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NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on ____________ September 8, 1982 ____________ at
____________ 9:00 ____________ a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Dated: ____________ August 31, 1982 ____________

By: ____________
Philip A. Overeynder
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

September 8, 1982
9:00 a.m.

NOTE:

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
   Action on Minutes of July 14, 1982
   Action on Minutes of August 11, 1982

IV PLANNING MATTERS
   A. Regional Plan Development

V REPORTS
   A. Delegation of Responsibility to APC
   B. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities
   C. 208 Status - Case-by-Case Review
   D. Public Interest Comments
   E. APC Members

VI RESOLUTIONS

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

August 31, 1982

TO: Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: July 14 and August 11, 1982 Minutes

The Minutes of July 14, 1982 with corrections, and the Minutes of August 11, 1982 are enclosed for your action at the September 8 APC meeting.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  July 14, 1982
South Lake Tahoe, California  9:00 a.m.

I  CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Mike Harper called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 9:15 a.m.

APC Members Present:  Mr. Hallam, Mr. Reno, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper, Mr. Sullivan

APC Members Absent:  None

II  APPROVAL OF AGENDA

As there were no changes or modifications to the agenda the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Hallam to approve the July 14, 1982 agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

III  DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The following corrections were noted: On page 10, paragraph 5, the phrase "investigating formed zoning" should read "investigating performance zoning". Page four under Planning Matters the phrase should read "Reasonable Further Progress" not "Reasonal Further Progress." Page 5, under C. second paragraph the phrase should read, "of the APC and the Governing Board" not "between the APC and the Governing Board", and on page 10, third paragraph the phrase "a resident of Carson City" should read "the president of the Nevada League of Women Voters and seconded by the California League of Women Voters".

MOTION by Mr. Pyle with a second by Hallam to approve the minutes of the June 9 Advisory Planning Commission meeting as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Meeting Locations

There was some discussion as to whether the meeting locations should be changed from time to time to allow for more participation from around the Basin. It was decided that the meeting location should be changed every three or four months and that the APC would try to have its first change in location in either September or October of this year.
V. PUBLIC HEARING


Philip Overeynder, Executive Director, gave an initial presentation on what was being asked of the APC and the public in so far as what recommendations the APC will be recommending to the Governing Board. It was decided by the APC to deal with each threshold category individually and at the end of this process the APC would vote on the certification of the EIS itself.

Water Quality - Mr. Overeynder gave the initial presentation on this threshold.

Pelagic Lake Tahoe. Senior Planner, David Ziegler, explained the process involved in preparing this threshold. There was lengthy discussion on this threshold by both APC and the public. There was considerable concern regarding whether the pelagic, littoral and tributary standards should be reworded into goals.

MOTION by Ann Bogush with a second by Star Hansen that all the ambient standards for pelagic, littoral and tributary be goals.

Ms. Bogush suggested the following wording to be part of her motion for the pelagic goal: Reduce dissolved inorganic Nitrogen (N) loading from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average to reverse the trends of water quality degradation in the pelagic zone, over an extended period of time, attempt to achieve the following water quality standards:

The APC was not in agreement with the wording of this motion, Ms. Bogush withdrew her motion and restated it as follows:

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with Second by Ms. Shellhammer as follows: The threshold for pelagic Lake Tahoe shall be to reduce dissolved inorganic Nitrogen (N) loading from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average to reverse the trends of water quality degradation in the pelagic zone. It shall be a goal, over an extended period of time, to attempt to achieve the following water quality standards:

- Annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity: 52 gmC/m²/yr.
- Annual mean secchi disk transparency: 29.7 m.

It shall be the policy of the Governing Body to attempt, through the regional plan, to achieve this threshold by reducing dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by 50 percent, from groundwater 30 percent, and from atmospheric sources 20 percent.

It shall be a goal to reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient thresholds for primary productivity and transparency.

There was discussion on this motion and several changes were made to the original motion Ms. Shellhammer was not in agreement with this wording of the motion and withdrew her second, Ms. McMorris seconded the motion.
Discussion was then centered on the percentage of reductions and whether or not they should be removed from the goal statement. The following motions were made to amend Ms. Bogush's original motion:

**MOTION** by Mr. Pyle with second by Ms. McMorris to amend the motion as follows:
It shall be the policy of the Governing Body to attempt, through the regional plan, to achieve this threshold by reducing dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff, groundwater and from atmospheric sources. The amendment to the motion failed on the following vote:

- **Ayes:** Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Harper
- **Nays:** Mr. Hallam, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow

- **Absent:** None
- **Abstain:** None

**MOTION** by Ms. Shellhammer to begin each sentence with the words "It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board to . . ." There was no second to this motion.

**MOTION** by Ms. Bogush to amend her original motion to change the "25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average . . ." to 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. . .". There was no second to this motion.

**MOTION** Mr. Goodenow with second by Ms. Shellhammer to leave the paragraph beginning with "Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, . . ." as originally stated leaving out the words "It shall be a goal. . .". The motion carried on the following vote:

- **Ayes:** Mr. Hallam, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
- **Nays:** Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart

- **Absent:** None
- **Abstain:** None

The last motion to amend returned discussion to the original motion by Ms. Bogush with second by Ms. McMorris. The motion carried on the following vote:

- **Ayes:** Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
- **Nays:** Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith

- **Absent:** None
- **Abstain:** None

Littoral Lake Tahoe. Mr. Overeynder gave the presentation on this issue with some input by Mr. Ziegler. After some discussion the following motion was made:

**MOTION** by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Smith that the threshold under littoral Lake Tahoe be amended to read as follows:
The threshold shall be to reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading from all sources by 25% of the 1973-81 annual average with a goal to restore phytoplankton primary productivity and periphyton biomass to the 1967-71 annual mean values.

Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient thresholds for primary productivity and transparency.

And to leave the last paragraph of the threshold as stated in the EIS.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper.
Nays: Ms. Smith, Ms. Shellhammer
Absent: None
Abstain: None

Tributaries. There was discussion whether this should be a goal statement and also whether or not this statement would be attainable.

MOTION by Ms. Smith to accept the threshold for Tributaries as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Surface Runoff. Mr. Overeynder gave a brief introductory.

MOTION by Mr. Bidart with a second by Ms. Shellhammer to accept the threshold as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Groundwater - Senior Planner, Dave Ziegler gave the presentation. After some questions and comments on this topic the following motion was offered to amend the threshold as recommended by staff.

MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Hallam to amend the second paragraph of the standard to make it a policy direction to amend the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality guidelines. The motion carried unanimously.

Other Lakes - There was no discussion on this topic.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen with second by Mr. Pyle to accept this threshold as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Air Quality - Executive Director, Philip Overeynder, gave the initial presentation on Air Quality commenting on some general concerns.

Carbon Monoxide. Senior Planner, Dale Neiman, gave the presentation. After some discussion between the APC, staff and the public, the following motion was made.

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Ms. McMorris to adopt the 9 ppm with the stipulation that TRPA make a commitment to review the data after the states have finished their evaluation. The motion carried unanimously.
MOTION by Mr. Renz with second by Mr. Combs to delete the second paragraph of the Carbon Monoxide threshold and make part of one of the implementation measures of the General Plan. The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Nays: Mr. Hallam, Ms. Smith, Mr. Goodenow
Absent: None
Abstain: None

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Hansen that the second paragraph of the Carbon Monoxide threshold be reworded to read: It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to reduce traffic volumes on the U.S. 50 Corridor to 43,000 daily traffic volume in the winter months. The motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bidart, Mr. Harper
Nays: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow

Ozone. There was no discussion on this category.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Dodgion to accept the threshold as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Regional Visibility. There was no discussion on this category.

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz that the reduction in wood smoke emission by 15% be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to be dealt with in the Region Plan as an implementing measure for the threshold of the 171 kilometers. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Nays: Ms. Smith, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Goodenow
Abstain: None
Absent: None

Subregional Visibility. There was some discussion on what 50% of the year referred to, how it would be measured, and how staff came to the 50% figure in the first threshold. There was also discussion on the reductions in wood smoke emissions.

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Combs to amend the thresholds as follows:

Achieve 87 Kilometers (54 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Achieve 26 kilometers (16 miles) 90% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.
It shall be a policy in development of the Regional Plan that the 15% reduction in wood smoke emissions be considered. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper

Nays: Ms. Smith, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Goodenow

Abstain: None
Absents: None

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to amend to read the same as Regional Visibility as follows:

Achieve 87 Kilometers (54 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Achieve 26 Kilometers (16 miles) 90% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to encourage a reduction of wood smoke emissions by 15 percent and suspended soil particles by 30% as measured by particulate concentrations.

It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to reduce the number of vehicle miles of travel of 10% based on 1981-82 information. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper

Nays: Ms. Smith, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Goodenow

Abstain: None
Absents: None

Nitrate Deposition. There was some discussion whether or not this threshold was needed for air quality as it mainly related to water quality.

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to amend the threshold as follows:

Reduce the transportation of nitrates into the Basin and reduce oxides of nitrogen (NOx) produced in the Basin.

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to consider a 10% reduction in vehicle miles traveled consistent with the threshold standard for pelagic Lake Tahoe. The motion carried unanimously.

Odor. Mr. Neiman stated that this was a policy and not a threshold as stated in the handout.
MOTION by Mr. Sullivan with second by Mr. Bidart to amend the threshold statement as follows:

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to reduce fumes from diesel engines to the extent possible. The motion carried unanimously.

Soil Conservation - Philip Overeynder, Executive Director, gave a brief presentation on this category.

Natural Pervious Surface. Gary Shellhorn, senior planner, gave a presentation and answered question of APC and the public. After some discussion the following motion was made:

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Smith to amend the threshold statement as follows:

Natural pervious surface shall meet the limits as defined in the Capability Classification, Bailey, 1974 to be applied on a geomorphic, watershed or areas wide basis.

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan that coverage transfers within associated watersheds (See Table 4-16, Figure 4-18) be permitted between similar geomorphic groups but not from high hazard and moderate to low hazard groups. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper

Nays: Mr. Renz, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Sullivan

Allowable Soil Loss. Senior Planner, Gary Shellhorn, commented on this threshold statement. After some discussion on "T" factors, the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Smith to accept the threshold as recommended by staff. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper

Nays: Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bidart

Abstain: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Hansen

Absent: Mr. Sullivan

Stream Environment Zones.

MOTION by Ms. Sparbel with second by Mr. Hansen to amend the threshold statement as follows:
Preserve existing naturally functioning SEZ lands in their natural condition and restore 25% SEZ lands that have been identified as disturbed, developed or subdivided, to attain a 5% total land increase in the area of naturally functioning lands. The motion carried unanimously.

VI PLANNING MATTERS

A. Consideration of Certification of the EIS for the Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment, El Dorado County.

James Dana gave the presentation to the APC, answered questions of the APC and recommended that the EIS be certified.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen with second by Mr. Bidart that the APC certify the technical adequacy of the Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment project. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper

Nays: None

Abstain: Mr. Smith

Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Ms. Shellhammer

There was some discussion and agreement that the public hearing on the Environmental Impact Statement for Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and Study Report be continued to 10:00 a.m. July 15, 1982.

MOTION by Ms. Hansen with second by Ms. McMorris to continue the public hearing on the Environmental Impact Statement for Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and Study Report be continued to 10:00 a.m. July 15, 1982. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen with second by Mr. Pyle that the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission be adjourned and continued to 10:00 a.m. July 15, 1982. The motion carried unanimously.

July 15, 1982

The meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission reconvened at 10:10 a.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush (10:12), Mr. Smith (11:20), Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper

APC Members Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf

Ms. Unsicker was introduced as taking Ms. Smith's place and the public hearing on the environmental impact statement for environmental threshold carrying capacities was reopened.
Vegetation - Chief of Long Range Planning Division, Randy Sheffield, gave the presentation on this category. Associate Planner, David Greer, commented on and answered questions of the APC and the public.

Common Vegetation.

MOTION by Mr. Renz with second by Mr. Pyle to amend the threshold statements as follows:

To accept the statements as recommended by staff up to Relative Abundance.

To amend number 3 to read Maintain no more than 25% dominant shrub association vegetation.

To add a number 4 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the yellow pine forest, seral other than mature.

To add a number 5 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the red fir forest seral other than mature.

Under Pattern amend number 1 to read: Limiting acreage size of new forest openings to 2 to 8 acres.

A nondegradation standard to preserve the plan communities shall apply to stands of native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold. This does not preclude management practices.

The motion carried unanimously.

Uncommon Plant Communities.

MOTION by Mr. Hallam with second by Mr. Renz to accept the threshold statement as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Sensitive Plants. There was some discussion on the Rorippa subumbellata.

MOTION by Ms. Shellhammer with second by Mr. Goodenow to accept as recommended by staff.

Ms. Bogush offered an amendment to Ms. Shellhammer's motion.

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Goodenow to amend the threshold statement as follows:

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board that management practices to preserve populations sites will be addressed in development of the Regional Plan. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Doddion, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper

Nays: Ms. Shellhammer

Abstain: Mr. Smith

Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan
Ms. Shellhammer's original motion was voted upon. The motion carried unanimously.

Noise - Chief of Long Range Planning, Randy Sheffield, gave the presentation on this category, Senior Planner, Dale Neiman answered and commented on questions presented by the APC and the public.

Single Noise Events.

MOTION by Mr. Renz with second by Mr. Dodgion to accept as recommended by staff with the addition of the following paragraph: Monitoring guidelines for aircraft are at positions 6,500 meters from the start of takeoff roll and 2,000 meters from the runway threshold approach. Boats on the open waters of Lake Tahoe are measured at 50 feet with the engine running at 3,000 r.p.m. The thresholds for motorized vehicles are based on a distance of 50 feet from the center lane of travel and apply to any condition of grade, load, acceleration, and deceleration. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Smith moved for a reconsideration of the allowable soil loss activity regarding the "T" factors and gave his reasons for this motion. It was suggested that this be brought up after the Noise category had been acted upon.

Cumulative Noise Events. After quite a bit of discussion on the CNEL ranges the following motion was made:

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Hansen to accept as recommended by staff the threshold standard with the exception of deleting the Major transportation corridors standard and the following paragraph add: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan that the definition of location and decibel levels of a transportation corridor be addressed. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer
Nays: Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris

Reconsideration of "T" factors under Soil. Mr. Smith gave a presentation and after some discussion the following motion was made.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with a second by Mr. Hansen for reconsideration of the threshold on "T" values. The motion carried on the following vote.

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart,
Nays: Ms. Unsicker, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris
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After considerable discussion between staff and the APC on this topic the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Pyle with second by Mr. Smith to remove the threshold maintain allowable soil loss rates as shown in Table 6-10. The motion failed on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Pyle, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Bidart
Nays: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris

MOTION by Ms. Bogush to maintain the allowable soil loss rates as shown in Table 6-10 for undeveloped areas and maintain the "T" values soil loss rates for developed areas with the policy of the TRPA Governing Board to develop "T" values that apply specifically to the Tahoe Basin soils in the Regional Plan process. As there was no second to this motion the motion died.

MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Shellhammer to adopt the recommendation made previously by APC with the condition that the "T" values and Table 6-10 be re-evaluated in the Regional Plan. The motion failed on the following vote:

Ayes: Ms. Unsicker, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Goodenow
Nays: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris

MOTION by Mr. Hansen with second by Mr. Renz to adopt the SCS "T" factors with further study during the Regional Plan update. Further, It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to study "T" values further to define acceptable soil loss rates for the Tahoe Basin.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Renz that the APC accept the threshold as originally written in the EIS, the Soil Conservation Service "T" factors for acceptable soil loss by soil type in the Lake Tahoe Basin sets the allowable amount of soil loss from an area or watershed area without impacting the productivity of the soil and that the "T" values be adopted for that purpose.

After much discussion Mr. Hansen withdrew his motion.

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Ms. Sparbel to amend this motion to have a policy statement that the "T" factors will be studied to determine acceptable soil loss rates for the Tahoe Basin. The motion failed on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow,
Nays: Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Smith, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Harper
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris
The original Motion by Mr. Smith carried on the following vote:

Ayes:  Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
Nays:  Mr. Hallam, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Unsicker, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel,
Abstain:  
Absent:  Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris

VI PLANNING MATTERS


Senior Planner, Dale Neiman, gave the presentation to the APC stating that the APC needed to certify the 1982 Air Quality Plan and give the staff recommendations to pass on to the Governing Board. Mr. Neiman answered questions and explained the changes that had been made to the Plan.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Bidart that the APC certify the 1982 Air Quality Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

The public hearing was reopened on the EIS on Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and Study Report.

Wildlife - Chief of Long Range Planning, Randy Sheffield, gave a brief presentation on this category.

Special Interest Species and Habitats of Special Significance. After discussion and several motions proposed and died due to lack of seconds the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion with second by Ms. Shellhammer to accept the threshold as recommended by staff. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes:  Mr. Hallam, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
Nays:  Mr. Renz
Abstain:  None
Absent:  Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen,

Fisheries - Associate Planner, David Greer, gave a presentation on this topic.

Instream Flows. After some discussion the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Pyle with second by Mr. Smith amend this threshold to read:

It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan that a nondegradation standard shall apply to instream flows. The motion carried unanimously.
Stream Habitat.

**MOTION** by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Hallam to accept the threshold as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. Associate Planner, David Greer, gave the presentation on this item.

**MOTION** by Ms. Shellhammer with second by Mr. Goodenow to accept this threshold standard as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION** by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to amend the first motion to add that it shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to support in response in addressed filed evidence state and federal efforts to reintroduce the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. The motion carried on the following vote:

**Ayes:** Ms. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper

**Nays:** Mr. Smith, Ms. Unsicker, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Goodenow

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris

Lake Habitat. After questions were answered by Mr. Greer on this topic the following motion was made:

**MOTION** by Ms. Shellhammer with second by Ms. Unsicker to accept this threshold statement as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Recreation - Mr. Sheffield commented and answered questions of the APC and public.

**MOTION** by Mr. Pyle with second by Mr. Hansen to accept the Recreation policy statements, Undeveloped Areas, Shorezone, Access, and Existing Developed Areas as recommended by staff.

**MOTION** by Ms. Sparbel with second by Mr. Dodgion to amend the above motion to read under Undeveloped Areas: Preserve semi-primitive non-motorized areas in their natural state and preserve them for low density use.

Mr. Pyle and Mr. Hansen withdrew their motion. Ms. Sparbel restated her amendment as a motion.

Undeveloped Areas.

**MOTION** by Ms. Sparbel with second by Mr. Dodgion to amend the above motion to read under Undeveloped Areas: Preserve semi-primitive non-motorized areas in their natural state and preserve them for low density use. The motion carried on the following vote:

**Ayes:** Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper

**Nays:** Mr. Smith, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer,

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris
Shorezone. There was some question as to access to these high quality areas.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Dodgion to accept this threshold statement as recommended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

Access.

MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Shellhammer to accept this threshold as recommended by staff.

After some discussion it was moved to amend Mr. Goodenow's motion to remove the phrase "low density" from the policy statement

MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Smith to amend the policy statement to read: Provide access to the shorezone and high quality undeveloped areas for recreational uses. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart,
Nays: Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris

The original motion on Access carried on the following vote.

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Mr. Harper
Nays: Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow,
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris

Existing Developed Areas. Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Overeynder commented on topic.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Ms. Sparbel to amend the threshold statement as follows:

Maintain outdoor recreation and developed capacity to at least the current level.

Establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation available to the public lands. The motion carried unanimously.

Scenic Resources. Mr. Overeynder commented to the concerns presented by the APC.

MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Pyle to accept as recommended by staff. The Motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Goodenow, Mr. Harper
Nays: Mr. Renz
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris
Water Quantity. The question was raised as to whether this topic would be included. After some discussion the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Bidart to not include water quantity not be an element of the environmental thresholds. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Nays: Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Goodenow
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris

Chairman Harper then allowed time for general comments and statements from both the Commission and the public.

Mr. Overeynder gave a brief outline as to what, in staff's opinion, the roll of the APC was in recommending certification of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. Mr. Overeynder gave three options: 1) recommend to the Governing Board that they certify the EIS as it is, in terms of its technical adequacy; 2) recommend that it has serious technical deficiencies and need remedies; and 3) recommend with certain conditions that the EIS be certified.

There was quite a bit of discussion on the part of the APC regarding their concerns that their comments and recommendations be presented separate from the staff's comments and recommendations and that the APC recommendations be received by the Governing Board members prior to the July meeting. It was suggested that the APC preferred to have the APC's recommendations and comments be received by the Governing Board at the same time as they receive the staff's comments and recommendations.

The APC felt very uncomfortable recommending certification of the EIS as they had not seen what the comments of the other agencies were and they felt there were substantial technical inadequacies contained the document. Based on this the APC chose to follow the third choice which was to recommend certification with certain conditions.

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion with second by Mr. Hansen to recommend certification of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities with the following exceptions: SEZ's, Alternative Thresholds, Social Economic, Public Health and Safety, and the fact that it is difficult to assess the document without the technical comments being available. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Pyle, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Harper
Nays: Mr. Renz, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Goodenow
Abstain: Mr. Hallam, Ms. Sparbel
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris

The APC requested the thresholds recommended by the Commission and the rationale for the recommendation be forwarded to the Governing Board for their consideration. This was accomplished in a memo to the Board dated July 19, 1982.
Mr. Harper asked for a motion to continue the other items of the agenda.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen with a second to continue the items of the July 14, 1982 APC meeting which were not taken up to the August meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Bogush commented on the Work Program for Development of the Regional Plan suggesting that a step in the process be added where the alternatives are circulated for comment. Mr. Overeynder suggested that all interested parties are invited to an open meeting of the Regional Plan Steering Committee on July 29, at 8:30 a.m. at the Chateau.

VII REPORTS

B. Status Report on Delegation of Authority and the Role of the APC

At this time no resolution has been brought up due to some technical problems.

C. Public Interest Comments - None

D. APC Members - The APC members thanked the staff and chairman for their efforts.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. July 15, 1982.

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (916) 541-0246.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sharon A. Fick
Secretary II
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

August 11, 1982
9:00 a.m.

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Mike Harper called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 9:20 a.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Milam (arrived at 9:55), Mr. Renz (arrived at 9:35), Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Dr. Unsicker, Mr. McCurry, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Randolph (arrived at 9:25), Mr. Harper

APC Members Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bidart

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mr. Hansen with a second by Mr. Smith to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The APC members agreed to defer approval of the minutes prior to adjournment.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Environmental Impact Statement for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

Randy Sheffield, Chief of Long Range Planning presented a status report on the Addendum to the Environmental Impact Statement for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. The purpose of the Addendum was to respond to the comments received on adequacy of the EIS, indicate necessary changes, and display the general comments received pertaining to the thresholds recommended. The thresholds recommended in the EIS were developed early in May, and since that time, Agency staff and the consultants have continued to refine the thresholds recommended to the Governing Board for their final decision.

Mr. Harper asked the APC members if they wished to make additional comments or new findings, or questions pertaining to the EIS with the information contained in the Addendum. Ms. Sparbel stated that at the July meeting she did not have the State's comments and, therefore, abstained; but requested to have the opportunity to have a revote taken on the adequacy of the EIS.
MOTION by Mr. Hansen, with a second by Mr. Pyle, for reconsideration of the vote for the EIS. The motion carried on the following vote.

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. McCurry, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Nays: Ms. Shellhammer
Abstain: Dr. Unsicker, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Randolph
Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bidart,

Mr. Combs stated that he was unable to attend the second day of the APC meeting held on July 15, 1982, but stated he would like to go on record as finding that the EIS should be certified.

Mr. Harper stated that at the July APC meeting there was a very narrow vote to certify the EIS due to the fact that it was difficult to assess the document without some of the technical comments being available at that time. Discussion of the APC's concerns pertaining to adequacy was led by Mr. Sheffield.

Dr. Unsicker commented that she had not reviewed the Addendum and was not sure if the response to Labontan's comments was adequate, but felt that the Draft EIS was not adequate to cover the land capability threshold recommendation to be applied on a watershed or geomorphic unit basis as finally proposed by staff.

MOTION by Ms. Sparbel with a second by Ms. Shellhammer to accept the EIS with the inclusion of the Addendum and the latest data presented to the APC without any exceptions and without any qualifications. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. McCurry, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Nayes: Mr. Randolph
Abstain: Dr. Unsicker
Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Combs (left the room), Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bidart

B. Work Program for Development of the Regional Plan

Mr. Sheffield read the list of names and the agencies represented, and introduced the Technical Team members who were present in the audience.

Gordon Barrett, Senior Planner briefly outlined the findings and directives of the Compact requirements for the Regional Plan. Legal Counsel has advised that June, 1983 is the target date for the adoption of the Regional Plan and all of its elements.
Mr. Barrett stated that implementation is one of the major points of the planning process. It has been recommended, and the Governing Board has generally agreed, that a sixth element which combines plan implementation, financial strategies and coordination should be added. Phil Overeynder, Executive Director, clarified that the TRPA will coordinate these activities within its jurisdiction with all agencies, such as the transportation linkages from the major transportation corridors with outside connecting points. Mr. Harper stated it was the feeling of the Steering Committee that those agencies which have jurisdictional responsibilities outside of the Lake Tahoe Basin be aware of how this plan will affect their jurisdictions and assist the staff in coordinating these issues so that it will not create an adverse impact outside of the Basin boundaries. Mr. Randolph suggested that Nevada and Alpine Counties be invited to join the Technical Team.

Discussion pertaining to the adoption of a new Regional Plan as opposed to amending the current plan followed. The Agency has the legal authority to develop a new Regional Plan in coordination with the States of California and Nevada, and the Federal entities. The APC members recommended that a new Regional Plan be written because of the recently identified environmental thresholds and the changes that have taken place over the past 12 years. The APC agreed there is need for a new unified plan, rather than adding amendments to the current plan.

MOTION by Mr. Smith, with a second by Mr. Milam, to recommend to the Governing Body that the new General Plan utilize the strong environmental points of the existing plan and ordinances, but because of the numerous amendments over the past 12 years, the ordinances and the Regional Plan should be completely updated and rewritten. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Overeynder stated that Agency staff, the APC and the Governing Board will continue to monitor and re-evaluate environmental threshold data during the Regional Plan development process.

As a result of various meetings with local, state and federal planning people, and the Steering Committee, Mr. Barrett presented a draft outline for the 1982-83 work program and time schedule for the Regional Plan. Mr. Barrett pointed out that it is a very tight schedule which will take a great deal of effort from everyone involved to correlate implementation strategies and alternatives within the remaining time frame.

The APC members discussed their concerns with the time schedule. Mr. Barrett stated that the draft EIS should be ready for review and comment by February/March with a draft of the Regional Plan available by April, 1983.

MOTION by Mr. Renz, with a second by Ms. Bogush, to recommend to the Governing Board that they adopt a plan before implementing the ordinances. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Barrett outlined the 1982-83 draft participation plan for various workshops and meetings to provide technical input on the issues to be considered for the Regional Plan.
Mr. Harper pointed out that Carson City should be included in the participation list for holding local forums. Mr. Andy Sawyer, California Water Resources Control Board, noted that out-of-basin forums were not included on the participation list and recommended that it should be expanded, especially during the later period when the general public can focus on what the alternatives are. Ms. Bogush suggested that out-of-basin forums should be the responsibility of the TRPA public participation coordinator. Mr. Overeynder commented that the local entities all have their offices outside of the Basin and when conducting the forum at each of the respective offices they could broaden the participation from outside the Basin. Mr. Overeynder clarified that the participation coordinator would set up the specifications for the information input that will be needed, which could be handled through sub-contracts to the local governments for specific services.

Mr. Barrett summarized the preliminary draft list of issues to be considered along with the land use, transportation, conservation, recreation, public service and implementation elements for the Regional Plan. The APC members discussed the issues and will review them further at the September meeting.

V REPORTS

A. Recommendations to Governing Board on Adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

Mr. Sheffield reported that Chapter I, Executive Summary was revised after the last APC meeting and was presented to the Governing Board at the July meeting, along with a comparison of the APC and staff recommendations. The Governing Board did not take any action for adopting thresholds at that meeting, but is scheduled for 9:30 at the August 25, 1982 meeting to resolve the issue. Staff has not revised Chapter I beyond what was provided to the Board at the July meeting. A draft resolution adopting environmental thresholds will be provided to the Governing Board at the August meeting.

B. 208 Status Report

Gary Shellhorn, Senior Planner, stated that staff is continuing to work with the counties and City of South Lake Tahoe on the letters of commitment. Progress is being made with the counties pertaining to the mitigation fund and modifications to the program in processing the applications. Lahontan Water Quality Control Board has processed some grants.

Mr. Shellhorn reported that Lahontan is proposing an erosion control program which deals with paving of unpaved parking areas and revegetation of existing eroding areas within the City of South Lake Tahoe. The runoff from these compacted areas is a source of suspended sediments and nutrients which is a significant problem. The Lahontan Board would like to implement a program to work with the property owners to identify compacted areas presently used for parking, requesting those areas be paved and infiltrate the runoff. The objective is to determine what is allowable coverage that may have been in existence prior to April 11, 1972 as the effective "Grandfather" date. The owners would be asked to pave these areas that they have authorized use for.
generally parking or roadway travel. If there is no authorization to use the areas, the approach would be to focus on revegetation and block future access in order to resolve erosion. Mr. Shellhorn stated that Lahontan is proposing a "credit program" for individuals who voluntarily take allowed coverage which they are not using and revegetate it. If sometime in the future they want to increase their type of business they could reclaim the coverage they had revegetated. Lahontan will be asking the Agency Governing Board to support this program in conjunction with processing the applications for approval permits. It will be the property owner's responsibility to finance their project.

Jim Eckman from Lahontan responded to questions that this program is an attempt to be fair to the property owner, as well as improving water quality. The program proposes to meet the requirements of Lahontan's Lake Tahoe Plan and TRPA's project requirements for review, and to come to an agreement between the agencies before the program is implemented. The areas in question will also be aesthetically improved. Mr. Hampson stated that Lahontan's waste discharge requirements is a direct order. The property owner has a responsibility to comply with that order in seeking the best alternatives or solution, meeting both agencies requirements and conditions, and using the Best Management Practices. If it is nonconforming coverage the property owner would be allowed to keep it. If it is illegal coverage, Lahontan and possibly TRPA would disallow paving and require that it be returned to its natural state and revegetated. Paving of illegal compacted coverage will not be encouraged with the intent being to block access and revegetate the area. Mr. Hampson emphasized that Lahontan will not issue any order which requires paving, but that the property owner may voluntarily request a solution to the problem.

Mr. Overeynder clarified that the Land Use Ordinance states that nonconforming coverage, which was created prior to 1972, can be maintained and improved and the policy of the TRPA will state it would be considered as ordinary repair and maintenance that would change from a similar type of use to paved surfaces which would upgrade the facilities, and should resolve any conflicts, as long as it was lawfully in existence prior to that date.

Mr. Eckman stated that the proposed program will be to inform the dischargers of the situation and the requirements and meet with them. Following adoption of the order for meeting the waste discharge requirements, the deadline for compliance is generally two building seasons.

C. Status Report on Delegation of Authority and the Role of the APC

Mr. Overeynder reported that this has been scheduled for a public hearing to amend the Agency's Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure on August 26, 1982. Legal counsel will draft the amendments which will delegate the authority to the APC and to staff. The APC will review appeals of staff decisions for recommendation/proposed resolution to the Governing Board for final action. The earliest transition of this authority will be the September APC meeting.

D. Public Interest Comments - None
E. APC Members

Ms. Bogush reported that the Tahoe Basin Area of Governments (TBAG), which is composed of all the counties around the Basin, met last month regarding the thresholds. As the representative for the APC and as the City Planning Director, she presented the APC's recommended thresholds and the process to TBAG. It was the consensus of the TBAG Board that the Regional Plan process is an important role that all of the governments should be involved in and that there should be a specific delegation of the planners time to participate. A task force of local planners was appointed to advise the TBAG Board on the Regional Plan process and how they could provide input. There will be a Memorandum of Understanding between the local governments and the City acknowledging that the Regional Plan process will be a high priority and reserving the local planners time to work on the Regional Plan.

Mr. Combs expressed appreciation to Randy Sheffield on the threshold report that he presented to the Placer County Planning Commission meeting in July.

Mr. Hampson announced that Charles White will be leaving the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board for a position with California's Hazardous Waste Program located in Berkeley.

Mr. Harper expressed appreciation to Phil Overeynder for presenting the threshold report to the Washoe County Planning Commission. Mr. Harper asked for volunteers to form a sub-committee who are familiar with CEQA and NEPA standards and guidelines for review of the EIS. Mr. Renz, Dr. Unsicker, and Mr. Heitkemper were recommended for the sub-committee.

VI RESOLUTIONS - None

VII CORRESPONDENCE - None

VIII PENDING MATTERS - None

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Harper asked that if the July 14, 1983 APC minutes could be accepted, he would like to have an authorization to transmit the minutes along with APC's recommendations to the Governing Board.

Mr. Renz questioned his vote on page 7 pertaining to the motion of Allowable Soil Loss to accept the threshold as written.

The following corrections were noted:

Mr. Combs stated that on page 8 he did not make the motion for the APC to certify the technical adequacy of the Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment project. The minutes should reflect that the motion was made by Mr. Hallam.
APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES AUGUST 11, 1982

On page 14 "Maintain outdoor recreation and developed to capacity to at least to the current level" should read Maintain outdoor recreation and developed capacity to at least the current level. Also on page 14 "Establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation available to the public lands" should read Establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation use on the public lands.

MOTION by Ms. Shellhammer, with a second by Mr. Randolph to table action on the APC July 14, 1982 minutes and not transmit to the Governing Board. The motion failed on the following vote:

Ayes: Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Randolph
Nayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. McCurry,
Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Abstain: Mr. Hampson, Mr. Schlumpf
Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart,
Mr. Pyle

MOTION by Ms. Sparbel, with a second by Mr. Renz to table action on the APC July 14, 1982 minutes, but to forward to the Governing Board a draft set of minutes with the corrections that have been noted to this point with a notation that the reference to the "as written" is the staff recommended threshold. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Hampson,
Mr. McCurry, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Harper
Nayes: Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Randolph
Abstain: Mr. Schlumpf
Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart,
Mr. Pyle

The APC meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (916) 541-0246.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Bailey
Secretary II
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Attached is a draft of the Regional Plan Scoping Report to be discussed with the Commission at the September 8 meeting. Staff will present this document to the Governing Board later this month following both APC and Steering Committee review.

Staff is seeking feedback on the issues and goals described in Chapters II and III. The non-threshold issues were presented to the Commission last month. The potential plan alternatives and planning techniques will also be discussed along with the substance of the work plan. The technical resource team, representing other federal, state, and local agencies, is being provided copies of the Scoping Report and will be asked to attend the APC meeting.
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I. REVIEW OF EXISTING PLANS AND LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

A. TRPA Compact Requirements

The following are excerpts from the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, which apply to the Regional Plan Process. Section 1 contains the findings of the Compact and Section 2 the Directives that apply to drafting the Regional Plan.

1. FINDINGS

   a. The waters of Lake Tahoe and other resources of the region are threatened with deterioration or degeneration, which endangers the natural beauty and economic productivity of the region.

   b. The public and private interests and investments in the region are substantial.

   c. The region exhibits unique environmental and ecological values which are irreplaceable.

   d. By virtue of the special conditions and circumstances of the region's natural ecology, developmental pattern, population distribution and human needs, the region is experiencing problems of resource use and deficiencies of environmental control.

   e. Increasing urbanization is threatening the ecological values of the region and threatening the public opportunities for use of the public lands.

   f. Maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by the Lake Tahoe Basin.

   g. There is a public interest in protecting, preserving, and enhancing these values for the residents of the region and for visitors to the region.

   h. Responsibilities for providing recreational and scientific opportunities, preserving scenic and natural areas, and safeguarding the public who live, work and play in or visit the region are divided among local governments, regional agencies, the States of California and Nevada, and the Federal Government.

   i. In recognition of the public investment and multistate and national significance of the recreational values, the Federal Government has an interest in the acquisition of recreational property and the management of resources in the region to preserve environmental and recreational values, and the Federal Government should assist the States in fulfilling their responsibilities.
j. In order to preserve the scenic beauty and outdoor recreational opportunities of the region, there is a need to insure an equilibrium between the region's natural endowment and its manmade environment. Article I(a).

2. DIRECTIVES

a. Overall Compact Direction:

In order to enhance the efficiency and governmental effectiveness of the region, it is imperative that there be established a Tahoe Regional Planning Agency with the powers conferred by this compact including the power to establish environmental threshold carrying capacities and to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which will achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities. Article I(b).

b. Nature of Plan:

The regional plan shall consist of a diagram, or diagrams, and text, or texts setting forth the projects and proposals for implementation of the regional plan, a description of the needs and goals of the region and a statement of the policies, standards and elements of the regional plan. Article V(c).

c. Timing:

Within 1 year after the adoption of the environmental threshold carrying capacities for the region, the agency shall amend the regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules and regulations, achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities. Article V(c).

Each element of the regional plan, where applicable, shall, by ordinance, identify the means and time schedule by which air and water quality standards will be attained. (Article V(d).)

Each element of the plan shall contain implementation provisions and time schedules for such implementation by ordinance. (Article V(c)).

d. Content:

The regional plan shall be a single enforceable plan and includes all of the following correlated elements. (Article V(c)).
i. A land-use plan for the integrated arrangement and general location and extent of, and the criteria and standards for, the uses of land, water, air, space and other natural resources within the region, including, but not limited to indication or allocation of maximum population densities and permitted uses. Article V(c)(1).

ii. A transportation plan for the integrated development of a regional system of transportation, including but not limited to parkways, highways, transportation facilities, transit routes, waterways, navigation facilities, public transportation facilities, bicycle facilities, and appurtenant terminals and facilities for the movement of people and goods within the region. The goal of transportation planning shall be:

1. To reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes and of public transit to move people and goods within the region; and

2. To reduce to the extent feasible air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles.

Where increases in capacity are required, the agency shall give preference to providing such capacity through public transportation and public programs and projects related to transportation. The agency shall review and consider all existing transportation plans in preparing its regional transportation plan pursuant to this paragraph.

The plan shall provide for an appropriate transit system for the region.

The plan shall give consideration to:

1. Completion of the Loop Road in the States of Nevada and California;

2. Utilization of a light rail mass transit system in the South Shore area; and

3. Utilization of a transit terminal in the Kingsbury Grade area.

Until the regional plan is revised, or a new transportation plan is adopted in accordance with this paragraph, the agency has no effective transportation plan. Article V(c)(2).
iii. A conservation plan for the preservation, development, utilization, and management of the scenic and other natural resources within the basin, including but not limited to, soils, shoreline, submerged lands, scenic corridors along transportation routes, open spaces, recreational and historical facilities. Article V(c)(3).

iv. A recreation plan for the development, utilization, and management of the recreational resources of the region, including but not limited to, wilderness and forested lands, parks and parkways, riding and hiking trails, beaches and playgrounds, marinas, areas for skiing and other recreational facilities. Article V(c)(4).

v. A public services and facilities plan for the general location, scale and provision of public services and facilities, which, by the nature of their function, size, extent and other characteristics are necessary or appropriate for inclusion in the regional plan. Article V(c)(5).

f. Coordination:

In formulating and maintaining the regional plan, the planning commission and governing body shall take account of and shall seek to harmonize the needs of the region as a whole, the plans of the counties and cities within the region, the plans and planning activities of the State, Federal and other public agencies and nongovernmental agencies and organizations which affect or are concerned with planning and development within the region. (Article V(e).

Whenever possible without diminishing the effectiveness of the regional plan, the ordinances, rules, regulations and policies shall be confined to matters which are general and regional in application, leaving to the jurisdiction of the respective States, counties and cities the enactment of specific and local ordinances, rules, regulations and policies which conform to the regional plan. Article V(8).

Where necessary for the realization of the regional plan, the agency may engage in collaborative planning with local governmental jurisdictions located outside the region, but contiguous to its boundaries. In formulating and implementing the regional plan, the agency shall seek cooperation and consider the recommendations of counties and cities and other agencies of local government, of State and Federal agencies, of educational institutions and research organizations, whether public or private, and of civic groups and private persons. Article V(i).
g. Enforcement of Air and Water Quality Standards:

The regional plan shall provide for attaining and maintaining Federal, State, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the region for which the standards are applicable. Article V(d).

The agency may, however, adopt air or water quality standards or control measures more stringent than the applicable State implementation plan or the applicable Federal, State, or local standards for the region, if it finds that such additional standards or control measures are necessary to achieve the purpose of this compact. Article V(d).

h. Implementation:

The governing body shall adopt all necessary ordinances, rules, and regulations to effectuate the adopted regional plan. Except as otherwise provided in this compact, every such ordinance, rule or regulation shall establish a minimum standard applicable throughout the region. Any political subdivision or public agency may adopt and enforce an equal or higher requirement applicable to the same subject of regulation in its territory. Article VI(a).

The regulations of the agency shall contain standards including but not limited to the following: Water purity and clarity; subdivision; zoning; tree removal; solid waste disposal; sewage disposal; land fills, excavations, cuts and grading; piers, harbors, breakwaters or channels and other shoreline developments; waste disposal in shoreline areas; waste disposal from boats; mobile-home parks; house relocation; outdoor advertising; flood plain protection; soil and sedimentation control; air pollution; and watershed protection. Article VI(a).

The agency shall adopt ordinances prescribing specific written findings that the agency must make prior to approving any project in the region. These findings shall relate to environmental protection and shall insure that the project under review will not adversely affect implementation of the regional plan and will not cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities of the region to be exceeded. Article VI(g).

i. Monitoring:

The planning commission and governing body shall continuously review and maintain the regional plan. Article V(c).
The agency shall maintain the data, maps, and other relevant information developed in the course of formulating and administering the regional plan, in a form suitable to assure a consistent view of developmental trends and other relevant information for the availability of and use by other agencies of government and by private organizations and individuals concerned. Article V(h).

j. Regional Plan Boundaries:

"Region," includes Lake Tahoe, the adjacent parts of Douglas and Washoe Counties and Carson City, which for the purposes of this compact shall be deemed a county, lying within the Tahoe Basin in the State of Nevada, and the adjacent parts of the counties of Placer and El Dorado lying within the Tahoe Basin in the State of California which lies southward and eastward of a line starting at the intersection of the basin creasline and the north boundary of section 1, thence west to the northwest corner of section 3, thence south to the intersection of the basin creasline and the west boundary of section 10; all sections referring to township, 15 north, range 16 east, M.D.B. & M. The region defined and described herein shall be as precisely delineated on official maps of the agency.

B. Local, State and Federal Plans and Laws

The new Regional Plan will help guide decision making as it affects the growth and development of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Because of its inherent broad scope and purpose, the Plan will cross over and affect the planning directions of numerous governmental jurisdictions and utility service districts. Each of the affected entities will be encouraged to actively participate in the development of the Regional Plan to help ensure adequate consideration of local individual and community needs.

A "mix" of local, state, and federal plans now exist in the Basin. However, it appears that the development of the new TRPA Regional Plan will act as a catalyst for Basin agencies to amend, update, or develop new plans. The following is a partial list of those agencies with planning responsibilities in the Basin. Laws that significantly influence the direction of regional plan development are also listed. Also included are brief statements of the anticipated affects of regional plan development of other agency plans.

Local Planning

Placer County: Plan for County portion of Basin to be developed in conjunction with the TRPA Regional Plan update.

El Dorado County: Plan for County portion of Basin to be developed in conjunction with the TRPA Regional Plan update.
Douglas County: Plan for County portion of Basin to be updated in conjunction with the TRPA Regional Plan update.

Carson City County: In-Basin lands zoned for conservation reserve (1 dwelling unit per 20 acres).

Washoe County: Policy plan for Incline Village and Crystal Bay recently adopted by County.

City of South Lake Tahoe: Development of City plan to be coordinated with development of the TRPA Regional Plan.

State Planning

California Department of Parks and Recreation: Coordinate with the TRPA to assess strategies for attaining projected facility demands and maintenance of reserve utility capacity. No long range plans anticipated.

Nevada Division of State Parks: Coordinate with the TRPA to assess strategies for attaining projected facility demands and maintenance of reserve utility capacity. No long range plans anticipated.

California State Water Resources Control Board: Work cooperatively with the TRPA to develop a Basin-wide 203 Plan.

Nevada Department of Environmental Protection: Work cooperatively with the TRPA to develop a Basin-wide 203 Plan and air quality element of the TRPA Regional Plan.

California Air Resources Board: Work cooperatively with the TRPA to develop air quality element of the TRPA Regional Plan.

Federal Planning

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Work cooperatively with the TRPA to develop air quality and water quality elements of the Regional Plan.

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit of the USFS: Collaborate with the TRPA in developing a new Forest Service Basin Management Plan.

Soil Conservation Service: Existing long range plans (1979) for the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District and Tahoe Resource Conservation District.

Legal Considerations

Tahoe Regional Planning Compact: Authorizes development of the Regional Plan.

Interstate Water Compact: Specifies interstate water allocations in the Basin.
Porter/Cologne Act: Basis for authority in California for water quality planning and provision for sewage export out of Basin.

NRS 445: Nevada law containing provision for export of sewage from Basin.

Based on this initial feedback, it is obvious that Basin agencies are anxious to work closely with the TRPA in development of the Regional Plan. Such participation will be encouraged as a means for addressing local issues in the plan and, by so doing, enhance the chance of local support. Depending on the detail of various plan elements and degree of interagency involvement, it is anticipated that local planning agencies (in the development of their own plans) will either use the TRPA plan as a guideline or simply incorporate entire elements of the regional plan.

II. STATEMENT OF GOALS AND NEEDS FOR THE REGIONAL PLAN

A. Threshold Standards

The Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency adopted an environmental threshold carrying capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region on August 26, 1982. The Regional Plan is to provide for achieving and maintaining the adopted threshold standards. The preliminary value (goal) statements developed early in the threshold establishment process have been revised, where appropriate, to reflect the decisions made by the Governing Board. The adopted thresholds are shown below. The revised goal statements are displayed in Chapter III of this Scoping Report and provide, along with current issues developed in Section B of this Chapter, the basis for an analysis of the status of the Lake Tahoe Basin regarding goals and needs.

WATER QUALITY

Pelagic Lake Tahoe

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD

Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen (N) loading from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973–81 annual average. Achieve the following long-term water quality standards:

- Annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity: 52 gC/m²/yr
- Winter (December – March) mean Secchi disk transparency: 0.63 m

2. POLICY

This threshold is currently being exceeded and will likely continue to be exceeded until some time after full implementation of the loading reductions prescribed by the thresholds.
3. **MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient standards for primary productivity and transparency.

4. Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50 percent, from groundwater approximately 30 percent, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the agency has no direct control over out-of-basin sources. The cooperation of the States of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.

**Littoral Lake Tahoe**

1. **NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average.

2. **MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50 percent, from groundwater approximately 30 percent, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the agency has no direct control over out-of-basin sources. The cooperation of the States of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.

3. **NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Decrease sediment load as required to attain turbidity values not to exceed 3 JTU. In addition, turbidity shall not exceed 1 JTU in shallow waters of the lake not directly influenced by stream discharges.

4. Reduce the loading of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources to meet the 1967-71 mean values for phyto-plankton primary productivity and periphyton biomass in the littoral zone.

**Tributaries**

1. **NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Attain applicable state standards for concentrations of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus, and dissolved iron. Attain a 90 percentile value for suspended sediment concentration of 60 mg/L.

2. **MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment load to achieve loading thresholds for littoral and pelagic Lake Tahoe.
Surface Runoff

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for dissolved inorganic nitrogen of 0.5 mg/l, for dissolved phosphorus of 0.1 mg/l, and dissolved iron of 0.5 mg/l in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body in the Basin.

2. Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for suspended sediment of 250 mg/l.

3. MANAGEMENT STANDARD
   Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment loads as necessary to achieve loading thresholds for tributaries and littoral and pelagic Lake Tahoe.

Groundwater

1. MANAGEMENT STANDARD
   Surface runoff infiltration into the groundwater shall comply with the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines as set forth in Table 4.5.2 of the Draft Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study Report, May, 1982.

2. Where there is a direct and immediate hydraulic connection between ground and surface waters, discharges to groundwater shall meet the guidelines for surface discharges, and the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines shall be amended accordingly.

Other Lakes

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Attain existing water quality standards.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Impervious Cover

1. MANAGEMENT STANDARD

Stream Environment Zones

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Preserve existing naturally functioning SEZ lands in their natural hydrologic condition, restore all disturbed SEZ lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands, and restore 25 percent of the SEZ lands that have been identified as disturbed, developed or subdivided, to attain a 5 percent total increase in the area of naturally functioning SEZ lands.
AIR QUALITY

Carbon Monoxide

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Maintain carbon monoxide concentrations at or below 9 parts per million averaged over 8 hours provided that each state shall review and certify to TRPA by February 28, 1983, as to what their carbon monoxide standards are as of that date, and this TRPA threshold standard shall be changed effective February 28, 1983, if necessary to be the applicable state carbon monoxide standard applicable to the respective portions of the region in accordance with Article V(d) of the Compact.

2. MANAGEMENT STANDARD
   Reduce traffic volumes on the U.S. 50 Corridor by 7 percent during the winter from the 1981 base year between 4:00 p.m. and 12:00 midnight, provided that those traffic volumes shall be amended as necessary to meet the respective state standards.

Ozone

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Maintain ozone concentrations at or below 0.08 parts per million averaged over 1 hour.

2. Maintain oxides of nitrogen (NO\textsubscript{x}) emissions at or below the 1981 level.

Regional Visibility

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Achieve 171 kilometers (103 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

2. Achieve 97 kilometers (58 miles) at least 90% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

3. Reduce wood smoke emissions by 15% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs.

Subregional Visibility

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Achieve 87 kilometers (54 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate matter.

2. Achieve 26 kilometers (16 miles) 90% of the year as measured by particulate matter.

3. Reduce suspended soil particles by 30% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs. Reduce wood smoke emissions by 15% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs. Reduce vehicle miles of travel by 10% of the 1981 base values.
Nitrate Deposition

1. MANAGEMENT STANDARD
   Reduce the transport of nitrates into the Basin and reduce oxides of
   nitrogen (NOx) produced in the Basin consistent with the water quality
   thresholds.

2. Reduce vehicle miles of travel in the Basin by 10% of the 1981 base-
   year values.

Odor

1. POLICY STATEMENT
   It is the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in the development of the
   Regional Plan to reduce fumes from diesel engines to the extent
   possible.

VEGETATION PRESERVATION

Common Vegetation

1. MANAGEMENT STANDARD
   Increase plant and structural diversity of forest communities through
   appropriate management practices as measured by diversity indices of
   species richness, relative abundance, and pattern.

   Maintain the existing species richness of the Basin by providing
   for the perpetuation of the following plant associations:

   Yellow Pine Forest: Jeffrey pine, White fir, Incense cedar,
   Sugar pine.

   Red Fir Forest: Red Fir, Jeffrey pine, Lodgepole pine, Western
   white pine, Mountain hemlock, Western juniper.

   Subalpine Forest: Whitebark pine, Mountain hemlock, Mountain
   mahogany.

   Shrub Association: Greenleaf and Pinemart manzanita, Tobacco
   brush, Sierra chinquapin, Huckleberry oak, Mountain whitethorn.

   Sagebrush Scrub Vegetation: Basin sagebrush, Bitterbrush,
   Douglas chaenactis.

   Deciduous Riparian: Quaking aspen, Mountain alder, Black cotton-
   wood, Willow.

   Meadow Associations (Wet and Dry Meadow): Mountain squirrel
   tail, Alpine gentian, Whorled penstemon, Asters, Fescues,
   Mountain brome, Corn lilies, Mountain bentgrass, Hairgrass, Marsh
   marigold, Elephant heads, Tinker’s penney, Mountain Timothy,
   Sedges, Rushes, Buttercups.
Wetland Associations (Marsh Vegetation): Pond lilies, Buckwheat, Mare’s tail, Pondweed, Common bladderwort, Bottle sedge, Common spikerush.

Cushion Plant Association (Alpine Scrub): Alpine phlox, Dwarf ragwort, Draba.

Relative Abundance -- of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin:
1. Maintain at least 4% meadow and wetland vegetation.
2. Maintain at least 4% deciduous riparian vegetation.
3. Maintain no more than 25% dominant shrub association vegetation.
4. Maintain 15-25% of the Yellow Pine Forest in seral stages other than mature.
5. Maintain 15-25% of the Red Fir Forest in seral stages other than mature.

Pattern -- Provide for the proper juxtaposition of vegetation communities and age classes by:
1. Limiting acreage size of new forest openings to no more than 8 acres.
2. Adjacent openings shall not be of the same relative age class or successional stage to avoid uniformity in stand composition and age.

2. A nondegradation standard to preserve plant communities shall apply to native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the 5% threshold.

3. Native vegetation shall be maintained at a maximum level to be consistent with the limits defined in the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada, A Guide For Planning, Bailey, 1974, for allowable impervious cover and permanent site disturbance.

4. POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board that a nondegradation standard shall permit appropriate management practices.

Uncommon Plant Communities

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
Provide for the nondegradation of the natural qualities of any plant community that is uncommon to the Basin or of exceptional scientific, ecological, or scenic value. This threshold shall apply but not be limited to (1) the deepwater plants of Lake Tahoe, (2) Grass Lake (sphagnum bog), (3) Osgood swamp, and (4) the Freel Peak Cushion Plant community.
Sensitive Plants

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain a minimum number of population sites for each sensitive plant species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Number of Population sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carex pauciflora</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisia pygmaea longipetala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draba asterophora v. macrocarpa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draba asterophora v. asterophora</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rorippa subumbellata</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILDLIFE

Special Interest Species

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
Provide a minimum number of population sites and disturbance zone for the following six species:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species of interest</th>
<th>Population sites</th>
<th>Disturbance zone</th>
<th>Influence zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goshawk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle (Winter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle (Nesting)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Eagle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Habitats of Special Significance

1. MANAGEMENT STANDARD
A nondegradation standard shall apply to significant wildlife habitats consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations.

FISHERIES

Stream Habitat

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain the 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat as indicated by the map on page 76 of the EIS for the environmental thresholds study.
Instream Flows

1. **MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
   Until instream flow standards are established in the Regional Plan to protect fishery values, a nondegradation standard shall apply to instream flows.

2. **POLICY STATEMENT**
   It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to seek transfers of existing points of water diversion from streams to the Lake.

**Lahontan Cutthroat Trout**

1. **POLICY STATEMENT**
   It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board to support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce Lahontan cutthroat trout.

**Lake Habitat**

1. **MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
   A nondegradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe. Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat.

**NOISE**

Single Noise Events

1. **NUMERICAL STANDARD**
   The following maximum noise levels are allowed: (All values are in decibels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Less Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Greater Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Monitoring Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>80^1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,500 m - start of takeoff roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 m - runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.1^2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,500 m - start of takeoff roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 m - runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50 ft. - engine at 3,000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 6,000 GVW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 6,000 GVW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off road vehicles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Not to be effective until five years after adoption of Environmental
Threshold Carrying Capacities, provided that incremental and phased
improvements toward that standard shall be provided by the Regional
Plan.
2. Between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.

Cumulative Noise Events

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Background noise levels shall not exceed existing levels, or the
   following levels, whichever is less:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use category</th>
<th>Average noise level or CNEL range (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High density residential areas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low density residential areas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/motel facilities</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial areas</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban outdoor recreation areas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural outdoor recreation areas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness and roadless areas</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical wildlife habitat areas</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. POLICY STATEMENT
   It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Body in the development of
   the Regional Plan to define, locate, and establish CNEL levels for
   transportation corridors.

RECREATION

1. POLICY STATEMENT
   It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of
   the Regional Plan to preserve and enhance the high quality
   recreational experience, including preservation of high quality
   undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas. In developing the
   Regional Plan, the staff and Governing Body shall consider provisions
   for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shorezone and
   high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses.

2. It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of
   the Regional Plan to establish and insure a fair share of the total
   Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general
   public.

SCENIC RESOURCES

Roadway and Shoreline Units

1. NUMERICAL STANDARD
   Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each unit, including
   the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each
   unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in
2. Maintain the 1982 ratings for all roadway and shoreline units as shown in Tables 13-6 and 13-7 of the Draft Study Report.

3. Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below and shoreline units rated 7 or below.

Other Areas

1. MANAGEMENT STANDARD
   Maintain or improve the visual quality of views from bike paths and outdoor recreation areas open to the general public. Upon completion of the 1982 Visual Quality Index, this standard shall become a numerical standard.

Built Environment

1. POLICY STATEMENT
   It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, to control the height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signage, and other design elements of new, remodeled and redeveloped buildings be compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreational values of the region.

H. Non-Threshold Issues and Goals

The following is the first cut at drafting a list of non-threshold goals to be considered in the Regional Plan. The goals are derived from the major issues and sub-issues listed below. The issues are the result of Agency staff meeting with the U.S. Forest Service, California and Nevada State Parks, League to Save Lake Tahoe, the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council, and local planners. This list of issues was then reviewed by the Advisory Planning Commission and the Technical Planning Team. It is staff's intent to have these goals confirmed by the Advisory Planning Commission, the Steering Committee, and the Governing Board in September. Alternatives developed in response to these issues and goals will be reviewed in public forums scheduled for October or November.

1. Issue: What are the Proper Amounts, Types, and Locations of Activity/Development Within the Region?

   Goal: Develop a land use plan that will be consistent with the environmental thresholds and provide for orderly growth and development.

   a. Issue: How can the land use conflicts be resolved within the limits of the land capability system?

   Goal: Resolve the conflicts between the land capability system and the existing land use pattern.
2. Issue: How Can Development/Activity of the Region be Managed to Insure Compliance with the Regional Plan?
   a. Goal: Provide for orderly growth and development within the Region while achieving attainment of environmental thresholds.
   b. Issue: How can the Regional Plan be implemented?
   c. Goal: Insure a stable economic environment within the Region.
   d. Issue: How can the Plan provide for the orderly development and management of the required public services?
   e. Goal: Provide recreational experiences unique to the Region.
   f. Issue: How can the Plan provide for the orderly development and management of public services?

3. Issue: What are the priorities of economic growth within the Region?
   a. Goal: Insure that the economic growth of the Region is compatible with adopted environmental thresholds.
   b. Issue: How can the "quality" of the economic growth be maintained, restored, or improved?
   c. Goal: Maintain, restore, or improve the quality of the Lake Tahoe experience.
   d. Issue: How can the Regional Plan be compatible with activities/development external to the Region?
   e. Goal: Insure public access to the Lakes and shorelines of the Region.
   f. Issue: What is the proper balance of activity/development to assure public access to the Lakes and shorelines of the Region?
Goal: Provide the proper incentives or, as a second choice, disincentives to achieve environmental thresholds during development of the Regional Plan.

d. Issue: Is development with mitigation or prohibition of development the most effective treatment on environmentally sensitive lands?

Goal: Provide an effective balance of mitigation and prohibition for development on environmentally sensitive lands to achieve environmental thresholds.

3. Issue: What are the Proper Allocations of Scarce Resources Within the Region?

Goal: Insure a proper ("fair share") allocation of scarce resources during development of the Regional Plan.

a. Issue: What are the proper allocations between public and private interests?

Goal: Insure a proper allocation of scarce resources between public and private interests.

b. Issue: What are the proper allocations between visitor and resident interests?

Goal: Insure a proper allocation of scarce resources between visitor and resident interests.

c. Issue: What are the proper geographical allocations?

Goal: Insure a proper allocation of scarce resources for lands and communities throughout the Region.

4. Issue: How Can the Natural Resources of the Region be Managed to Protect the Natural Amenities of the Region and Assure Compliance with the Direction of the Compact?

Goal: Manage the natural resources of the Region to protect the natural amenities of the Region, assure compliance with the direction of the Compact and achieve and maintain environmental thresholds.

a. Issue: How can Stream Environment Zones be maintained, restored, and improved?

Goal: Maintain, restore, and improve Stream Environment Zones as required by adopted environmental thresholds.

b. Issue: How can natural scenic qualities be maintained, restored or improved?

Goal: Maintain, restore and improve the natural scenic qualities as required by adopted environmental thresholds.
c. Issue: How can man's activities be made compatible with the resources of the Region?

Goal: Insure man's activities are compatible with the natural resources of the Region.

5. Issue: How Can the Transportation System be Improved and Still Meet the Compact Goals and Remain Consistent with the Environmental Thresholds?

Goal: Improve the transportation system, meet the Compact directives, and achieve and maintain adopted environmental thresholds.

a. Issue: Can the transportation system be designed to attain the Environmental Thresholds and still achieve a desired "level of service"?

Goal: Implement a transportation system that will achieve a desired level of service while attaining the environmental thresholds.

b. Issue: What is the proper balance between highway, operational and public transportation facility/system improvements needed to achieve increases in capacity?

Goal: Insure a proper balance between highway, operational systems and public transportation systems to achieve increases in capacity.

c. Issue: What type of transportation measures can be implemented to achieve the recommended reductions in trip generation and in annual VMT?

Goal: Implement those transportation measures needed to achieve the reductions in trip generation and VMT as required by the adopted environmental thresholds.

d. Issue: What type and degree of incentive/disincentive measures may be necessary to attain the goals of the Regional Plan?

Goal: Provide the proper incentives or as a second choice disincentives, to achieve environmental thresholds during development of the Regional Plan.

e. Issue: What type of transportation linkages should be implemented within the Region and outside the Region?

Goal: Provide adequate transportation linkages to and throughout the Region to meet public need and achieve and maintain environmental thresholds.
6. **Issue:** How Can the Regional Plan Be Most Effectively Implemented?

**Goal:** Implement the Regional Plan to achieve environmental thresholds and provide for orderly growth and development.

a. **Issue:** What is the most effective balance of responsibility and commitments to implement the Regional Plan?

**Goal:** Insure local, state, and federal responsibility and commitment to effectively implement the Regional Plan.

b. **Issue:** How can the Regional Plan provide the most cost/effective solutions?

**Goal:** Provide for the most cost/effective planning solutions while achieving environmental thresholds.

c. **Issue:** How can orderly growth, economic stability, and social well being be provided for within the constraints established by environmental thresholds and the directives of the Compact?

**Goal:** Provide for orderly growth, economic stability and social well being within the constraints of the environmental thresholds and the directives of the Compact.

---

**III. 1982 STATUS OF THE REGION RELATIVE TO GOALS AND NEEDS**

**A. Goals/Threshold Relationships**

The Regional Plan will be built or structured around environmental and socio-economic issues as expressed by goal statements. In general terms, goals provide direction towards a preferred end-state that will be achieved over some period of time. The recent adoption of environmental thresholds provides solid direction for achieving environmental goals for the Lake Tahoe Basin. As pointed out in Chapter II of the Report, other issues extend beyond the Basin's environmental considerations. This is demonstrated by the following graph which shows interrelationships between goals (environmental, scoping goals) and the adopted environmental thresholds. Many thresholds cannot be directly linked to the goals identified during the scoping process. [The numbers shown along the threshold axis correspond to the numbered list of thresholds presented in Chapter II.] A list of both the environmental goals and "scoping" goals follow the graph and correspond to the numbers on the goal axis.
POOR QUALITY ORIGINAL (S) TO FOLLOW
Water Quality

1. Improve the water quality of the Basin's lakes, streams, and groundwater with special emphasis on reducing the algal productivity and improving the clarity of Lake Tahoe.

2. Reduce loads to Lake Tahoe of algae stimulating nutrients from the atmosphere, tributary streams, and groundwater.

Soil Conservation

1. Land coverage and disturbance shall not exceed the level of use an area can tolerate without sustaining permanent damage through erosion and other causes.

2. Limit soil displacement to insure maintenance of soil productivity.

3. Restrict on-site erosion and resultant sediment transport to streams and lakes to improve water quality.

4. Maintain and restore Stream Environment Zones for such beneficial functions as sediment trapping, nutrient removal, and other natural environmental uses.

Air Quality

1. Improve air quality in those areas of the Basin currently experiencing air quality degradation.

2. Attain levels of air quality within the Basin suitable to maintain the identified beneficial uses of the Lake Tahoe Basin (e.g., recreation, vegetative preservation, water quality, aesthetics, public health and welfare).

3. Improve the clarity of the air and resultant visibility in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Noise

1. Maintain those noise levels in the Basin suitable for community and neighborhood tranquility and other natural environmental benefits.

Vegetation Preservation

1. Provide for a wide mix and increased diversity of plant communities in the Tahoe Basin.

2. Provide for the maintenance and restoration of such unique ecosystems as wetlands, meadows, and other riparian vegetation.

Wildlife

1. Maintain suitable habitat for all indigenous species of wildlife without preference to game or non-game species through maintenance of habitat diversity.

2. Preserve, enhance, and where feasible, expand habitat essential for threatened, endangered, rare, or sensitive species found in the Basin.

3. Preserve, protect, and enhance habitats of special interest species.

Fisheries

1. Improve aquatic habitat essential for the growth, reproduction, and perpetuation of existing and threatened fish resources in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

2. Maintain in-stream flows necessary for the beneficial use of the fishery.

Recreation

1. Maintain opportunities and facilities for the full spectrum of outdoor recreational uses unique to the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Scenic

1. Maintain and restore the dominant natural-appearing landscape in the Basin.

2. Maintain and/or improve the aesthetic characteristics of the man-made environment to be compatible with the natural environment.

Land Use

1. Resolve the conflicts between the land capability system and the existing land use pattern.

2. Insure that the economic growth of the Region is compatible with adopted environmental thresholds.

3. Maintain, restore, or improve the quality of the Lake Tahoe experience while achieving environmental thresholds.

4. Provide a proper balance of activity/development to assure public access to the lakes and shorezones of the Region.

5. Insure coordination of the Regional Plan with the communities surrounding the Region.

6. Provide recreational experiences unique to the Region.
Management

1. Within the parameters of environmental thresholds, insure a stable economic environment within the Region.

2. Provide for the orderly development and management of the required public services.

3. Provide the proper incentives or, as a second choice, disincentives to achieve environmental thresholds during development of the Regional Plan.

4. Provide an effective balance of mitigation and prohibition for development on environmentally sensitive lands to achieve environmental thresholds.

Resource Allocation

1. Insure a proper allocation of scarce resources between public and private interests.

2. Insure a proper allocation of scarce resources between visitor and resident interests.

3. Insure a proper allocation of scarce resources for lands and communities throughout the Region.

Natural Resources

1. Maintain, restore and improve Stream Environment Zones as required by adopted environmental thresholds.

2. Maintain, restore and improve the natural scenic qualities as required by adopted environmental thresholds.

3. Insure man's activities are compatible with the natural resources of the Region.

Transportation

1. Implement a transportation system that will achieve a desired level of service while attaining the environmental thresholds.

2. Insure a proper balance between highway operational systems and public transportation systems to achieve increases in capacity.

3. Implement those transportation measures needed to achieve the reductions in trip generation and VMT as required by the adopted environmental thresholds.

4. Provide the proper incentives or as a second choice disincentives, to achieve environmental thresholds during development of the Regional Plan.

5. Provide adequate transportation linkages to and throughout the Region to meet public need and achieve and maintain environmental thresholds.
Implementation

1. Insure local, state, and federal responsibility and commitment to effectively implement the Regional Plan.

2. Provide for the most cost/effective planning solutions while achieving environmental thresholds.

3. Provide for orderly growth, economic stability and social well being within the constraints of the environmental thresholds and the directives of the Compact.

B. 1982 Status

The following is a status summary of the environmental and "scoping" goals. Each goal briefly addresses a set of 3 questions:

1. Does a threshold pertain to the goal?
2. Is the goal currently being achieved?
3. What are some attainability issues?

The presented information is helpful in assessing how far and how much needs to be accomplished to achieve any single goal or composite of goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>Goal is to return to pre-1970 conditions. Principal implementation strategy is to reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads up to 1 ton/year for at least 18 years. Less load reduction per year would require a longer time frame to bring inputs in equilibrium with outputs. Money and technical considerations are integral to implementation time-frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>Goal is to reduce algal nutrient inputs to the Lake. Overall reduction target to be achieved on 4 &quot;fronts.&quot; Strategies expected to be long term and costly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nearing Limits</td>
<td>Involves application of the Bailey system on an aggregate watershed basis. Preliminary data suggests some parts of the Basin may already exceed allowable coverage for certain hazard groups. SEZ's show overcoverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Policy</td>
<td>Basically involves application of BMP's on existing and new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Policy</td>
<td>[see above]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>No permanent site disturbance in SEZ's and long term restoration of some disturbed SEZ's. Costs nested in with water quality goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>Short term capital expenses (5 yrs) expected to be $6 million. Long term expenses to be closely linked to costs involved with nutrient load reductions to the Lake (upwards to $200 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nearing Limits</td>
<td>Implementation strategies and costs closely linked to other goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>Many costs built-in with other goal attainment strategies but additional costs likely to be borne by local residents for purposes of retrofitting emission controls on fireplaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Partially Exceeded</td>
<td>Reduction of noise levels would be achieved over a long period of time for aircraft, wilderness and roadless areas, and critical wildlife habitat areas. Other noise sources and land uses are near acceptable levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>To be achieved over an extended period of time mostly through acceptable forest management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>Restoration to be achieved over an extended period of time. Implemented in association with Soil Conservation and Water Quality goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>At Threshold</td>
<td>Implementation only involves a maintenance and management program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>To be achieved over an extended period of time through improvement of plant diversity and conservation of riparian vegetation. Implemented in association with Soil Conservation and Vegetation Preservation goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>At Threshold</td>
<td>Implementation only involves a maintenance and management program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>At Threshold</td>
<td>[see above]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>Upgrade and restoration of stream and lake habitat to be achieved over an extended period of time in association with implementation of other goals and through regulation of habitat disturbance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>To be achieved through coordination with consumptive users of stream water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Direction</td>
<td>Demand exceeds facilities and existing opportunities. Fair share issue of utility (sewer, water) allocations and budget appropriations. Time schedule of achieving goal to be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
<td>Goal would require improvement of scenic quality for 22 Roadway Units and 4 Shoreline Units. The maintenance and improvement of scenic quality is a long term goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Direction</td>
<td>Retrofit and application of design criteria to existing and new development is a long term goal to improve the overall aesthetic qualities of the man-made environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Question</td>
<td>Nearing limits as discussed under the first soil conservation goal above. Further study is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Question</td>
<td>Exceeded as discussed under goal #4, Soil Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Planning Question</td>
<td>Exceeded as discussed under Scenic goal #1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Planning Question</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Direction</td>
<td>To be addressed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>The existing transportation system does not accommodate periods of peak demand which results in traffic congestion and transit delays. A plan incorporating highway operational and transit improvements, expansion of ridesharing programs, and non-motorized means of transportation can be designed and implemented within the environmental constraints to accommodate projected build-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>The existing transportation system does not provide sufficient capacity to efficiently move goods and services within the Basin. Increases in capacity can best be achieved through an integrated multi-modal approach. The balanced approach is best suited to the existing federal and state budgetary process programs for both highway improvements and public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL  | STATUS   | STANDARD           | COMMENT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
-------|----------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
#5     | Proposed |                   | To reduce dependency on the automobile, increased intra/inter-regional transportation system linkages should be implemented. These measures would include increased air service to be compatible with noise standards, bus service to areas outside the Region, and increased bus and waterborne service between the North and South shores. |

Implementation

#1     | Planning Direction | To be addressed in Regional Plan  |
#2     | Planning Direction | To be addressed in Regional Plan  |
#3     | Planning Direction | To be addressed in Regional Plan  |

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

A. Plan Content and Governmental Coordination

The following is a proposed outline of the subject matter to be included in the Regional Plan elements. The staff recommendation includes subject matter not specifically required by the Compact. The purpose of these additional topics i.e., housing, energy, etc. is to include topics now required of local plans which will help insure coordination between local and Agency plans. Also, staff has added sub-elements that refer to adopted thresholds. Agency staff is also recommending the addition of a sixth element to be titled "The Implementation Element". This is to insure a coordination of implementation strategies. Each sub-element has recommendations as to the role of the Agency in drafting and implementation.

LAND USE ELEMENT

1. Land Use
   (population)  

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with the state and federal implementing and planning
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Housing</td>
<td>Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local governments responsible for implementation and specific criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Noise</td>
<td>Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal governments responsible for implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Natural Hazards</td>
<td>Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal governments responsible for implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Air Quality</td>
<td>Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for drafting and seeking commitments to implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Water Quality</td>
<td>Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for drafting and seeking commitments to implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community Design</td>
<td>Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal governments responsible for implementation and specific criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regional Highway System</td>
<td>The TRPA will set regional criteria with local and state agencies responsible for specific criteria and implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Transportation System</td>
<td>The TRPA will prepare regional specific criteria with the TTD implementing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Aviation, Bicycle, and Waterborne Transportation

Public - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local and state agencies responsible for specific criteria and implementation

Private - The TRPA will prepare regional and specific criteria

CONSERVATION ELEMENT

1. Soil

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

2. Vegetation

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

3. Wildlife

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

4. Fisheries

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

5. Open Space

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation
6. Scenic

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

7. Stream Zone

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

8. Shorezone

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

9. Cultural

Private Lands - The TRPA will be the primary Agency for planning and implementation

Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with state and federal planning and implementing

10. Energy

Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal implementation and specific criteria

RECREATION ELEMENT

1. Rural Dispersed Recreation

Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal implementation and specific criteria
2. Rural Developed Recreation

Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal implementation and specific criteria.

3. Urban Recreation

Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal implementation and specific criteria.

PUBLIC SERVICES ELEMENT

1. Public Facilities

Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal implementation and specific criteria.

2. Public Services

Private and Public Lands - The TRPA will set regional criteria with local, state and federal implementation and specific criteria.

IMPLEMENTATION ELEMENT

1. Institutional

Agency will delegate responsibility.

2. Development Management

Agency will develop a coordinated program requiring commitments from all those involved.

3. Financial

Agency will develop a coordinated program requiring commitments from all those involved.

4. Monitor

Agency will develop a coordinated program requiring commitments from all those involved.

B. Alternatives

Agency staff has analyzed the proposed goals, planning techniques, threshold standards, and plan content to arrive at a conceptual framework of possible alternatives to be considered in the Regional Plan. The subcomponents of policy choices are arranged into three conceptual patterns which are:
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1. Reduction of intensity of use in developed areas. (This approximates plans developed on the California side of the Region.)

2. Increase in intensity of uses in developed areas. (This approximates the 1972 TRPA Plan and current practices in Nevada).

3. Redirect development patterns. (This calls for major revisions in the land use pattern.)

From these conceptual patterns, the individual components may be arranged in numerous combinations of which staff has created one possible combination. It should be noted that any combination chosen must meet the threshold standards.

It is staff's intent to produce 3 to 5 alternatives based on Regional Plan Participant Input. These alternatives would be officially selected at the November Governing Board meeting and put into the impact analysis to be completed in the winter.
### Alternative Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Choices</th>
<th>Reduction of Intensity of Use in Developed Areas</th>
<th>Increase Intensity of Uses in Developed Areas</th>
<th>Redirect Development Patterns</th>
<th>Possible Combination (Example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>1) No construction in High Hazard</td>
<td>1) Case-by-Case in High Hazard</td>
<td>1) Transfer of Dev. Rights</td>
<td>1) Case-by-Case Review Limited to Priority Areas With Strong Emphasis on Mitigation/Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>1) Land Acquisition</td>
<td>1) Remedial Programs</td>
<td>1) Redevelopment</td>
<td>1) Equal Emphasis on Land Acquisition and Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Prohibitions</td>
<td>2) Develop With Mitigation</td>
<td>2) Redirected Growth</td>
<td>2) Limitations on Areas Where Mitigation is Accepted to Priority Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Strong Regional Gov.</td>
<td>3) Strong Local Gov.</td>
<td>3) Extensive Gov. Coordination</td>
<td>3) Intergovernmental Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Permit Limits</td>
<td>4) Local Growth Control</td>
<td>4) Extensive Gov. Programs</td>
<td>4) Regional Growth Limits Administered Locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Reliance on Bonds</td>
<td>5) Reliance on Local and Private Funding</td>
<td>5) Reliance on Public/Private Funds</td>
<td>5) Reliance on Public/Private Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of Resources</strong></td>
<td>1) Priority on Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>1) Market Place Allocation</td>
<td>1) Priority on Low Intensity Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>1) Priority on Re-Establishing Fair Share Allocation For Outdoor Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) 40% Public Allocation</td>
<td>2) 15% Public Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2) 15% Public Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY CHOICES</td>
<td>REDUCTION OF INTENSITY OF USE IN DEVELOPED AREAS</td>
<td>INCREASE INTENSITY OF USES IN DEVELOPED AREAS</td>
<td>REDIRECT DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS</td>
<td>POSSIBLE COMBINATION (EXAMPLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>1) Auto Deemphasis</td>
<td>1) Short Term Highway</td>
<td>1) Land Use Modification to Reduce Trips</td>
<td>1) Auto Deemphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) No Highway Expansion</td>
<td>2) Moderate Public Transit</td>
<td>2) Strong Public Transit</td>
<td>2) Strong Public Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Strong Public Transit</td>
<td>3) New Linkages</td>
<td>3) Land Use Modifications in Limited Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>1) Manage For Water Quality Priority</td>
<td>1) Market Allocation/Economy/Social Priority</td>
<td>1) Manage Scenic/Recreation Priority</td>
<td>1) Manage For Water Quality in Problem Areas Overall Priority For Scenic/Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THRESHOLDS</td>
<td>1) Attain Thresholds 25 years</td>
<td>1) Attain Thresholds 25-50 years</td>
<td>1) Attain Thresholds 50 + years</td>
<td>1) Attain Thresholds 25-50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: There may and in all probability are other implications involved in attaining environmental thresholds.
C. Planning Techniques

Agency staff has drafted a "first cut" of the possible planning techniques to be utilized in the Regional Plan. The Techniques are rated as to their importance in each of the alternative scenarios as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reduction</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Redirection</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination Techniques

| 1. General Government Coordination | 0 | 0 | + | + |
| 2. Coordination of Information    | + | + | + | + |
| 3. Coordination of Plans and Projects | 0 | 0 | + | + |
| 4. Technical Assistance           | + | + | + | + |
| 5. Federal Coordination/Clearinghouse | 0 | 0 | + | + |
| 6. Education                      | + | + | + | + |

Policy/Program Techniques

| 1. Rehabilitation - Improvement or restoration of existing land use | 0 | + | + | 0 |
| 2. Redevelopment - Revision or replacement of existing land use    | - | - | + | 0 |
| 3. Conservation - Preservation of existing land use                 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Reclamation - Reassembly or replanning of prematurely subdivided and relatively unsettled lands | 0 | - | + | 0 |
| 5. Transfer of Development Rights - Acquisition and relocation of development potential | 0 | - | + | 0 |
6. Management Practices - Techniques applied to reduce or mitigate impacts
   | Reduction | Increase | Redirection | Combination |
   | +         | +        | 0           | +           |

7. Monitoring - Keeping track of the effectiveness of planning techniques
   | 0         | 0        | 0           | 0           |

8. Mitigation Programs - Programs designed to offset the impacts of development
   | 0         | +        | 0           | 0           |

**Expenditure and Revenue Techniques**

1. Regional Capital Improvement Programming - A program plan aimed at coordinating public facilities with future development
   | 0         | -        | +           | 0           |

2. Basin User Fee - A charge for use of the Region, i.e., a parking fee, toll road, etc.
   | 0         | 0        | 0           | 0           |

3. Grants - Subsidy for particular purposes
   | -         | -        | +           | 0           |

4. Land Banking and Land Acquisition - Purchase or trade of lands for public purposes
   | +         | 0        | +           | +           |

5. Bonding - Selling of interest bearing certificates
   | +         | +        | +           | +           |

6. Purchase of Development Rights - Acquisition of development rights
   | +         | 0        | 0           | 0           |

**Taxation Techniques**

1. Impact Taxes and Fees - A charge or fee based on the amount of pollution
   | -         | +        | 0           | 0           |

2. Open Space Easements and Scenic Restrictions - Reduction in taxes for lands dedicated or contracted
   | +         | 0        | 0           | 0           |
3. Rehabilitation Tax Incentives - Deferred taxes on improvements

4. Differential Tax Assessments - Extra revenue generated because of improvement allocated for special purposes

Regulatory Techniques

1. Zoning Regulation:

   a. Cluster Zoning - fixes the ratio of housing units to acreage and requires or allows clustering the units to preserve open space

   b. Inclusionary Zoning - establishes incentives (i.e., density bonuses) for or requires the inclusion of units for low-and-moderate-income residents in new residential developments

   c. Floating Zoning - a district described in the zoning ordinance, but not given a specific location until a developer applies for it

   d. Planned Unit Development (PUD Zoning) - A floating zone allowing innovative land use within a plan for the development of an area (i.e., cluster development, mixture of housing types and other uses, commonly owned open space, and recreational facilities)

   e. Mixed-Use Zoning - Under specified conditions, allows the combining of two or more uses on a single parcel or in a single structure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reduction</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Redirection</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Performance Zoning - Ties the type intensity of development to specified performance standards, instead of more traditional, prescriptive development standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Overlay Zoning - Establishes development standards in areas of special concern (i.e., fault zones, historic districts, flood plains, and hillsides) over and above the standards applicable to basic zoning (i.e., commercial, residential, and industrial)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subdivision Regulation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Building Code Regulations</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discharge Requirements and Standards</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prohibition and Moratoriums</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Project Review</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Conditional Approvals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Design Review</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Environmental Review</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Mandatory Criteria</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Growth Control</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Targets for Growth</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Limits on Development Permits</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mix Quotas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Specific Plans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Penalty</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. WORK PROGRAM

DRAFT
OUTLINE FOR 1982-83 TRPA
WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL PLAN

PHASE I (MAY-JUNE) - DEVELOP WORK PLAN

TASK 1.1 Work Plan for the Regional Plan

This plan will identify the scope of work and timing for the Regional Plan process. A time schedule is shown on Attachment A.

TASK 1.2 Work Plan for Participation

This plan will identify the participants in the process and the methods of involvement. An outline of the proposed plan is enclosed.

TASK 1.3 Agency Preparation

Based on the work program, the following support items must be completed in preparation of the Plan.

1. Hire participation coordinator and detail participation plan.

2. Design and commence operation of parcel-based information system.

3. Complete the Wildlands Resource Information System (WRIS) data base.

4. Develop water quality model.

5. Test and evaluate Caltrans model.

6. Test and evaluate GABBY model.


PHASE II (JULY-SEPT) SCOPE OF GENERAL PLAN PROCESS

TASK 2.1 Establish Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

This item is now in progress and is scheduled to be completed at the August TRPA GB meeting. This item will establish the environmental limits to which the plan must conform.
TASK 2.2 Review of Planning Literature and Existing Plans

Agency staff will review existing literature and case studies to ascertain the "state of the art". Agency staff will provide the Governing Body with a summary report and recommendations which will be valuable input in the scoping process. Included with this report will be summaries of federal, state and local plans within the Region.

TASK 2.3 Data Collection

Agency staff will complete the WRIS Data System, collect social/economic data, and update previous studies to provide the information base for the Regional Plan. Agency staff will provide the results of this data to the GB as needed.

TASK 2.4 Identification of Key Relationships

Agency staff will attempt to isolate the key impact variables related to the Regional Plan. The most important of these relationships will be the relationships between land use and the environmental threshold carrying capacities. The variables will directly relate to the impact analysis and future monitoring.

TASK 2.5 Issue Identification

Agency staff will attempt to aggregate the issues that the participants of the planning process think should be addressed in the Regional Plan. These issues will be presented to the Governing Board as needs or as potential goals to be considered in the alternatives. This information will be important in scoping the plan process.

TASK 2.6 Scoping the Regional Plan Program

Agency staff will develop a scoping study for the Regional Plan process generally based on the previous tasks. The Governing Body in September will be required to provide direction relative to:

1. The range of planning options the plan will address
2. Governmental coordination
3. Nature of the plan
4. Limits set by the thresholds

PHASE III (OCT-NOV) ALTERNATIVE PLAN(S) FORMULATION

TASK 3.1 Formulate Goal/Objective/Policy Relationships

Agency staff will evaluate and model the relationships between the Regional Plan goals and the policies to achieve those goals. The general format or logic is as follows:
Issue - The identification of a concern or problem.
(I.e. the issue that scarce resources within the Region are not being allocated properly.)

Goal - A statement of direction in regards to the problem.
(I.e. the needs of outdoor recreation should receive priority in the allocation of scarce resources.)

Analysis - Research and investigation in regards to the problem. (I.e. statistics and investigation indicate that majority of the resources are directed toward indoor recreation.)

Objective - Specific criteria for achieving the goal.
(I.e. 15% of the remaining capacities will be reserved for outdoor recreation.)

Policies - General implementation strategies.
(I.e. the sewer treatment facility will reserve 15% of its remaining capacity for outdoor recreation projects.)

TASK 3.2 Develop Management Strategies

Agency staff will investigate and analyze various management strategies as to their usefulness in the Regional Plan. Such strategies will be investigated as to their feasibility and cost effectiveness in attaining the desired goals.

TASK 3.3 Development of Economic Strategies

Agency staff will develop the methodology to analyze the economic impacts of the Regional Plan. Also, this work task will include an investigation of possible funding sources for the Regional Plan.

TASK 3.4 Develop Alternative General Plan Scenarios

Agency staff will arrange the goal statements into three to five consistent plan scenarios. These plan alternatives will be reviewed by the participants as indicated in the participation program to select alternative plans for further consideration. The alternatives will be prepared in sufficient detail to permit impact analysis. The outline of the elements to be considered is as follows:

I  Land Use Element
   A.  Land Use
   B.  Housing
   C.  Noise
   D.  Natural Hazards
   E.  Air Quality
   F.  Water Quality
   G.  Community Design
II  Transportation Element
   A.  Regional Highway System
   B.  Public Transportation System
   C.  Aviation, Bicycle, and Waterborne Transportation

III Conservation Element
   A.  Soil
   B.  Vegetation
   C.  Wildlife
   D.  Fisheries
   E.  Open Space
   F.  Scenic
   G.  Stream Zone
   H.  Shorezone
   I.  Cultural
   J.  Energy

IV Recreation Element
   A.  Public Lands
   B.  Private Lands

V  Public Services Element
   A.  Rural Dispersed Recreation
   B.  Rural Developed Recreation
   C.  Urban Recreation

VI Implementation Element
   A.  Institutional
   B.  Development Management
   C.  Financial
   D.  Monitor and Evaluation

PHASE IV (DEC-MARCH) IMPACT ANALYSIS

TASK 4.1  Impact Analysis

The selected plans will be modeled and analyzed to determine impacts.

TASK 4.2  Preparation and circulation of the Environmental Impact Statement and Regional Plan Alternatives

A draft EIS will be prepared utilizing the chosen alternatives and meeting the requirements of the Compact. The EIS procedure will provide a review of proposed plans, impact analysis, and public comment.

PHASE V (APRIL-JUNE) PLAN ADOPTION

TASK 5.1  EIS Certification and Identification of Preferred Plan

The Agency, through the public hearing process, shall certify the EIS and, based on all evidence, select a preferred plan.
TASK 5.2  Draft Plan/Elements
The Agency will complete and detail the preferred plan.

TASK 5.3  Draft Implementation Mechanisms
The Agency shall draft and adopt necessary ordinances, rules and regulations consistent with the plan.

TASK 5.4  Monitoring Program
The Agency shall develop a monitoring program and a continuing program to update and correct the plan.
TIME SCHEDULE*

J J A S O N D J F M A M J
1982

Work Tasks

1.1 Work Plan

1.2 Participation Plan

1.3 Preparation

2.1 Thresholds

2.2 Review of Lit. and Plans

2.3 Data Collect.

2.4 Ident. of Relationships

2.5 Issue Ident.

2.6 Scoping

3.1 Goal/Obj./Policy

3.2 Management

3.3 Dev. of Econ. Strategy

3.4 Alt. Gen. Plan

4.1 Impact Anal.

4.2 Draft EIS

5.1 EIS Cert/Plan Selection

5.2 Complete Plan

5.3 Implement Strat.

5.4 Monitor Program

= * See following page for key Regional Plan dates
REGIONAL PLAN
KEY DATES 1982-83

1982

August 25       Board Adopts Thresholds
September 8     APC Reviews Recommended Issues
September 23    Board Finalizes Issues/Range of Alternatives
October 15      Range of Alternatives to Public - 30 Day Review
October/November Public Hearings and Input on Alternatives
November 3      APC Hearing Alternatives
November 17     Board Hearing and Adoption of Alternatives

1983

January 15     Complete EIS and Begin 60 Day Public Review
January 27     Board Hearing on Regional Plan EIS
February 9     APC Hearing on Regional Plan EIS
February 24    Board Hearing on Regional Plan EIS
March 9        APC Hearing on Regional Plan EIS
March 14       Public Review/Comment Period Closes
March 24       Board Certifies EIS and Adopts Regional Plan
April 13       APC Reviews Necessary Ordinances
April 28       Draft Ordinances Presented to Board
June 23        First Reading of Ordinances

1982-83 DRAFT TRPA
PARTICIPATION PLAN

I  PARTICIPANTS

TRPA Governing Body (GB)       Decision maker/policy direction/public hearings
GB Steering Committee            Provide direction/make recommendation to GB
TRPA APC                        Recommendations to Board
TRPA APC workshop               Technical review/coordination/public hearings
(APC + technical team)          Conformation of issues and selection of alternatives to be considered (use local
government)/information

- Local forums                  - South Shore -
                                 Douglas, El Dorado Counties
                                 and City of So. Lake Tahoe

- Out-of-Basin forums           - NE Shore - Washoe County
                                 - NW Shore - Placer County
Tahoe Trans. Dist.-TAC  Transportation review
Small workshops  Technical review
Staff presentations  Information
Key contacts  Coordination
Mass media  Information

II  SCHEDULE

(July–Sept.) - Scoping of General Plan Process

Objective: Identify planning issues and focus direction

Method: GB hearing
         Steering Committee meetings
         APC workshop
         Key contacts

Agency Output: Public orientation
            Threshold findings

Participant Input: Perception of issues
      Federal, state and local plans

(Oct.–Nov.) - Alternative Plans Formulation

Objective: Select a range of alternative plans for analysis

Method: GB hearing
        Steering Committee workshop
        APC workshop
        Public forums

Agency Output: Range of issues
            Technical information and analysis

Participant Input: Selection of plan alternatives

(Dec.–Feb.) - Impact Analysis

Objective: Perform TRPA EIS procedure/public review of plan alternatives

Method: GB hearing
        Steering Committee workshop
        APC workshop

Agency Output: Impact analysis

Participant Input: Review and comment on EIS and preferred plan
(March-June) - Plan Adoption

Objective: Select plan alternative and implementation strategies

Method: GB hearing
        APC hearing
        Workshops

Agency Output: Technical information
               Coordination

Participant input: Review and comment
MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1982

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Delegation of Responsibility to APC Agenda Item V. A.

Attached is a Resolution amending the TRPA Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure to permit the Advisory Planning Commission review appeals of staff decisions in regards to projects. This Resolution was passed at the August 26 TRPA Governing Board meeting and will become effective 30 days from that date. Therefore, the October APC meeting would be the first meeting which the Commission may expect to review such appeals. It should be noted that the APC will consider the application de novo and recommend appropriate action to the Governing Body.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

RESOLUTION NO. 82-12

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AMENDING THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE OF SAID AGENCY, DELEGATING CERTAIN PROJECT-REVIEW AUTHORITY TO AGENCY STAFF, SUBJECT TO APPEAL TO THE GOVERNING BODY, AND DELEGATING AUTHORITY TO THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE AGENCY TO CONSIDER APPEALS OF CERTAIN STAFF DECISIONS PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION THEREOF BY THE GOVERNING BODY; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency ("Agency") finds:

1. It is necessary and desirable for the Governing Body to more effectively utilize the resources and services of the Agency staff and Advisory Planning Commission, which utilization is accomplished by the amendments to the Agency Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure adopted by this resolution.

2. The delegation of authority accomplished by said amendments to the Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure would also enable the TRPA Governing Body to properly devote its attention to preparation of amendments to the Agency Regional Plan and implementing ordinances pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended.

3. This resolution, including the amendments to the Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure adopted hereby, is adopted pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, is necessary and desirable to promote, and is reasonably related to, the public health, safety and general welfare of the Tahoe Region, complies in all respects, procedural and substantive, with said
Compact and Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure, and is necessary to effectuate and implement the same.

4. The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, does not restrict project-approval to action by the Agency Governing Body, thus permitting the delegation of authority pursuant to the amendments to the Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure adopted by this resolution, subject to ultimate appeal to the Governing Body. The standards and requirements for exercise of the authority delegated by the amendments adopted hereby are set forth in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, regional plan and ordinances of the Agency, which standards and requirements are sufficiently definite to lawfully permit such delegation.

5. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Agency Governing Body, prior to the adoption of this resolution, pursuant to Article III of the Agency Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure, conducted a duly noticed public hearing upon the amendments to said Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure adopted hereby, at which hearing all interested persons were afforded reasonable opportunity to submit data, views or arguments, orally or in writing.

6. This resolution, including the amendments to the Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure adopted hereby, will not have a significant effect on the environment of the Tahoe Region and is thus exempt from the requirement of preparation of an environmental impact statement pursuant to Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, by virtue of authority conferred by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, as follows:

1. Amendment Delegating Project-Review Authority to Agency Staff.

Article V of the Agency Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure is hereby amended by adding new Section 5.20, to read as follows:

5.20 Issuance Of Permits By Staff:

(a) Types of Permits - Subject to the provisions of Agency ordinances for respective issuance of permits for projects by the Governing Body and staff, and except as otherwise provided by this section, Agency staff shall review applications and approve with conditions, require modification of, or reject permits for all "projects", as defined in Agency Ordinance No. 81-1, as amended from time to time, other than those projects set forth on Exhibit "A", attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. Said Exhibit "A" may be amended by resolution of the Governing Body without amending these Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure. In the event a project, the permit for which is otherwise to be issued by staff pursuant to this section, requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement, the permit for such project shall be issued by the Governing Body and not staff.

(b) Procedure - Action by Agency staff pursuant to this section shall be in accordance with the applicable provisions of Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.6, 5.15, 5.16, 5.17, 5.18, and 5.19, of this Article. In the event a person, other than the applicant, is required to receive notice pursuant to Section 5.6, such notice shall advise such person that a permit pursuant to the application may be issued by agency staff immediately upon the conclusion of the respective time-periods for receipt by staff of comments upon the application and responses thereto pursuant to Section 5.6(c)(2) and that such issuance shall commence the 10-day period within which such interested person may file an appeal pursuant to this section.
(c) Appeal - An appeal from the action of Agency staff pursuant to this section may be made by the applicant by lodging with Agency staff a written notice of appeal within ten (10) days from the date of the applicant's actual receipt, in the case of hand delivery, or the date of deposit in the United States mail, first class, with postage prepaid, addressed to the applicant, of the permit or other notice of the action taken by staff. Any other interested person, whether or not required to receive notice pursuant to Section 5.6, may make such an appeal within ten (10) days from the date of the issuance of the permit or other action by Agency staff. All such appeals shall initially be heard by the Advisory Planning Commission pursuant to Section 7.10 of these Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure and receive ultimate disposition by the Governing Body. The action of Agency staff pursuant to this section shall be final action of the Agency in the absence, or until disposition, of any appeal. On appeal, the Governing Body shall review the application de novo, and action by the Governing Body shall be final. In the event of a conflict between this subsection (c) and the provision of any ordinance of the Agency otherwise applicable to the appeal of any action by staff pursuant to this section, as distinguished from an action by staff pursuant to authority expressly delegated by an ordinance of the Agency, the applicable provision of the ordinance governs.

(d) Compliance With Compact and Ordinances - Action by Agency staff pursuant to this section shall comply with the standards and requirements of the Compact and provisions of applicable ordinances, including, but not limited to, those governing the permissibility of the construction, use or activity proposed by the application and the making of written findings on the basis of substantial evidence.

2. Amendment Delegating Advisory Planning Commission Authority To Consider Appeals.

Article VII of the Agency Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure is hereby amended by adding new Section 7.10, to read as follows:

7.10 Appeals of Staff Actions:
Without limiting the generality of the procedure
set forth in Section 7.2 for determination by the
Governing Body of matters appropriate for APC
consideration, the APC shall initially consider all
appeals from staff actions or other determinations
pursuant to Section 5.20 of these Rules and Regulations
of Practice and Procedure and pursuant to authority
expressly delegated to staff by any ordinance of the
Agency. The APC shall consider the application de novo
and recommend appropriate action by the Governing Body.
The action by the APC pursuant to this section is
strictly recommendatory and not binding upon the
Governing Body. Subsequent to action by the APC
pursuant to this section, the appeal shall be scheduled
for hearing by the Governing Body as soon as is reason-
ably practicable. In considering the appeal, the APC
shall review the application in accordance with the
Compact and applicable provisions of Agency ordinances.

3. **Effective Date:**

In accordance with Section 3.7 of the Agency Rules and Regulations
of Practice and Procedure, the amendments to said rules and regulations
adopted by this resolution shall be effective thirty (30) calendar
days after adoption and filing of a certified copy of this resolution
in the office of the Agency. The Executive Officer is authorized
and directed to immediately certify a copy of this resolution and
file it in the office of the Agency.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional
Planning Agency this 26th day of August, 1982, by the following vote:

**AYES:** Mr. Hsieh, Mr. Meder, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Kjer, Mr. Steele,
Mr. Swackhamer, Mr. Seviston, Mr. Weise, Mr. Reed, Mr. Jacobsen,
Mr. Heikka, Mr. Woods, Mr. Ferrari

**NAYES:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** Mr. Hall

Bennie D. Ferrari, Chairman
EXHIBIT A

The projects listed below will require final action by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. All other activities not listed below and not requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement may be reviewed by the TRPA staff under the discretion of the Executive Director, with final action taken on such matters as provided by the respective ordinance and the Agency's Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure.

Matters Requiring Governing Body Review

I. Residential

A. New Construction (conversion or change in use)
   a. sfd 2-4 units
   b. sfd 5+ units
   c. multiperson dwellings
   d. mobilehome park +2 units

B. Nonconforming uses, projects requiring an EIS

C. Miscellaneous
   a. variances
   b. determination of like and similar uses

II. Tourist Residential/Timesharing

A. Additions and accessory structures to existing facilities
   a. addition of 4 or less transient dwelling units
   b. addition of 5 or more transient dwelling units
   c. accessory structures (includes recreation facilities)

B. New construction or change in use
   a. hotels/motels
   b. timesharing other than sfd
   c. RV park

C. Miscellaneous
   a. variances
   b. determination of similar use
   c. permits for additional coverage/certification of EIS
III Commercial

A. New construction of accessory structures or additions to existing structures
   a. greater than 100 vehicle trips or 1% of remaining roadway capacity

B. New construction or significant change in use
   a. batch plants
   b. bulk storage
   c. commercial development including professional offices
   d. commercial parking lots
   e. medical facilities
   f. indoor amusement facilities
   g. wrecking yards
   h. outdoor amusement facilities
   i. quarries
   j. marinas, backshore facilities
   k. ski area base facilities
   l. other

C. Miscellaneous
   a. variances
   b. determination of similar use
   c. permits for additional coverage/EIS certification

IV Public and Quasi-Public

A. New construction, use change and expansion of service capacity or service area
   a. airports, heliports and landing strips
   b. education facilities, general
   c. electrical power plants
   d. electrical substations
   e. educational facilities, avocational/vocational
   f. fire lookouts
   g. substantial fire protection facilities
   h. religious facilities
   i. radio, TV, and telephone relay stations and transmission lines and structures
   j. solid waste transfer stations
   k. transportation facilities
   l. sewage lift stations
   m. police protection facilities
   n. post office facilities
   o. historical sites
   p. incarceration facilities
   q. highways, roads and structures
   r. sewage treatment plants
   s. water storage tanks and reservoirs
t. water treatment plants
u. overhead or underground utilities but excluding service
v. public services
w. child care nurseries
x. communication equipment buildings
y. cultural facilities
z. expansion of service area, annexations

B. Miscellaneous
a. variances
b. determination of similar use
c. permits for additional coverage/EIS certification/regional public facilities

C. Federal projects requiring review under TRPA air and water quality plans and ordinances - not performed by private concessionaire
a. EIS

V Recreation

A. New construction, change in use and expansion of capacity
   a. undeveloped campgrounds
   b. outdoor recreation concessions
   c. private recreation areas
   d. private stables
   e. riding trails, corrals and stables
   f. skiing facilities
   g. organized recreation camps
   h. pack stations
   i. developed campgrounds
   j. golf courses
   k. day use areas
   l. recreation vehicle parks

B. Nonconforming uses, variances and projects requiring an EIS

VI Resource Management

A. New construction, change in use, and new resource management programs
   a. commercial forest products removal
   b. fish and wildlife management projects
   c. forest management programs
   d. forest products removal
   e. tree farms
   f. timber harvesting
B. Miscellaneous
   a. variances
   b. determination of similar use

C. Permits for additional coverage
   a. EIS certification

VII Land Divisions

A. Subdivisions of 2 or more undivided interests

B. Nonconforming divisions, variances and divisions requiring an EIS

VIII Grading

A. Major alterations
   a. disturbance in an SEZ
   b. grading pursuant to permits issued by the Board

B. Variances and projects requiring an EIS

IX Demolition

A. Demolition of historic sites and all other sites

X Shorezone

A. New construction or change in use
   a. piers, buoy fields (20+), boat ramps, groins and jetties, filling and dredging
   b. marinas

B. Nonconforming uses, variances and projects requiring an EIS
MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1982

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities
Agenda Item V. B.

The Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region on August 26, 1982. Attached is a copy of the adopting resolution including Exhibit A, the thresholds.
RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency ("TRPA") finds:

1. On December 19, 1980 the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact ("Compact") was amended, requiring, among other things, that the TRPA adopt Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region. The Compact further requires that, within one (1) year after the adoption of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities TRPA shall amend its regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements, as implemented through Agency ordinances, rules and regulations, achieves and maintains the adopted Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities.

2. The Compact finds, among other things, that: (a) the waters of Lake Tahoe and other resources of the Lake Tahoe Region are threatened with deterioration or degeneration; (b) said region exhibits unique environmental and ecological values; (c) said region is experiencing problems of resource use and deficiencies of environmental control; (d) increasing urbanization is threatening the ecological values of said region; (e) maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by said region; (f) there is a public interest in protecting, preserving and enhancing said values for the residents of and visitors to said region; (g) in order to preserve the scenic beauty and outdoor recreational opportunities of said region, there is a need to insure an equilibrium between said region's natural endowment and its man-made environment; and (h) it is imperative that there be established a TRPA with the powers, among others, to establish Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which will achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent therewith.

3. The Compact defines "environmental threshold carrying capacity" as "an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region".

4. Although not required to do so by the Compact, the Governing Body and Advisory Planning Commission of the TRPA, prior to the adoption of this resolution, conducted duly-noticed public hearings, at which hearings considerable oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered by the Governing Body and Advisory Planning Commission. Evidence in the record
of said hearings, which evidence is hereby determined substantial, established
that each of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted by this
resolution is necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational,
educational, scientific or natural value of the Lake Tahoe Region or to maintain
public health and safety within the region.

5. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted hereby comply
in all respects, procedural and substantive, with the Compact, as amended, and
are necessary to effectuate and implement the same.

6. In addition to other evidence received at said public hearings, the
Governing Body of the TRPA, prior to the adoption of this resolution, has
received for the administrative record and had opportunity to review, a lengthy,
detailed study report concerning the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities,
which report was prepared by TRPA staff and consultants and substantiates the
Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted hereby.

7. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted by this
resolution were the subject of an environmental impact statement ("EIS"), which
was prepared, considered, circulated, certified and otherwise processed, reviewed
and approved by the TRPA in accordance with the substantive and procedural
provisions of Article VII of the Compact. Without limiting the generality of the
foregoing, the Governing Body further finds that the said EIS contained the
information required by Article VII(a)(2) of the Compact and provided the
Governing Body substantial information upon which it could base a reasoned review
and evaluation of the environmental impacts of the Environmental Threshold
Carrying Capacities adopted by this resolution. The Governing Body further finds
that, prior to approving this resolution, it made the alternative written
findings required by Article VII(d) of the Compact, a separate written finding
having been made for each significant effect identified in the EIS as resulting
from the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted hereby. The
Governing Body further finds that said written findings are supported by
substantial evidence in the record.

8. Pursuant to Article II(i) of the Compact, Environmental Threshold
Carrying Capacities are to include, but not be limited to, standards for air
quality, water quality, soil conservation, vegetation preservation and noise,
thus permitting, if not requiring, the adoption of standards for other elements
necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific
or natural value of the Lake Tahoe Region or to maintain public health and safety
within the region.

9. In certain instances it was not reasonably possible or feasible to set
forth Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities as numerical standards,
requiring in such instances that standards be set forth as management standards.
The Governing Body further finds that the inability to set forth a numerical
standard for a particular Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity does not
render such Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity improper or inappropriate
for adoption under the Compact. In association with adoption of Environmental
Threshold Carrying Capacities, the Governing Body is adopting policy statements
that will provide specific direction for Agency staff in development of the
regional plan. It is the intent of the Governing Body that amendment or repeal
of the Policy Statements shall be subject to the dual-majority voting provisions
of Article III(g)(1) of the Compact.
10. The definition of "environmental threshold carrying capacity" set forth in Article II(i) of the Compact requires an exercise of discretion by the Governing Body in setting a standard "necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region". In approving this resolution, the Governing Body of the TRPA recognizes that it must amend the TRPA regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements, as implemented through TRPA ordinances, rules and regulations, achieves and maintains the adopted Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. The Governing Body further recognizes that it is required under Article V(d) of the Compact to adopt a regional plan attaining and maintaining federal, state, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the Lake Tahoe Region for which such standards are applicable.

11. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted by this resolution are achieved and maintained through implementation of TRPA's regional plan. The Governing Body further finds, however, that said Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, as achieved and maintained through implementation of TRPA's regional plan, may be achieved and maintained pursuant to an orderly time schedule adopted for that purpose.

12. In adopting this resolution, the TRPA Governing Body expressly recognizes that there is a distinction between adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and the subsequent planning process resulting in an amended regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements achieves and maintains the adopted Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities.

13. Inasmuch as the Compact specifies no particular method for the adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, this resolution is a proper method for the adoption thereof.

14. The Governing Body recognizes that, in adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, it is establishing standards for the Lake Tahoe Region which must be carried out through the regional plan and that its jurisdiction to achieve and maintain those standards is limited to the Lake Tahoe Region.

15. The Governing Body recognizes that, in establishing Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region, it is establishing the basis for a long-term program which will protect and enhance the significant environmental values of the region, which program will be reviewed from time to time to ensure its consistency with the currently available scientific evidence and technical and other information. Attainment of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities prior to the dates scheduled in the regional plan, while beneficial, is not required.

16. The Governing Body recognizes that the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, provides for the adoption of an orderly program to attain the environmental standards through the development of its regional plan, including time schedules for implementation of specific measures necessary to attain those standards and that an immediate or short-range demonstration of attainment of some standards is physically impossible.
17. The Governing Body recognizes and respects the legislative intent of the States of Nevada and California and the United States Congress in entering into and approving the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended.

18. The Governing Body recognizes that the degree of success in attaining and maintaining the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities depends upon a program of mutual cooperation among the two states, local governmental entities, the Federal Government and the private sector in implementing its regional plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as follows:

1. That the Governing Body will develop its regional plan, recognizing that out-of-basin sources of air pollution may affect its ability to achieve and maintain environmental standards. The cooperation of the States of California and Nevada and the Federal Government will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.

2. That the Governing Body hereby recognizes the long-term nature of the planning process established by the Compact and further recognizes that attainment and maintenance of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities is a continuing process requiring establishment of time schedules by which the environmental standards will be attained, and the Governing Body intends to amend its regional plan to meet such requirements with realistic time schedules and the best available means.

3. That the Governing Body hereby recognizes the long-term nature of the planning process established by the Compact and further recognizes that some of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for water quality are currently being, and will likely continue to be, exceeded until some time after the full implementation of the loading reductions prescribed by the thresholds.

4. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities shall be reviewed by staff and the Governing Body at the time of adoption of the regional plan to assure that said plan and the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities are consistent, and shall be reviewed at least every five years thereafter by the most appropriate means. After such review, the pertinent environmental threshold standards shall be amended where the scientific evidence and technical information indicate:

   (a) two or more threshold standards are mutually exclusive; or
   (b) substantial evidence to provide a basis for a threshold standard does not exist; or
   (c) a threshold standard cannot be achieved; or
   (d) a threshold standard is not sufficient to maintain a significant value of the Region or additional threshold standards are required to maintain a significant value.

The Agency shall maintain a monitoring program to determine progress towards attainment of threshold standards and to provide the basis for such review and amendment of the threshold standards pursuant to the foregoing criteria.
5. That the Governing Body hereby recognizes the long-term nature of establishing, planning for and actually achieving Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and will diligently pursue the attainment of those environmental standards through the regional plan and its schedule for implementation. The Governing Body further recognizes that the environmental standards adopted hereby may be considered as part of the environmental review process on projects reviewed pursuant to Article VI(b) of the Compact during the period of time prior to adoption of the regional plan envisioned by Article V(c) of the Compact and adoption of the ordinances required by Article V(g), and that no provision of this resolution or the environmental standards adopted hereby shall affect the maximum number of building permits authorized under the provisions of Article VI(c) of the Compact.

6. That the Governing Body hereby adopts the following as a statement of intent, which will guide the development of the regional plan and actions subsequent to the adoption of that plan:

(a) The Governing Board hereby finds and declares that in adopting these Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities it does not intend, and it shall not be construed as authorizing the Agency, to exercise its power to grant or deny a permit in a manner which shall take or damage private property for public use without payment of just compensation.

(b) Nothing in the adoption of these Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities is intended to increase or decrease the rights of any property owner under the Constitution of California, Nevada or the United States.

(c) It is the intent of the Governing Body that the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities will provide the basis for the adoption and enforcement of a regional plan and implementing ordinances which will achieve and maintain such capacities while at the same time providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities. It is further the intent of the Governing Body that the regional plan will provide for carrying out all of the policies expressed in Article I of the Compact.

7. That the Governing Body directs that the regional plan be so structured as to require a fair share of the financial resources required to implement the plan be borne by each of the entities or groups with interests in the region, including the State of California, the State of Nevada, the United States Government, entities of local government with jurisdiction within the Lake Tahoe Region, and the private sector; and

8. That the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities set forth in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, be, and the same hereby are, adopted pursuant to Article V(b) of the Compact.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency this twenty-sixth day of August, 1982, by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Heikka, Mr. Hsieh, Mr. Meder, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Kjer, Mr. Steele, Mr. Swackhamer, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Weise, Mr. Reed, Mr. Jacobsen, Mr. Hall, Mr. Woods, Mr. Ferrari

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

Bennie D. Ferrari, Chairman
EXHIBIT A
TO RESOLUTION NO. 82-11

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

WATER QUALITY

Pelagic Lake Tahoe

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen (N) loading from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. Achieve the following long term water quality standards:

- Annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity: 52 gmc/m²/yr.
- Winter (December - March) mean Secchi disk transparency: 33.4 m.

POLICY
This threshold is currently being exceeded and will likely continue to be exceeded until some time after full implementation of the loading reductions prescribed by the thresholds.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient standards for primary productivity and transparency.

Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50 percent, from groundwater approximately 30 percent, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the agency has no direct control over out-of-basin sources. The cooperation of the States of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.

Littoral Lake Tahoe

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50 percent, from groundwater approximately 30 percent, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction.
necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the agency has no
direct control over out-of-basin sources. The cooperation of the States of
California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution
which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Decrease sediment load as required to attain turbidity values not to exceed
3 JTU. In addition, turbidity shall not exceed 1 JTU in shallow waters of
the Lake not directly influenced by stream discharges.

Reduce the loading of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus,
iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources to meet the 1967-71 mean
values for phyto-plankton primary productivity and periphyton biomass in
the littoral zone.

Tributaries

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Attain applicable state standards for concentrations of dissolved inorganic
nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus, and dissolved iron. Attain a 90 percentile
value for suspended sediment concentration of 60 mg/l.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment load to achieve loading
thresholds for littoral and pelagic Lake Tahoe.

Surface Runoff

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for dissolved inorganic nitrogen
of 0.5 mg/l, for dissolved phosphorus of 0.1 mg/l, and for dissolved iron
of 0.5 mg/l in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body
in the Basin.

Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for suspended sediment of 250
mg/l.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment loads as necessary to
achieve loading thresholds for tributaries and littoral and pelagic Lake
Tahoe.

Groundwater

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Surface runoff infiltration into the groundwater shall comply with the
Uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines as set forth in Table 4-12 of
the Draft Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study Report, May,
1982.

Where there is a direct and immediate hydraulic connection between ground
and surface waters, discharges to groundwater shall meet the guidelines for
surface discharges, and the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines
shall be amended accordingly.
Other Lakes

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Attain existing water quality standards.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Impervious Cover

MANAGEMENT STANDARD

Stream Environment Zones

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Preserve existing naturally functioning SEZ lands in their natural hydrologic condition, restore all disturbed SEZ lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands, and restore 25 percent of the SEZ lands that have been identified as disturbed, developed or subdivided, to attain a 5 percent total increase in the area of naturally functioning SEZ lands.

AIR QUALITY

Carbon Monoxide

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain carbon monoxide concentrations at or below 9 parts per million averaged over 8 hours provided that each state shall review and certify to TRPA by February 28, 1983, as to what their carbon monoxide standards are as of that date, and this TRPA threshold standard shall be changed effective February 28, 1983, if necessary, to be the applicable state carbon monoxide standard applicable to the respective portions of the region in accordance with Article V(d) of the Compact.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce traffic volumes on the U.S. 50 Corridor by 7 percent during the winter from the 1981 base year between 4:00 p.m. and 12:00 midnight, provided that those traffic volumes shall be amended as necessary to meet the respective state standards.

Ozone

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain ozone concentrations at or below 0.08 parts per million averaged over 1 hour.

Maintain oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions at or below the 1981 level.

Regional Visibility

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Achieve 171 kilometers (103 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.
Achieve 97 kilometers (58 miles) at least 90% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Reduce wood smoke emissions by 15% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs.

Subregional Visibility

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Achieve 87 kilometers (54 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate matter.

Achieve 26 kilometers (16 miles) 90% of the year as measured by particulate matter.

Reduce suspended soil particles by 30% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs. Reduce wood smoke emissions by 15% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs. Reduce vehicle miles of travel by 10% of the 1981 base values.

Nitrate Deposition

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce the transport of nitrates into the Basin and reduce oxides of nitrogen (NOx) produced in the Basin consistent with the water quality thresholds.

Reduce vehicle miles of travel in the Basin by 10% of the 1981 base year values.

Odor

POLICY STATEMENT
It is the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in the development of the Regional Plan to reduce fumes from diesel engines to the extent possible.

VEGETATION PRESERVATION

Common Vegetation

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Increase plant and structural diversity of forest communities through appropriate management practices as measured by diversity indices of species richness, relative abundance, and pattern.

- Maintain the existing species richness of the Basin by providing for the perpetuation of the following plant associations:

  Yellow Pine Forest: Jeffrey pine, White fir, Incense cedar, Sugar pine.
Red Fir Forest: Red Fir, Jeffrey pine, Lodgepole pine, Western white pine, Mountain hemlock, Western juniper.

Subalpine Forest: Whitebark pine, Mountain hemlock, Mountain mahogany.

Shrub Association: Greenleaf and Pinemat manzanita, Tobacco brush, Sierra chinquapin, Huckleberry oak, Mountain whitethorn.

Sagebrush Scrub Vegetation: Basin sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Douglas chaenactis.

Deciduous Riparian: Quaking aspen, Mountain alder, Black cottonwood, Willow.

Meadow Associations (Wet and Dry Meadow): Mountain squirrel tail, Alpine gentian, Whorled penstemon, Asters, Fescues, Mountain brome, Corn lilies, Mountain bentgrass, Hairgrass, Marsh marigold, Elephant heads, Tinker's penney, Mountain Timothy, Sedges, Rushes, Buttercups.

Wetland Associations (Marsh Vegetation): Pond lilies, Buckbean, Mare's tail, Pondweed, Common bladderwort, Bottle sedge, Common spikerush.

Cushion Plant Association (Alpine Scrub): Alpine phlox, Dwarf ragwort, Draba.

Relative Abundance -- of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin:

1. Maintain at least 4% meadow and wetland vegetation.
2. Maintain at least 4% deciduous riparian vegetation.
3. Maintain no more than 25% dominant shrub association vegetation.
4. Maintain 15-25% of the Yellow Pine Forest in seral stages other than mature.
5. Maintain 15-25% of the Red Fir Forest in seral stages other than mature.

Pattern -- Provide for the proper juxtaposition of vegetation communities and age classes by:

1. Limiting acreage size of new forest openings to no more than 8 acres.
2. Adjacent openings shall not be of the same relative age class or successional stage to avoid uniformity in stand composition and age.
A nondegradation standard to preserve plant communities shall apply to native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold.

Native vegetation shall be maintained at a maximum level to be consistent with the limits defined in the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada, A Guide For Planning, Bailey, 1974, for allowable impervious cover and permanent site disturbance.

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board that a nondegradation standard shall permit appropriate management practices.

Uncommon Plant Communities

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Provide for the nondegradation of the natural qualities of any plant community that is uncommon to the Basin or of exceptional scientific, ecological, or scenic value. This threshold shall apply but not be limited to (1) the deepwater plants of Lake Tahoe, (2) Grass Lake (sphagnum bog), (3) Osgood swamp, and (4) the Freel Peak Cushion Plant community.

Sensitive Plants

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain a minimum number of population sites for each of five sensitive plant species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Number of Population sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carex paucifluctus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisia pygmaea longipetala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draba asterophora v. macrocarpa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draba asterophora v. asterophora</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rorippa subumbellata</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILDLIFE

Special Interest Species

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Provide a minimum number of population sites and disturbance zone for the following six species:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species of interest</th>
<th>Population sites</th>
<th>Disturbance zone</th>
<th>Influence zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goshawk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle (Winter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle (Nesting)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Eagle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Meadows</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Habitats of Special Significance**

**MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
A nondegradation standard shall apply to significant wildlife habitat consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations.

**FISHERIES**

**Stream Habitat**

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Maintain the 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat as indicated by the map on page 76 of the EIS for the environmental thresholds study.

**Instream Flows**

**MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
Until instream flow standards are established in the Regional Plan to protect fishery values, a nondegradation standard shall apply to instream flows.

**POLICY STATEMENT**
It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to seek transfers of existing points of water diversion from streams to the Lake.

** Lahontan Cutthroat Trout**

**POLICY STATEMENT**
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board to support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce Lahontan cutthroat trout.

**Lake Habitat**

**MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
A nondegradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe. Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat.
Single Noise Events

NUMERICAL STANDARD
The following maximum noise levels are allowed: (All values are in decibels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Less Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Greater Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Monitoring Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>80(^1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,500 m - start of takeoff roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 m - runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.1(^2)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,500 m - start of takeoff roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 m - runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50 ft. - engine at 3,000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 6,000 GVW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 6,000 GVW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off road vehicles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Not to be effective until five years after adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, provided that incremental and phased improvements toward that standard shall be provided by the Regional Plan.

\(^2\) Between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m.

Cumulative Noise Events

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Background noise levels shall not exceed existing levels, or the following levels, whichever is less:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use category</th>
<th>Average noise level or CNEL range (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High density residential areas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low density residential areas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/motel facilities</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial areas</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban outdoor recreation areas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural outdoor recreation areas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness and roadless areas</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical wildlife habitat areas</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Body in the development of the Regional Plan to define, locate, and establish CNEL levels for transportation corridors.

RECREATION

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience, including preservation of high quality undeveloped shoreline and other natural areas. In developing the Regional Plan, the staff and Governing Body shall consider provisions for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shoreline and high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses.

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public.

SCENIC RESOURCES

Roadway and Shoreline Units

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each unit, including the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in Tables 13-3, 13-5, 13-8 and 13-9 of the Draft Study Report.

Maintain the 1982 ratings for all roadway and shoreline units as shown in Tables 13-6 and 13-7 of the Draft Study Report.

Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below and shoreline units rated 7 or below.

Other Areas

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Maintain or improve the visual quality of views from bike paths and outdoor recreation areas open to the general public. Upon completion of the 1982 Visual Quality Index, this standard shall become a numerical standard.

Built Environment

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, to insure the height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signing and other design elements of new, remodeled and redeveloped buildings be compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreational values of the region.
MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1982

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: 208 Status Report - Water Quality Management Program
Agenda Item V. C.

Attached you will find a quarterly progress report for TRPA's water quality management effort. The report covers the period from April 1, to June 30, 1982. Water Quality Management is funded by a section 208 grant from the Environmental Protection Agency and section 106 funds from the State of Nevada.

On August 24, 1982, EPA and the two States conducted an evaluation of TRPA's water quality management program. The attendees at the evaluation meeting were Harry Ball and Rick Hoffman (EPA), Lew Dugdion (NDEP), Mike James (Lahontan Board), Andy Sawyer and Fran Anderson (SWRCB), and Randy Sheffield, Gary Shellhorn, and Dave Ziegler from the staff. During the evaluation meeting, the participants identified three main issues that the staff must resolve in the near future:

1. What is the relationship of the Phase IV 208 planning program to the update of the Regional Plan? How will they be meshed together?

2. What is the status of work element 101.014, Erosion and Runoff Control Strategies? The Lahontan Board is carrying out this work element under a sub-agreement with TRPA. Is the schedule for 101.014 realistic? Have all administrative requirements been met?

3. What is the proper direction for work element 101.02, Water Quality Plan Implementation? The staff has been concentrating on assisting local governments with development of remedial projects. The work program focuses more on evaluation and enforcement of conditions of approval on new development.

Staff will work with the States and EPA to resolve these issues and will address them in more detail in the next quarterly report.

DZ:md
QUARTERLY REPORT
WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLANNING
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

August 31, 1982

I. Introduction

This report covers progress TRPA has made in carrying out Phase IV 208 planning under its work program of August, 1981. The work program has been modified in accordance with letters from EPA Region IX (April 20, April 29) clarifying EPA's position on the scheduling of Phase IV work. This report also covers activities TRPA is conducting with section 106 funds from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection. (See work plan element 101.02.) The time period covered in this report is the third quarter of FFY 82 (April 1 - June 30). For further information on the Phase IV effort, see also the first two quarterly reports.

II. Status of Work Relative to the Work Program

A. Work Element 101.011, Management of Stream Environment Zones

To assist with development of management plans for stream environment zones (SEZs), staff is nearing completion of a resource information system for the Basin. The information system is in the form of a computerized "geographic data base" which contains data on zoning, traffic zone, soil, land capability, geomorphic type, precipitation, watershed, and land
use for the entire Basin. Staff is now de-bugging the final data
base and investigating the feasibility of transferring the data
from Brown and Caldwell's computer facility to another mainframe
computer.

Staff has also begun to prepare pilot management strategies for
two watersheds—Bijou Creek and Cold Creek. These pilot
strategies will include financial, institutional, and technical
components, and serve as a model for use in the 208 plan update.
Staff has made no additional progress on policies for management
of man-modified SEIs or transfer of development rights (TDR).
Also, staff must resolve the issue of the relationship of the
management strategies in the 208 work program to the update of
Tahoe regional plan.

B. **Work Element 101.012, Management of High-Hazard Lands**

The resource information system and the pilot strategies
discussed above will also contribute to management strategies for
high-hazard lands. Staff is also conducting a thorough
evaluation of development on high-hazard lands in its staff
report on the environmental effects of the Nevada case-by-case
review policy. (See EPA condition of approval E-1, below.)

C. **Work Element 101.013, On-Site Runoff Control Strategies**

The TRPA Governing Board adopted the remedial ordinance for
erosion and runoff control at its June meeting (first reading)
and July meeting (second reading). The ordinance took effect 60
days after the second reading. Now that the ordinance is in
place, staff will use the resource information system and work with local governments and other regulatory agencies to implement a remedial program. Staff has been working with the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board on a regulatory program for unpaved parking areas in the South Shore.

D. Work Element 101.014, Erosion and Runoff Control Strategies

The Lahontan Board is conducting this work element under a subagreement with TRPA. TRPA is contributing $58,900 in 208 funds, and the Lahontan Board is contributing $67,000 of its own funds. The first deliverables under the agreement are due October 31, 1982, and include (1) a report describing urban runoff patterns, (2) a preliminary assessment of erosion and runoff problems, and (3) a report on locations of water quality and quantity monitoring sites.

TRPA has several major concerns about work element 101.014, and has scheduled an in-depth evaluation with the Lahontan Board for September 16. Some of TRPA's concerns are: scheduling of work, lack of EPA approval of the subagreement, Lahontan's use of grab samples to collect runoff data, the lack of in-place BMPs to evaluate, and the difficulty of obtaining before-and-after data on BMPs. [A copy of the subagreement between TRPA and the Lahontan Board is attached for EPA's approval. See Attachment 1.]

E. Work Element 101.015, Development of Implementation Plans

As mentioned under work element 101.013, the Governing Board has adopted the remedial ordinance, and staff is developing an
implementation program for remedial efforts. Since the last quarterly report, staff has made no additional progress on transfer of development rights (TDR) or transfer of land coverage (TLC). On June 16-17, a four-person team from EPA's Nationwide Urban Runoff Program (NURP) visited Tahoe to consult with TRPA staff on the particular problems of the drainage area in California adjacent to the south stateline. [USGS watershed number 69, often called the "Wildwood" drainage.] See attachment 2 for a discussion of the results of the visit.

An issue that the staff must resolve is the relationship of work element 101.015 to the 20-year implementation program which the certified and approved 208 plan calls for.

F. Work Element 101.016, Financial and Institutional Strategies

Staff has no additional progress to report in this quarter on this work element. During the quarter, the TRPA Governing Board denied a staff request to hire a financial consultant to assist with this work element. The Governing Body's decision was based on their feeling that the staff's proposal was too vague and would not produce a useful product. The Board did indicate that staff could return to them at a later date with a more-specific proposal.

F. Work Element 101.017, Public Involvement

Staff has made continuing use of the regular Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and Governing Board meetings to provide for public involvement in the execution of the Phase IV work program.
In addition, the Association of Bay Area Governments has completed a draft erosion control handbook for the public under a subagreement with TRPA.

**G. Work Element 101.02, Water Quality Plan Implementation**

This work element calls for TRPA to (1) review previous development approvals for compliance with conditions of approval, (2) document compliance and issue compliance orders, (3) monitor continuing compliance, (4) initiate enforcement actions as necessary, and (5) monitor the creation of unauthorized coverage and grading. To date, staff has worked more in the area of coordinating remedial erosion control projects with local governments than in the areas of evaluation, monitoring, and enforcement. [With respect to evaluation of TRPA approvals, see the discussion of EPA condition of plan approval E-1, below. With respect to remedial erosion control projects, see Attachment 3.] To speed up the process of applying for and receiving State Assistance Grants for remedial projects in California, the Lahontan Board conducted a one-day grants workshop on May 6, at the urging of TRPA and the STPUD Mitigation Task Force.

**III. Conditions of Plan Approval**

**A. Management Agency Commitment Letters**

EPA Condition A and Nevada Condition 4 require TRPA to obtain letters of commitment from all major management agencies. EPA has revised its due date from December 31, 1981 to July 1, 1982. Nevada's due date is also July 1, 1982. TRPA has obtained
commitments from the California State Board, Caltrans, the Forest Service, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and El Dorado County. [See Attachment 4.] Staff is still working, through the AFC, to obtain the required commitments from Placer Co., Washoe Co., Douglas Co., and the Nevada Department of Transportation.

B. Remedial Ordinance

EPA Condition C requires the adoption and implementation of a remedial erosion and runoff control ordinance. As discussed above, the Governing Board has adopted the ordinance. A copy is attached. [Attachment 5.]

C. Methodology for Evaluation of Case-by-Case Review Policy

EPA Condition of Approval E-1 required TRPA to submit a methodology for the review of the case-by-case policy currently being used for development proposals in Nevada. TRPA submitted a draft work program to EPA and the States on July 6, 1982. Staff has received comments on the work program and is making the appropriate revisions. In addition, substantial work is already underway under the draft work program. The final report on the case-by-case process is due November 30, 1982.

IV. Financial Status and Disbursements

During the period of April 1 to June 30, 1982, TRPA’s disbursements against 208 and 106 funds were for staff salaries. The exact disbursements were as follows:
Disbursements

Funding Category | April 1- June 30 | Total To Date
--- | --- | ---
(1) Water Quality Management Planning (20B) | $6000 | $20,415
(2) Water Quality Management Implementation (106) | $4533 | $8,905

The total disbursements represent 10 percent of the 20B grant ($210,107) and 18 percent of the 106 funds from the State of Nevada ($50,000).

V. Progress Made and Difficulties Encountered

The Long Range Planning Division has continued to make progress during the third quarter of FFY 82 in carrying out the work program and associated assignments. This report has already discussed progress staff has made on (1) the remedial ordinance, (2) management agency commitments, (3) remedial projects, (4) the resource information system, (5) staff review of the case-by-case policy, (6) the Lahontan Board’s grants workshop, and (7) adjustment of the schedule of the Phase IV work program.

With respect to difficulties the staff encountered during the quarter, there are four main areas of concern:

-- The workload on the water quality staff was heavy, primarily because of the demands of the threshold study. At times, the threshold study demanded priority treatment, at the expense of progress on the Phase IV work program.

-- Progress on work element 101.014, Erosion and Runoff Control Strategies has been slow. This is primarily because of a lack of communication with the Lahontan Board and a lack of management attention on the part of TRPA. Staff is now working to correct this problem.
Progress on work element 101.016, Development of Financial and Institutional Strategies, was slowed by the Governing Board's decision not to authorize the hiring of a financial consultant at this time.

There is now, and will always be, a need for continuing water quality monitoring to support the Phase IV work program and other TRPA activities. While the need for monitoring is increasing, funding for monitoring appears to be decreasing.

VI. Activities and Priorities for the Upcoming Quarter

Two items which staff identified as priorities in the previous quarterly report will require continuing attention in the period from July 1 to September 30, 1982:

-- Identifying specific opportunities for public input and participation in the water quality program.

-- Assisting local jurisdictions in the development of remedial projects.

Additional water quality management priorities for the quarter are as follows:

-- Use of the resource information system, in conjunction with field work and the existing 208 plan, to refine implementation priorities for the remedial program.

-- Development of implementation strategies, particularly in the areas of TDR and financial strategies.

-- Additional BMP evaluations.

-- The staff report evaluating the environmental effects of the existing case-by-case review policy in Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1982

TO:       TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM:     Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Case-by-Case Review Policy;
          APC Review of Lot and Subdivision Criteria
          Agenda Item V. C.

EPA's conditions of plan approval for the 208 Water Quality Plan require TRPA to
craft an evaluation of the case-by-case review policy currently in use in
Nevada. Staff's report to EPA is due on November 30, 1982. Staff submitted a
draft work program to EPA, the States, and other interested parties in July, has
received comments on the draft, and is making revisions to the work program. At
the same time, evaluation work is already underway.

To date, the following evaluation tasks have been completed:

1. A five-person team has visited 32 lots in Nevada to evaluate their
   "buildability," installation of temporary and permanent BMP's, and the
   status of vegetation, coverage, soils, and construction. The sample
   includes both target and control lots.

2. Staff has prepared case studies and data summaries for all 32 lots.

3. A three-person team has visited seven subdivisions in Nevada to
   familiarize themselves with the work of the subdivision review team
   and to review the subdivision-wide status of vegetation, coverage,
   soils, and construction.

Remaining tasks include:

1. Assessment, through modeling, of the cumulative impacts of the
   case-by-case review policy.

2. Evaluation of the effectiveness of off-site mitigation measures.

3. Evaluation of administrative impacts and socio-economic impacts of
   case-by-case review.

4. Assessment of the consistency of the case-by-case review policy with
   the thresholds.

5. Evaluation and discussion of alternatives.
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
RE: Evaluation of Case-by-Case Review Policy;
APC Review of Lot and Subdivision Criteria
Agenda Item V. C.
September 1, 1982
Page 2

At the September 8 APC meeting, staff will make a presentation on the evaluation of the case-by-case review policy and answer questions from the Commission. Staff will also make a presentation regarding the existing criteria for reviewing subdivisions and individual lots under the case-by-case program. (See attachment.)

For more information on these subject areas, contact Dave Ziegler (Long Range Planning Division), or Nora Shepard (Project Review and Enforcement Division).
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

SUBDIVISION

SUB-AREA

DRAINAGE AREA

1. Road Placement

Good Placement in Relation to Natural Features
Fair Placement in Relation to Natural Features
Poor Placement in Relation to Natural Features
Remarks -

2. Drainage System

Good Placement in Relation to Natural Features
Fair Placement in Relation to Natural Features
Poor Placement in Relation to Natural Features
Remarks -

3. Maintenance

Good Maintenance of Vegetation/Structures/Snow
Fair Maintenance of Vegetation/Structures/Snow
Facilities Not Adequately Maintained
Remarks -

4. Downstream Impacts

No Channel Cutting, Flooding, Deposition Evident
Some Channel Cutting, Flooding, Deposition Evident
Channel Cutting, Flooding, Deposition is Evident
Remarks -

5. Stable Cuts and Fills

Cuts & Fills Stabilized by Vegetation/Structures
Some Cuts & Fills Stabilized by Vegetation/Structures
Inadequate Stabilization
Remarks -
6. **Stable Internal Drainage**

No Internal Channel Instability/Cutting Deposition
Some Internal Channel Instability/Cutting Deposition
Internal Channel Instability
Remarks -

7. **Access Difficulties**

Low Percentage of Lots with Severe Access
Moderate Percentage of Lots with Severe Access
High Percentage of Lots with Severe Access
Remarks -

8. **Land Coverage**

Land Coverage Generally in Conformance with Land Capability
Land Coverage Generally Not in Conformance with TRPA Ords.
Land Coverage in Excess of TRPA Ords.
Remarks -

**Planning Team Classification**

Adequate
Potentially Adequate
Needs Further Evaluation
Remarks -
1981 TRPA CASE-BY-CASE LOT REVIEW CRITERIA

PURPOSE

This criteria will be utilized to characterize the impacts of development on an individual lot pursuant to section 12.22 of the TRPA Water Quality Management Ordinance. The purpose of this review is to determine the extent of impacts on water quality related features of the site and to verify the ability to mitigate adverse impacts to the greatest possible extent.

Introduction

The individual lot review criteria applies only to areas or portions of subdivisions classified as "Adequate" or "Potentially Adequate" under Section 12.11 of the above-referenced ordinance. The following factors will be evaluated as indicated for individual characteristics.

1. Proximity to Stream or Wetland

Protection of stream environment zones is an important component of maintaining their natural treatment capability and preventing damage to the watershed. Three classes of lands have been identified determining the classification of properties with regard to stream environment zones.

A. Classification

High Risk (Class I)

Building site or area of land disturbance located within a marsh, meadow or limits of the stream environment zone (SEZ) as defined in the Agency's Grading Ordinance.

Moderate Risk (Class II)

Building site or area of land disturbance located adjacent to or on slope above the area delineated as SEZ. Risk of development impact is minimized if adjacent wetland or stream zone is well vegetated and slopes provide for overland flow without potential for creating gully erosion or channel downcutting.

Low Risk (Class III)

Building site or land disturbance is away from the direct area of influence of a stream environment zone.
B. Management Criteria

High Risk (Class I)

Applications involving construction or land disturbance within SEZ's (Risk Class I) are prohibited under the Water Quality Plan.

Moderate Risk (Class II)

Applications involving construction adjacent to SEZ's (Risk Class II) will require special attention to siting, best management practices, temporary and permanent erosion controls and any accessory uses must be carefully reviewed.

Low Risk (Class III)

Applications involving construction clearly outside of a water influence area (Risk Class III) will not require any special management techniques beyond the application of best management practices (applicable to all construction in the Tahoe Basin).

II Runoff Potential

Runoff potential is an indication of the hydrologic characteristics of various soil classifications and affects the ability to maintain precipitation on-site, thereby minimizing the potential for concentration of downstream runoff, increased flooding and erosion, and the potential for downstream channel bank-cutting. The TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices requires the retention of a certain intensity (frequency storm event on the site - 2 year 6-hour storm). In evaluating individual sites, the following categories will be identified:

A. Classification

High Risk (Class I)

Site characteristics in these areas will indicate an inability to maintain runoff from major precipitation events (i.e. 2-year 6-hour storm) on-site utilizing standard management techniques. Attempts to provide for on-site runoff detention would require excessive land disturbance because of extremely low infiltration rates. These areas include areas underlain by bedrock, grus, or an extremely dense hardpan soil condition.

Moderate Risk (Class II)

Applications in this class involve construction on soils with a high runoff potential where individual site characteristics indicate the ability to provide for containment of major precipitation events utilizing standard management techniques.
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Low Risk (Class III)

Applications in these areas would include soils with low to moderate runoff potential as classified by the soil survey criteria. Individual site characteristics within larger soil mapping units will be utilized to make this determination.

B. Management Criteria

Risk Class I - Applications involving construction in areas where it is not feasible to contain runoff on-site (Risk Class I) will not be further considered under the case-by-case review.

Risk Class II - Applications involving high runoff potential soil characteristics where it is feasible to maintain runoff on-site will require special consideration with regard to siting, design and verification of the soil's ability to infiltrate water on site.

Risk Class III - Risk Class III applications will not require special consideration beyond the recommendations of the Handbook of Best Management Practices.

III Land Stability

Classification of the land stability of an individual lot is an important criteria in determining the presence or potential for mass earth movement, excessive rill, gully or sheet erosion and problems related to access of the site.

A. Classification

High Risk (Class I)

These areas include over-steepened slopes between 30-60% on the construction site, contain some spring and seep areas with the potential for land instability, and contain some lots with steep road cuts or fills causing access difficulties for either driveways or utilities. Conformance with local requirements for on-site parking and setback standards or construction of utilities would require excessive excavation.

Moderate Risk (Class II)

Moderate risk lots include lands in capability classes 1a and 2 with slopes of 15-30% or less on the construction site, where roadway cuts and fills are stable, there is no evidence of springs or seeps which may contribute to instability of soil and access problems are not encountered. Moderate risk lots will also include capability class 3 lands with slopes ranging from 15-30% on the construction site and exhibiting the other characteristics as described above.
Low Risk (Class III)

Low Risk lots with respect to land stability will include land capability class 3 lots with slopes of 15% or less on the construction site where roadway cuts and fills are adequately stabilized, there is no evidence of springs or seeps which may contribute to instability of soil, and access problems are not encountered.

B. Management Criteria

Management of individual lots with regard to land stability involves consideration of several potential problem areas including potential earth movement, erosion and access problems. Protection of high risk areas is important to minimize erosion problems and limit the amount of material leaving the site.

High Risk (Class I)

Applications involving construction in areas with identified land stability, erosion or access difficulties (Risk Class I) will not be further considered under the case-by-case review.

Moderate Risk (Class II)

Applications for construction in areas with moderate potential for land stability problems (Risk Class II) will require special consideration with regard to on-site management practices including siting, restricting land coverage and disturbance, minimization of any modifications to stable cut and fill slopes, and revegetation.

Low Risk (Class III)

Risk Class III applications will not require special considerations beyond the recommendations of the Handbook of Best Management Practices.

IV Vegetation

Protection of vegetation, including the understory vegetative cover, is particularly important in maintaining the stability of fragile lands, and in minimizing the release of nutrients to groundwater. Other considerations relative to vegetative characteristics include the vegetative cover type and the ability to reestablish native vegetation on site without the use of rapid release fertilizers.

A. Classification

High Risk (Class I)

On-site vegetation susceptible to complete loss or deterioration as a result of the proposed construction with few opportunities to reestablish vegetative cover which would be capable of providing long-term stabilization. Factors to be considered in classifying lands in this category include specie composition and age, extent of soil cover, moisture regime and microclimate.
Specie Composition and Age - Heavy competition (as with lodgepole) or very old or weak shrubs (shaded out) would rate as a high risk for vegetation removal. Extent of vegetative removal will be considered in determining risk to vegetation.

Soil Cover - Poor soil cover or potential for loss due to construction.

Potential for Recovery - Moisture regime, soil conditions and microclimate determine the potential for long-term recovery of vegetation. Areas with an extremely short growing season (for example as a result of sub-alpine climate or with low water holding capacity) will be extremely difficult to re-establish vegetation.

Moderate Risk (Class II)

Vegetation on-site would sustain some damage due to construction activities. Site characteristics include the following:

Specie Composition and Age - Young trees or small shrubs, as on a previously-logged site would have a moderate potential for loss. Lodgepole pine or other species sensitive to disturbance are not predominant.

Soil Cover - Moderate soil cover with trees and/or shrubs.

Potential for Recovery - Moisture regime, microclimate and specie composition do not preclude effective long-term revegetation with native species.

Low Risk (Class III)

Vegetation on-site amenable to development with little loss other than on construction site, including the following characteristics:

Specie Composition and Age - Well established trees, shrubs and groundcover, vigorous and effective. Resistant to deterioration due to development.

Soil Cover - Good soil cover at ground level with tree cover which would survive development.

Potential for Recovery - Moisture regime, microclimate and specie composition favor rapid and effective revegetation of minimal area disturbed by development.

B. Management Criteria

Maintenance of existing on-site vegetation and the ability to provide for effective revegetation of areas disturbed due to development are closely related to the potential for site runoff, erosion and nutrient cycling and transport to groundwater.
ATTACHMENT

STANDARD CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES
UTILIZED IN EVALUATING IMPACT

1,200 square foot minimum land coverage for single family dwelling
Provide off-street parking for two vehicles
Land disturbance limited to land coverage
Construction techniques:
  - hand-dug foundations
  - parking decks
  - hand-dug infiltration facilities
  - compliance with Best Management Practices
High Risk (Class I)

Applications involving construction or land disturbance in areas exhibiting high risk characteristics for vegetation would not receive further consideration under the case-by-case review.

Moderate Risk (Class II)

Applications involving construction in Risk Class II would require special consideration with regard to siting to minimize vegetation removal, temporary vegetative protective measures and long-term revegetation plans which ensure the recovery of the site.

High Risk (Class III)

Applications for construction where there are few limitations on vegetative considerations (Risk Class III) would be required to comply with best management practices.

V Procedure

Any applications which result in the designation of a particular lot in a high risk category for any of the four rated characteristics shall be precluded from further consideration under the case-by-case review. Agency staff, other than the Executive Officer, shall initially review and take action whether to approve, require modification or to reject an application for a permit under Section 12.20 of Ordinance No. 81-5 of the Agency. An appeal from such action by Agency staff may be made to the Executive Officer of the Agency by lodging with such officer a written notice of appeal within ten (10) days after the date of such action. On appeal, the Executive Officer shall review the application anew and either approve, require modification or reject it. An appeal from such action by the Executive Officer may be made to the Governing Body of the Agency in the same manner as the appeal to the Executive Officer, and the Governing Body shall review the application anew and either approve, require modification or reject it. Such action by the Governing Body shall be final.

Action by Agency staff hereunder shall be final action of the Agency for the purposes of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact in the absence, or until disposition, of any appeal. In the event of a rejection of the application by Agency staff or the Executive Officer, the applicant shall be informed in writing of the precise reasons therefor.