



## Shoreline Plan

### November 3, 2016 Community Forum #2

#### Raw Notes

#### Prepared by Freshtracks Communications

---

##### 1. Policy Topic: Boating

- Safety concerns were the primary topic of discussion during all three sessions
  - Safety education and enforcement are needed for both motorized and non-motorized boaters. Everyone (visitors' authorities, marinas, public agencies, etc.) should be responsible for educating public, especially visitors
    - There should be an easy handout to give to boaters with all rules/safety info
    - Who is responsible for enforcing the 600-foot no-wake zone?
    - More enforcement of the no-wake zone is needed.
    - No-wake zone expansion should be considered.
    - There is a need to identify no-wake zone on the water.
    - Boaters need clarification on safe distances to other vessels.
    - Maybe something could be developed like the Avalanche Center's daily advisories for boating
    - Many people are unaware of inherent dangers of boating at Lake Tahoe.
  - We need to make the non-motorized experience more enjoyable.
    - Separate types of boats uses with a time/location policy
    - Noise rules need to be enforced, and education presented to visitors every week due to visitor turnover
    - Speed of boats needs to be reduced
    - Non-motorized boaters are difficult to see. There should be regulations for how to traverse buoy fields
    - Extend and enforce no-wake zones. Have motorboat-free days to promote non-motorized boating in Lake Tahoe.
    - Maybe a smartphone app could be developed for navigation, rather than something like signs or buoys, to improve scenic threshold.



- Streamlining shoreline processes also received significant discussion:
  - Agencies need to give up their own entitlement to streamline the process.
  - People don't know how or where to get a permit.
  - Rules need to be streamlined so a consultant isn't needed to follow them.
- Also discussed:
  - TRPA should designate buoy fields as anchorage to resolve NDOW buoy light issue.
  - Funding will be critical for all Shoreline work.
  - We need a buoy ID system that works. Stickers do not work.
  - Low lake levels will continue to be an issue.
  - Climate Change and low lake levels will make it so dredging will need to be considered.
  - People with direct knowledge of boating need to be working on the Shoreline Plan.
  - Closure of Cave Rock boat ramp left some boats stranded on the lake.
  - Prioritize human-powered, non-polluting boats.
  - Disallow motorboats in areas with high concentrations of AIS.

## **2. Policy Topic: Low Lake Level Adaptation**

- Streamline permitting
  - So you don't have to go through five agencies – make one agency the lead
- Safety Impact
  - First responders are big issue
  - For example--SLT police boat is in the Tahoe Keys.
- Local Businesses Impacts
  - Water outlet to Truckee River problem for river rafting business
  - Having docks and piers long enough is important to businesses and to tourists.
  - Need to change the culture in the basin – development that is good for the environment should be approved.
  - Combine permanent piers with floating pier to get to a lower scenic impact and provide benefits to lakeside businesses.



- Allow restaurant at the end of a piers – increases access but could decrease scenic value.
- Environmental
  - Prepare for next 20 years with the Shoreline Plan and low lake level impacts that will come from climate change trends.
  - Today: Low lake level = pools = warm water = invasive species, higher environmental impact
  - Today: Low water access means boats are going to other lakes, potentially bringing back invasive species to Tahoe.
  - Today: Nearshore water quality is looking scary – ski run, Keys,
  - Create walkways in mudflats, infrastructure for when the lake is lower.
  - Today: Incline/Sand Harbor pushing boats with a tractor.
  - Shown floating piers can take a beating in wind/weather.
  - If dredging is needed create a standard depth for marinas. Streamline the process
  - Need environmentally sound temporary pier extensions: not based on number of years or low levels, based on projections and circumstances
  - What are long-term environmental impacts of dredging?
    - Dredging deeper one time vs multiple times shallower?
- Recreation
  - Need greater flexibility in relocating buoy fields for low lake levels.
  - People don't want to/can't get on the lake. Piers are the only way they can get on the lake.
  - Low lake = lots of beach, which is a positive.
  - Long piers make paddlers have to go a long way out.
  - Shoaling effect in buoy fields
  - Eliminate personal motorized boats.
  - Approved solutions: temporary ramps, channel access, perm vs temp, phased solutions, extreme solutions
  - Look at how reservoir lakes deal with it.
  - Kings Beach general plan calls for a 1,000 foot pier far enough to always have access

### 3. Policy Topic: Access Issues

- Private



- Privately owned lake access that is open to the public is not accurately characterized in this planning process—on the Info Sheet.
- Protect private property rights.
  - Create an association of non-lakefront homeowners so they have a say in access.
  - Private shorezone should not be open to the public because of impacts on neighborhood (parking), impacts on infrastructure (boating in Tahoe Keys impact on bulkheads, weeds control).
- Conflicts between public access areas and private property need to be resolved.
  - Look at California Coastal Commission and Oregon Coast for models of access – required access points in private subdivisions, etc.
  - Too much of the lake is private or has entrance fees. On the California side there are fences where there shouldn't be and private property signs where there should be no signs. Enforcement issue
- Public
  - Access points need to be safe. Areas with roadside parking and access to the lake need to have a safe way to cross roads and get down to the lake. Put steps in steep areas.
  - Motorized vs. Nonmotorized
    - Access conversation seems focused on boat access rather than people access. No voice for non-motorized access.
    - Consider non-motorized days or times of day on Lake Tahoe
    - More and better public transit options would help with parking issues in popular areas, but doesn't address bringing canoes/kayaks/stand up paddleboards, etc.
    - State parks are evaluating on-site storage of canoes/kayaks/stand up paddleboards to address the above issue, possible solution elsewhere around the lake.
    - Not enough places to launch non-motorized boats, need single ramps blocked to vehicles to wheel down boats.
    - Paddleboarders don't want to use marinas to access the lake.
  - Education/Signage
    - Better signage and education for points of public access.



- Remove all illegal barriers to public trust areas. Anything that impedes public right of way – for example, no trespassing signs on public land, fences, and other obstructions. Make it clear to the public that all land below high water mark is public. Also, who enforces these issues, who should people contact to report these obstructions and have them corrected? Below high water mark is public but is often signed as private property with no trespassing signs.
- Education is important in solving access issues and safety issues (wind, weather, water conditions). Consider red or green flags to advise people about conditions and safety issues at access points.
- The Tahoe Educational Project (One Tahoe/Exploratorium) should include educating the public about access and safety.
- No wake zone needs to be enforced as a safety zone, a trail around the lake. Needs to be more information available to public about it.
- Transportation/Parking
  - Someone should reinstate the Lake Lapper buses with trailers for bicycles and other recreation equipment for people to get to recreation areas without parking and vehicle congestion issues.
  - Transit and better biking and walking trails are all part of improving shoreline access.
  - Consider water shuttles and piers as a transit mechanism to help get people to shoreline recreation areas and reduce vehicle miles traveled.
  - Parking is a zoo. Work with hotels and businesses to help with shuttles to recreation sites. It doesn't have to be public transit.
  - Where do people with boat trailers park?
  - Lack of parking/dangerous vehicle-pedestrian interactions at Emerald Bay also negative experience for visitors.
  - Water Taxi – not enough education public information.
  - Mammoth has free buses – collaboration of ski area, town, businesses – use advertising, maps, brochures, lodging partners.
  - Increase trails and bike paths for non-motorized transit to beaches.



- Put parking meters in South Lake Tahoe to control parking – it is a small price to pay. Use that funding to pay for other lake-benefiting programs.
- It should be hard to drive to the beach, but we should have easy alternatives.
- There should be free transit all the way around the lake.
- Reduced parking on west shore means less public access. Having to walk farther along the highway from parking to access is a safety hazard with vehicle traffic.
- Caltrans and Nevada Department of Transportation need to be part of the shoreline access planning process to coordinate on their projects. Issues of them taking away roadside parking at popular lake access areas as part of road projects. Some of these road projects have made access more dangerous with steep slopes, people walking on the highway, in Hurricane Bay.
- The same goes for land managers around the basin like the U.S. Forest Service. Where are they in this?
- Enforcement Issues
  - There is no enforcement of existing laws/rules especially no-wake zones.
- Environmental Issues
  - Access is important but willing to sacrifice access for environmental protection and cutting back on numbers/traffic.
  - Willing to explore giving up some public access on south shore to address restoration, invasive species, trash, water quality.
  - Environmental impact of access – need more education, more trash cans, more volunteer cleanups.
  - Access is also an issue for people to get to popular recreation areas to clean them up.
  - People with dogs need to clean up after them. They feel picked on because they are not allowed access with their dogs.
- Concerns about capacity
  - Concerns about access capacity at shoreline recreation sites. How many people is too many? The U.S. Forest Service did a study on East Shore capacity issues for beaches in the



1990s and it should be included and considered in this planning process.

- We need a Total Maximum Daily Load program for tourists. What's the tipping point?
- The Persons at One Time (PAOT) recreation commodity system is not working and needs to be overhauled.
- Lake Tahoe Basin needs a comprehensive recreation access plan for the lake, for upland areas, and for managing parking and trash issues.
- Is capacity a pay-to-play thing for parking? Should be considered as part of transit/vehicular access to shoreline areas.
- Capacity issue is more related to parking and vehicles than it is to people, at least on the Nevada side where people park along the highway.

○ Misc.

- Differences in public trust between California and Nevada are an issue.
- U.S. Forest Service needs to be a partner in this initiative because they control access to much of the lake.
- Land management agencies lack operational plans for lake access.
- Handicap accessibility per Americans with Disabilities Act is an issue at many access points.
- Edgewood is required to provide public beach access as part of its permit with TRPA and is not doing so

4. Policy Topic: Marinas

○ Master Plan Guidelines

- We need to address how we define a marina "expansion" and reconsider what triggers the creation or modification of a marina master plan
- The marina master plan guidelines should address private and public marinas equitably
- Recognition that marinas rely on varying mechanisms including buoys, slips, and dry storage; and therefore the flexibility to adapt to those different operating mechanisms

○ Marinas in the Context of Expansion/Reconfiguration



- Flexibility, to reconfigure to adapt to low water levels as well as to implement more environmentally friendly designs, needs to be allowed
- The Agency (TRPA) needs to emphasize that marinas need to adapt to the needs of their users, which change primarily due to fluctuating water levels
- The average boat is larger than it was when the original shorezone ordinances were adopted and when the marina master plan guidelines were adopted; marinas ought to be able to expand or reconfigure to address this changing need
- Buoy fields were designed when the average boat was smaller; the buoy fields need to be redesigned to accommodate larger boats. Also, buoy fields should be allowed flexibility to reconfigure in consideration of various sizes of boats
- What role does upland storage (dry storage) play in the marina master plan guidelines? In this process? In a potential policy?
- A shoreline ordinance should clearly define dry storage and whether or not it counts as a mooring or towards the PAOT allotment
- Environmental best practices should be used as an incentive for marina expansion or reconfiguration
- How does the TRPA pierhead line affect a marina's ability to expand/modify
- Public Health & Safety Marinas should be able to expand and modify to accommodate public health and safety vessels without triggering a marina master plan
- Loss of Capacity
  - When buoys are unusable (because of low water), the marinas experience a loss of capacity, so a new ordinance should define the process and allowances for relocating existing buoys
  - Since marinas are better equipped for potential containment of spills, the focus should be on re-allocating the capacity associated with buoys towards marinas when those buoys become unusable due to low water
  - If marinas are going to absorb boating capacity that is lost elsewhere (i.e. buoy fields, whether associated with a marina or not), we need to evaluate the upland facilities associated with the marina





- Demand
  - If the shoreline policies move towards placing more restrictions on piers, the boating population should have a safe alternative which is the marinas
  - Not everyone has a lakefront home, so let's make marinas highly function by allowing for more dry storage
- Predictability in Consideration of Fluctuating Water Levels
  - From a business standpoint, marinas and the concessionaires that operate within them need some sort of predictability in the face of fluctuating lake levels and flexibility to adapt to lake levels on a yearly basis could help achieve predictability
  - Streamlined permitting processes can help with predictability
- Environmental Impacts that Need to be Addressed (environmental best practices)
  - Is this plan an appropriate place to address the problem of street drainage into marinas (participants identified this drainage as a major contributor to the increase in AIS presence)
  - A marina master plan should be contingent upon the environmental improvements employed.
  - Environmental benefits to consider as incentives include reconfigurations to tackle AIS, flexibility to employ AIS eradication measures, using marinas as control points for addressing and educating the public on marina-related environmental issues, employ a clean marina program, and improve littoral processes
  - Employ solar, wind, and power to run circulation pumps to cut down on algae growth, which could be incentivized through an appropriate mechanism
- Adaptability/Functionality
  - How can this shoreline policy manage/limit the need to go to deeper water, further out into the lake? When do we stop adapting to low water levels? How deep is too deep and how far is too far?
  - Marinas should have additional capacity to manage excess demand (due loss of use of buoy fields and piers)
  - Marina services should be portable so they can move to boats in deeper water (i.e. use floating piers/barges to deliver services)
- Dredging



- Marinas should be able to dredge deeper so that they can minimize how often dredging is needed
- Flexibility in dredging to allow for access where it's impeded due to low water but employ site specific constraints
- Access
  - ADA access→How do people get to their boats if they are disabled? ADA upgrades for marinas should be considered in employing more flexibility for marinas
  - Some marina customers have become customers due to low water, so creating more access needs to be a high priority
  - Are there alternative methods to get boats in the water that marina operators can consider?
- Maximum/Ultimate Capacity
  - Is there such a thing as "loving Lake Tahoe to death"? Should there be an ultimate, maximum capacity?

## 5. Policy Topic: Piers

- Public, Private and Multi Use Pier Definition
  - The plan and code definition should distinguish land ownership vs access from piers. The plan should recognize that some private piers are used for public access and that some publicly owned piers (State Parks for example) are not open to the public.
  - The code/plan should not give priority or preference for multi-use piers that reduce overall development, as new development of piers can improve conditions
  - Marina piers should be included in definition of multi-use piers
  - Homeowner would rather see 1 long pier than 10-12 short piers
- Public Access as Priority
  - Public access piers should be a priority
  - All public access piers should be extended
  - Piers should support water taxis
  - Consider easement to allow public access through private property
  - Handicap accessible
- Temporary Piers
  - Every property owner should be able to extend a temporary floating pier to access water



- Temporary private pier extensions should be allowed for both private and public access
- Floating Piers
  - How long is too long?
  - Have their own environmental consequences
  - Pier head should be fixed
  - Temporary versus permanent fixes
- Marina Piers
  - Allow adaptation of piers from marinas to expected lake levels
  - Move marinas out into the middle of the lake and shuttle people to their boats.
  - Marina should be private but the pier can be public.
- Environmental Impacts of Piers
  - Separate myth from reality regarding fish populations and piers
  - We need to look at impacts from piers to littoral drift
  - Some places shouldn't have piers at all, no one size fits all solution.
  - Support Dredging deeper to avoid extending piers
  - Piers open circulation of water- latest finding to support environmental goals
- Misc
  - Piers for viewing should be considered
  - The pier headline is arbitrary- it should be based on science
  - Pier extensions should be based on site specific conditions and lake levels to provide access from those locations
  - The Shoreline map should show bike trail connections to shoreline facilities
  - Homeowner's association piers of a certain number should be given priority
  - There's something missing from the language here. Is TRPA combining boat lifts and boat houses? Because these should be separate.
  - Could TRPA model permitting process off the Army Corps of engineers?
  - Parking near public piers?
- 6. Other:
  - Funding? How will all these ideas be paid for? Don't get our hopes up
  - Model after the California Coastal Commission Public Access Program (increase public access through small easement purchases).





## RAW NOTES

### Shoreline Workshop 2 Meeting Notes- Piers (R. Cremeen)

#### Public, Private and Multi Use Pier Definition

- The plan and code definition should distinguish land ownership vs access from piers. The plan should recognize that some private piers are used for public access and that some publicly owned piers (State Parks for example) are not open to the public.
- The code/plan should not give priority or preference for multi-use piers that reduce overall development, as new development of piers can improve conditions
- Marina piers should be included in definition of multi-use piers

#### Public Access as Priority

- Public access piers should be a priority
- All public access piers should be extended

#### Temporary Piers

- Every property owner should be able to extend a temporary floating pier to access water
- Temporary private pier extensions should be allowed for both private and public access

#### Marina Piers

- Allow adaptation of piers from marinas to expected lake levels

#### Environmental Impacts of Piers

- Separate myth from reality regarding fish populations and piers
- We need to look at impacts from piers to littoral drift

#### Misc

- Piers for viewing should be considered
- The pier headline is arbitrary- it should be based on science
- Pier extensions should be based on site specific conditions and lake levels to provide access from those locations
- The Shoreline map should show bike trail connections to shoreline facilities
- Homeowner's association piers of a certain number should be given priority

November 3, 2016 Shoreline Plan Workshop at TRPA

Greyson:  
ACCESS



More public access – way too much of the lake is private or has entrance fees. On the California side there are fences where there shouldn't be fences, and private property signs where there should be no signs. Enforcement issue.

Create an association of non-lakefront homeowners so they have a say in access.

Look at California Coastal Commission and Oregon Coast for models of access – required access points in private subdivisions, etc.

Reduced parking on west shore means less public access. Having to walk farther along the highway from parking to access is a safety hazard with vehicle traffic.

More and better public transit options would help with parking issues in popular areas, but doesn't address bringing canoes/kayaks/stand up paddleboards, etc.

State parks are evaluating on-site storage of canoes/kayaks/stand up paddleboards to address the above issue, possible solution elsewhere around the lake.

Not enough places to launch non-motorized boats, need single ramps blocked to vehicles to wheel down boats.

Sign in Tahoe Beach saying “public beach in 1.5 miles” when it is really all public beach, misleading.

Lack of parking/dangerous vehicle-pedestrian interactions at Emerald Bay also negative experience for visitors.

Consider non-motorized days or times of day on Lake Tahoe.

Access conversation seems focused on boat access rather than people access. No voice for non-motorized access.

Better signage and education for points of public access.

Privately owned lake access that is open to the public is not accurately characterized in this planning process.

Private shorezone should not be open to the public because of impacts on neighborhood (parking), impacts on infrastructure (boating in Tahoe Keys impact on bulkheads, weeds control).



There is no enforcement of existing laws/rules especially no-wake zones.

Increase trails and bike paths for non-motorized transit to beaches.

Access is important but willing to sacrifice access for environmental protection and cutting back on numbers/traffic.

Willing to explore giving up some public access on south shore to address restoration, invasive species, trash, water quality.

Environmental impact of access – need more education, more trash cans, more volunteer cleanups.

Put parking meters in South Lake Tahoe to control parking – it is a small price to pay. Use that funding to pay for other lake-benefiting programs.

It should be hard to drive to the beach, but we should have easy alternatives.

There should be free transit all the way around the lake.

Water Taxi – not enough education public information.

Mammoth has free buses – collaboration of ski area, town, businesses – use advertisement, maps, brochures, lodging partners.

Better public education and public transportation will go a long way in solving access issues.

ACCESS table:

Concerns about access capacity at shoreline recreation sites. How many people is too many? The U.S. Forest Service did a study on East Shore capacity issues for beaches in the 1990s and it should be included and considered in this planning process.

We need a Total Maximum Daily Load program for tourists. What's the tipping point?

The Persons at One Time (PAOT) recreation commodity system is not working and needs to be overhauled.

Lake Tahoe Basin needs a comprehensive recreation access plan for the lake, for upland areas, and for managing parking and trash issues.



Is capacity a pay-to-play thing for parking? Should be considered as part of transit/vehicular access to shoreline areas.

Capacity issue is more related to parking and vehicles than it is to people, at least on the Nevada side where people park along the highway.

Access is also an issue for people to get to popular recreation areas to clean them up.

People with dogs need to clean up after them. They feel picked on because they are not allowed access with their dogs.

Caltrans and Nevada Department of Transportation need to be part of the shoreline access planning process to coordinate on their projects. Issues of them taking away roadside parking at popular lake access areas as part of road projects. Some of these road projects have made access more dangerous with steep slopes, people walking on the highway, in Hurricane Bay.

The same goes for land managers around the basin like the U.S. Forest Service. Where are they in this?

Access points need to be safe.

Protect private property rights.

Improve wayfinding signage. It is hard for people to know where anything is currently. Let visitors know where they can go. Better wayfinding signage needed on land, on lake, and online.

Areas with roadside parking and access to the lake need to have a safe way to cross roads and get down to the lake. Put steps in steep areas.

Someone should reinstate the Lake Lapper buses with trailers for bicycles and other recreation equipment for people to get to recreation areas without parking and vehicle congestion issues.

Transit and better biking and walking trails are all part of improving shoreline access.

Consider water shuttles and piers as a transit mechanism to help get people to shoreline recreation areas and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

Parking is a zoo. Work with hotels and businesses to help with shuttles to recreation sites. It doesn't have to be public transit.

Where do people with boat trailers park?

Remove all illegal barriers to public trust areas. Anything that impedes public right of way – for example, no trespassing signs on public land, fences, and other obstructions. Make it clear to the public that all land below high water mark is public. Also, who enforces these issues, who should people contact to report these obstructions and have them corrected? Below high water mark is public but is often signed as private property with no trespassing signs.

Conflicts between public access areas and private property need to be resolved.





Differences in public trust between California and Nevada are an issue.

No wake zone needs to be enforced as a safety zone, a trail around the lake. Needs to be more information available to public about it. Is a safety issue.

U.S. Forest Service needs to be a partner in this initiative because they control access to much of the lake.

Land management agencies lack operational plans for lake access.

Handicap accessibility per Americans with Disabilities Act is an issue at many access points.

There is a lack of adequate parking.

Paddleboarders don't want to use marinas to access the lake.

Education is important in solving access issues and safety issues (wind, weather, water conditions). Consider red or green flags to advise people about conditions and safety issues at access points.

The Tahoe Educational Project (One Tahoe/Exploratorium) should include educating the public about access and safety.

### **Shoreline Workshop Notes – 11/3/16**

**Table Host:** Tiffany Good

**Table Topic:** Marinas

#### **Master Plan Guidelines**

- We need to address how we define a marina “expansion” and reconsider what triggers the creation or modification of a marina master plan
- The marina master plan guidelines should address private and public marinas equitably
- Recognition that marinas rely on varying mechanisms including buoys, slips, and dry storage; and therefore the flexibility to adapt to those different operating mechanisms

#### **Marinas in the Context of Expansion/Reconfiguration**

- Flexibility, to reconfigure to adapt to low water levels as well as to implement more environmentally friendly designs, needs to be allowed
- The Agency (TRPA) needs to emphasize that marinas need to adapt to the needs of their users, which change primarily due to fluctuating water levels



- The average boat is larger than it was when the original shorezone ordinances were adopted and when the marina master plan guidelines were adopted; marinas ought to be able to expand or reconfigure to address this changing need
- Buoy fields were designed when the average boat was smaller; the buoy fields need to be redesigned to accommodate larger boats. Also, buoy fields should be allowed flexibility to reconfigure in consideration of various sizes of boats
- What role does upland storage (dry storage) play in the marina master plan guidelines? In this process? In a potential policy?
- A shoreline ordinance should clearly define dry storage and whether or not it counts as a mooring or towards the PAOT allotment
- Environmental best practices should be used as an incentive for marina expansion or reconfiguration
- How does the TRPA pierhead line affect a marina's ability to expand/modify
- **Public Health & Safety** Marinas should be able to expand and modify to accommodate public health and safety vessels without triggering a marina master plan

#### **Loss of Capacity**

- When buoys are unusable (because of low water), the marinas experience a loss of capacity, so a new ordinance should define the process and allowances for relocating existing buoys
- Since marinas are better equipped for potential containment of spills, the focus should be on re-allocating the capacity associated with buoys towards marinas when those buoys become unusable due to low water
- If marinas are going to absorb boating capacity that is lost elsewhere (i.e. buoy fields, whether associated with a marina or not), we need to evaluate the upland facilities associated with the marina

#### **Demand**

- If the shoreline policies move towards placing more restrictions on piers, the boating population should have a safe alternative which is the marinas
- Not everyone has a lakefront home, so let's make marinas highly function by allowing for more dry storage

#### **Predictability in Consideration of Fluctuating Water Levels**

- From a business standpoint, marinas and the concessionaires that operate within them need some sort of predictability in the face of fluctuating lake levels and flexibility to adapt to lake levels on a yearly basis could help achieve predictability
- Streamlined permitting processes can help with predictability
-



### **Environmental Impacts that Need to be Addressed (environmental best practices)**

- Is this plan an appropriate place to address the problem of street drainage into marinas (participants identified this drainage as a major contributor to the increase in AIS presence)
- A marina master plan should be contingent upon the environmental improvements employed.
- Environmental benefits to consider as incentives include reconfigurations to tackle AIS, flexibility to employ AIS eradication measures, using marinas as control points for addressing and educating the public on marina-related environmental issues, employ a clean marina program, and improve littoral processes
- Employ solar, wind, and power to run circulation pumps to cut down on algae growth, which could be incentivized through an appropriate mechanism

### **Adaptability/Functionality**

- How can this shoreline policy manage/limit the need to go to deeper water, further out into the lake? When do we stop adapting to low water levels? How deep is too deep and how far is too far?
- Marinas should have additional capacity to manage excess demand (due loss of use of buoy fields and piers)
- Marina services should be portable so they can move to boats in deeper water (i.e. use floating piers/barges to deliver services)

### **Dredging**

- Marinas should be able to dredge deeper so that they can minimize how often dredging is needed
- Flexibility in dredging to allow for access where it's impeded due to low water but employ site specific constraints

### **Access**

- ADA access 7 How do people get to their boats if they are disabled? ADA upgrades for marinas should be considered in employing more flexibility for marinas
- Some marina customers have become customers due to low water, so creating more access needs to be a high priority
- Are there alternative methods to get boats in the water that marina operators can consider?

### **Maximum/Ultimate Capacity**

- Is there such a thing as "loving Lake Tahoe to death"? Should there be an ultimate, maximum capacity?



Greyson:

## LOW LAKE ADAPTATION

Seeing low lake level projections for the next 20 years and need to be prepared.

Temporarily extend piers for low levels.

If dredging is needed create a standard depth for marinas. Streamline the process

Need environmentally sound temporary pier extensions: not based on number of years or low levels, based on projections and circumstances.

Streamline so you don't have to go through five agencies – make one agency the lead.

Having docks and piers long enough is important to businesses and to tourists.

With development you can upgrade, without upgrading things degrade. Need to change the culture of the basin – development that is good for the environment should be approved.

What are long-term environmental impacts of dredging?

Dredging deeper one time vs multiple times shallower?

Greater flexibility in relocating buoy fields for low lake levels.

Combination permanent pier and floating pier has a lower scenic impact, low profile.

Restaurant at the end of a pier – increases access, decreases scenic value.

Kings Beach general plan 1,000 foot pier far enough to always have access

Shown floating piers can take a beating in wind/weather.

People don't want to/can't get on the lake. Piers are the only way they can get on the lake.

Low lake = lots of beach, which is a positive.

Approved solutions: temporary ramps, channel access, perm vs temp, phased solutions, extreme solutions

Look at how reservoir lakes deal with it.



Keys want to deposit dredging for beach restoration, must be tested.

Long piers make paddlers have to go a long way out.

Stormwater runoff issues = beach erosion. NDOT outflows on to beach

Lose 100s of yards of beach.

Shoaling effect in buoy fields

Erosion sand going into lake

Can't control outflow of water.

Water outlet to Truckee River problem for river rafting business

First responders area big issue. SLT police boat is in the Tahoe Keys.

Low lake level = pools = warm water = invasive species, higher environmental impact

Bad low water access means boats are going in other lakes, potentially bringing back invasive species.

Nearshore water quality is looking scary – ski run, Keys,

Create walkways in mudflats, infrastructure for when the lake is lower.

What solutions help the greater good?

Concentrated launching to reduce impact.

Incline/Sand Harbor pushing boats with tractor.

Eliminate personal motorized boats.

The lake isn't going away, but it might change how we enjoy it.

South Shore Shoreline Workshop - 11/3/16

Table subject: Boating. Table host: Adam



Safety concerns were the primary topic of discussion during all three sessions:

- Safety education and enforcement are needed for both motorized and non-motorized boaters. Everyone (visitors' authorities, marinas, public agencies, etc.) should be responsible for educating public, especially visitors.
- There should be an easy handout to give to boaters with all rules/safety info.
- Who is responsible for enforcing the 600-foot no-wake zone?
- More enforcement of the no-wake zone is needed.
- No-wake zone expansion should be considered.
- There is a need to identify no-wake zone on the water.
- Boaters need clarification on safe distances to other vessels.
- Maybe something could be developed like the Avy Center's daily advisories for boating?
- Many people are unaware of inherent dangers of boating at Lake Tahoe.
- We need to make the non-motorized experience more enjoyable.
- Separate types of boats by time/location?
- Noise rules need to be enforced, and education presented to visitors every week due to visitor turnover.
- Speed of boats needs to be reduced.
- Non-motorized boaters are difficult to see.
- There should be regulations for how to traverse buoy fields.
- Extend and enforce no-wake zones. Have motorboat-free days to promote nonmotorized boating of Lake Tahoe.
- Maybe a smart phone app could be developed for navigation, rather than something like signs or buoys, to improve scenic threshold.

Streamlining shoreline processes also received significant discussion:

- Agencies need to give up their own entitlement to streamline the process.
- People don't even know process for how to get a permit or even where to go.
- Rules need to be streamlined so a consultant isn't needed to follow them.

Also discussed:

- TRPA should designate buoy fields as anchorage to resolve NDOW buoy light issue.
- Funding will be critical for all Shoreline work.
- We need a buoy ID system that works. Stickers do not work.
- Low lake levels will continue to be an issue.
- Climate Change and low lake levels will make it so dredging will need to be considered.
- People with direct knowledge of boating need to be working on the Shoreline Plan.
- Closure of Cave Rock left some boats stranded on the lake.
- Prioritize human-powered, non-polluting boats.
- Disallow motorboats in areas with high concentrations of AIS.