above.

Approvals from all regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over this project have been obtained.

CALENDAR PAGE	260.10
MINUTE PAGE	288.3

INDUSTRIAL
ENGINEERING, INC.



NOTES:

Proposed extension does not exceed TRPA headline or 6219 elevation.

All existing wood piles to be replaced with steel pilings. Size to be determined by pier contractor. 2 x 6 decking to be replaced as needed.

PROPOSED PIER REPAIR


Purpose: Private Recreational Use

Owner: Ken Ambrose
 5826 North Lake Blvd.
 A.P.N. 115-020-11

Placer County
 Sheet 1 of 1

May, 1988
 Job No. 88112

ADJOINING PROPERTIES:
 WEST 115-020-12
 EAST 115-020-10



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST - PART II

Form 13.20 (7/82)

File Ref.: W 1124.207

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Applicant: Ken Ambrose
c/o K.B. Foster Engineering Inc. (Attn: Leah Kaufman)
P.O. Box 146
Carnelian Bay, CA 95711

B. Checklist Date: 1 / 30 / 89

C. Contact Person: Dan Cohen
Telephone: (916) 324-8497

D. Purpose: Recreational Use

E. Location: Lake Tahoe at Carnelian Bay, adjacent to 5826 N. Lake Blvd.
Oak Creek Subdivision, Placer County

F. Description: Reconstruction of 50' private recreational pier; replace wooden pilings with steel pilings; extension of pier (35' x 6.7') with a catwalk (32' x 3'); removal of 2 existing boat hoists and installation of a low-level boat lift; and removal of a 7' x 8' rock crib.

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

- A. Earth. Will the proposal result in:
1. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures?
2. Disruptions, displacements, compaction, or overcovering of the soil?
3. Change in topography or ground surface relief features?
4. The destruction, covering, or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?
5. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?
6. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of the ocean or any bay, inlet, or lake?
7. Exposure of all people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?

260-12
2335 X
CALIFORNIA STATE
MINUTE PAGE

B. Air. Will the proposal result in:

Yes Maybe No

- 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:

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 260.14
MINUTE PAGE 2537

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)

E.4. Project appears to be located in area designated by the Department of Fish and Game as "prime fish habitat". However, it is not anticipated that this activity will have a significant effect upon this habitat.

F.1. An increase in noise levels associated with project construction will be minimal and short-term.

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: 1 / 30 / 89



DAN COHEN

For the State Lands Commission
 COUNTY PAGE 260.15
 COUNTY PAGE 2898
 Form 1-20 (7-82)

STATE LANDS COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, California 95814CLAIRE T. DEDRICK
Executive OfficerJO T. McCARTHY, Lieutenant Governor
GRAY DAVIS, Controller
JESSE R. HUFF, Director of FinanceFile Ref.: W 1124.207
February 8, 1989NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW
OF A
PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
(SECTION 15073 CAC)

A Proposed Negative Declaration has been 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 Administrative Code), and the State Lands Commission regulations (Section 2901 et seq., Title 2, California Administrative Code), for a project currently being processed by the staff of the State Lands Commission.

The document is attached for your review. Comments should be addressed to the State Lands Commission office shown above, with attention to the undersigned. All comments must be received by March 9, 1989.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please call (916) 324-8497.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dan Cohen".

DAN COHEN
Environmental Specialist
Division of Research
and PlanningDC:ma
Attachment

2568S

OPENING PAGE	260.16
CLOSING PAGE	2899

Memorandum

EXHIBIT "E"

To : Mr. Dwight Sanders, Chief
Division of Research and Planning
State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Date : August 14, 1989
W 1124.207

From : Department of Fish and Game

Subject : Pier Reconstruction/Extension - Ambrose Property at Lake Tahoe,
Placer County, APN 115-020-11

The California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) has received a request from the staff of the State Lands Commission (SLC) to issue a finding concerning impacts to Tahoe yellow cress (Rorippa subumbellata) from beach development on the shores of Lake Tahoe. Tahoe yellow cress is a State-listed endangered species that is only found on sandy beach habitats around the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. Pier construction and maintenance activities could seriously impact existing plant populations and habitat for this species.

The subject parcel, the Ambrose property, has an existing dock in need of replacement. The shoreline in the project area is rock strewn above the minimum lake level of 6,223 feet. Due to the presence of boulders and rocks the habitat appears unsuitable for yellow cress. DFG has, therefore, determined that this reconstruction and extension of the Ambrose property pier is not expected to impact Tahoe yellow cress or its habitat.

Other DFG concerns related to water quality and fishery resources have been adequately addressed in a Streambed Alteration Agreement, Notification II-22 89, which has already been executed.

If you have any further questions, please contact either Mr. David Showers, Associate Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Services Division, telephone (916) 322-5655 or Mr. Jerry Mensch, Environmental Services Supervisor, Region 2, telephone (916) 355-7030.


Pete Bontadelli
Director

SEARCHED	INDEXED
SERIALIZED	FILED
AUG 14 1989	
FBI - SACRAMENTO	
260.17	
2599	