

MINUTE ITEM
This Calendar Item No. C05
was approved as Minute Item
No. C05 by the State Lands
Commission by a vote of 2
to 0 at its 9/27/90
meeting.

CALENDAR ITEM

C 0 5

A 7
S 1

09/27/90
W 1124.38 PRC 7459
J. Ludlow

RECREATIONAL PIER PERMIT

APPLICANT: James T. English and Sarah Jean English
P. O. Box 483
Kentfield, California 94904

AREA, TYPE LAND AND LOCATION: A parcel of submerged land located in Lake
Tahoe at Moana Beach, Placer County.

LAND USE: Retention, reconstruction, and a 22-foot
extension to an existing pier including the
installation of a low level boatlift and the
retention of two mooring buoys.

TERMS OF PROPOSED PERMIT:

Initial period: Five years beginning
September '7, 1990.

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 and processing costs have been
received.

CALENDAR PAGE 6
MINUTE PAGE 2142

CALENDAR ITEM NO. **C 0 5** (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: 01/26/91.

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 491, State Clearinghouse No. 89091114. 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. 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.
3. The Department of Fish and Game has determined that the shorezone at this location is unsuitable habitat for Tahoe Yellow Cress (*Rorippa*) and has issued, pursuant to consultation under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), a letter of "no jeopardy" for the proposed project.
4. The property was physically inspected by staff for purposes of evaluating the impact of the proposed activity on the public trust.

5. In order to determine the other potential trust uses in the area of the proposed project, the staff contacted representatives of the following agencies: TRPA, 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.
6. All permits issued at Lake Tahoe include special language in which the permittee/lessee agrees to protect and replace or restore, if required, the habitat of *Rorippa subumbellata*, commonly called the Tahoe Yellow Cress, a State-listed endangered plant species.
7. If any structure hereby 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 this lease is automatically terminated, effective upon notice by the State, and the site shall be cleared pursuant to the terms thereof. If the location, size, or number of any structure hereby authorized is to be altered, pursuant to order of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Lessee shall request the consent of State to make such alteration.
8. The Applicants have been notified that the public has a right to pass along the shoreline and the permittee must provide a reasonable means for public passage along the shorezone area occupied by the permitted structure.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 005 (CONT'D)

APPROVALS OBTAINED:

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Department of Fish and Game, and Placer County.

FURTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED:

United States Army Corps of Engineers.

EXHIBITS:

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

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. CERTIFY THAT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION, EIR ND 491, STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 89091114, 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 JAMES T. ENGLISH AND SARAH JEAN ENGLISH OF A FIVE-YEAR RECREATIONAL PIER PERMIT, BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 27, 1990 FOR THE RETENTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND A 22-FOOT EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING PIER INCLUDING THE INSTALLATION OF A LOW LEVEL BOATLIFT AND THE RETENTION OF TWO MOORING BUOYS ON THE LAND DESCRIBED ON EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED, AND BY REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.

LAND DESCRIPTION




EXHIBIT "A"

W 1124.38




LAKE TAHOE

Prepared by Judy Ludlow
on 9/12/89



LOCATION MAP

175' TO PIER
50' TO PIER
101' TO PIER



CALENDAR NO. 69
FIGURE NO. 2446

PIER REPAIR/EXTENSION
ENGLISH PROPERTY
20 MOANA CIRCLE
TAHOMA AREA
PLACER COUNTY CA
APN 98-191-14
NOVEMBER 1988
RAYMOND VAIL AND ASSOCIATES
SACRAMENTO • SAN FRANCISCO • SAN JOSE • STOCKTON
ENGINEERING • PLANNING • ARCHITECTURE • SURVEYING

ADJOINING PROPERTIES
NORTH 98-191-16
SOUTH 98-191-18

REVISED
3/89

NO 7125.321




EXHIBIT "B"
W1124.38D



70
2447

EXHIBIT "C"
W 1124.38



PLACER COUNTY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

JACK WARREN, Director
JAN WITTER, Assistant Director
LARRY ODDO, Deputy Director
ALAN ROY, Deputy Director

OPERATING DIVISIONS:
Administration
Engineering
Equipment Maintenance
Road Maintenance
Special Districts
Surveying
Transportation

March 3, 1989

Judy Ludlow
California State Lands Commission
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814


RE: PIER - SHOREZONE CONSTRUCTION

The County of Placer has reviewed the below referenced requests for construction activities within the Shorezone of Lake Tahoe. We have no objection to the construction activities described in the below applications contingent upon approval by your office.

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|------------|
| 1. | E.S. Bertagnolli | PRC 3209.9 |
| 2. | Charlotte and Robert Angell | W 24144 |
| 3. | Sweet/Avanessian | PRC 5022 |
| 4. | Wickland | PRC 3599 |
| 5. | Lyons/Hawkins | WP 5884 |
| 6. | Mein - 83-162-28 | PRC 6714 |
| 7. | Mein - 83-162-31 | W 24134 |
| 8. | McFarland | PRC 3659 |
| 9. | Gibb | WP 3652 |
| 10. | Crabtree | W 21445 |
| 11. | English | W 1124.38 |
| 12. | Wallis | PRC 4314 |
| 13. | Metas | W 24103 |
| 14. | Barrow | PRC 7167.9 |
| 15. | Nahas | PRC 4066 |
| 16. | Hicks | W 21665 |

Should you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance, please call at your convenience.

COUNTY OF PLACER
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
JACK WARREN, DIRECTOR


JAMES MCLEOD
ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER

JH:rs

CALENDAR PAGE 71
MINUTE PAGE 2448

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Governor

STATE LANDS COMMISSION

LEO T. MCCARTHY, Lieutenant Governor
 GRAY DAVIS, Controller
 JESSE R. HUFF, Director of Finance

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
 1807 - 13th Street
 Sacramento, CA 958
 CHARLES WARREN
 Executive Officer

AMENDED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

EIR ND: 491

File Ref: W 112438

SCH. NO.: 89091114

Project Title: English Pier Reconstruction/Extension

Project Proponent: James T. English

Project Location: Lake Tahoe, Placer County adjacent to APN: 98-191-17, 36 Moana Circle

Project Description: Pier reconstruction/extension and installation of one low-level boatlift. The project also involves the permitting of the pier and two mooring buoys which are currently unauthorized

Contact Person: Judy Brown Telephone: (916) 324-4715

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:

that project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

mitigation measures included in the project will avoid potentially significant effects.

FORM 13.17 (4/90)

CALENDAR PAGE	72
MINUTE PAGE	249

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST - PART II

Form 13.20 (7/82)

File Ref.: W 1124.38

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Applicant: James T. English
P.O. Box 483
Kentfield, CA 94909

B. Checklist Date: 07 / 27 / 90

C. Contact Person: Judy Brown
Telephone: (916) 324-4715

D. Purpose: To bring under permit, an existing unauthorized pier and two mooring buoys. The project will also involve some modifications to the existing pier.

E. Location: In Lake Tahoe adjacent to Moana Circle - McKinney Bay northwesterly of Tahoma, Placer County.

F. Description: Pier reconstruction, extension and installation of one low level boatlift. The project also involves the permitting of the pier and two mooring buoys which are currently unauthorized.

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

Table with 3 columns: Question, Yes, Maybe, No. Contains 7 rows of environmental impact questions regarding earth conditions, soil, erosion, and hazards.

CALENDAR PAGE 173
MINUTE PAGE 2450

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?

CALENDAR PAGE 74
 MINUTE PAGE 2450.1

- 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Possible interference with emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- K. Population.** Will the proposal result in:
- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The alteration, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- L. Housing.** Will the proposal result in:
- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Affecting existing housing, or create a demand for additional housing? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- M. Transportation/Circulation.** Will the proposal result in:
- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Affecting existing parking facilities, or create a demand for new parking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Alterations to waterborne, rail, or air traffic? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Parks and other recreational facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Other governmental services? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- O. Energy.** Will the proposal result in:
- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- P. Utilities.** Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Power or natural gas? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Communication systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Sewer or septic tanks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Storm water drainage? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Solid waste and disposal? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- Q. Human Health.** Will the proposal result in:
- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard (excluding mental health)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Exposure of people to potential health hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
- S. Recreation.** Will the proposal result in:
- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. An impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

CALENDAR PAGE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MINUTE PAGE	2450		

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Will the proposal result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does the proposal have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Will the proposal restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (See Comments Attached)

(SEE ATTACHED COMMENTS)

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: 7 / 27 / 90

For the State Lands Commission
MINUTE PAGE 2450
 CALIFORNIA JUDY BROWN 70

III. DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION - W 1124.36 - ENGLISH

- C5. There could be a slight rise in the turbidity level during pile driving, however caissons or sleeves will be used to avoid or minimize turbidity-related impacts to water.
- E4. TRPA fish habitat maps indicate that this project is in a fish spawning/habitat restoration area and has the potential of adversely affecting spawning grounds. TRPA has concluded that this activity will not cause a significant impact to this habitat. If disturbed shoreline/lakebottom sediments are found due to the construction activity associated with the removal and installation of this project, the affected areas will be hand rolled and/or rock cobble hand placed to reconsolidate the shoreline sediments.
- F1. A temporary rise in the ambient noise levels may occur during construction which will be of short-term duration.
- R1. This proposal seeks to bring under permit an existing pier and two mooring buoys, an extension to the existing pier and the addition of a boatlift.

The applicant has obtained a TRPA permit which specifies visual requirements for piers.

There are many piers located in this segment of shoreline, and the addition of this pier and buoys will not significantly change the existing aesthetics of this area.



In the report, Cumulative Impacts of Shorezone Development at Lake Tahoe, by Phillips, Brandt, Reddick, McDonald and Grefe, public responses to visual aspects of shorezone development and use considered a grouping of seven boats closely spaced to be a "visual dislike". Therefore, this proposal does not constitute a significant effect.

- S1. The nearest waterward structures to this pier is a pier located 50 feet to the north, and another pier located 175 feet to the south.




The buoys of this proposal are located approximately 155 feet from the shoreline, and one of the buoys will be approximately 50 feet from the end of the pier once extended. The second buoy is spaced 50 feet south of the first buoy. (See attached exhibit)

There are many piers in this shorezone segment, and the authorization of this pier and buoys will not change the existing pattern of topline trolling.

CALENDAR PAGE	77
MINUTE PAGE	2450



175' TO PIER
80' TO PIER
10' TO PIER



CALENDAR PAGE 78
MINUTE PAGE 2150.5

PIER REPAIR/EXTENSION
ENGLISH PROPERTY
26 MOANA CIRCLE
TAHOMA AREA
PLACER COUNTY, CA
APN 98-191-14
NOVEMBER 1998

RA
RAYMOND VAIL AND ASSOCIATES
ENGINEERING • PLANNING • ARCHITECTURE • SURVEYING

NO 7125.321

ADJOINING PROPERTIES
NORTH 98-191-16
SOUTH 98-191-18

REVISED
4/90

Memorandum

Mr. Charles Warren, Executive Officer
State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-9990

Date: July 13, 1990

Attention: Dan Cohen, Environmental Coordinator

From: Department of Fish and Game - Region 2

Subject: English Pier Improvement and Boatlift Project, Placer County

RECEIVED
JUL 16 1990

STATE LANDS COMMISSION

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) has reviewed the request from the State Lands Commission for informal consultation pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act to determine if the proposed English Pier Improvement and Boatlift Project APN 98-191-17 would jeopardize the Tahoe yellow cress (Rorippa subumbellata). The Tahoe yellow cress is a State-listed Endangered species and a Federal Candidate species that is found only on granitic sandy beach and sandy cobblestone habitats on the shores of Lake Tahoe. Pier construction and maintenance activities may seriously impact existing populations and habitat for this species.

If potential or existing habitat exists on the project site, the DFG must make a determination of jeopardy until such time as the Rorippa Habitat Management Plan has been completed and has identified appropriate mitigation measures which will offset adverse impacts to Rorippa. The English Project consists of reconstruction of the existing open piling pier, extension of the pier and installation of a boatlift. The project site substrata consists of sand, cobbles and gravel lakeward of the mean high water level elevation (6,229.1 feet). The bank is marked by a ca. 3-foot rock retaining wall. The DFG has determined that the English Property does not maintain habitat present to support populations of Rorippa. If formally requested, the DFG would issue a determination of jeopardy for this project.

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Ms. Sherry Teresa, Associate Wildlife Biologist, or Mr. Jerry Mensch, Environmental Services Supervisor, telephone (916) 355-7030.

J. Mensch
James D. Messersmith
Regional Manager

CALENDAR PAGE	79
MINUTE PAGE	2450

Copy forwarded to: D. Cohen
UK, TES, RA, JR

Memorandum

EXHIBIT "E"
W 1124.38

To : Mr. Charles Warren, Executive Officer
State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-9900

Date : July 13, 1990

Attention Dan Cohen, Environmental Coordinator

From : Department of Fish and Game - Region 2

Subject : ~~English~~ Pier Improvement and Boatlift Project, Placer CountyRECEIVED
JUL 16 1990
STATE LANDS COMMISSION

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) has reviewed the request from the State Lands Commission for informal consultation pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act to determine if the proposed English Pier Improvement and Boatlift Project APN 98-191-17 would jeopardize the Tahoe yellow cress (Rorippa subumbellata). The Tahoe yellow cress is a State-listed Endangered species and a Federal Candidate species that is found only on granitic sandy beach and sandy cobblestone habitats on the shores of Lake Tahoe. Pier construction and maintenance activities may seriously impact existing populations and habitat for this species.

If potential or existing habitat exists on the project site, the DFG must make a determination of jeopardy until such time as the Rorippa Habitat Management Plan has been completed and has identified appropriate mitigation measures which will offset adverse impacts to Rorippa. The English Project consists of reconstruction of the existing open piling pier, extension of the pier and installation of a boatlift. The project site substrata consists of sand, cobbles and gravel lake and of the mean high water level elevation (6,229.1 feet). The bank is marked by a ca. 3-foot rock retaining wall. The DFG has determined that the English Property does not maintain habitat present to support populations of Rorippa. If formally requested, the DFG would issue a determination of ~~no~~ jeopardy for this project.

If we can be of further assistance, please contact Ms. Sherry Teresa, Associate Wildlife Biologist, or Mr. Jerry Mensch, Environmental Services Supervisor, telephone (916) 355-7030.

J. Mensch
James D. Mensch-Smith
Regional Manager

CALENDAR PAGE	80
MINUTE PAGE	2450

copy forwarded to: D. A. ...
LK, DAS, RA, FR