



## Shoreline Workshop Series #1

Sept. 21, 2016 | North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach CA

### Summary Notes

---

#### Overview

On Sept. 21, 2016, over 60 community members gathered at the North Tahoe Event Center in Kings Beach to learn about the Lake Tahoe Shoreline Plan and participate in the project by providing ideas, comments, and questions at breakout sessions that focused on the following five policy topic areas:

1. Boating
2. Low Lake Level Adaptation
3. Access Issues
4. Marinas
5. Piers

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency hosted the meeting and Freshtracks Communications, a Truckee-based outreach firm, provided facilitation ([www.freshtracks.org](http://www.freshtracks.org)).

Following is a summary of the ideas, comments and questions captured at the table discussions at the Sept. 21 workshop. Please note that participants shared many ideas, and the team from Freshtracks did their best to record the comments as written down by table hosts.

#### Meeting Format

The two-hour meeting included a 30-minute overview presentation (posted on [www.shorelineplan.org](http://www.shorelineplan.org)) followed by table breakout discussions on the five policy topic areas. A table facilitator hosted participants in small group discussions and recorded ideas from the three, approximately 20-minute, table discussions with various stakeholders. Participants circulated among different topical areas, contributing on a variety of tables. In short, hundreds of ideas were captured and organized in the following notes.

#### How TRPA will Consider Feedback

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Governing Board will make the final decisions on the Shoreline Plan. The TRPA staff will use participant feedback to inform the planning process over the next few months. Additionally, questions and comments



will help improve communications moving forward. Summary notes from this and future workshops will be posted on the project website: [www.shorelineplan.org](http://www.shorelineplan.org).

## **Organization of Summary Notes**

- I. Key Themes (pages 2-5)
- II. Questions Collected Per Theme Area (pages 5-6)
- III. All Notes — Recorded Notes Captured (pages 7-21)

## **I. Key Themes**

---

### **1. Policy Topic: Boating**

- Strong support for providing public access and boater safety
- Hope expressed for opportunity to put in new buoys
- Strong support for enforcement on illegal buoys
- Enhance enforcement. Consolidate to one agency
- Urge streamlined permitting, agency coordination
- Public access is important; consider improving ramps and dredging to improve access
- Would like to see opportunity for new and shared buoys
- Create a master plan that provides logic and order for placement
- Customize buoy line based on topography/depth
- Remove abandoned weights
- Buoys aren't very safe; encourage use of marinas
- Scenic: suggest grouping and limiting buoy field views
- Provide access and increase storage for non-motorized sports
- Increase boater education for both motorized and non-motorized users to improve safety
- Involve Coast Guard in safety and navigation
- Consider effect on non-motorized recreation and the water trail when extending piers
- Support floating piers for low lake levels
- Address noise pollution
- Aquatic invasive species a huge concern
- Consider working toward a buoyed 1,200 foot no-wake zone



## 2. Policy Topic: Low Lake Level Adaptation

- Address number and placement of buoys
- Consider shared buoys
- Allow for buoy relocations due to low lake levels
- Streamline buoy permitting process
- Better enforcement of buoys

### Low lake levels impact lake access

- Increased demand and increased user conflicts
- Consider moving rocks on the beach to improve access
- Educate the public, improve signage

### Customize approach and streamline process for pier extensions for low lake levels

- No one size fits all
- Rules and regulations need to be upgraded to reflect current conditions
- Allow temporary extensions/structures
- Consider shared piers
- Consider impacts to navigation (lake bottom topography) and scenery
- Consider cost and time of permitting/streamline the process
- Customize pier designs and lengths based on site specifics
- Coordination between agencies (part of streamlined process)

### Dredging as a solution to low lake level issues

- Providing public access is really important: support improving ramps and dredging to provide access.
- May need to allow for new dredging in response to low lake levels, especially for public health and safety concerns
- Better off extending piers, than dredging because of concerns.
- There is a need for a simplified process for dredging, both new and maintenance dredging.
- Dredging helps access, but presents affordability and funding problems, and needs to be done regularly.
- Streamline the process to allow for new technology that can mitigate negative impacts from dredging and piling

### Environmental impacts

- Protect drinking water quality
- Protect fish habitat and water quality



- Identify critical impact zones; create buffers from water intakes/utilize signage to mark intakes
- Consider scenic impacts

Develop new navigation system

- Provide six-foot clearance under boats
- Reconsider definition of safe navigation

Consider noise and pollution from boats

- Consider banning direct injection two-stroke engines
- Consider noise compliance testing

### **3. Policy Topic: Access Issues**

Address shortage of access points and different user types for each

- Make sure public doesn't access through private property; user conflicts
- Need more public access points/piers
- Separate access areas by motorized/non-motorized

Address stewardship and enforcement

- Trash and pet waste are problems; include amenities at access points (restrooms, trash cans, signage)
- Consider larger, concentrated public access points (such as marinas suggestion) instead of lots of small, scattered access points
- More access leads to more people and more impacts
- Define partnership roles for maintenance and enforcement among agencies (better coordination among agencies)
- Create specific, enforceable public trust terms, rules and regulations

Transit and parking at access points

- Prioritize access areas with public transit routes
- Need better parking at access points
- Improve wayfinding signage for parking and public access

### **4. Policy Topic: Marinas**

Streamline the master plan process and process for upgrading marina infrastructure and technology

- Streamline the process to allow for new technology that can mitigate negative impacts from dredging and piling



Concentrate use at marinas to where it already exists

- Part of low lake level adaptation
- Consider ramps and boat lifts
- Marinas act as visitor centers

Aquatic invasive species need to be addressed

- Concern about drinking water protection and Tahoe Keys weeds management; UV light as a possible alternative

### **5. Policy Topic: Piers**

- Main areas of concern: plant growth, scenic, permitting process, public access, floating vs. solid piers
- Look more into floating piers
- Consider "blue docks" (environmentally friendly)
- Pier mitigation fees should benefit plant/invasive species treatment
- Use piers to connect water trail and water taxis
- Sense of urgency: Streamline permitting processes for piers, buoys, wrap up planning phase of shoreline plan and begin implementing

## **II. Questions Collected at the Meeting**

---

### **Questions re: Buoys**

- How many buoys is the Shoreline Plan going to allow?
- When will the 2016 Buoy Survey be available?
- What are the impacts of moving a buoy anchor on fisheries and water quality?
- Will TRPA mandate buoy placement?
- What is the enforcement of buoy fields?
- Who manages buoys? What is the role of Army Corps of Engineers?
- How do we determine if our buoys are legal? When will Homewood's buoys be permitted?

### **Questions re: Marinas**

- Why was the Meeks Bay Marina closed?
- What are the benefits of marina master plans?
- Does/will dry storage be considered in the shorezone policy? What about other marina-related land operations?



### **Questions re: Piers**

- How far is too far to extend a pier?
- Why can't we extend piers? What are the impacts to scenic and navigation?
- Who makes a determination regarding if a dock's scenic value (i.e. if it considered ugly)? What can be done to change that designation or those opinions?
- Re: floating extensions for community piers - what's needed and what's possible?
- What does the science tell us about how piers impact plant growth (floating vs. solid, level of UV light penetration)?
- Re: permitting process for piers and public access, what is currently allowed?
- What is the distinction between public and private and how does it impact piers?
- What is the maximum number of piers that would be allowed and how many potential piers can be built?

### **Questions re: Overall Plan**

- Is the new plan going to be a minor update to the old plan?
- Who makes the final decision - stakeholders or board?
- Why do we need to do anything? Why do we need a plan? Are we starting from scratch? Are we reinventing the wheel or building upon previous research?
- When will we implement the research/studies?
- How much has the science changed since 1990s studies?
- Increased lake temps impact plant growth - does receding lake impact temperatures?

### **Questions re: Access**

- What are the logistics of state vs. other public access?
- What do you do about boat ramps?
- What are the issues with access? Please clarify - is it: 1. Not enough places to access lake (but 45 percent of shoreline is public) or 2. not enough parking, signage and other means to facilitate people being able to use the existing public access?
- What can public trust access be used for? Please clarify.
- What about capacity (re: access)? How do we know when enough is enough?

### **Questions re: Boating**

- How many boats go on the lake? How to manage demand?



### III. All Notes Collected

---

#### **Table Topic: Boating**

Brief Summary: Strong support for providing public access and boater safety. Hope expressed for opportunity to put in new buoys. Strong support exists for enforcement on illegal buoys. Clarity on buoy legality, fee / application status also a request. Urge streamlined permitting, agency coordination.

#### **Public Access**

- Providing public access is really important: support improving ramps and dredging to provide access.
- Launch facilities are limited, making it hard to get on the lake without a buoy.
- Parking limits ability to use ramps – need places to park trailers.

#### **Capacity and Demand**

- How many boats go on the lake?
- How to manage demand?

#### **Buoys**

- Many participants representing homeowners association in the workshop would like to see opportunity for new buoys.
- The buoy line doesn't work in steep environments / where lakebed drops off dramatically.
- Buoy placement in coves is difficult.
- Share buoys like shared piers. Many buoy anchors are empty; creating a system to share would expand access without necessarily increasing the number of buoys.
- Landowner interests (especially within homeowners associations) to come together and share buoy fields.
- Cost of buoys is of interest (not necessarily a concern).
- Will TRPA mandate buoy placement? (Does not mandate right now)
- Create a master plan that provides logic and order for placement.
- Address parking congestion for owners trying to access buoys.
- Buoys are not that safe; boats can capsize. Suggest using marinas, expanding boat storage, which would also decrease pollutants associated with capsized boats.



- Urge removal of abandoned weights.

### **Scenic and Buoys**

- Suggest grouping buoys for view shed.
- Kings Beach resident would like to limit views of buoy fields.

### **Enforcement**

- What is the enforcement for buoy fields?
- Frustration with the number of buoys popping up in front of public lands.

### **Suggested Solutions**

- There need to be rules! Rules need to be enforced.
- Enforcement would be best done by one agency.
- If TRPA is charging for buoys, then it needs to provide enforcement.
- Lack of compliance in front of public lands and impacts on view shed are a problem, and enforcement is needed.
- People take advantage so enforcement is needed.
- Stand up paddle boards and kayaks need more rules and boater education for safety.

### **Multiple Agencies**

- Who manages buoys is unclear.
- Having all the permitting agencies are on the same page.
- Prefer that one agency do enforcement.
- What is the role of the Army Corps of Engineers.

### **Buoy Permits + Fees (and 2008)**

- Most Homewood homeowners applied for permits in 2008, including paying the application fee, but there was a moratorium on our buoy permits. Most are recognized by State Lands.
- Would like TRPA to recognize these permits or return the application fees.
- Multiple fees required – to different agencies.

### **Non-Motorized Sports**

- Provide access for non-motorized sports
- Increase public storage for non-motorized boats
- Speed of motorboats can create safety concerns
- Boater education and safety is important: Kayakers and paddle boarders can be difficult to see.
- Flags and lights are important for non-motorized boaters.
- Participant would not support the use of lights on non-motorized boats because of scenic issues.
- Coast Guard should be involved in safety and navigation.

### **Pier Extensions**

- Unsure about pier extensions.



- Must consider non-motorized boating and effect on water trail.

### **Temporary Floating Structures**

- Support floating piers for low lake levels
- Good alternative when you can't build a pier
- Substantial anchoring is required to have a temporary floating structure.

### **Pollution**

- Love the woodies, but the sound carries and creates noise pollution.
- Recommend address noise pollution associated with boating by limiting times that these boats can operate.

### **Sea Planes**

- Sea planes are on the water are treated as boats.

### **AIS**

- Repeatedly mentioned as a huge concern.
- Tahoe Keys contributes significantly to this problem.

### **Questions**

- We don't know if our buoys are legal. How do we determine if they are?
- When will Homewood's buoys be permitted?

## **Table Topic: Low Lake Level Adaptation**

### **Buoys**

- What about sharing buoys? Allow buoys to be leased by multiple people. ½ are empty most of the year.
- We should allow for buoy relocations due to low lake levels.
- NV State Lands only charges \$30 for a lease. TRPA was charging close to \$1,000 for a buoy permit under the old regulations. TRPA was charging too much (TRPA response: This was done to help pay for enforcement).
- Need better enforcement of buoys.
- We need to clean up the buoy fields. There are too many buoys.
- How many buoys are we going to allow?
- When will the 2016 Buoy Survey be available?

### **Access**

- Low lake levels impact access.
- There is going to be increased demand.
- There are user conflicts.
- We should consider moving rocks on the beach (specifically in Kings Beach) to enhance access.
- We need to allow for people to temporarily move their buoys when lake levels drop.



- We need to educate the public about the impacts of moving rocks on the shoreline.
- Should we allow for a second anchor to be dropped for buoys and allow people to move their buoy floats to a second anchor (farther out in the lake) when lake levels drop? Only one buoy float could be use at a time.
- Two buoy anchors and floats are already allowed.
- We should allow people to move their anchors when lake levels drop. This would be easier. What are the impacts of moving an anchor? Fisheries or Water Quality?
- We need a streamlined buoy permitting process.
- We need a water taxi.
- As a result of low lake levels below 6,223, there is now public access on the NV side of the lake.
- There is user conflict between commercial uses (concessionaires) and public access. Commercial operators put their equipment in the public access easement and claim that it is theirs and not available to the public.
- We need signage showing public access.
- What do you think about working toward a buoyed 1,200 foot no-wake zone?
- Why was Meeks Bay Marina closed? This is the best marina.
- Meeks Bay Marina needs to be paved. It is a good location for a public pier. There are environmental constraints because of the stream.

## **Piers**

- We should allow temporary pier extensions, such as floating piers.
- Floating piers only work in some areas.
- Temporary structures can be installed with pilings or blocks.
- Allow for barges, such as the one off the Tahoe Gal pier.
- Temporary structures only work in some areas.
- Provide opportunities for shared public piers to promote access.
- Allow for longer piers to provide access during low lake levels.
- How far is too far to extend a pier?
- Pier design/length needs to be determined on a site-specific basis.
- Take into consideration impacts to navigation from longer piers.
- Tried to install a \$4,000 lift off of a pier to adapt to low lake levels, but was told it would take over \$20,000 and one to two years to get a permit. The cost and permitting time are preventing low lake level adaptation.



- The Timber Cove Pier is 1,000 feet long and the end is only in three feet of water.
- Why can't we extend piers? What are the impacts to scenic and navigation?

### **Ramps**

- We need alternative/new public boat ramps that are accessible when the lake is low.

### **Dredging**

- We may need to allow for dredging when lake levels are low.
- We should allow new dredging for public health and safety and at marinas.

### **Streamlining**

- We need to develop a streamlined permitting process that allows people to quickly adapt to low lake levels. The current process takes too long because there are too many agencies requiring too many permits. The different agencies have different regulations and requirements, which sometimes conflict. It is also very expensive to get all the required permits.
- Marinas want a streamlined permitting process.
- The buoy permitting process needs to get streamlined.

### **Environmental Impacts**

- We need to protect fish habitat and water quality.
- We need to consider scenic impacts.
- Who makes a determination regarding if a dock is ugly?
- We need to consider nearshore threshold impacts.
- Tahoe Yellow Cress likes low lake levels.
- We need to identify critical impact zones.
- We need a buffer from water intakes up to 1,320 feet (currently 600 feet). Water purveyors need to be noticed when a shoreline structure is proposed within 1,320 feet.

### **Navigation**

- We need to provide six feet of clearance under boats.
- The U.S. Coast Guard has removed navigation safety buoys because they are too expensive.
- We need to develop a new navigation system for Lake Tahoe.
- We need to reconsider the definition of safe navigation.

### **Boating**

- How about banning direct injection two-stroke engines given that they are 10x more polluting than four-stroke engines?



- How about mandatory noise compliance testing on all marine engines 500 mph and over as these are primarily ocean racing type cigarette boats and tend to be the noisiest on the lake?

### Process

- Is the new plan going to be a minor or major update to the old plan? In other words, are you asking for our feedback but at the end of the day you will keep the plan mostly the same?
- Who makes the final decision? Stakeholders or Board?

### Table Topic: Low Lake Level Adaptation

#### Public Comments Group 1:

- Include impacts of Shoreline Plan on: Drinking water quality & awareness of intake locations as lake levels drop (keep people from dropping an anchor on these, etc.)
  - Bacteria contamination from increase in people and closer proximity to intakes
- Truckee River Operating Agreement- Truckee and Pyramid are empty, which is unfortunate. Tahoe should be #1 priority.
- Mandates regarding piers and water releases haven't changed in 30, 50 years, but these old rules don't reflect current conditions.
- If you create the rules and regulations, you need to ensure you can enforce them; otherwise we have illegal buoys, etc. Some people follow law, some don't.
- Old standards don't fit; reexamine water & lake level policies.
- Suggested Solutions:
  - Old assumptions about water levels no longer fit current reality
    - Lake level storage requirements & policy
  - Hire attorney
  - Coordination is necessary to satisfy the needs of all parties. Leave politics out and work together across agencies.

#### Group 2:

- Some of Group 1's concerns not part of TRPA's jurisdiction.
- How do you add floating piers without any where to attach them
- Don't take the one size fits all approach
  - Lake bottom topography varies in different parts of the lake.
    - KB- shallow shelves
    - Hurricane Bay- steep drop off
    - Approach these areas differently
- Dredging is bad, yet getting people out on the lake is a priority.



- There needs to be a match or grant for agencies that increase public access. Focus low lake adaptation efforts on public. Identify options with least impact and greatest benefit.
- PUDs should clearly mark their intakes.
- Streamlined Permitting process for all shorezone structures
- Definition of shorezone structure needs to be reexamined.
- Suggested Solutions
  - Streamline needs to be faster
    - Redefine Shorezone structure- fast track this process and don't let documents sit, address right away.
  - Recognize that structures that are regulated due to habitats (ex, piers) need to be reexamined when those habits move as lake levels drop.

#### Group 3:

- Dredging leads to algae: creates a low spot/ponds that fill with algae, then when lake levels rise this floods back into Tahoe.
- Better off extending piers than dredging.
- Floating extensions for community piers
  - What's needed and is it possible?
  - State vs. other public access, what are the logistics?
  - Avoid dredging
  - Streamline this process
- What do you do about boat ramps?
  - Basically putting everyone through marinas.
  - When there are people on the lake (which there will be) we need to make sure emergency response has access & fast response time.
  - How can they have better access to Tahoe?
    - Might need to relocate Coast Guard
    - No one size fits all solution
- Emerging Themes/ Potential Solutions
  - 3 takeaways:
    - Streamlining Permitting
    - Coordination between agencies- work smarter not harder
    - No 1 size fits all solution for any of these issues.

#### **Table Topic: Access**

- Need more public access, more public piers
- Access areas should be split for motorized boats/access, non-motorized boats/access
- Not enough places to access the lake



- Need to prioritize access areas with public transit routes
- Need more and better parking, but access sites should also be served by bike lanes, transit. Transit needs to be free, frequent, easy
- Parking limits don't necessarily limit numbers of people on beaches
- Transit: How to carry things like bikes and kayaks? Possibly with trailers behind buses with racks for those items and outdoor seating for passengers
- State parks, Forest Service need to do a better job of tracking visitation to identify usage
- Need better parking at access areas. Lot unused public land because of lack of parking.
- No good way-finding signage for parking and public access. Need more public information, maps, and education about where access and parking are available
- Need to balance needs for signage with scenic protections (not too many signs)
- Many access areas have no facilities, leads to problems with trash, pet waste, urination, etc.
- Access areas should include facilities for restrooms and trash, and it has to include defined partnership for maintenance roles among public agencies
- Pets are an issue at access areas
- Enforcement of laws, rules, regulations is needed with access
- Smaller, scattered access areas can be problematic. Need bigger, better public access areas, but who pays for them and their maintenance
- Look at Emerald Bay – more access leads to more people and more impacts
- Public access trust – differences between CA and NV should be worked out so they are same throughout the basin
- People are using public properties to access the beach and then going onto private property, creates trash, pet waste, and nuisance issues, as well as enforcement issues in areas that are hard for law enforcement to access
- Parking is a problem. Speedboat beach, people are parking on side of narrow roads, limits emergency responders' ability to get to areas and creates safety issues
- Dredging helps access; but affordability and funding problems, and needs to be done regularly
- Recognize that marine contractors need access to and from lake
- Need better stewardship at access sites and parking lots
- User conflicts between commercial and private owners
- Home lakefront owners want access—lakefront owners resist access because the public leaves a mess ... and park blocking driveways. There is a basic



conflict. Only tons of money will solve this – i.e. people to clean up the public trust and lots of parking areas.

- Public trust terms and rules and regulations need to be iron clad. There needs to be actual meaning not vague terms to be enforceable.
- Trash! Need cultural and environmental stewardship education to visitors and agency action to “clean up”
- Need to clarify issue: is the issue 1. Not enough places to access lake (but 45 percent of shoreline is public) or; 2. Not enough parking, signage and other means to facilitate people being able to use the existing public access.
- Need to make it clear what the public trust access can be used for (e.g., only for walking along the lake, or build piers, boardwalks, or allow structures built above for kayak renters, snack shacks, etc.)
- Any access “improvement” that directly impacts “stakeholders” (county, state, parks, forest service, private property owners etc.) must be a consensus solution – where the stakeholders are those directly impacted, not those who “have an interest” in the issue.
- What about capacity? How do we know when enough is enough? Public access with no facilities, facilities for water trail
- Public use requires public services, restrooms, trash pick up and receptacles, policing. Dogs are a problem
- No fertilizer along lake – no in basin. If you want an English garden please move to England

### **Table Topic: Marinas**

#### **Master Plan Guidelines**

- What are the benefits of marina master plans?
- Reconsider what triggers an EIS (i.e. additional slips)
- Utilize more incentives
- If marinas can upgrade/operate in ways that demonstrate flexibility in adapting to fluctuating water levels they should not be required to do a master plan

#### **Marinas in the Context of Public Access**

- When water levels are low, public access is difficult at the North Shore so perhaps marinas that don't have ramps should be able to have a ramp. The rationale behind this is to concentrate the boating population where it naturally exists anyway

#### **Shorezone Strategy**



- Concentrate boats to existing marinas (also part of low lake level adaptation)
- Focus on redevelopment of the built environment (marinas), similar to the impetus behind Area Plans
- Holistic strategy = consider geography, boating concentrations, activity nodes, population, traffic/circulation, air quality, and parking
- Traffic and air quality impacts of the existing boating patterns, how can we use marinas to address these impacts
- Allow marinas to utilize non-contiguous parking and shared parking or other alternative parking strategies
- Scenic = Don't evaluate marinas the same as upland development or the same as the natural environment because they are industrial in nature

#### **Questions/Considerations**

- Does/will dry storage be considered in the shorezone policy? What about other marina-related land operations?
- Marinas are often the home of invasive species (i.e. Tahoe Keys)
- Marina adaptation to low lake levels
- There is a need for additional fueling stations in the northeast quadrant of the lake
- Fueling station located on a barge? Fueling station at Sand Harbor?
- Consider allowing commercial seaplane operations in marinas
- Look at alternative boat slip designs where boats can be lifted so water levels don't matter as much and more boats can be concentrated in one location

#### **Table Topic: Marinas**

- New regulations need to allow for the use of improved technology in marinas and a streamlined process for allowing improved technology. Piling and dredging creates negative impacts that can be mitigated with new technology.
- Marina operators should be able to upgrade existing structures to solve environmental issues. There is a need for a simplified process for dredging, both new and maintenance dredging.
- Aquatic invasive species in the Tahoe Keys lagoons and marina need to be addressed. Concern among water providers and the public about the



potential, proposed use of herbicide to control aquatic invasive species in the Keys. Ultraviolet light is a possible alternative.

- Marinas act as visitor centers and an increase in boating should be concentrated at marinas.
- Boating habits, like appropriate emptying of bilge water, is more of a concern among some than the marinas themselves.
- Pier headline should be site-specific.
- Policies need to protect drinking water infrastructure.

### **Table Topic: Piers**

#### **Pierhead line**

- Is arbitrary
- Limiting
- Should be site specific
- The line is based on outdated reality
- We should take “ombudsman approach” (to regulating piers)
- Need a real definition
- The existing pier headline is 10’ wide to scale
- Forget pierhead line-use bottom elevation as criteria.
- Need new pierhead line that allows safe depth for boat access (sailboats) during low water conditions

#### **Fish Habitat Mapping**

- There is no scientific basis for limiting pier construction based on impacts to fish habitat
- Fish love piers
- We need an NDOW or California Fish and Wildlife based fish study

#### **Pier Design**

- Design should work with topography
- Should be flexibility in design
- Pier design should be site specific
- Cat walk is not allowed -should be in certain places
- TRPA should stay on top of engineers
- Allow movement of boulders for better pier construction

#### **Floating piers**

- Hard to get permits for floating piers
- Should allow combined stationary/floating pier
- Should allow floating piers that adjust to water levels
- Float the piers if possible



- Allow floating piers in certain areas

### **Sharing facilities**

- Should be provision to attach a pier to an existing neighbor's pier
- Should be able to share a state lease (buoys)
- Learn to share private piers
- Develop incentives for neighbor to consolidate multiple smaller piers to larger multi-use piers
- Should be shared buoys and shared piers

### **Public Access**

- We need more public piers
- Prioritize public piers
- Provide an educational experience at the piers
- Make the public piers really, really long
- Should be a moratorium on private piers until more public piers are built
- Allow public access marinas to be expanded without strict scenic standards
- Allow private piers to take pressure off public facilities
- Will the Shoreline Plan include allowed public uses for private piers with public access? Also, the pier owner should have the ability to determine appropriate use within a range of options.

### **Misc. Piers**

- Need clarity on the maximum number of piers that would be allowed, how many potential piers can be built on the lake?
- We should expedite the permitting process for piers
- Existing moratorium needs to be lifted
- We should not allow any more piers

### **Scenic**

- The definition should be expanded
- Definition of scenic is arbitrary

### **Table Topic: Piers**

#### **Overview / Themes**

- More information was desired about the planning process and purpose and whether or not the plan was building upon existing research or starting fresh
- Eager for implementation

#### **The main areas of concern were:**

#### **Plant growth**

- What does the science tell us? How do piers impact plant growth (floating vs. solid, level of UV light penetration, etc.)
- How much has the science changed?



## **Scenic**

- Who determines scenic value or detracting of piers?
- What can be done to change that designation or those opinions? (Perception is that piers detract from scenic but some think they add)
- Action item requested: Revamp scenic evaluation; currently too restrictive

## **Permitting process and public access**

- Would like more public access piers
- Would like streamlined process for repairing public piers and for modifications and extensions to piers for low lake level adaptation
- What is currently allowed?

## **Floating vs. solid piers**

- Address the design of piers: which is better (floating or solid) for fish, plant growth, water quality, and low lake level adaptation?
- Consider specific materials that discourage plant growth, etc.
- More information was desired about the planning process and purpose and whether or not the plan was building upon existing research or starting
- Eager for implementation

## **Shoreline Plan / General Comments Captured**

- Why do we need to do anything?
- Why do we need a plan?
- Hourglass: we're at the top of the funnel, but if you put another funnel upside down you get an hourglass; TRPA has been through this process before and when they get to the bottom of the funnel, they turn it over and start the process all over again.
- Are we starting from scratch?
- Are we reinventing the wheel or building upon previous research from the 1990s?
- When will we *implement* the research / studies?
- How much has the science changed since 1990s studies?
- More studies need to be done
- Inadequate funding for invasive species research
- UNR does most of the studies; what about UC Davis?
- Create a public pier plan

## **Concerns**

### **Scenic issues**

- Who has determined piers are unsightly? TRPA staff
- How do we change opinions, such as that piers are unsightly?
- Revamp "scenic evaluation" criterion; currently too restrictive

### **Fish**



- Fish habitat - already has been addressed

### **Plants**

- Do plants prefer to grow on piers or rocks?
- UV light impacts plant growth; perhaps use transparent decking or lights to allow UV light/not block UV light to keep plant growth down

### **Floating vs. solid piers**

- Do solid piers encourage the growth of plants / invasives?
- Plans to put floating piers in parks; could be used by floating taxis (electric boats)
- \*Look more at floating piers
- Are floating piers allowed to be built now? TRPA answer: yes, for extensions
- Seems like there is less visual impact with floating piers
- Why not use "blue docks" (a kind of floating pier that uses environmentally friendly standards)
- Pier mitigation fees should benefit plant/invasive species treatment because current funding is inadequate

### **Permitting**

- What about extension of piers?
- High cost to get through TRPA permitting / rigorous permitting process
- Streamline the permit process to repair public piers; there is a decrease in public access when piers deteriorate
- Streamline extension of piers and new construction processes because of low lake levels. Currently cost prohibitive.
- Many existing piers are not usable and cost prohibitive to become usable
- Ease of pier modification to deal with low water

### **Access**

- Lack of public access on the West Shore; all private docks except one; creates bottlenecks because it is the only access point
- Using piers to connect the Water Trail; public access

### **Relocating piers**

- What about being able to trade or transfer piers?
- What about shared buoys, like shared docks?
- Does receding lake impact temperatures? Increased temps impact plant growth

### **Other Comments and Questions**

- What is the distinction between public and private and how does it impact piers?
- TRPA projection lines don't agree with State Lands projection lines - why not? Those lines need to be better defined for the purpose they serve which is to



ensure all surrounding lakefront owner have equitable distribution of the lake area in front of their properties.