

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE TAHOE  
and SIERRA CLUB,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING  
AGENCY,

Defendant.

NO. CIV. S-08-2828 LKK/GGH

O R D E R

\_\_\_\_\_ /  
The above-captioned case is an action brought by the Sierra Club and the League to Save Lake Tahoe, challenging the decision of the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency ("TRPA"), to amend the "Regional Plan" so as to permit the development of piers, buoys, boat ramps and boat slips within "Lake Tahoe's Shorezone." The complaint alleges that this development will increase the discharge of pollutants into Lake Tahoe, threatening its famed clarity, in violation of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact ("Compact"), the rules governing TRPA's actions, state environmental law and federal environmental law.

1           The court is in receipt of the plaintiffs' notice that the  
2 above-captioned case is related to Sierra Club v. TRPA, 2:12-cv-44-  
3 WBS-CKD, brought by the Sierra Club and Friends of the West Shore  
4 against TRPA and Placer County entities. That case challenges the  
5 decision of TRPA to amend the Tahoe Regional Plan so as to permit  
6 the expansion of Homewood Mountain Resort from 25,000 square feet  
7 to over 1 million square feet, and the decision of the Placer  
8 County defendants to adopt a plan to permit this expansion. The  
9 complaint alleges that this expansion will bring new homes, cars,  
10 tourist accommodations, and bulky structures to the area, thus  
11 polluting the air and water, and threatening the area's famed calm,  
12 rustic and scenic character, all in violation of the Compact, the  
13 rules governing TRPA's actions, and state environmental law.

14           Plaintiff's Notice of Related Cases highlights the common  
15 parties and the laws common to both cases, and the fact that both  
16 cases involve amendments to the Regional Plan.

17           TRPA, and the Real Parties in Interest in the 2:12-cv-44 case,  
18 oppose the Notice of Related Cases. Defendants highlight the non-  
19 common parties, the different laws involved, and the fact that the  
20 cases involve different development plans and different amendments  
21 to the Regional Plan.

22           After review of the cases, the court concludes that the above  
23 captioned case, 2:08-cv-2828-LKK-GGH, is not related to 2:12-cv-  
24 44-WBS-CKD within the meaning of E.D. Cal. R. 123(a), and the court  
25 therefore **DECLINES** to relate them.

26       ////

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 30, 2012.



LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
SENIOR JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT