TRPA
GOVERNING BOARD
PACKETS

OCTOBER
1984
NOTICE OF AMENDED AGENDA
AND
NOTICE OF COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the agenda for the regular October 24, 25, 1984 meeting of the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is hereby amended by adding the following:

Douglas County/Harvey's Resort Hotel, Request for Exemption From Grading Deadline Due to Threat to Public Health, Safety and Welfare

Administrative Matters, Resolution for Programming UMTA Section 18 Funds for Tahoe Basin (agenda item VI F.)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that at the conclusion of the Wednesday, October 24, 1984 session, the Executive Director Committee will meet to discuss the status of the recruitment program. (Committee Membership: Woods, Hansen, Westergard, Reed)

October 17, 1984

By

Gary D. Midkiff
Acting Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
NOTICE OF MEETINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on October 24 & 25, 1984, commencing at
9:30 a.m. each day at the TRPA office, 2155 South Avenue, South Lake Tahoe,
California, the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will
conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for said meeting is attached to and
made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on October 24, 1984, commencing at 8:30
a.m. in the same location, the Finance Committee of said agency will meet to
consider the following: 1) FY 1984-85 operating budget; 2) a status report on
FY 1985-86 and FY 1986-87 budget requests; and 3) allocation of Transportation
Development Act funds. (Committee membership: Stewart, Clark, Hibdon, Haagen)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on October 25, 1984, commencing at 8:00
a.m. in the same location, the Litigation Committee will meet to consider the
following: 1) pending litigation involving the Wickland unauthorized pier
construction; 2) proposed settlement in Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control
Board v. TRPA (Brockway); 3) settlement of prospective litigation involving
Larry Russell unauthorized pier repair; 4) Barsotti v. TRPA (authorized deck);
5) City of South Lake Tahoe v. TRPA (airport expansion); and 6) Glenridge Park
Company v. TRPA et al. (Committee membership: Sevison, Clark, Reed,
Westergard)

October 9, 1984

By: Gary D. Midkiff
Acting Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

NOTE: Items on the agenda without a time designation may not
necessarily be considered in the order in which they
appear on the agenda.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BODY MEETING

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

October 24, 1984  9:30 a.m.
October 25, 1984  9:30 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I  CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II  APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III  DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV  PROJECT REVIEW

A.  McCloud Condominiums, Modification of Condition of Approval, Washoe County, TRPA File #79074

B.  Lakeside Park Association, Shoreline Protective Structure, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APN 29-030-02, TRPA File #83209

C.  North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, Incline Village Fire Station Advance Warning Lights, Highway 431 and Country Club Drive, Washoe County, TRPA File #84509

V  PLANNING MATTERS

A.  Approval of the TRPA Social Services Transportation Plan Required by AB 120

B.  Approval of the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan as the Regional Transportation Plan Update Required by Caltrans

C.  Special Report and Agency Comments, California State Water Resources Control Board Draft EIR, Policy for Water Allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin

D.  Glenbrook Shorezone Master Plan

E.  Approval of Plan Area Statements for Drafting Purposes - Washoe, El Dorado, Placer and Douglas Counties

F.  Status of Code of Ordinances

VI  ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A.  Appointment of California Lay Member to Fill Vacancy on Advisory Planning Commission

B.  Change in Regular December Meeting Date Schedule

C.  Agency Legal Support
D. Recruitment Program for Executive Director

E. Allocation of Transportation Development Act Funds

VII LITIGATION

A. Consideration of Litigation in Regard to the Regional Plan and Actions Filed By the California Attorney General/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA

B. Closed Session to Confer on the Following:
   1. California Attorney General/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA
   2. City of South Lake Tahoe v. TRPA (South Tahoe Airport)
   3. Forrester v. TRPA (Tahoe Keys Convenience Center)

C. Consideration of Proposed Settlements in the Following Matters:
   1. Wickland Unauthorized Pier Construction
   2. Larry Russell Unauthorized Pier Repair
   3. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board v. TRPA (Brockway)
   4. Barsotti v. TRPA (Unauthorized Deck Construction)
   5. City of South Lake Tahoe v. TRPA (Expansion of Service at the South Tahoe Airport)

VIII ENFORCEMENT

A. Show Cause Hearings
   1. City of South Lake Tahoe, Unauthorized Expansion of Service at the South Tahoe Airport
   2. Unauthorized Tree Removal, Tahoe Tavern Homeowners Association, Placer County APN 094-200-34

B. Reports
   1. Status of the Voluntary Action Plan for Hubbard Road, Douglas County
   2. Other

IX REPORTS

A. Litigation Committee
B. Finance Committee

C. Acting Executive Director

1. Report on Specific Projects Approved by Staff Under the
   Provisions of the Temporary Restraining Order and the Preliminary
   Injunction Order

2. Other

D. Legal Counsel

E. Executive Session

F. Governing Body Members

G. Public Interest Comments

X RESOLUTIONS

XI CORRESPONDENCE

XII PENDING MATTERS

XIII ADJOURNMENT
Four of the members of the governing body from each State constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the agency. The voting procedure shall be as follows:

(1) For adopting, amending or repealing environmental threshold carrying capacities, the regional plan, and ordinances, rules and regulations, and for granting variances from the ordinances, rules and regulations, the vote of at least four of the members of each State agreeing with the vote of at least four members of the other State shall be required to take action. If there is no vote of at least four of the members from one State agreeing with the vote of at least four of the members of the other State on the actions specified in this paragraph, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

(2) For approving a project, the affirmative vote of at least five members from the State in which the project is located and the affirmative vote of at least nine members of the governing body are required. If at least five members of the governing body from the State in which the project is located and at least nine members of the entire governing body do not vote in favor of the project, upon a motion for approval, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken. A decision by the agency to approve a project shall be supported by a statement of findings, adopted by the agency, which indicates that the project complies with the regional plan and with applicable ordinances, rules and regulations of the agency.

(3) For routine business and for directing the agency's staff on litigation and enforcement actions, at least eight members of the governing body must agree to take action. If at least eight votes in favor of such action are not cast, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

- Article III(g) Public Law 96-551
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 16, 1984

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Agency Staff

Subject: McCloud Condominiums, Modification of Condition of Approval, Washoe County, TRPA File #79074

Project Status:

The McCloud Condominiums is a 256 unit project located in Incline Village that was originally approved by the TRPA in 1979. The final map was recorded in 1980. Construction commenced in late 1980, and there has been continuous construction of phases at the project since that time. The building permits for all units have been issued and maintained. Thirty two units (Cluster II) have been completed and sold. In June, 1984 Agency staff determined that the plans for Clusters I and III (64 units) were in substantial conformance with the plans approved in 1979. In July, 1984 construction commenced on Clusters I and III. No construction has commenced on the remaining 5 Clusters.

Condition of Approval:

TRPA condition of approval #13 reads as follows:

"Construction of all improvements shall be completed within sixty (60) months of the date of commencement of construction. If construction is not completed within said time, this approval shall expire and the applicant or his successor in interest shall immediately remove all partially completed work and return the site, as far as possible, to its original condition. If the applicant or his successor in interest fails to do so, the permit-issuing authority or the Agency may have the work performed at the applicant's or his successor's in interest expense, costs to constitute a lien against all the real property which is the subject of this approval."

This condition has been interpreted by the Governing Board to require only civil offsite improvements to be constructed within the specified time frame. Construction commenced on August 11, 1980, so construction of all civil offsite improvements must be completed by August 11, 1985.

Applicant's Request:

The applicant is requesting that condition #13 either be waived or extended. The applicant feels that because of the cluster design of this particular
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project, there is little reason to complete construction of the civil improve-
ments until construction of the condominium units commences. The applicant's
representative, John Frankovich, will present additional information at the
Governing Board meeting.

Staff Analysis:

The primary purpose of the condition in question is to require that construction
of the project be diligently pursued and completed within a reasonable time. A
specified completion date is important so that the site does not remain in an
unstable condition for an indefinite period of time.

Due to the cluster design of this project, there may be some disadvantages in
requiring completion of all civil offsite improvements prior to construction of
the units within any particular cluster. As the project has proceeded to date,
only small portions of the total site are disturbed at one time. This type of
construction phasing allows installation of the final landscaping and drainage
improvements within a particular cluster much sooner after initial disturbance
than if all civil offsite improvements were constructed at one time.

In light of the above considerations, Agency staff has developed the following
condition for consideration by the Governing Board and applicant in lieu of the
present conditions. (The underlining indicates new language):

13. Construction of the subject project shall proceed with due diligence
and all civil offsite improvements shall be completed by October 15,
1988. To establish due diligence a substantial amount of construction
shall occur each building season in accordance with the final con-
struction drawings approved by the TRPA. Substantial construction
shall be deemed to have occurred only if the costs of such construc-
tion equals at least 1/3 of the total construction cost, including
civil offsite improvements, of any one cluster. If construction does
not proceed with due diligence and all civil offsite improvements are
not completed by October 15, 1988, the project approval shall expire
and the applicant or his successor in interest shall immediately
remove all partially completed work and return the site, as far as
possible, to its original condition. If the applicant or his succes-
sor in interest fails to do so, the permit-issuing authority or the
Agency may have the work performed at the applicant's or his successor
in interest's expense, costs to constitute a lien against all the real
property which is the subject of this approval.

Agency legal counsel will provide information with respect to how the Prelimi-
nary Injunction may apply to the requested modification of this condition of
approval.
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October 16, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board
From: The Staff

Subject: Lakeside Park Association, Shoreline Protective Structure, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APN 29-030-02, TRPA File #93209

The applicant has requested that this item be removed from the October agenda and placed on the November agenda.
MEMORANDUM

October 15, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board
From: The Staff
Subject: North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District,
Incline Village Fire Station Advance Warning
Lights, Washoe County, TRPA File #84509

The above item has been removed from the October agenda pending further evaluation of alternatives and potential impacts of the project on the scenic threshold standards established for the affected Roadway Unit.
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 12, 1984

To: TRPA Governing Body

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Approval of the TRPA Social Services Transportation Plan Required by AB 120

Enclosed in your packet is a copy of the Social Services and Handicapped Transportation Plan for the Tahoe Basin. This study was part of an UMT Section 8 planning grant. This plan was brought before the Advisory Planning Commission several months ago and to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Tahoe Transportation District in August. The TAC recommended Alternative 1 of the Plan.

At this time, the plan still lacks a cover, acknowledgements and appendices. Staff anticipates the document to be in final form by the end of October.
DRAFT
TRPA SOCIAL SERVICES
TRANSPORTATION PLAN
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Preface

The Lake Tahoe Region is located on the California - Nevada border between the Sierra Nevada Crest and the Carson Range. Approximately two-thirds of the Basin is in California and one-third in Nevada.

The California portion of the Lake Tahoe Region contains the incorporated area of the City of South Lake Tahoe and portions of El Dorado and Placer Counties. The Nevada side is comprised of portions of Washoe and Douglas Counties, and the Carson City rural area. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is a separate legal entity formed by a bi-state compact and governed by a body of 7 delegates from California and 7 from Nevada. There is also a nonvoting federal representative on the Governing Board.
I. Introduction: The TRPA Social Services Transportation Plan identifies those public and private non-profit agencies which provide transportation services to low-mobility groups comprised of the elderly, handicapped and/or low-income disadvantaged. The plan explores the opportunities for cooperation and coordination of existing services and recommends an action plan for implementation.

The TRPA adopted Resolution #83-18 in May, 1983 setting forth its intention to prepare and implement a basin-wide Action Plan to address coordination of social service transportation planning.

The proposed plan is both an update of the 1982 Action Plan prepared by the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for the California portion of the Tahoe basin and information on existing services in the Nevada portion of the basin.

The purpose of the Action Plan is to meet the requirements of California’s Social Service Transportation Improvement Act (AB 120) and to disclose any potential opportunities to reduce total vehicle miles traveled through coordination of existing services. The goal of AB 120 is to promote the coordination of transportation services provided by social service agencies in order to "achieve greater operating and service efficiencies".

The plan inventories the existing services in terms of amount and source of funding, geographic area served, number of recipients, mileage per month and eligibility requirements. In addition, types of vehicles used and management and operations information is provided for each agency offering such services, when available.

II. Inventory Process: A total of eight agencies which serve the basin were identified that provide social service transportation on a regular basis. Two agencies were not included in the inventory, as they were only marginally involved in transportation. These two were the El Dorado and Placer County Welfare Departments which purchase small quantities of bus tickets for STAGE and TART respectively and distribute them to clients on certain occasions as determined by the case worker.

Those agencies which provide transportation to the elderly, handicapped and low-income were identified in several ways. The 1982 CTRPA AB120 Action Plan was reviewed and all five identified providers were contacted. The Nevada Department of Transportation provided a list of nine Nevada agencies to contact regarding existing or potential services (see appendix). Each existing and potential provider contacted was asked to identify any other services of which they were aware. This process resulted in the list of eight known providers (see map). Of these eight, three had been evaluated in the earlier CTRPA plan. Two programs in the CTRPA plan had been dropped. A program in Placer County for 15-20 chronically mentally disordered, which was disbanded when Federal funds were cut, and the south shore Awakening Peace trips which were dropped upon the conclusion of a YMCA grant.

Each of the providers were sent a questionnaire which was very similar to the questionnaire used by the CTRPA study. The length and complexity of the questionnaire appeared to request more information than was available.
Visits to providers and follow-up phone calls were used to develop the necessary information.

III. Summary of the Inventory:

A. The Provider Agencies: At the south shore, there are seven agencies which provide transportation services. These consist of El Dorado County Community Programs, El Dorado County Welfare Department In-Home Supportive Services, El Dorado County Mental Health, California Department of Rehabilitation, Voluntary Action Center, South Lake Tahoe Cancer League and, from Carson City, Nevada, the Ormsby Association of Retarded Citizens (OARC).

At the north shore, the sole provider of social service transportation is the Volunteer Center of Placer County.

Both fixed-route public transportation systems, STAGE at the south shore and TART at the north shore, offer reduced fares to seniors and handicapped and are equipped with wheelchair lifts. Several reasons for the lack of use are cited, including snow and the lack of sidewalks, both of which make wheelchair use extremely difficult. Also, there has been reported failure of the lift's working.

In the Nevada portion of the basin, Douglas County, Washoe County and the State of Nevada offer no transportation programs for the elderly or handicapped in the Tahoe Basin. Interviews with providers of such services in Washoe, Douglas and Carson City counties elicited the information that there is no present demand at Tahoe and none is anticipated. Further, they felt that if such a demand developed, it would best be met by an in-basin organization.

1. South Shore:

El Dorado County Community Programs an El Dorado County agency, began transportation services for eligible elderly and handicapped in 1978. Transportation is provided by contract by Lake Tahoe Transportation Systems' Dial-a-Ride service, a private transportation business. Community Programs' clients receive tickets from the Community Program office at the County Center and pay 50¢ for each ride. The Community Programs total riders account for approximately 3% of Dial-a-Ride business, an estimated 337 trips per month.

El Dorado County Welfare Department has an In-House Supportive Service program which certifies clients to El Dorado County Community Programs for Dial-a-Ride tickets. All clients are disabled. The program is funded by Title XX of the Social Security Act. The welfare department provides trips to Sacramento and Reno for medical purposes, at no cost to the client. The program will also pay minimum wage to those who will drive clients as needed, but they must provide their own car. This occurs very rarely.

The California Department of Rehabilitation authorizes El Dorado County Community Programs to issue Dial-a-Ride tickets for its low-mobility clients. The Department's clients are physically, mentally
or emotionally handicapped. More mobile clients are issued tickets to STAGE or gas money for personal autos. The Department's budget does not distinguish between the three types of transportation services.

Voluntary Action Center, a private non-profit agency, began a transportation program for seniors, 60 years and older, in December, 1983. The center uses two volunteers to drive a 1968 Jeep Wagoneer donated by Nels' Hardware. The service is offered two days a week with no restrictions on income or destination.

The South Lake Tahoe Cancer League has operated at the South Shore since 1974. Its function is to transport low-income cancer patients for medical appointments. Generally trips are to Reno and frequently for chemotherapy.

The Ormsby Association for Retarded Citizens, (OARC) a private non-profit agency, provides a 19 day a month workshop in Carson City. Six south shore residents, two from Nevada and four from California, are driven to Carson City for the workshop. The workshop is held 5 days per week for 3 weeks a month, then 4 days during the 4th week.

El Dorado County Mental Health offers a day treatment program three days per week for psychiatric patients at the south shore. Ten to eleven patients are picked up at their homes, taken to the mental health clinic and returned home. As often as once a week, the program includes a trip out of the basin to Markleeville, Reno, or other such places for combined social and treatment opportunity. The mental health department employee in charge of the program drives the departments' eleven passenger 1971 GMC van. The program began in August, 1981 and reports that 99% of its patients are from within the City of South Lake Tahoe. The program is funded by California mental health funds.

2. North Shore:

The Volunteer Center of Placer County, a private non-profit agency with headquarters in Auburn, California, is a well organized effort which offers transportation in private autos with volunteer drivers and covers the entire north shore, from Meeks Bay to Incline Village, Nevada. Eighty-five percent of the Center's workload is for their transportation program. They report that 90% of their trips are for medical purposes. Elderly and handicapped people are the primary recipients, although the center has transported low income at the request of the County Welfare Department. This is a rare occurrence.

B. The Recipients: The total number of recipients of transportation services for low income elderly and handicapped persons in the Basin appears to range from 150 to 175 per month. El Dorado County provides for approximately 65%, the State of California for 18%, while the remaining 17% are served by private non-profit agencies.

C. Mileage: The total mileage is approximately 4,500 to 7,000 miles per month, in transporting social service agency clients in, out and around the Tahoe Basin. A significant amount of that mileage, approx-
imately 74%, is for trips of a medical nature to Reno, Sacramento and San Francisco for services ranging from hearing aids to chemotherapy. The retarded citizens program travels 1,250 miles per month, or 18% of the total miles travelled.

D. Funding and Costs: Funding and cost information for the transportation services is somewhat sketchy. This is not unexpected, as was identified in a CalTrans feasibility study for coordination of human service agency transportation in three California towns, (Human Service Agency Transportation Coordination, California Department of Transportation, Division of Mass Transportation, June 1979). While total funding and total expenditures are known, specific costs for transportation and transportation administration are not broken out. However, El Dorado County Community Programs and the Volunteer Center of Placer County, the agencies serving the largest number of riders, do have broken-out cost figures, which can be found in Table 1.

The annual expenditures total approximately $34,000. El Dorado County Community Programs transportation program is funded entirely by TDA monies, as allocated by the TRPA. The eligible elderly and handicapped clients of Community Programs and the California Department of Rehabilitation pay 50¢ for each ride on Dial-a-Ride. LTTS submits a monthly bill for the difference between the normal fare and 50¢. Dial-a-Ride fares range from $2.50 to $4.50. The average trip is 2.5 miles and costs a nonsubsidized rider $3.00.

The Volunteer Center of Placer County program uses Area IV Agency on Aging Funds and pays its Tahoe director from the Older American Act Title III. Two part-time staff are also paid from Title III funds. Eighty-five percent of the three staff member efforts are transportation related. There is no cost to recipients. Volunteer drivers are reimbursed 26¢ per mile. The Volunteer Center has not applied to TRPA for TDA monies. They have not as yet been reimbursed by the American Cancer Society for transporting low-income cancer patients to Reno.

The Ormsby Association of Retarded Citizens transports four Californians who are clients of Alta California Regional Center, a state funded private non-profit agency, which pays OARC $18 per month for each client for transportation costs. Douglas County does not reimburse OARC for transportation costs.

El Dorado County provides the cars used by IHSS and the van used by the mental health program. Maintenance costs are not broken out by program and the vehicles are used for other purposes. Maintenance is generally performed at the county public works yard. There is no charge to the recipients.

E. Geographical Area and Vehicles Used: There is one UMTA 16(b) purchased van used within the Basin at present. This van, operated by the Ormsby Association for Retarded Citizens, picks up four California residents and two Nevada residents and transports them 19 days each months to a workshop in Carson City.
El Dorado County contracts with Lake Tahoe Transportation Systems through its Community Programs department to provide tickets for eligible county residents to use the Dial-a-Ride program. Eligibility is based on income; $5,964 per year total for a single person, $10,872 for a couple, and on age; 60 years and older, or on disability.

Lake Tahoe Transportation Services is a privately owned, profit seeking business. The fleet of vehicles owned by LTTS (see appendix) is dispatched much as a taxi service, except vehicles pick up a number of riders in one area. This procedure results in some delays, yet is efficient in terms of passenger miles. No vehicle is set aside solely for the elderly or handicapped, and no vehicle is equipped with a wheelchair lift. Discussions with service recipients indicate that some drivers are known to help riders from home to vehicle, when necessary, while others were not as cooperative. Dial-a-Ride reports that they have only two wheelchair riders. The dispatcher sends a station wagon for these riders, in order to accommodate their wheelchair. Electric wheelchairs will not fit in the station wagon.

Voluntary Action offers a donated car and volunteer driver to seniors for unrestricted trips twice a week. Volunteers of the South Lake Tahoe Cancer League provide transportation for medical services for low-income cancer patients in private cars, generally to Reno.

The El Dorado County Welfare Department and the California Department of Rehabilitation offer passes for STAGE to recipients they certify. The Department of Rehabilitation clients who use Dial-a-Ride receive tickets issued through the El Dorado County Community Programs office. The additional 50¢ is provided directly from the Department to its clients.

The El Dorado County Welfare Department In-Home Supportive Service section offers transportation in a county vehicle to medical appointments, both in and out of Basin, including Reno and Sacramento. The vehicle is shared with other sections of the welfare department. Welfare department employees drive the county cars.

The El Dorado County Mental Health Department takes patients in its psychiatric day care program from their homes to the departments’ offices 3 days per week. Group therapy occurs in the van as well as at the office. During good weather, patients are taken on outings, combining social and therapy opportunities. The trips occur up to once a week and many go as far as Reno and Virginia City. The van is an eleven passenger 1971 GMC which has been previously used by the department in Placerville.

The Volunteer Center of Placer County transports its clients in and around the North Shore as well as to Sacramento, Reno, Truckee and occasionally to San Francisco. Out-of-Basin trips are for medical services. The Volunteer Center serves the Incline Area in Nevada as well. The Volunteer Center provides the only door-to-door service for elderly and handicapped at the North Shore. The Placer County Welfare Department relies on the Volunteer Center for emergency referrals and provides a few TART passes on a case-by-case basis.
## Table 1: Inventory Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>%/Year</th>
<th>Geographic Area Served</th>
<th>Average # Monthly Recipients</th>
<th>Fee Charged</th>
<th>Average Monthly Mileage</th>
<th># Vehicles</th>
<th>Eligibility Requirements</th>
<th>Driver Info</th>
<th>Mgmt. &amp; Operations Responsible</th>
<th>Cap. &amp; Admin. Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Shore - California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County Community Programs</td>
<td>$23,000 est.</td>
<td>El Dorado Co.</td>
<td>80% fluctuates widely</td>
<td>50% one way</td>
<td>900 - 1,400</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60 yrs or handicapped.</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Transport. Systems (LTTS)</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Transport. Systems (LTTS)</td>
<td>2,000 admin contract with LTTS. No cap. costs to county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract with Lake Tahoe Transportation</td>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>Tahoe Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems (Dial-a-Ride)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calif. Dept. of Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$15,165 est.</td>
<td>El Dorado Co.</td>
<td>10 LTTS</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UMTA guidelines, Physical, mental or emotionally handicapped</td>
<td>LTTS &amp; STAGE</td>
<td>LTTS &amp; STAGE</td>
<td>LTTS &amp; STAGE No capital costs to Rehab. Admin. costs not broken out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>includes gas (Placer line to Strawberry &amp; Alpine Co. 20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reimburses clients pay if choose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for clients with auto.</td>
<td>Dial-a-Ride over bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Rehab. Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Action Center</td>
<td>United Way amount to program not known</td>
<td>South Shore generally</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>275-300</td>
<td>1 donated</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>2 Volunteers</td>
<td>Nels Hardware</td>
<td>Not known (donated vehicle) admin. cost not broken out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Co. Welfare Dept. In-home Supportive Services (IMSS)</td>
<td>Social Security Act Title XX amount not known</td>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Client to pay 25c/mi to private driver</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>partial use two county cars &amp; STAGE</td>
<td>SSI recipients only of dept.</td>
<td>County emp. or can hire driver 3.35/hr. to drive own car.</td>
<td>El Dorado Co &amp; LTTS</td>
<td>No separate records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount/Source</th>
<th>Geographic Area Served</th>
<th># Recipients</th>
<th>Fee Charged</th>
<th>Average Monthly Mileage</th>
<th># Vehicles</th>
<th>Eligibility Requirements</th>
<th>Driver Info</th>
<th>Mgmt. &amp; Operations Responsible</th>
<th>Cap. &amp; Admin. Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center of Placer Co.</td>
<td>United Way Older Am.</td>
<td>Meeks Bay - Incline</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,860 avg. 1983</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>60 yrs or handicapped or low income</td>
<td>17 volunteers</td>
<td>Volunteer Center of Placer Co.</td>
<td>No cap. costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000 admin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000 driver reimbursement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Inventory Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Trip purpose: Regulations?</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Fixed Route or Demand Responsive</th>
<th>Date Program Began</th>
<th>Interest in Coordination</th>
<th>Program Advertised</th>
<th>Type Vehicle</th>
<th>Driver Reimbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County Community Programs</td>
<td>Not to be used for trips to gamble</td>
<td>One Person 1/4 time. Staff director in Placerville</td>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See LTTS inventory in appendix</td>
<td>LTTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Dept. of Rehab.</td>
<td>medical school, work job seeking</td>
<td>Director est. 1/3 time</td>
<td>LTTS - Demand responsive STAGE - Fixed routes</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See LTTS &amp; STAGE</td>
<td>LTTS &amp; STAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Action Center</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>One person 7 time 2 volunteer drivers</td>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>Dec. 1983</td>
<td>Agency is assessing senior needs in Douglas Co.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68 Jeep Wagoneer</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Co. Welfare Dept. IHSS</td>
<td>Medical only</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>69 Ford Maverick 81 Ram Charger</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Co. Mental Health Department</td>
<td>Home to program and return</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11 passenger van 1971 GMC</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT Cancer League</td>
<td>Low income cancer 4-6 drivers patients only</td>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private autos</td>
<td>$10 per trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore - Nevada</td>
<td>Home to workshop one driver and return</td>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15 passenger van 83 Plymouth</td>
<td>$5,900.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
Table 2: Inventory Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Trip purpose: Regulations?</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Fixed Route or Demand Responsive</th>
<th>Date Program Began</th>
<th>Interest in Coordination</th>
<th>Program Advertised</th>
<th>Type Vehicle</th>
<th>Driver Reimbursment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Shore - California</td>
<td>Not regulated</td>
<td>Tahoe director</td>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Only system in existence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private autos</td>
<td>26¢/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center of Placer County</td>
<td>regulated</td>
<td>3-15 drivers</td>
<td>part time staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. **Transportation Across State Lines:** Service across the state line is offered by six of the eight provider agencies. None of the six have experienced nor foresee any legal problems with their bi-state travel. Those crossing the state line are Voluntary Action, South Lake Tahoe Cancer League, El Dorado County In-Home Supportive Services, El Dorado County Mental Health, Volunteer Center of Placer County and the Ormsby Association of Retarded Citizens (OARC). The OARC van is garaged in Carson City and travels to South Lake Tahoe each morning and evening. The OARC uses an UMTA purchased van, while the In-Home Support Services and Mental Health use El Dorado County vehicles. All other services are in private cars.

G. **Eligibility:** Eligibility for each program is established by the providing agency. Age, income level and/or degree of handicap are certified by the agency. STAGE receives a certification form signed by a physician in order to issue a disabled I.D. card. These cards are required for Department of Rehabilitation and Community Programs clients.

Voluntary Action Center provides transportation services to California seniors over 60 years and has not set an income level requirement.

H. **Marketing:** None of the programs are advertised as such. The Volunteer Center of Placer distributes its brochure to doctor's offices, the hospital in Truckee and nutrition centers. All other programs rely on word-of-mouth for potential clients. Most providers felt there were eligible people who were unaware of their services and who would benefit from a marketing program.
IV. Issues of the Plan:

A. North Shore/South Shore Coordination: The geographical separation of the North and South Shore appears to preclude the need for coordination of systems for the elderly and handicapped between the two areas. All but one of the eight providers contacted felt that the two areas were entirely separate and that there was no need to attempt to coordinate them. The two agencies that cover both areas (in California), the Department of Rehabilitation and Alta California Regional Center seem to view the areas as separate and distinct. Alta California Regional Center has two potential clients at the North Shore who would benefit from a workshop in Reno. The Department of Rehabilitation has no regular clients at the North Shore, a condition the director attributes to the difficult topography of the North Shore and lack of employment opportunities. However, the Department of Rehabilitation director did feel that a link-up to TART would be beneficial for North Shore clients to get to the South Shore for employment.

B. Coordination of Existing Programs: The critical issue to be addressed by the Social Services Transportation Plan is that of consolidating existing social service transportation programs. This issue is easily addressed at the North Shore, where there is only one such program. While TART offers reduced rates to seniors and handicapped and is equipped with wheelchair lifts, the service is not accessible to those clients of the Volunteer Center whose age or disabilities require that they be picked up at their residence. In addition, TART cannot schedule out-of-basin medical trips, which account for 90% of the Volunteer Center's trips.

At the South Shore, there are four programs that do not appear susceptible to coordination with other existing programs. These are offered by the OARC, the South Lake Tahoe Cancer League, the out-of-basin medical trips of El Dorado County In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), and the El Dorado County Mental Health Program. The OARC van is parked in Carson City during the day, the Cancer League trips involve specific medical appointments in Reno and the IHSS trips are scheduled for specific medical appointments. The Mental Health program involves ongoing group therapy sessions in the van as it travels both to and from patients homes and on social outings.

El Dorado County Community Programs issues Dial-a-Ride passes for certified elderly, IHSS clients and authorized California Department of Rehabilitation clients. In essence, this is coordination of the three programs that represent the largest number of riders.

Voluntary Action's two day a week car offers rides to seniors whose income is too high to qualify for the county subsidized Dial-a-Ride tickets.

STAGE and TART have no coordination mechanisms with the other providers in the Basin. Their existing fixed-route systems do not lend themselves to the special needs of those of the elderly and handicapped that are served by the social services providers and who need door-to-door service as well as driver assistance.
C. **Coordination of Financial Matters:** Funding sources, with the exception of TDA monies and donations are generally program-related. The contractor at the South Shore has combined the social service transportation with his regular service, to achieve some efficiency and economy. The expenditures of the other providers do not add up to enough to warrant considerations of coordination. The North Shore has only the one program.

STAGE and TART do have services that could be helpful to the human services agencies, in a cooperative arrangement. Those public transportation systems have both dispatching and maintenance capabilities as well as wheelchair lifts on their buses.

D. **The Need for Coordination:** The needs for coordination appear minimal at this time and existing transportation programs for the elderly, handicapped and low income generally appear to meet the needs of those people. El Dorado Community Programs issues up to 900 Dial-a-Ride passes per month, yet actual usage can drop as low as 360. Volunteer Center of Placer County states they have not turned anyone away. On the other hand, they feel they are operating at the maximum. The lack of wheelchair equipped vans appears to concern most of the service providers. However, STAGE has expressed concern about the lack of requests for their wheelchair lifts.

Seventy Douglas County, Nevada Seniors were surveyed by Voluntary Action Center in April regarding the need for a senior site. One question was asked about transportation needs and four respondents of the seventy said they would require transportation.

All service providers interviewed noted that Tahoe is not a convenient living place for the elderly and handicapped and did not predict any change in the present ratio of population level of handicapped people. There is some speculation that the population of elderly will increase, in proportion to the general population shift to an older level, which could result in an increased demand for special transportation services.

E. **Constraints due to Eligibility Requirements:** Income level eligibility requirements of El Dorado County for elderly and handicapped may be such that a number of potential clients, who cannot afford the average $3.00 one-way fare on Dial-a-Ride, do not qualify for the county’s subsidized tickets. Several social service agency staff mentioned that the income level limit of $5,964 for a single person and $10,872 for a couple was a severe restraint for those elderly and handicapped people whose income is slightly higher.
V. The Action Plan Alternatives: Several alternatives are considered for future coordination of or cooperation among transportation services for the elderly, handicapped and low-income who are generally unable to use fixed-route systems.

A. Alternative 1: Status Quo plus Coordinated Information: Under this alternative, existing services would coordinate to expand or decrease based on levels of program related funds, services and providers. Awareness and identification of needs will be made by non-profit agencies, counties and states. New services may be instituted by new or existing agencies. TRPA will institute an ad-hoc organization of providers and clients to coordinate information. TRPA will gather data for an annual report.

B. Alternative 2: Tahoe Transportation District designated as Consolidated Transportation Service Agency:

Scenario A. The Tahoe Transportation District coordinates all in-basin social service transportation programs. Such coordination consists of:

1) Applications to TRPA for TDA funds for providers.
2) Needs assessment for Nevada portion of Basin.
3) Arrangement for cooperative dispatching where practical.
4) Utilization of STAGE and TART equipment and maintenance facilities where feasible.
5) Design and implementation of marketing programs.
6) Provide annual report to TRPA.

Scenario B. The Tahoe Transportation District provides clearinghouse function to social service transportation providers. Such functions consist of:

1) Transportation information clearinghouse for providers.
2) Information referral service for potential recipients.
3) Monitor and report on changes in service, funding, number of recipients and usage.
4) Design and implementation of marketing programs.
5) Organize and staff an ad hoc organization of providers and clients, including a representative of TRPA staff, STAGE and TART.
6) Provide annual report to TRPA.
C. Alternative 3. STAGE and TART Designated as Consolidated Transportation Service Agency for South and North Shore areas, respectively. STAGE and TART provide clearinghouse functions to social service transportation providers. Such functions consist of:

1) Transportation information clearinghouse for providers.

2) Information referral service for potential recipients.

3) Monitor and report on changes in service, funding, number of recipients and usage.

4) Design and implementation of marketing programs.

5) Organize and staff ad hoc organization of providers and clients, including a representative of TRPA staff.

6) Provide annual report to TRPA. Preparation by TRPA staff.

D. Discussion: The alternatives offer a gamut of approaches, from low-profile to full coordination under one agency. The eventual levels of TTD funding may affect Alternative 2A, since without a substantial budget, a full fledged program would be difficult. Further, it appears that the limited number of people who require such services and the success of the existing programs may argue against the need for such complete coordination.

Alternative 2B offers a cooperative approach on the part of TTD, which could be accomplished by the district whether or not it has a large operating budget.

Alternative 3 offers a somewhat more coordinated approach than the status quo plus alternative and is suggested in order to utilize the technical knowledge and industry information to which STAGE and TART have access for the benefit of the social service agencies.

The list of alternatives and scenarios was developed after a review of the bi-state Compact and with the understanding that the sources of funding for the TTD are not yet known. Consequently, the alternatives are not based solely on formulation of the TTD. The alternative selected should be that which provides the most effective and efficient service to the recipients and reduces the total vehicle miles travelled. Based on the low number of total recipients of social service transportation services in the basin, the alternative selected should emphasize simplicity in coordination and ease of implementation.

The question of providing transportation services across state lines may arise in the future. Presently, Lake Tahoe Transportation Systems possesses the appropriate ICC permits for such service. Since this plan has not identified a need for services to Douglas County or Incline for the near future, this issue has not been addressed.
Responses and reactions from the social service transportation providers have been requested, as well as comments from the states and local governments. Based on those responses, a preferred alternative will be presented to the TRPA Governing Board.

E. Comments and Responses:

Comment
Existing services could be more efficient.

Response
The coordination process should be a mechanism to air concerns and encourage efficient uses of existing services.

Comment
TTD could provide a STAGE wheelchair-equipped bus for better service than Dial-a-Ride.

Response
TTD funding is still an unknown. Decisions must await full operation of TTD.

Comment
Alternative 3 should designate TRPA responsible for preparation of annual report.

Response
Agree. Added to text.

Comment
The compact intended TTD as the primary coordinator within the basin.

Response
The plan allows flexibility and provides for TTD participation in the alternatives.

Comment
What are regular fares of Dial-a-Ride and how much subsidy does El Dorado County provide per ride?

Response
Text has been clarified. Regular fares range from $2.50 for 2 miles or less to $4.50 for 6 to 7 miles. El Dorado County pays the regular fare less 50c.

Comment
How much is spent by state and local agencies for meals, clothing, medicine in relation to transportation for clients?

Response
The difficulty of developing this information exceeds the scope of this plan.
Comment
Do limitations placed on eligibility discourage ridership?
Response
Service providers feel they do. This information has been added to the text.

Comment
Report should recommend the next basin-wide survey address the question of why the ratio of elderly and handicapped to the overall population is low.
Response
Agree. Designation of a CTSA or an ad-hoc coordinating group should provide a mechanism to determine information needs of the providers.

Comment
While OARC is the only Nevada agency presently providing service to the basin, there is a legal right of agencies in the Carson City and Minden/Gardnerville areas to do so.
Response
Agree. Interviews with these providers (and in Washoe County) elicited the information that there is no present demand and none is anticipated. Further, they felt that if such a demand developed, it would best be met by an in-basin organization. This information has been added to the text.

Comment
The Nevada Transit Plan recommends an UMTA 16(b)(2) vehicle for the State-line area.
Response
Based on to the Voluntary Action Center survey of Douglas County seniors, the need appears minimal on the Nevada side at this time.

Comment
Mileage for the Volunteer Center of Placer County is increasing monthly.
Response
Noted in text and chart.

Comment
Low usage of wheelchair lifts on fixed route systems needs to be explained.
Response
Agree. Added to text.

Comment
Should consider fixed-route systems for coordination.
Response
Agree. STAGE and TART are included as participants in all alternatives.
Comment
Nevada Section 16(b)(2) vehicles can't be operated by TTD.

Response
TTD can provide coordination of services. Existing agencies may continue to operate the vehicles. All federal and Nevada regulations would have to be satisfied.

Comment
There are disabled and elderly people who need transportation, but don't qualify by income level.

Response
Agree. Information added to text.

Comment
Very difficult to coordinate doctors appointments.

Response
This is an issue which should be discussed by the involved providers.

Comment
Nevada agencies which have Section 16(b)(2) vehicles not identified. They perhaps would provide services into the basin at a later time.

Response
Agencies with vans in Washoe County and Douglas County were contacted (see appendix). Two reasons were cited for no plans for services to the basin: 1) no known need and no future need anticipated; and 2) distance and snow. Elderport in Washoe County and Young at Heart Senior Citizens in Douglas County felt that any program for the basin for seniors would have to be run in-basin.

Comment
No on-site visits to providers were made.

Response
Author visited STAGE, El Dorado Community Programs, Dial-a-Ride and Nel's Hardware offices.

Comment
Meetings were not arranged for providers to meet and discuss coordination.

Response
El Dorado Community Programs, California Department of Rehabilitation, Alta California Regional Center and Awakening Peace had scheduled a meeting during April which was eventually held May 8. Alta suggests a meeting of all providers.

Comment
Lack of data concerning numbers of trips provided.

Response
True. Mileage was the only consistent information to compare agencies. The TRPA transportation plan assumes that VMT reduction may occur as a result of a more coordinated system. Consequently mileage is important to the study.
Comment

One provider could make many trips for out-of-basin purposes.

Response

Perhaps this is a potential area for coordination, which could be explored under the aegis of the CTSA selected. Coordinating trips to Reno (the Cancer League travels only to Reno) for approximately 3 people per month should be relatively easy.

Comment

Coordination in the Tahoe Basin could be handled by the Private Nonprofit Providers (PNP's) themselves.

Response

This was not proposed as an alternative since the TRPA plan assumes a reduction in VMT from this program; an existing transportation agency would be better equipped to develop an annual report to address VMT reduction.

F. Recommended Plan:
Agencies Contacted

Nevada

Elderport
Carson City Senior Center
Ormsby Association of Retarded Citizens
Young at Heart Senior Citizens
Washoe Tribe
Division of Aging Services
Department of Human Resources
Douglas County
Washoe Regional Transportation Commission

California

Voluntary Action Center
South Lake Tahoe Cancer Society
El Dorado County Community Programs
Area Agency on Aging
STAGE
TTD
TART
Volunteer Center of Placer County
Alta California Regional Center
California Department of Rehabilitation
Awakening Peace
Lake Tahoe Transportation Systems (Dial-a-Ride)
El Dorado County Mental Health Department
Placer County Mental Health Department
CTRPA
Women's Center, South Lake Tahoe
El Dorado County Welfare Department
Placer County Welfare Department
Placer County Health Council

Lake Tahoe Transportation Systems Fleet

1 1975 Chevrolet 4-door sedan
2 1978 Oldsmobile 4-door sedan
1 1978 Buick station wagon
1 1977 Dodge station wagon
1 1973 Dodge Max-van 14 passenger
1 1975 Dodge Maxi-van 11 passenger
1 1978 GMC van 11 passenger
1 1974 Cad. stretch limo 8 passenger
4 1978 Wayne buses 14 passenger
MEMORANDUM

October 11, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board

From: The Staff

Subject: Biennial Regional Transportation Plan Update

Upon the deactivation of the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency was designated by Caltrans as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the California portion of the Basin. In accepting this designation, the TRPA is required to biennially update the Regional Transportation Plan. On September 12, 1984, the Advisory Planning Commission recommended that the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies be submitted to satisfy this requirement. This action was consistent with Caltrans guidance to the Agency.

Staff requests that the Governing Board endorse the Transportation Element as the Regional Transportation Plan Update required by Caltrans. A copy of the Transportation Element is included in your packet.
CHAPTER III

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

The Transportation Element of the Regional Plan describes an integrated multi-modal plan for improvement to the regional system of transportation. The overall direction of the recommended transportation plan is to achieve Compact goals, environmental thresholds, and improve the movement of people, goods and services into and within the Basin. The transportation plan is subdivided into elements which describe programs for the more efficient use of existing transportation systems, expansion of regional streets and highways, mass transportation systems and facilities, nonmotorized facilities, aviation and waterborne, and transportation related measures. Each subelement is further subdivided into phases which identify when the recommended programs, measures and projects should be implemented to achieve stated goals of the Regional Plan and Compact. The exact program or level of implementation recommended shall be determined as part of the TRPA annual transportation improvement program after evaluating the relative cost effectiveness of the various options designed to reduce vehicle miles of travel within the Basin.

Development of the transportation plan incorporates both a regional and transportation systems planning approach into the recommended goals and policies. The recommended multi-modal transportation system was evaluated by an area transportation corridor approach. The analysis included existing public and private services, feasible program extensions, and new program implementation. Each system was evaluated by its vehicle miles of travel reduction potential and its contribution to the overall improvement to the regional system of transportation.

Establishment of policy for the Transportation Element is derived from Compact goals, existing state and federal laws, and environmental threshold carry capacities.

The Compact goals related to the transportation plan include those listed below:

- 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 V(c)(2);

- 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 V(c)(2)(A);

- To reduce to the extent feasible air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles V(c)(2)(B);

- 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 V(c)(2);
The Plan shall provide for an appropriate transit system for the Region V(c)(2); and

- The Plan shall give consideration to:

  - Completion of the Loop Road in the State of Nevada and California V(c)(2)(A);
  - Utilization of a light rail mass transit system in the South Shore area V(c)(2)(B); and
  - Utilization of a transit terminal in the Kingsbury Grade area V(c)(2)(C).

The Transportation Element is a comprehensive regional transportation plan which achieves Compact and threshold requirements as well as state and federal transportation planning requirements. The Plan incorporates requirements of the Alquist-Ingalls Act (AB 402, 1977) of the State of California and complies with Title 23 USC 450.12 which defines both the federal and Nevada Department of Transportation planning needs. The State of Nevada and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) do not, however, require submittal of transportation plans for areas of less than 50,000 population.

Elements in the transportation planning process (Title 23) that were addressed include:

- The transportation plan will describe policies, strategies and facilities necessary to achieve regional transportation system goals;
- Consideration of social, economic and environmental effects;
- Coordination with air quality planning pursuant to the Clean Air Act;
- A plan identifying the appropriate transit operators to provide the facilities and services that address the needs of the elderly and handicapped;
- Consideration of energy conservation program efforts;
- Consideration of existing private mass transportation services;
- The transportation plan should include an evaluation of alternative Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies to more efficiently utilize existing transportation services and systems;
- Projections of regional economic, demographic and land use activities and estimates of potential transportation demands;
- Description of alternative transportation investments to meet areawide needs for new transportation facilities and development of the long range element of the transportation plan;
- Continued refinement of the transportation plan based on results of studies of legislative, fiscal, corridor, functional classification, transit feasibility and institutional studies;

- The Plan shall include a transportation improvement program process which identifies annually specific system improvement projects;

- Monitoring and reporting of transportation indicators and a regular program of reappraisal of the transportation plan; and

- The Plan shall include a staged multi-year implementation program which aggregates separate elements of the transportation plan to produce a transportation improvement program.

To meet the requirements of the State of California, the transportation plan defines a course of action to achieve a transportation system that reflects the goals and objectives of the Region. The Plan is also directed at the achievement of a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, which could include, but is not limited to:

- Mass transportation;

- TSM actions;

- Regional highway;

- Waterborne;

- Nonmotorized; and

- Aviation facilities and services.

The Plan is an action oriented program (containing commitments by each affected jurisdiction to fulfill agreed upon implementation responsibilities) considering both the short- and long-term future. It presents clear, concise transportation policy guidance to local and state officials. It identifies regional issues and problems, develops and evaluates alternative solutions, and recommends an alternative which will provide direction for programming decisions.

The Plan considers and incorporates, as appropriate, the transportation plans of cities, counties, special districts, private organizations, and state and federal agencies. The resulting transportation plan is not merely a simple aggregation of existing plans; rather, it identifies and attempts to resolve regional issues and provides policy direction for these local plans so that they conform with regional goals and policies.

The regional transportation plan is consistent with, and supportive of and/or complementary to, state and regional comprehensive planning. This includes at least the State Implementation Plan, the 208 Water Quality Plan, the 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the region's comprehensive land use plan. Also included are urban development objectives and overall social, economic, environmental, system performance, and energy conservation goals and objectives.
The principal policy direction set by the environmental thresholds was to reduce vehicle miles of travel in the Basin by 10% of the 1981 base year values. In addition, the TRPA Governing Board adopted a management standard stating in order to achieve the 6 PPM carbon monoxide state standard, the transportation plan should reduce traffic volumes on the U. S. 50 corridor by up to 35% during the winter from the 1981 base year. In addition, it is the policy of the TRPA Governing Board to reduce fumes from diesel engines to the extent possible.

These and other policy statements have been ranked by priority within each time schedule for implementation. The rationale being that the higher priority policies should be implemented first in order to expedite achievement of the desired result.

The transportation goals have been evaluated to indicate the relative significance of each goal in achievement of the reduction in vehicle miles of travel Basin-wide by 10% of the 1981 base year values. The percent reduction figures presented in the following policies are preliminary and are used as an indicator to identify the relative VMT reduction significance of each policy.

### VMT REDUCTION BY POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subelement</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>% Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transportation</td>
<td>Expanded public</td>
<td>24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded private</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Ridesharing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmotorized</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation &amp; Waterborne</td>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterborne</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Related</td>
<td>Neighborhood Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100

* VMT reductions achieved through expanded private carrier service (charter bus and airlines) into the Basin is credited to the policies of expanded private service.
MASS TRANSPORTATION

The Mass Transportation Subelement is the framework and the direction for the development of an integrated multi-modal transportation system for the Tahoe Basin. It recognizes that the achievement of the policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) within the Basin will require a dramatic change in the way people travel to and within the Basin. The Mass Transportation Subelement establishes a building block approach towards meeting these challenges. The focus in the first five years is to make operational the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) to establish and implement a major capital improvements program, and to establish complementary investments and programs which support the deemphasis of the private automobile as the predominant mode of travel within the Basin. The Mass Transportation Subelement is integrated with the other subelements of the Transportation element of the Regional Plan. Likewise, it supports the Land Use and other elements of the Regional Plan.

The Mass Transportation Subelement is a vital component of the comprehensive approach toward preserving and enhancing the quality of life within the Basin. It is complementary to the other adopted goals and policies in the Regional Plan. This Subelement comprises the long term aspect of overall regional mass transportation improvements along with the necessary supporting public and private actions. It includes the process by which the existing mass transportation system can be improved in stages to attain the longer-term goals. Short term objectives are derived from the Subelement, and will be updated annually in a five year Transportation Improvement Program prepared by TTD and subject to TRPA approval. The Mass Transportation Subelement will be reviewed and updated to reflect evolving circumstances every five years, or more frequently if warranted by unanticipated major events. The TRPA, with assistance from the TTD, will evaluate the results of the first five year program/policy implementation phase. Program direction may be determined by new technology, financial feasibility and other considerations.

The Mass Transportation Subelement serves as the basis for critical decisions which will affect not only the mobility of everyone within the Basin, but also the quality of life, economic viability, and by helping focus future growth in those areas of the Basin which are ecologically and culturally suited for future development, consistent with regional and local land use plans. The system consists of three primary elements: the bus network which serves as the foundation of the overall transportation system, the rapid transit system in the most heavily traveled corridor in the Basin, and public and private management strategies and complementary investments.

The bus network includes both public and private systems and consists of several types of bus service, including paratransit, neighborhood circulator, local, express and inter-regional routes. The type of bus service is selected to be most appropriate to the particular characteristics of each transit market and service area in order to provide the highest level of mobility and accessibility attainable within the overall constraint of cost effectiveness. The bus system would be designed to be fully integrated with the rapid transit system so that transfer times between the two components of the overall system are minimized and schedules are coordinated.
The rapid transit network consists of high quality, high intensity transit operating in the highest volume travel corridor of the Basin. The location of this corridor is on the South Shore along Highway 50 from approximately the 'Y' to South Stateline Area. The system would be built in stages beginning with intensive bus service operating in mixed traffic and followed by an evaluation of the feasibility of utilizing a separate right-of-way and improved technology.

The Mass Transportation Subelement includes a range of policies to improve the inter-intraregional service provided by public and private surface transportation systems. Implementation of the policies will achieve approximately 41% of the required Basin-wide VMT reductions; approximately 24% by public transit service and approximately 17% through expanded private mass transportation systems.

GOAL #1 EXPAND PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE.

The regional transportation plan shall emphasize development and implementation of a basin-wide public transportation system. Agencies responsible for transportation services and planning shall review public transportation needs to insure that there are no unmet transit needs which can reasonably be met. Establishment of a public/private partnership to achieve dramatic increases in public transit ridership throughout the Basin should be achieved. In addition, use of the private sector to increase the number of visitors arriving in the Basin by mass transportation is essential to achievement of the public transportation goals. Service expansion may be through public transit or public contracted service. Implementation of the following policies may achieve 24% of the desired VMT reductions.

POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. INITIATE THE FORMAL FORMATION OF THE TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD).

The formation is to include the acquisition of the South Tahoe Area Ground Express (STAGE) and the Tahoe Area Rapid Transit (TART) systems and associated facilities, and secure financing for the local share of capital projects and continuing operating deficits. The first priority of the TTD is to pursue funding sources consistent with the Compact in order to accomplish implementation of the transit portions of the transportation plan.

Consistent with the Compact and policies herein, TRPA and the TTD shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) setting forth the respective powers and duties.

2. IMPLEMENT A RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM OF HIGH QUALITY AND INTENSITY IN THE SOUTH SHORE & ALONG THE HIGHWAY 50 CORRIDOR.

Provide an intensive rapid transit bus system along the highway 50 corridor, integrated with an intensive feeder service during the first 5 year implementation phase. Headways providing convenient use and peak ridership periods should be determined in a study by the TTD based upon funding capabilities and other factors consistent with, but not limited to, the 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (Appendix D, Page 4).
operation plan will be prepared by the TTD and approved by TRPA Governing Board. Establishment of this service level is essential in order for the public to find the system reliable, efficient and a convenient alternative to the private automobile. In the Highway 50 corridor, all bus systems should be fully integrated so that transfer times between feeder, express, and interbasin components are minimized and schedules are coordinated.

The private sector will provide the marketing expertise to develop and implement marketing programs targeted to attract discretionary riders to public transit within this corridor.

3. **EXPAND THE TAHOE AREA REGIONAL TRANSIT (TART) SERVICE BY EXTENDING SERVICE AREAS AND IMPROVING HEADWAYS.**

TART service area should be expanded into Incline Village and along the West Shore. For overall North and West Shore service, the objective of the TTD shall be to; (1) increase the frequency of service, (2) expand the hours of operations, and (3) implement strategies to improve the system and increase ridership.

4. **THE TTD WILL EXPEDITE GRANT APPLICATIONS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION FUNDS AND SEEK OTHER APPROPRIATE FUNDING SOURCES FOR TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS.**

The TTD should seek sources of operating revenue as well as capital funding support from the state and federal government as soon as possible for the total program for the first five years to include design and construction of new facilities, new buses for the intensive bus service along Highway 50, and the increases in TART service, and associated support facilities.

5. **IMPLEMENT A BASIN-WIDE, SUMMER BEACH/CAMPGROUND, FIXED ROUTE SCHEDULED BUS SERVICE.**

Service shall be provided between all major attractions and residential/activity centers. The system should accommodate approximately 300 passengers per day. Initially, service should be provided between Nevada Beach (Douglas County) to Emerald Bay, and operate approximately 10 hours per day with hourly directional service.

6. **EXTEND THE STAGE TRANSIT SYSTEM INTO DOUGLAS COUNTY.**

Fixed route scheduled service should be initiated between Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, and South Stateline with intermediate stops in the Kingsbury Grade area and Casino Core areas.

7. **ENCourage IMPLEMENTATION OF AN EXPRESS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM BETWEEN THE LAKE TAHOE AIRPORT AND THE SOUTH STATELINE AREA.**

This service should accommodate each scheduled air carrier arrival/departure and may be provided by either public, public contracted, or private carrier.
8. STAGE SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO SERVE RESIDENTIAL AREAS ALONG PIONEER TRAIL BETWEEN MEYERS AND SOUTH STATELINE.

A line-haul system may be more effective than paratransit in providing service to the area. The fixed route system along Pioneer Trail would conveniently link residential and activity centers without the need for transfer.

9. DEVELOP SCHEDULED SERVICE BETWEEN THE NORTH STATELINE AREA AND TRUCKEE VIA BROCKWAY SUMMIT AND HIGHWAY 89.

Service should be initiated to meet commuter demand between Truckee and North Shore and to provide service to the Truckee Airport. Consideration should be given to initiation of a reliable and regularly scheduled connecting service. Service could be provided by either public transportation service providers, public contracted service or private carriers for profit.

10. INITIATE PARATRANSPORT SERVICE IN INCLINE VILLAGE.

The service should operate 24 hours per day. Paratransit operation would link remote, low-density residential developments to line-haul systems and provide door step pick-up and delivery to and from the fixed route system and/or activity centers. Service could be provided by either public, public contracted, or private carriers.

11. A TRANSIT SYSTEM MAINTENANCE FACILITY ON THE WEST OR NORTH SHORES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) should determine the need, site location, facility design, and cost of a maintenance facility for the TART bus transit system.

Second (5 to 10 year) phase:

1. EVALUATE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PUBLIC OR PRIVATE CONTRACT PARATRANSPORT SERVICE IN THE KINGS BEACH AND TAHOE CITY AREAS.

Refer to explanation in number 10 above.

2. DETERMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF A PARATRANSPORT SYSTEM TO SERVE THE KINGSBURY GRADE AREA AND BETWEEN CAVEROCK AND ROUND HILL.

Refer to explanation in number 10 above.

3. COMPLETE AN EVALUATION OF THE FEASIBILITY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF A LIGHT RAIL SYSTEM ALONG THE HIGHWAY 50 CORRIDOR.

TRPA will initiate an evaluation within the 5 to 10 year phase from adoption of the Regional Plan which assesses the location, financing, ridership potential, and environmental impacts of a light rail transit system.
4. EVALUATE EXTENSION OF SOUTH TAHOE AREA GROUND EXPRESS (STAGE) AND TART TO PROVIDE PUBLIC TRANSIT SERVICE BETWEEN THE NORTH AND SOUTH SHORES.

An expanded fixed route schedule should operate 24 hours per day. The purpose of such service is to reduce the approximately 6,460 vehicle or 11,500 person trips between the North and South Shores per average summer day. Each person trip by public transit represents approximately a 13 vehicle miles of travel (VMT) reduction.

Third (10 to 15 year) phase:

1. CONSTRUCT BASIN-WIDE MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION TERMINALS.

Terminals should be constructed in the vicinity of North and South Statelines, Tahoe City, Kingsbury Grade, South Tahoe "Y", Incline Village, Meyers, and the Lake Tahoe Airport. The TTD is responsible for site selection, design, and construction of the terminal facilities.

2. IMPLEMENT A BUSWAY OR LIGHT RAIL SYSTEM AS DETERMINED BY THE TRPA EVALUATION STUDY BETWEEN THE LAKE TAHOE AIRPORT AND SOUTH STATELINE UTILIZING THE U.S. HIGHWAY 50 TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR. A FIXED ROUTE AND/OR PARATRANSPORT SYSTEM WOULD PROVIDE PUBLIC TRANSIT FROM NEIGHBORHOODS TO A BUSWAY/FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEM.

If the TRPA evaluation concludes that a light rail transit system is feasible, then the TTD may be directed to initiate implementation. The system should be capable of accommodating approximately 24,300 passengers per day. Both the busway system or fixed guideway would utilize electric vehicles and travel within exclusive right-of-way where practical. Vehicles should be provided with signal preemption devices.

Fourth (15 to 20 year) phase:

1. BETWEEN PARK AVENUE AND THE NEVADA LOOP ROAD, THE BUSWAY/LIGHT RAIL SYSTEM SHALL BE INCORPORATED INTO A PEDESTRIAN/TRANSIT MALL. A MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT TERMINAL WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE MALL.

A South Stateline motel/casino area by-pass capable of accommodating through and local access vehicular traffic at a "Level of Service" D shall be implemented prior to incorporation of a pedestrian/transit mall on the existing U.S. 50 travelway. The by-pass may result in modifications to the existing Lake Parkway (Loop Road) as provided for under phase I Regional Highway System Subelement configuration/alignment. Along the U.S. Highway 50 limited automobile access will be permitted between the Park and Stateline Avenue areas. Automobile access will not be permitted along Highway 50 between the Nevada Loop Road and Stateline Avenue. The project would involve a joint effort between Caltrans, NDOT, TTD, City of South Lake Tahoe, Douglas County, and the TRPA.

2. ASSESS THE FEASIBILITY OF A LIGHT RAIL SYSTEM BETWEEN LAKE TAHOE AND THE SACRAMENTO AREA.

The study conducted by the TRPA should evaluate both the U.S. Highway 50 or SR 89/Interstate 80 corridors.
3. CONSIDER A FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEM BETWEEN THE SOUTH STATELINE AREA AND HEAVENLY VALLEY SKI AREA.

This project has been assessed by Heavenly Valley Ski Resort and should be considered by the TRPA as a possible traffic mitigation project.

GOAL #2

ENCOURAGE EXPANSION OF THE PRIVATE TRANSPORTATION SERVICE.

The expansion of private transportation service can significantly attract potential vehicle trips both into/out and within the Basin that public transit is unable to accommodate. Expansion of private transportation services may achieve 17% of the Basin wide VMT reductions. The TRPA and TTD will cooperate in the encouragement of private transportation service.

POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. ENCOURAGE NORTH SHORE CASINO SHUTTLE BUS SERVICE.

   Implement a private and/or public contracted service which operates 24 hours per day. Service should not compete with future Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) route expansion into Washoe County. The system should be capable of accommodating approximately 500 passengers per day.

2. ENCOURAGE EXPANSION OF CHARTER BUS SERVICE TO THE SOUTH SHORE.

   Basin-wide visitor external-internal trips account for approximately 63% of visitor related VMT per day. Providing the alternative travel mode eliminates approximately 22 vehicles, 125 vehicle trips, and achieves a reduction of 775 VMT per bus per day. The expanded service should accommodate approximately 15 additional charter bus arrivals and/or departures per day.

3. ENCOURAGE EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE SKI RESORT PRIVATE AND/OR PUBLIC CONTRACTED SHUTTLE BUS SERVICE.

   For optimum efficiency, shuttle buses should coordinate routes and schedules with public fixed route transit service. An important goal of these services should be to improve service between North and South Shore origins and in-basin, out-of-basin ski resorts.

4. IMPLEMENT SCHEDULED TRANSIT SERVICE BETWEEN THE SOUTH STATELINE AREA, MINDEN-GARDNERVILLE AND CARSON CITY.

   The TRPA and TTD will promote implementation of this service. The service frequency should be hourly by direction and operate 24 hours. The service would primarily be utilized by daily South Stateline area commuters. Initiation of a demonstration project funded by private industry should be encouraged.
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5. ENCOURAGE EXPANSION OF CHARTER BUS SERVICE TO THE NORTH SHORE.

(For reasons presented in No. 2 above.) The expanded service should accommodate approximately 15 charter bus arrivals and/or departures per day.

6. ENCOURAGE EXPANDED PRIVATE CARRIER SERVICE BETWEEN RENO AND IN-BASIN DESTINATIONS.

The South Shore/Cannon International Airport service should be expanded to hourly service by direction. Service should be expanded between Reno/Cannon International Airport and the North and West Shores.

7. ENCOURAGE ADDITIONAL AMTRAK SERVICE TO TRUCKEE.

Promotion and marketing through private industry, Chambers of Commerce, and Visitor Bureaus could make this a viable alternative travel mode. To optimize the benefit of expanded AMTRAK service to Truckee, it will be necessary to provide bus service linking the AMTRAK terminal with both north and south shore destinations.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

The Transportation System Management (TSM) Subelement includes a range of transportation policies designed to achieve more effective use of existing transportation systems and facilities. Implementation of the TSM programs/policies could achieve approximately 37% of the required Basin-wide VMT reductions. The benefits of TSM's are realized through improved system efficiency, coordination, and public awareness.

GOAL #1

IMPLEMENT A VEHICLE TRIPS REDUCTION PROGRAM.

The TRPA, with assistance and advice from the TTD, will initiate an aggressive resident vehicle trip reduction program. This will reduce a Basin-wide average of 10 vehicle trips per day per occupied residence to 8.5 vehicle trips per day. This could achieve 36% of the basin-wide 10% VMT reduction goal. The program will be implemented in the first 5 year phase through an extensive public awareness campaign including news releases through the media, meetings with special interest groups, employee and employer groups. The TRPA will conduct a study at the end of the first five year phase to evaluate effectiveness of program implementation.

GOAL #2

IMPLEMENT A BASIN-WIDE RIDESHARING PROGRAM

To achieve basin-wide reductions in VMT, emphasis should be placed on ridesharing programs. Voluntary programs may achieve a 5% reduction in work-related VMT, and a 1% reduction of the Basin wide 10% VMT reduction. The private sector should be encouraged to implement ridesharing programs. Where practical, implementation of the ridesharing program may be required as part of a traffic mitigation program to offset increased vehicle trips generated by a new development or a significant change of use/intensity of an existing commercial/residential development. The recommended program
would be directed initially at large employers and include carpool matching capability, vanpool formation assistance, and promotional components. The program could be significantly improved by incorporating ridesharing incentive and single occupancy auto disincentive strategies into the overall program. The TRPA has lead agency responsibility in program initiation. Businesses have set up ridesharing programs mainly to:

- reduce parking facilities costs;
- reduce traffic congestion;
- enhance employee recruitment;
- reduce pollution; and
- increase energy conservation.

Employees in ridesharing programs are receiving substantial, direct and indirect benefits that in many cases have increased their job satisfaction and productivity. Some employees benefits include:

- lower commuting costs;
- more relaxed commute;
- personalized service through preselected pickup points and preferential parking spaces; and
- reduced wear on personal automobile.

POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. WORK WITH CASINO MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LARGE EMPLOYERS ON ESTABLISHMENT OF RIDE SHARING PROGRAMS.

Programs focusing on large employers are more successful than decentralized, areawide programs. Achievement of a 5% reduction in resident/casino employee work related trips would reduce approximately 8,275 vehicle miles of travel and 1,350 vehicle trips per day.

2. IMPLEMENT A BASIN-WIDE COORDINATED SOCIAL SERVICE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.

This program is intended to promote the consolidation and coordination of existing federal, state, and local social service transportation service for the elderly, physically handicapped, and other less mobile segments of the population. The TRPA will complete the social service transportation plan (AB120) and direct the TTD to implement the plan.
3. INITIATE A BASIN-WIDE PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAM TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC AND BUSINESS SECTOR ON METHODS AND BENEFITS OF RIDESHARING.

A principal element of the program is the initiation of an effective promotional/educational program. The goal of this program is to inform the business/public sector on benefits and methods of ridesharing programs.

4. INITIATE A RIDESHARE COMPUTERIZED MATCHING SYSTEM.

A computerized matching system aids interested parties in locating others with a common work trip origin and destination so that carpools and other rideshare arrangements can be made.

5. ASSIST IN THE LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL OUT-OF-BASIN AND IN-BASIN "PARK-N-RIDE" LOTS.

Convenient and secure vehicle parking areas are essential for the successful attraction/promotion of ridesharing programs. The TRPA will coordinate with state and local agencies to develop a "Park-N-Ride" lot plan with construction undertaken during the second phase.

6. ENCOURAGE THE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR TO PROVIDE PREFERENTIAL PARKING FOR "HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLES" (HOV).

Implementation of such a program may improve the attractiveness of ridesharing programs.

Second (5 to 10 year) phase:

1. DEVELOP INCENTIVE/DISINCENTIVE STRATEGIES TO AID IN IMPLEMENTATION OF A RIDESHARE PROGRAM.

Strategies could include employee preferential parking, wage/employment benefits, special business operational incentives, etc.

GOAL #3 ENCOURAGE IMPROVEMENTS OF PRIVATE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS SERVING THE BASIN.

Private carriers are presently meeting transportation service needs which are unmet by public systems. Improved coordination is critical for achievement of reduced auto dependency. Policies recommended below are intended to reduce both internal and external-related VMT by improving alternative travel modes. Transit system coordination between public and private carriers is essential for both cost effective and efficient transit service.
POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. ENCOURAGE COORDINATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.

The TRPA, with assistance and advice from the TTD, will encourage mass transportation system coordination. Coordination is necessary to insure implementation of a coordinated transportation system that serves all segments of the population and all residential/activity centers. Consideration will be given to routes, schedules, ridership, and a coordinated dispatch system for non-fixed route service. In addition, service will be promoted in those areas that are not served by public transit.

2. ATTAIN IMPROVEMENTS AND ASSIST IN OPERATIONAL PLANNING OF A COORDINATED SOUTH SHORE CASINO SHUTTLE BUS SYSTEM.

The TRPA, with assistance and advice from the Gaming Alliance and the TTD, will improve the coordination between the casino shuttle service and STAGE. An effort must be made to coordinate existing service as necessary to provide 24 hour service between the casino area and Ski Run Boulevard (City of South Lake Tahoe) and Kahle Drive (Douglas County). The system should be capable of accommodating approximately 4,700 passengers per day. The benefit of this service is from the significant vehicle trip reductions achieved by the casino shuttle bus system.

3. ENCOURAGE IMPROVEMENTS AND COMPATIBLE SERVICE EXPANSION OF PRIVATE CARRIERS FOR HIRE.

Carriers include taxi, limousines, tour operators, and "Dial-a-Ride" systems.

GOAL #1 EXPAND PUBLIC TRANSIT RIDERSHIP THROUGH IMPROVED SERVICE AND EFFICIENCY.

Institution of low cost operational improvements combined with punctual management decisions can beneficially affect transit patronage. Recommendations should come from frequent system reviews of operational/management features. Changes may include reduced headways through use of additional buses, improved route design, more flexible schedules, improved passenger information, aggressive marketing programs, etc. All improvements will improve public transit competitiveness with auto usage.

POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. IMPROVE TRANSIT SYSTEM ATTRACTIVENESS THROUGH AN AGGRESSIVE BUS PULLOUT/Bus SHELTER CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

A program of bus pullout/shelter construction and proper site identification is essential for maximum efficiency of the transit system. Shelters will be located along the high-frequency line-haul transit routes and neighborhoods where ridership levels warrant.
2. **MONITOR AND EVALUATE TRANSPORTATION SERVICE NEEDS.**

This policy requires the TTD to assist the TRPA in its annual evaluation of public transit and paratransit system routes, ridership levels, schedules, service areas, and fare structure for recommended operational improvements. The evaluation will include ridership levels, service area, and routes served by private carriers. Additionally, the TRPA will evaluate unmet transit needs as part of the Agency's administration of California Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding.

3. **ENCOURAGE MAXIMUM UTILIZATION OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BY ALL SOCIAL LEVELS THROUGH USE OF ATTRACTIVE FARE SCHEDULES.**

Reduced fare rates to transit dependents (students, elderly, low income) should be offered to encourage ridership. The feasibility of reducing rates for designated times/areas and incorporating zonal rate structures should be assessed.

4. **ENCOURAGE BUSINESS PARTICIPATION AND INVOLVEMENT IN PUBLIC TRANSIT.**

By encouraging business participation in the promotion of public transit, the system becomes more of a community project, aids financial stability of the system, reduces parking requirements, and improves ridership levels. Private industry may aid through provision of discount fares to employees, public transit subsidy programs, and purchase/lease agreements for capital improvements.

5. **PUBLIC TRANSIT SYSTEMS SHALL PERIODICALLY EVALUATE SERVICE.**

Transit system operators shall conduct triennial performance audits to evaluate service productivity and efficiency. In addition, operational, financial, marketing and/or other reviews as necessary should be completed to achieve improved service and efficiency. The performance-operational audits shall meet the requirements of TDA.

6. **PROVIDE "PARK-N-RIDE" LOTS WITH MAJOR PUBLIC TRANSIT TERMINAL FACILITIES.**

Adequate auto parking facilities must be provided with drive-transit terminals. Parking needs will be assessed in conjunction with a transit terminal feasibility study.

**Second (5 to 10) year phase:**

1. **EVALUATE THE FEASIBILITY OF COMBINING STUDENT TRANSPORTATION SERVICE WITH PUBLIC TRANSIT.**

Combining transportation services improves system efficiency and lowers overall operation and maintenance costs. The evaluation must determine peak student demand, service area, etc., and social implications of placing students with adult riders.
2. DEVELOP A PROGRAM OF INCENTIVE MEASURES IF PUBLIC TRANSIT RIDERSHIP LEVELS ARE NOT BEING ACQUIRED.

The TRPA will develop an aggressive incentive program if transit ridership is not achieving VMT and vehicle trip reduction goals. If these goals are not being attained, then TRPA will develop a comprehensive program of transit incentives for attracting riders to public transit. This program may involve commercial or residential area auto constraint programs.

GOAL #5 DEPLOY AND INSTITUTE A TRAFFIC MITIGATION PROGRAM.

Implementation of transportation improvements are costly and require long time periods to complete phases of problem identification, project planning, funding, design, and implementation. A traffic mitigation program is necessary to ease the financial burden placed upon implementing agencies and to insure that traffic impacts are mitigated in a timely manner. A traffic mitigation program that assesses a traffic mitigation fee commensurate with the project impacts is required. The mitigation fee should be assessed against both residential, public and commercial construction, and significant change-of-use projects. The traffic mitigation program will be implemented through Agency ordinance. The traffic mitigation program will replace the current Indirect Source Review (ISR) policy.

POLICIES

1. NEW RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC PROJECTS SHALL OFFSET THE TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS OF THEIR DEVELOPMENT.

The TRPA implementing ordinances for the Regional Plan will establish a fee rate to offset the cumulative impacts from minor projects. The fee will be assessed on residential, commercial and public development. The ordinances will also define what projects have significant environmental impacts and require these projects to complete an EIS and mitigate traffic impacts with specific projects, programs, or fees.

2. IMPACTS OF INCREASED VEHICLE TRIPS ASSOCIATED WITH COMMERCIAL CHANGE OF USE OR INTENSITY OF USE MUST BE MITIGATED AS DEFINED BY ORDINANCE.

3. TRAFFIC MITIGATION FEES COLLECTED, OR MITIGATION PROJECTS MUTUALLY AGREED TO BY THE PROJECT APPLICANT AND THE TRPA, WILL BE SPENT/CONSTRUCTED WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE POLITICAL SUBDIVISION IN WHICH THE PROJECT IS LOCATED.

Mitigation fees collected by the TRPA will be spent generally for positive transportation projects, measures or improvements, public transit capital or operational improvements, or street and highway operational improvements designed to meet the environmental thresholds. Projects for funding will be determined by the TRPA from the project priority list.
GOAL #6  IMPLEMENT A PARKING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM WHICH ENCOURAGES REDUCED
UTILIZATION OF THE PRIVATE AUTOMOBILE.

A parking management program will be developed to promote the use of
alternative modes of transportation to the private automobile. The program
is an important addition to encourage and improve transit and the
competitiveness of carpooling.

POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. IMPLEMENT BASIN-WIDE PARKING STANDARDS.

The TRPA will work in cooperation with local agencies to implement, by
ordinance, standards for provision of private vehicle parking which will be
developed consistent with commercial, public or quasi-public project
classification and size.

2. IMPLEMENT RESTRICTIONS FOR ON-STREET PARKING WITHIN DESIGNATED AREAS/TIMES.

The TRPA in conjunction with state and local agencies will implement the
program. Restriction of on-street parking improves traffic flow and
reduces available automobile parking. The program will be implemented
along designated transportation corridors. A review should be undertaken
to determine areas of program implementation, impacts of reduced parking
availability, and possible solutions. Examples for possible consideration
under this policy may be the business corridor of Tahoe City or auto
parking along Nevada SR 28. The program would be implemented through
signing and placement of barriers where necessary.

Second (5-10 year) phase:

1. DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A BASIN-WIDE PROGRAM TO ENCOURAGE PUBLIC TRANSIT USE
FOR COMMERCIAL AND/OR PUBLIC FACILITIES SERVED BY PUBLIC/PRIVATE TRANSPOR-
TATION SYSTEMS.

Such a program should be developed in conjunction with both private and
public entities and may include measures to reduced the numbers of parking
spaces, institution of parking fees, establishment of parking time limits,
etc.

REGIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The Regional Highway System Subelement includes a range of
policies for state highways and other roads of regional signifi-
cance intended to improve the operation, safety, and convenience
features of the highway system. The improvements are not in-
tended to achieve vehicle miles of travel reduction but are
intended to improve mobility through reduced congestion. Ind-
directly, the projects will affect transit service by improving schedule reli-
ability and reducing travel times. Projects are identified for consideration in
those areas where improvements may be necessary to insure mobility for both transit and the automobile. Preference should be given to public transportation or transportation system management alternatives, where appropriate, except when highway improvements which would not increase capacity are needed for erosion control, rehabilitation, repair of storm damage, or responding to a safety problem. Project planning to include feasibility studies, environmental documentation, engineering and design studies could be pursued at any time by state, local, and regional agencies.

GOAL #1 PROVIDE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE REGIONAL STREET AND HIGHWAY SYSTEM.

The improvements shall provide an overall benefit to the Basin in terms of impacts upon the environment and benefit for the user.

POLICIES

1. INCREASE HIGHWAY CAPACITY THROUGH IMPROVEMENTS TO LOCAL STREETS AND HIGHWAYS BY EXPANSION OR REALIGNMENT. CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE FOLLOWING IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (REFER TO FIGURES 3 & 4):

First (5 year) phase:

- Realignment and reconstruction of SR 207 (Kingsbury Grade) intersection with U.S. Highway 50; and

- Construction of a right-turn lane on U.S. Highway 50 between the intersections of Pioneer Trail and Park Avenue to include operational improvements to both intersections.

Second (5 to 20 year) phase:

- Expansion of SR 207 to four lanes between U.S. Highway 50 and Meadow Lane;

- Realignment and reconstruction of Al Tahoe/Tulare intersection with U.S. Highway 50;

- Roadway improvements to Pioneer Trail as necessary to provide an alternative route between Meyer and the South Stateline area;

- Expansion of SR 28 (Incline Village) to four lanes between the east and west intersections with Lakeshore Boulevard;

- Expansion of SR 28 to four lanes between Kings Beach and North Nevada-California Stateline and/or Incline Village; and

- Evaluate operational improvements for SR 89 between Tahoe City and Truckee.
2. **CONSTRUCT NEW REGIONAL HIGHWAY ALIGNMENTS WHERE NEEDED TO INSURE MOBILITY FOR BOTH TRANSIT AND THE AUTOMOBILE (REFER TO FIGURES 3 & 4).**

Each project shall have a detailed evaluation completed of the project feasibility, to include environmental documentation prior to inclusion into the TRPA annual transportation improvement program report.

**First (5 year) Phase:**

- Construction of a two lane highway facility between Montreal Road (City of South Lake Tahoe) and the Nevada Loop Road (Douglas County). The project would complete the Loop Road identified for consideration by the Compact. Construction of the mitigation measures identified in the Lake Parkway (Loop Road) EIS and/or a project approval letter shall be completed within the identified time frame; and

- Preparation of design plans and environmental documentation and, if appropriate, construction of a two lane bypass at Tahoe City (Highway 28) and SR 89 to include a pedestrian mall concept. Realignment is to be in conformance with the concept of the Tahoe City Urban Design Study submitted by Placer County.

**Second (5 to 20 year) phase:**

- Evaluate construction of a two lane bypass from the Pioneer Trail - Needle Peak area connecting with Montreal Road/Lake Parkway;

- Evaluate reconstruction/realignment of a limited access South Stateline motel/casino area by-pass (Lake Parkway) in conformance with final adopted design specifications agreed to by CALTRANS, NDOT, TRPA Douglas County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe. Design should accommodate a possible South Stateline pedestrian/transit mall (refer to Mass Transportation Subelement, Goal #1, fourth phase, Policy #1); and

- Evaluate continuation of the two lane by-pass from the Nevada Lake Parkway Road to and crossing SR 207 and connecting with U.S. Highway 50 at Elks Point Road (Round Hill, Nevada).

**GOAL #2 IMPLEMENT REGIONAL STREET AND HIGHWAY FACILITY OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS.**

Traffic flow operational improvements benefit both transit and auto efficiency in terms of less congestion and improved safety. Air quality is also improved due to reduced idling times. Projects shall be identified annually as part of the TRPA annual transportation improvement program process.
DRAFT REGIONAL POLICY PLAN

Regional Highway Capacity Improvements

New Highway Alignment •••••
Expansion of Hwy. for Transit •••••

Scale

See Figure 4
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DRAFT REGIONAL POLICY PLAN
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POLICIES

1. RESTRICT POINTS OF VEHICLE ACCESS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING TO PROPERTIES ADJOINING REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS.

This policy will limit ingress and egress driveways to lessen vehicle turning movement conflicts and improve vehicle movement safety for all new commercial, public, and residential projects.

2. ENCOURAGE ON-GOING TRAFFIC ENGINEERING EVALUATIONS WITHIN LOCAL JURISDICTIONS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS AND IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOWS.

3. COORDINATE AN OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BETWEEN ALL FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS PLANNING/IMPLEMENTATION AGENCIES.

Problem assessment and traffic flow improvement identification shall be accomplished in a timely manner. Traffic mitigation fees collected may accelerate project timing and construction.

4. DEVELOP A STREET/HIGHWAY OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY PROGRAM.

The priority list should include: minor alignment improvements, minor intersection modifications, traffic signal and vehicle detection improvements, passing lanes, left/right turn and acceleration/deceleration lanes, street connections traffic control and advisories, and minor traffic circulation/movement modifications.

5. RESTRICT ACCESS POINTS FROM ALL NEW REGIONAL STREET/HIGHWAY ALIGNMENTS.

The TRPA will coordinate with state and local agencies to achieve implementation. All new regional highway alignments will be constructed as limited access facilities.

6. REDUCE AND/OR ELIMINATE EXISTING VEHICLE ACCESS POINTS AND OFF-STREET PARKING.

The TRPA will coordinate with state and local agencies to achieve implementation. This policy would reduce the number of existing ingress/egress driveways where possible by providing alternate access points. In addition, it would require all vehicle parking spaces that adjoin regional streets and highways to be removed. Implementation of the program would be through the TRPA project review process and control of access easements by state and local agencies.

NONMOTORIZED

The Nonmotorized Subelement includes policies to improve the effectiveness and attractiveness of nonmotorized facilities. Improvements to the facilities may achieve up to 3% of the desired VMT reduction standards. The principal benefit is to those who would desire an alternative travel mode.
GOAL #1 DEVELOP AND COMPLETE A COMPREHENSIVE BASIN-WIDE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM.

Construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities provides an alternative travel mode for short vehicle trips, non-drivers, and recreational opportunities.

POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. IN COORDINATION WITH IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES, DEVELOP A BASIN-WIDE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITY PLAN TO COMPLEMENT THE LAND USE PLAN.

The activities/planning must be coordinated to insure development of a comprehensive Basin-wide plan. The plan must address any interconnecting neighborhood areas with major activity centers and transportation terminal facilities.

2. YEAR-ROUND MAINTENANCE AND SNOW REMOVAL WILL BE REQUIRED FOR BUS STOPS AND ENCOURAGED FOR PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES WITHIN URBAN AREAS.

The business sector shall be responsible for snow removal from pedestrian facilities within property limits. Local agencies shall be responsible for snow removal from pedestrian facilities elsewhere in urban areas. A voluntary program of snow removal will be implemented in rural areas.

3. THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES MAY BE REQUIRED WHERE APPROPRIATE, AS A CONDITION OF APPROVAL OF ANY COMMERCIAL PROJECT.

As detailed in the facility plan (No. 1, above), construction of pedestrian facilities will be provided where appropriate.

4. DEVELOPMENT ON PROPERTIES DESIGNATED WITHIN THE BICYCLE FACILITY PLAN MAY BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE RIGHT-OF-WAY AND A FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TO OR CONSTRUCTION OF THE BIKE TRAIL AS A CONDITION OF PROJECT APPROVAL.

As detailed in the facility plan (No. 1, above). The amount of financial contribution would be that amount determined by the traffic mitigation program.

5. EXPANSION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION OF REGIONAL STREET/HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND INTERSECTION MODIFICATION WILL INCORPORATE BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES, WHERE APPROPRIATE, AS A CONDITION OF PROJECT APPROVAL.

It shall be the responsibility of implementing agencies to provide bicycle/pedestrian facility improvements in conjunction with improvements to regional streets and highways.
6. ENCOURAGE THE INSTALLATION OF SECURE BICYCLE STORAGE/PARKING FACILITIES AT COMMERCIAL/EMPLOYMENT CENTERS.

The public and private sectors shall be encouraged to promote bicycle usage through provision of secure storage areas.

Second (5 to 20 year) phase:

1. CONSTRUCT PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES PARALLELING U.S. HIGHWAY 50 BETWEEN KAHLER DRIVE (DOUGLAS COUNTY) AND H STREET ON U.S. 50/89 AND 15th STREET ON SR 89.

In order to encourage pedestrian usage, it shall be necessary to provide a year-around alternative travel mode along Highway 50.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION TERMINAL FACILITIES WILL INCLUDE BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES.

Provision of bicycle/pedestrian access and secure bicycle storage/parking facilities shall be required as part of the design criteria for public transportation facilities.

3. THE TRPA SHALL ASSESS THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY OF SNOW REMOVAL FROM BICYCLE TRAILS.

AVIATION AND WATERBORNE

The aviation and waterborne policies are recommendations which provide for alternative travel modes into the Basin and between the West, North, and South Shore areas. Expansion of air carrier service within preliminary estimates on the type and frequency of aircraft permitted by the "Lake Tahoe Airport Master Plan/ANCLUG Study" should achieve approximately 4% of the desired VMT reduction standard. Expansion of in-Basin car rental fleets should be regulated consistent with an approved Lake Tahoe Airport Master Plan.

GOAL # 7: PROVIDE COMMERCIAL AIR CARRIER SERVICE AS AN ALTERNATIVE TRAVEL MODE.

Air carrier service provides an alternative travel mode into/out of the Basin, and therefore is an important element in the transportation plan. Additional vehicle trips will be generated by the airport facility. However, a significant number should be accommodated by public/private transportation service. Overall, visitor-related auto trips into and within the Basin will be reduced as a result of commercial air carrier service. Providing the alternative travel mode eliminates approximately 65 vehicles, 333 vehicle trips, and achieves a reduction of 2,100 VMT per plane per day.
POLICIES

1. REVIEW AND ADOPT THOSE PORTIONS OF THE LAKE TAHOE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS AND THE REGIONAL PLAN.

Those portions of the "Lake Tahoe Airport Master Plan/ANCLUG Study" that are consistent with the goals and policies of the Regional Plan should be certified and adopted.

2. PERMIT EXPANSION OF COMMERCIAL AIR CARRIER SERVICE WITHIN ACCEPTABLE NOISE STANDARDS.

The master plan and accompanying EIS/environmental documentation must be completed which includes an evaluation of noise impacts on residential neighborhoods and commercial areas from aircraft flights into and from the Lake Tahoe Airport. The Master Plan should make specific recommendations on aircraft type and the number of flights per day per aircraft type, as necessary to attain the environmental thresholds. The master plan should also include implementation provisions for attaining the noise thresholds.

3. PROMOTE IMPROVEMENT AND EXPANSION TO AIRPORT OPERATIONAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.

Support activities may include adequate parking, transit terminal, terminal remodeling, erosion control projects, landing aids, taxiway lighting and runway, taxiway, and parking apron overlays. The airport terminal and commercial air carrier parking apron are adequate to accommodate projected passenger loads without expansion of additional land coverage (refer to policy #2).

4. LIMIT THE LOCATION OF AVIATION FACILITIES TO THOSE FACILITIES EXISTING AS OF THE DATE OF PLAN ADOPTION.

TRPA will limit airports, seaplane bases, heliports and other aviation sites to exiting locations. It is not the intent to apply this policy to emergency facilities. This policy is required to meet noise standards and limit the impacts of aviation facilities on the existing environment.

GOAL #2 PROVIDE A WATERBORNE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AS AN ALTERNATIVE TRAVEL MODE.

Waterborne service would provide an alternative travel mode between the West, North, and South Shores. The system would reduce the exchange of North-South vehicle trips for the Basin residents and provide a vacation experience for the visitor. The service could achieve approximately 7% of the VMT reduction goal. Waterborne service may either be implemented by public or private transportation providers.
POLICIES

First (5 year) phase:

1. PROMOTE PUBLIC/PRIVATE WATERBORNE SERVICE TO MAJOR ATTRACTION AREAS.
   TRPA will promote service to major attractions if the service is economically feasible and can be provided within environmental constraints.

2. COMPLETE AN EVALUATION OF THE FEASIBILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF A SCHEDULED/FIXED ROUTE WATERBORNE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.
   The TRPA will conduct an evaluation within 5 years from adoption of the Regional Plan which includes an assessment of service routes, schedules, type of craft utilized, possible location of terminals including South Lake Tahoe, Tahoe City, and the Crystal Bay-Incline Village area, cost, and financial implication/strategies. The environmental assessment shall also evaluate impacts upon water quality, fisheries, noise, etc.

Second (5 to 20 year) Phase:

1. INITIATE WATERBORNE SERVICE AS DETERMINED BY THE TRPA EVALUATION STUDY.
   If the TRPA evaluation concludes that a waterborne system is environmentally and financially feasible, then the TTD may be directed to provide or contract for the provision of service to the above areas. Waterborne and surface transportation systems will be integrated, to include multi-model terminals where practical, coordinated schedules, etc.

TRANSPORTATION RELATED

The transportation related policies are those that affect or are effected by the operation of the transportation system. Policies are recommended which address the movement of goods and services, land use and maintenance, and operational characteristics affecting the transportation system.

GOAL #1

REQUIRE BASIN-WIDE NEIGHBORHOOD MAIL DELIVERY.

A change in the mail delivery mode has several positive aspects in terms of fewer vehicle trips, less VMT, less traffic congestion, and improved air quality. Consideration shall also be given to other alternative delivery modes that may be appropriate for certain locations in the Basin. The policy may achieve approximately 8% of the VMT reduction goal.

GOAL #2

PROVIDE A COORDINATED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WHICH COMPLEMENTS THE LONG TERM SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE REGION.
POLICIES

1. ESTABLISH TRAFFIC CAPACITY AND LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA FOR VARIOUS TYPES OF HIGHWAYS AND AN OPERATIONAL LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS. GENERALLY, PEAK USE TRAFFIC FLOW SHALL NOT EXCEED:

A. LEVEL OF SERVICE "C" ON RURAL SCENIC/RECREATIONAL ROADS;
B. LEVEL OF SERVICE "D" IN RURAL DEVELOPED AREAS;
C. LEVEL OF SERVICE "D" ON URBAN ROADS; OR
D. LEVEL OF SERVICE "D" FOR SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS. LEVEL OF SERVICE "E" MAY BE ACCEPTABLE DURING PEAK PERIODS NOT TO EXCEED 4 HOURS PER DAY.

Project review activities will evaluate existing and estimated future project related traffic to ensure adequate implementation of this policy. The Agency shall evaluate existing traffic volume/capacity ratios, intersection critical movement analysis, and projected traffic resulting from the project.

2. EVALUATE THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SOUTH SHORE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR.

The TRPA and California Department of Transportation, with assistance from the City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County, will evaluate the need for preserving and/or utilizing the designated Highway 50 South Shore bypass alignment as a regional transportation corridor.

3. NODE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE ENCOURAGED.

Commercial and residential projects should be developed in a manner to enhance mass transportation and nonmotorized travel alternatives. Projects incorporating this policy shall be given preference under redirection/redevelopment land use plans.

4. PROVIDE UTILITY CORRIDORS FOR THE TRANSPORTATION OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC UTILITY SERVICES NECESSARY TO SATISFY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE REGIONAL PLAN.

Utility corridors are necessary for transmission lines, pipelines, and sewage export lines, etc. into, out of, and within the Basin. Plans detailing future needs should be prepared within 5 years by the responsible public or private utility and submitted to the TRPA for evaluation and concurrence with the Regional Plan.
5. The level of commercial, residential, and recreational development shall be adjusted with effectiveness of the improvements to the transportation system.

Development may need to be adjusted based on the effectiveness of the transportation measures and programs being implemented to reduce vehicle trips and VMT. This is needed to ensure that development does not outstrip the ability of the transportation system to provide adequate service and alternatives, thereby hindering progress towards achievement of thresholds.

6. Insure that regional transportation facilities are adequate to meet the needs of freight movement into and distribution within the basin.

Activities/needs shall be coordinated with state and local agencies and service providers.

7. Evaluate and recommend operational and maintenance improvements to agencies and private firms that provide public transportation and street and highway transportation service.

The TRPA has overall responsibility for transportation planning, coordination, and attainment of environmental thresholds and compact goals. To ensure individual mobility, the TRPA shall monitor transit ridership levels and roadway vehicle counts to determine the adequacy of service level.

GOAL #3


POLICIES

1. Comply with all federal and state laws and requirements.

Incorporate within the Regional transportation plan all elements required to comply with federal and state transportation planning guidelines.

2. Transportation programs and plans shall be coordinated and developed in cooperation with all regulatory and transportation agencies.

All transportation plans and programs developed by the TRPA shall include review by all affected agencies and jurisdictions.

All transportation plans and programs developed by local, county, regional, state, and federal agencies shall be submitted for review by the TRPA to evaluate consistencies with the Regional Plan.

3. Maintain continuity in transportation facilities into and through the Tahoe region.

Closures of inter-intraregional highways so as to effect a noncontinuous highway system shall not be considered within transportation plans of the TRPA.
GOAL #4  HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS SHOULD NOT DISRUPT TRAFFIC FLOWS DURING PERIODS OF PEAK TRAFFIC VOLUME.

POLICIES

1. REVIEW ALL REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS TO ENSURE THAT TRAFFIC CONGESTION IS REDUCED TO A MINIMUM.

The TRPA will work with state and local agencies in the scheduling of highway construction and maintenance projects. Projects should be scheduled to avoid the peak congestion months of July, August, and September through Labor Day whenever possible. Projects which need to be constructed in July, August, or September prior to Labor Day should be scheduled to minimize the resulting traffic delays and congestion. For these projects, specific work schedules and days of construction/maintenance shall be mutually agreed to by the TRPA and the state or local implementing agency.

GOAL #5  PROVIDE A REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WHICH WILL HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE BASIN ENVIRONMENT.

POLICIES

1. THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN WILL BE FULLY INTEGRATED WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN OBJECTIVES, ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS, AND COMPACT GOALS.

2. DURING TRANSPORTATION FACILITY CONSTRUCTION OR MAINTENANCE PROJECTS, MEASURES SHALL BE UNDERTAKEN TO PROTECT SOILS FROM EROSION AND CREATION OF UNSTABLE AND HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS.

3. TRANSPORTATION FACILITY CONSTRUCTION/MAINTENANCE PROJECTS SHALL NOT ADVERSELY IMPACT SENSITIVE LANDS.

Where facilities permitted by the Regional transportation plan would impact these areas, specific mitigation programs shall be required prior to any project approval.

4. ALL TRANSPORTATION FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PLANS SHALL PROVIDE FOR STABILIZATION DURING CONSTRUCTION, WITH REVEGETATION AND LANDSCAPING REQUIRED IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF WORK. ADEQUATE DRAINAGE PLANS SHALL BE REQUIRED AND IMPLEMENTED WHERE DETERMINED NECESSARY.

5. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES SHALL MINIMIZE DAMAGE TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.

6. IMPACTS OF PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS WILL BE ASSESSED RELATIVE TO AIR, WATER, VEGETATION, WILDLIFE, FISH, NOISE, ESTHETIC, PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, WELFARE AND VISUAL FACTORS SO AS TO MINIMIZE THE POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS.

7. THE AGENCY, THROUGH PROJECT REVIEW, SHALL PROTECT THE APPEARANCE OF SCENIC CORRIDORS.
GOAL #6

REDUCE NOISE IMPACTS RELATED TO TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS AND FACILITIES.

Achieve residential and commercial area "Community Noise Equivalent Level" (CNEL) noise standards. (See Noise Subelement.)

POLICIES

1. DESIGNATE STATE AND FEDERAL HIGHWAYS AND THE LAKE TAHOE AIRPORT AS TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS.

Highways in the Basin include U.S. 50 and State Routes 28, 89, 207, 267, and 431. These transportation corridors will be brought into noise standard compliance through noise abatement programs and projects. The TRPA will define the limits of the transportation corridor associated with the airport.

2. TRANSMISSION OF NOISE FROM THE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR SHALL BE REDUCED.

Refer to Noise Subelement: Goal #2, Policy #1.

3. REDUCE NOISE RELATED IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AIRPORT TO ACCEPTABLE LEVELS.

Refer to Noise Subelement: Goal #2, Policy #2.

4. IMPLEMENT A LAND USE PLAN/PROGRAM WHICH BRINGS EXISTING/FUTURE RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT INTO COMPLIANCE WITH ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION NOISE STANDARDS.

This policy will be accomplished through project review and redevelopment of existing residential/commercial areas.
MEMORANDUM

October 17, 1984

To: Governing Body

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Special Report and Agency Comments, California State Water Resources Control Board Draft EIR, Policy for Water Allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin

At the September meeting of the TRPA, staff presented a briefing on the draft EIR on water allocation policy for the Tahoe Basin. (Briefing notes attached.) The Board directed the staff to schedule an informal discussion between members of the TRPA and the State Water Board.

A meeting is scheduled for October 18 in Tahoe City, to be attended by TRPA members Sevion, Stewart, and Westergard and State Water Board members Carole Omoreto and Douglas Noteware. Discussion will focus on resolution of mutual problems.

Given the date of the informal meeting, Agency staff does not plan, at this time, to make comments at the October 19 public hearing on the draft EIR. Staff will attend the meeting to answer questions and hear other public comments. The staff will then draft written comments for the TRPA to transmit to the State Board before the November 30 deadline.

Since the September meeting, the TRPA has received the "Draft Policy for Water Allocation in the California Portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin." (attached) Pending discussions with the State Board, TRPA staff reiterates the position taken in the briefing notes.

The staff has also held informal discussions with TCPUD and STPUD. The utility districts question several technical and legal premises in the draft EIR and policy.

At the October meeting of the TRPA, the staff will present a brief summary of progress in establishing an Agency position on the draft EIR and policy. If possible, based on the October 18 meeting, the staff will present draft comments for the Board to consider.

If you have any questions or comments on this issue, contact David Ziegler, Chief, Long Range Planning Division at (916) 541-0249.

V.C.

AGENDA ITEM
BRIEFING NOTES:

TRPA COMMENTS ON DRAFT EIR --

POLICY FOR WATER ALLOCATION IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The California-Nevada Interstate Compact allocates water for the Lake Tahoe Basin.

-- 23,000 afa for California
-- 11,000 afa for Nevada
-- applies to all sources

B. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has decided to collect information on water use to direct water rights policies for the Tahoe Basin.

-- the 1979 report recommended water use/water rights policies
-- under CEQA, an EIR is required to implement the policies
-- the proposed action in the EIR is a refinement of the 1979 recommendations

C. Public Involvement in the EIR

-- public hearing scheduled for October 19, 1984
-- comments due on draft EIR and draft policy for water allocation by 5 p.m., November 30, 1984
-- utility districts have retained a consultant to review the technical basis of the EIR
II. TRPA POLICY REVIEW

A. The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact

   -- No provision of the Compact shall have any effect on the allocation, distribution, or storage of interstate waters or upon any appropriative water right.  [X(d)]

   -- The Regional Plan shall include an integrated land use plan for the uses of land, water, air, space, and other natural resources. [V(c)]

B. The Thresholds

   -- Resolution 82-11 does not include water supply or water allocation thresholds.

   -- It is the policy of the TRPA in developing the Regional Plan to establish and ensure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation. [Res. 82-11, Recreation Element]

C. Regional Plan Goals and Policies

   -- Public services and facilities (including water supply) should be allowed to upgrade and expand consistent with the land use element and federal, state, and local standards. [Chapter VI, Goal 1, Policy 1]

   -- All new development shall employ appropriate devices to conserve water. Existing development shall be retrofitted on a voluntary basis in conjunction with a public education program. [Chapter VI, Goal 1, Policy 3]

   -- No additional development requiring water shall be allowed unless it can be demonstrated that there is adequate water supply within a existing water right. [Chapter VI, Goal 2, Policy 1]
The TRPA, water purveyors, and the states shall monitor the use of water within the region and evaluate conformance with the California-Nevada Interstate Compact. [Chapter VI, Goal 2, Policy 2]

The Regional Plan shall provide a fair share of the total basin capacity (including water supply) for outdoor recreation. [Chapter V, Developed Recreation, Goal 1]

All existing reservations of services for outdoor recreation shall continue. The TRPA shall, in project review, make written findings that sufficient resource capacity remains for recreation. Provisions shall be made for additional developed outdoor recreation capable of accommodating specified PAOT levels. [Chapter V, Developed Recreation, Goal 1, Policies 1-3]

D. The Water Quality Plans

Under the federal Clean Water Act, the TRPA is a designated water quality management planning ("208") agency. The Agency must have a certified and approved "208" plan which protects water quality.

Under state law, the SWRCB is responsible for basin planning in the Tahoe region, which responsibility overlaps with TRPA's federal designation.

At this time, the "208" plan includes, by ordinance, the pertinent parts of the State's basin plan (e.g., coverage limits, limits on development of sensitive lands). The possibility exists, however, for conflicts between the plans. (See the draft EIR, p. V-29.) The states may adopt stricter standards than the TRPA.
III. SUMMARY OF THE EIR ON THE WATER ALLOCATION POLICY

A. Water Use

-- The Interstate Compact limits diversion from all sources to 23,000 afa in the California portion of the Basin.

-- Present California-side water use is estimated at 16,528 afa. 1,326 afa is being used on public lands.

-- Water use in the Basin has been increasing steadily for 20 years.

-- Water demand under the TRPA Regional Plan is estimated at about 27,000 afa. Water demand under the SWRCB basin plan is estimated at about 26,000 afa. Water conservation measures could conserve about 2,000 afa.

B. Proposed Action

-- allocation of 3,288 afa for public lands

-- allocation of 19,712 afa for use on private land among three zones (corresponding to the NTPUD, TCPUD, and STPUD service areas), with these conditions:

(1) each utility district's diversions will be limited so that total diversions within the zone shall not exceed the allocation

(2) service connections will be limited to areas where development is consistent with the SWRCB's basin plan*

-- specific policies for water rights administration, including the coordination of water rights administration with water quality and land use planning

* According to the draft EIR, the purposes of this condition are (1) to keep development to a level where conservation can realistically keep water use within the allocation and (2) to direct development to areas where it has the least impact on water quality.
IV. ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE EIR

A. Are the EIR and the proposed action generally consistent with the policies of the Compact and the Regional Plan summarized above?

-- The staff feels that the EIR and the proposed action are consistent with the Goals and Policies for recreation and public services and facilities.

B. Is it appropriate for the water rights permits of NTPUD, TCPUD, and STPUD to limit new service connections to areas where development is consistent with the SWRCB's basin plan?

-- The staff feels this is not appropriate, since it could place the utility districts in the position of enforcing a plan different from the TRPA's Regional Plan.

-- Example: The Regional Plan may permit a commercial coverage override at a transportation node. Under the proposed action, the utility district could not provide water to such a project, assuming that the basin plan still prohibited commercial coverage overrides.

-- The proposed action appears to contemplate two land use plans for the California portion of the Basin. (See page V-29 of the draft EIR.) This could make the many of the deliberations of the TRPA for the last two years virtually meaningless on the California side.
V. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

A. That the Board direct the staff to prepare comments for transmittal to the SWRCB over the chairman's signature as follows:

-- With the exception of the issue below, the TRPA feels that the EIR adequately discloses the impacts of the proposed action and that the proposed action is consistent with the Compact, the thresholds, and the Goals and Policies.

-- With regard to conditioning water rights permits for NTPUD, TCPUD, and STPUD to limit new service connections to areas where development is consistent with the SWRCB's basin plan, the State Board should:

(1) Drop the condition because it is unnecessary in light of the first condition and the adoption of the TRPA Regional Plan, OR

(2) Change the condition to limit new service connections to areas where development is consistent with the TRPA's Regional Plan, OR

(3) Agree to amend the basin plan from time to time so that it is consistent with the TRPA's "208" plan.

B. That the Board direct the staff to review the comments from the utility districts and, if appropriate, return to the Board at the October or November meeting to discuss additional issues.
September 28, 1984

TO: All Interested Parties

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

DRAFT POLICY FOR WATER ALLOCATION IN THE CALIFORNIA PORTION OF THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

Attached is a draft policy prepared by the Board staff which is being circulated to the public for review. The draft policy is based on the concepts described in a draft environmental impact report (EIR) which was prepared by the Board staff to explain the problems of water allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin, the possible alternative actions which the Board could take, and the environmental impacts of those alternative actions.

The draft EIR on the Proposed Policy for Water Allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin was released for public review on July 18, 1984. The Board held public hearings to receive oral and written comments on the draft EIR on August 24, 1984 in Sacramento and on August 28, 1984 in Tahoe City. The Board will receive oral and written comments on both the draft EIR and the attached draft policy for Water Allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin at a public hearing scheduled as follows:

10:00 a.m. - Friday, October 19, 1984
City Council Chambers
1900 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
South Lake Tahoe, California

Written comments on both the draft EIR and the draft policy will continue to be received by the Board until 5:00 p.m. on November 30, 1984. The Board members will consider all comments, so it is not necessary to appear at the hearing to make oral comments to them.

The comments will be considered in the preparation of a final EIR and a final draft of the policy which the staff intends to recommend to the Board for adoption at some future public meeting several weeks after November 30.

Questions regarding the hearing, requests for a copy of the draft EIR, or requests for a summary of the draft EIR should be referred to Ray Dunham, Division of Water Rights, P. O. Box 2000, Sacramento, CA 95810; telephone (916) 445-7765.

If you wish to be notified of any future meeting scheduled by the Board to consider adoption of a final EIR and proposed Policy for Water Allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin, please inform Mr. Dunham.

S. D. Johnson
Raymond Walsh, Chief
Division of Water Rights
STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

POLICY FOR WATER ALLOCATION IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide for the allocation and use of water and for the protection of water quality in the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Basis For Policy Action

In 1968, the joint California-Nevada Interstate Compact Commission adopted the "California-Nevada Interstate Compact" (Interstate Water Compact or Compact) which allocated water in the Lake Tahoe, Truckee River, Carson River and Walker River Basins. California ratified the Interstate Water Compact in 1970; Nevada ratified in 1971. Although ratification by the U.S. Congress is still pending, the Interstate Water Compact has been accepted in both states as the only comprehensive basis for allocating the available water resources.

The Interstate Water Compact sets the total amount of water which may be diverted for use in the Lake Tahoe Basin at 34,000 acre-feet per year (or "acre-feet per annum," abbreviated "afta"). Of this total, 23,000 afta is allocated to California and 11,000 afta to Nevada. The Compact limitations are based on total gross diversions from surface and ground waters.
The Interstate Water Compact provides that each State shall have jurisdiction to determine, pursuant to its own laws, the rights to water use within the limits set by the Compact. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) is the agency responsible for water rights administration. The State Board has permit authority over surface appropriations. Riparian diversions (surface diversions to serve lands contiguous to the watercourse from which water is diverted), certain surface appropriations initiated before 1914, and diversions from ground water do not require a permit, although they may be affected by other State Board actions. After California ratified the Interstate Water Compact, the State Board determined that the total amount of water under existing use, authorized for future use by appropriation, and requested by pending applications to appropriate water in the Lake Tahoe Basin exceeded the total water available under the Interstate Water Compact.

In 1972, the State Board adopted a "Policy for the Administration of Water Rights in the Lake Tahoe Basin." This policy specifies that issuance of new permits shall be limited so that, when diversions from other sources including ground water are taken into account, total allowable diversions do not exceed the limits set by the Interstate Water Compact.

Water use in the Lake Tahoe Basin has been increasing steadily. Total gross diversion for use in California has increased from an estimated 9,600 afa in 1969 to 13,900 afa in 1977 and to 16,534 afa in 1982. With the development and increased occupancy projected to occur under the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's April 1994 Regional Plan Goals and Policies (TRPA Regional Plan), total public and private water demand in California is projected to increase to over 27,000 afa. Even with the more moderate level of development projected to occur under the State Board's Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan (Basin Plan), water demand will exceed that available under the Interstate Water Compact unless a highly effective water conservation program is implemented.
The Basin Plan documents a deterioration of Lake Tahoe water quality as a result of development in the Lake Tahoe watershed. Strict controls on development, and an extensive program of remedial erosion control, are needed to reverse this trend. The Basin Plan sets discharge prohibitions which in practical effect preclude development in certain areas, including virtually all environmentally sensitive lands. Development which is inconsistent with the Basin Plan would threaten the extraordinary water quality which makes Lake Tahoe an outstanding national resource.

The Basin Plan also specifies that waste discharge requirements issued to sewerage agencies shall include conditions designed to prevent water use from exceeding the limits set by the Interstate Water Compact.

Recreation in various forms is the major industry in the Lake Tahoe Basin. However, increased water use for residential and commercial development threatens to interfere with long-term plans for the provision of public outdoor recreation facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin unless steps are taken to ensure that adequate water supplies are allocated to state and federal agencies responsible for recreation facilities.

Review and consideration of the above information has reaffirmed the State Board's belief that it is in the public interest to adopt a policy for water allocation in the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin as the basis for future actions to comply with the Interstate Water Compact and the state and federal laws for protection of water quality. Keeping water use within the limits set by the Interstate Water Compact will require implementation of a comprehensive policy which applies to diversions from all sources, including ground water. Any such policy should ensure that water right decisions are
consistent with measures necessary for the protection of Lake Tahoe water quality and that guidance is provided as to how water quality orders shall take into account the limited availability of unappropriated water.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) continues to recognize and rely upon the California-Nevada Interstate Compact, as ratified by the California Legislature, as the basis for allocating water in the Lake Tahoe, Truckee River, Carson River and Walker River Basins.

2. The State Board shall ensure that total water diverted for use in the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin from all sources, including ground water, and under all claims of water rights will not exceed 23,000 acre-feet per annum (afa).

3. A fair share of the water available for appropriation in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be allocated for maintenance and development of public lands needs.

4. Water available for appropriation after the needs for public lands are taken into account should be allocated equitably among the different areas of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

5. To promote the efficient use of water available for appropriation in the Lake Tahoe Basin, the State Board will encourage voluntary transfers of water among water suppliers.
6. The State Board will encourage the preparation and implementation of local water conservation programs in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

7. The State Board will take such action as is necessary to ensure the protection of instream beneficial uses of water in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and, where feasible, to encourage restoration where water quality or fish and wildlife habitat has been degraded.

8. Water right administration and regional planning should be coordinated, so that regional plans for the Lake Tahoe region take into consideration the limited availability of water, and so that water right decisions will not cause regional environmental standards to be exceeded.

9. Water right administration and water quality planning in the Lake Tahoe Basin will be coordinated, so that water quality orders are consistent with the limits on water availability set by the Interstate Water Compact, and water right decisions provide for protection of Lake Tahoe water quality.

WATER SUPPLY ALLOCATION

10. a. The water available for diversion for use in the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be allocated as follows:

   U. S. Forest Service 2,938 aʃa
   California State Department of Parks and Rec. 350 aʃa
   Zone A (North Tahoe Public Utility District) 3,018 aʃa
   Zone B (Tahoe City Public Utility District) 4,201 aʃa
   Zone C (South Tahoe Public Utility District) 12,493 aʃa
10. b. Within the above allocations, the following amounts shall be reserved for remedial erosion control projects required by the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan:

- U. S. Forest Service: 145 afa
- California State Department of Parks and Rec.: 5 afa
- Zone A (North Tahoe Public Utility District): 5 afa
- Zone B (Tahoe City Public Utility District): 15 afa
- Zone C (South Tahoe Public Utility District): 20 afa

The reservations made within each of the public lands allocations shall remain in effect until the public agency assigned the allocation completes all remedial erosion control projects it is required to implement to comply with the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan, except that the reservation made within the allocation to the United States Forest Service shall be reduced to 25 afa upon completion of all remedial erosion control projects required on lands owned by the Forest Service on the effective date of this policy. The reservations made within each zonal allocation shall remain in effect until completion of all remedial erosion control projects within that zone which are required by the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan, other than projects on National Forest or State Parks lands.

10. c. The allocation to the California State Department of Parks and Recreation shall be subject to a requirement for preparation of a comprehensive water use analysis to demonstrate that the allocation is
reasonably necessary for State Park needs, or for other outdoor recreation facilities. If the State Board finds that any portion of the allocation to the California State Department of Parks and Recreation is not necessary for these purposes, the unnecessary portion of the allocation shall be reallocated among the three zones in proportion to the allocations set forth above.

10. d. Zone A includes the area within the boundaries of the North Tahoe Public Utility District, plus unsewered areas outside the District's boundaries. Zone A is generally described as the area bounded by the Lake Tahoe Basin boundary on the west and north, the California State line on the east, Lake Tahoe and the watershed boundary between Dollar Creek and Burton Creek from Dollar Point west to the Lake Tahoe Basin boundary on the south.

10. e. Zone B includes lands within the boundaries of the Tahoe City Public Utility District, plus unsewered areas outside the District's boundaries. Zone B is generally described as the area bounded by the watershed boundary between Dollar Creek and Burton Creek (through Dollar Point) on the north, Lake Tahoe on the east, Emerald Bay and the watershed boundary between Eagle Creek and Cascade Creek on the south and the Lake Tahoe Basin watershed boundary on the west. The term "Lake Tahoe Basin," as defined by the Interstate Water Compact, includes a small area tributary to the Truckee River below the outlet from Lake Tahoe.
10. f. Zone C includes lands within the boundaries of the South Tahoe Public Utility District, plus unsewered areas outside of the District's boundaries. Zone C is generally described as the area bounded by the watershed boundary between Eagle Creek and Cascade Creek, Emerald Bay, Lake Tahoe and California state line on the north, and the Lake Tahoe Basin watershed boundary on the east, south and west.

10. g. Except to the extent that allocated waters are voluntarily transferred pursuant to paragraph 11, the allocations in Paragraph 10.a. shall be applied as follows:

1. All diversions for use from surface and ground water and under all claims of water rights shall be charged against the allocations.

2. The total gross diversion for use shall be charged against the allocations, except that in the case of diversion for non-consumptive uses the net depletion shall be charged against the allocations.

3. Sewerline infiltration and inflow shall be charged against the allocation to the zone assigned to the utility district which provides sewerage in the area where the infiltration and inflow occur.

4. All diversions for use on National Forest lands shall be charged against the allocation to the United States Forest Service regardless of the point of diversion and the basis of right for the diversion.
5. All diversions for use in California State Parks shall be charged against the allocation to the Department of Parks and Recreation regardless of the point of diversion or the basis of right for the diversion.

6. All other diversions shall be charged against the allocation to the Zone where the water is used.

11. a. Waters allocated to one of the three zones may be transferred to another zone or to the U. S. Forest Service or Department of Parks and Recreation on a trial, temporary or permanent basis if all of the following occur:

1. The transfer is approved by each of the agencies involved in the transfer.

2. Each of the public utility districts which provide service within the zones involved in the transfer has a permit or license incorporating the conditions called for by paragraph 22 and the public utility districts are in compliance with those conditions.

3. If the allocation for a zone is reduced by the transfer, water use within that zone has not exceeded such reduced allocation for any of the previous five years, and the public utility which provides service within the zone agrees to abide by the reduced allocation.

4. The terms and conditions of the transfer are reported to the State Board at least 45 days before the transfer takes effect.
b. Transfers meeting the above conditions may take effect after the 45 days notice to the State Board unless the Chief of the Division of Water Rights notifies the concerned public utility districts that approval by the State Board will be required. State Board approval shall be required if the Chief of the Division of Water Rights finds that State Board review is reasonably necessary to determine if the above conditions have been met, or that the public interest otherwise requires State Board review and approval of the transfer. The existence of this procedure for voluntary transfer of allocations shall not be construed to prohibit use of other procedures for change in place of use, purpose of use or point of diversion authorized by law.

12. Upon approval by the State Board, either the U. S. Forest Service or the California State Department of Parks and Recreation may transfer waters allocated to it on a trial, temporary, or permanent basis, provided that all of the following occur:

a. The agency making the transfer and any agency or water purveyor to which the transfer is made has a permit or license incorporating the conditions called for by paragraph 22 and is in compliance with those conditions.

b. If the transfer reduces the allocation for use on federal or State lands, use on those lands has not exceeded such reduced allocation for any of the previous five years and the agency whose allocation is reduced agrees to abide by the reduced allocation.

c. The transfer is in furtherance of the purposes of allocating a fair share of water supplies for public outdoor recreation.
13. The allocations set by paragraph 10a may be superseded by an
alternative allocation set by the State Water Board when it approves any
application or petition, if and only if all of the following occur:

a. The alternative allocation is consistent with the General Principles
   set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.

b. The alternative allocation does not reduce the amount allocated to any
   permittee in any permit issued before the State Board adopts the
   alternative allocation, except where the permittee agrees to the
   reduction, or where the reduction is made in conjunction with issuance
   of a license to the permittee.

CONSERVATION, EFFICIENT USE, AND PROTECTION OF INSTREAM VALUES

14. The State Board supports establishment of procedures by which water
diversions will be metered, recorded, and tabulated.

15. The State Board will make up-to-date information available to water
purveyors, planning agencies, and the public on the amount of remaining
unappropriated and unused water.

16. The State Board urges agencies with regional and land use planning
responsibilities to assure that the development allowable under their plans
is consistent with the availability of water supply as limited by the
Interstate Water Compact.
17. The State Board encourages water purveyors to enter agreements for cooperative action consistent with this policy, including agreements concerning suballocation of water available for use within each zone, interconnections and transfers, and coordination of water conservation programs.

18. The State Board supports the preparation of water conservation programs by all water purveyors in the Lake Tahoe Basin, as well as by the United States Forest Service and the California State Department of Parks and Recreation. The State Board also supports incorporation of water conservation requirements as part of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's regional plan, implementing ordinances, and permit approvals. Feasible conservation measures include installation of interior dwelling unit water conservation devices, public awareness programs, and use of plant species which do not require irrigation on a long-term basis in landscaping projects. Other measures which may be feasible in particular areas include reducing leaks and bleed water, restrictions on landscape irrigation, metering of individual units, reducing sewerline infiltration and inflow, and pressure reduction. Although all of these measures should be considered, agencies and entities preparing water conservation programs should be given flexibility to decide what specific measures to include in their conservation programs, so long as the overall program avoids waste or unreasonable use and is consistent with the general principles set forth in this policy.

19. The State Board should discourage any new diversions or increase in diversions which would reduce flows in tributaries to Lake Tahoe, and should encourage transfer of existing points of diversion from tributaries to points of diversion on Lake Tahoe.
20. The State Board should not issue any permit or license, or approve any petition for change in point of diversion or place of use, for any water supply project which would violate the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan or would serve development not in accordance with Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan.

21. The State Board should not issue any application or issue any permit or license, or approve any petition for change in point of diversion or place or use, for any water supply project which would violate the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's regional plan or implementing ordinances, or which would cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

22. All permits and licenses which are issued or for which a change in point of diversion or place of use is approved after the adoption of this policy should set conditions which provide that:

a. The permittee or licensee will provide no new water service connections to developments which would violate the discharge prohibitions in the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan.

b. An annual limit is set on the total amount of water which may be stored or diverted to use. In addition to any limits which may be set as to the amount of diversion permitted at specific points of diversion, all permits and licenses should set annual limits on the total gross diversion for use from all sources, including ground water, by the
permittee or licensee. In the case of permits or licenses issued to the United States Forest Service, the California State Department of Parks and Recreation, and three Public Utility Districts, total gross diversions by the permittee or licensee should be limited such that diversions by the permittee or licensee, plus all diversions chargeable against the applicable zonal or public lands allocation, are consistent with that allocation.

c. Permittees and licensees will meter all their diversions of water and all interconnections with other water suppliers and provide annual summary reports of the data collected by such metering to the State Board in a format established by the chief, Division of Water Rights.

d. Utility District permittees will arrange to meter or estimate all unpermitted diversions of water within their allocation zone and annually report the results to the State Board. The methods of estimating diversions and reporting data, which may include use of reports water purveyors submit to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and the time for completion of arrangements should be acceptable to the Chief, Division of Water Rights.

e. The State Board reserves jurisdiction to reassess the allocation or permitted amounts in the event the total amount of water available for use within the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin is changed by judicial or legislative action.
f. Water purveyors will provide water at a reasonable cost for erosion control projects on public lands required by the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan.

g. Permittees and licensees will prepare and periodically update conservation plans to reduce water use and encourage such measures as the use of natural drought tolerant plants for landscaping.

23. As recommended in the Final Environmental Impact Report on the Policy for Water Allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin, the State Board should approve change petitions by the United States Forest Service, and applications by the California State Department of Parks and Recreation and the three Public Utility Districts, subject to the conditions called for in this policy. Other applications ordinarily should not be approved, but may be approved where the action would be consistent with said final environmental impact report, and this policy. While the permits to the Forest Service, State Parks and the three Public Utility Districts should provide flexibility as to place of use and the amount which may be diverted at particular points of diversion from Lake Tahoe, including allowance for voluntary transfers, a petition for change in point of diversion will be required for each new point of diversion not specifically approved in the permits. In reviewing such petitions for change in point of diversion, the State Board will focus on the site specific impacts of the diversion, the indirect and cumulative impacts of water diversions having been addressed in this policy.
24. a. Waste discharge requirements and grant contracts for the construction, operation or maintenance of facilities for the collection, treatment or export of sewage from the Lake Tahoe Basin shall include conditions to ensure that water use in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall not exceed the allocations set by the Interstate Water Compact. These conditions shall provide for the following:

1. The discharger or grantee shall provide no new service connections to developments which would violate the discharge prohibitions in the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan.

2. If total gross diversions for use in the zone within which the discharger or grantee collects sewage equal or exceed that allowable under the allocation for that zone, the discharger or grantee shall not provide any sewer service connections for any new development.

3. The discharger or grantee shall submit annual reports providing the basis for estimating the volume of sewerline infiltration and inflow within the area served by the discharger or grantee.

4. The discharger or grantee shall be required to meter all their diversions of water and all interconnections with other water suppliers, and provide annual summary reports of the data collected by such metering to the State Board in a format established by the Chief, Division of Water Rights.
5. The discharger or grantee shall arrange to meter or estimate all unpermitted diversions of water within its allocation zone and annually report the results to the State Board. The methods of estimating diversions and reporting data, which may include use of reports water purveyors submit to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and the time for completion of arrangements, should be acceptable to the Chief, Division of Water Rights.

b. In the case of a discharger or grantee which treats or exports, but does not collect, sewage from the Lake Tahoe Basin, waste discharge requirements and grant contracts shall include a condition or conditions providing that the discharger or grantee shall not accept for treatment or export any additional sewage from any entity which collects sewage in the Lake Tahoe Basin unless that entity is in compliance with the conditions called for by this paragraph 24.

25. Not later than 18 months after adoption of this policy, the State Board shall make a finding pursuant to paragraph 10 as to the amount of water reasonably necessary for the allocation to the California State Department of Parks and Recreation. To provide a basis for that decision, the California State Department of Parks and Recreation shall complete a comprehensive water use analysis, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board shall complete an analysis of irrigation needs for remedial erosion control, not later than 15 months after adoption of this policy.
26. The State Water Board shall schedule a hearing for no later than 18 months after adoption of this policy for any application to appropriate water or petition for change in point of diversion or place of use in the Lake Tahoe Basin that is pending at the time this policy is adopted, provided that the applicant or petitioner shall have completed all necessary environmental documentation within fifteen months of the adoption of this policy. To the extent feasible, hearings on applications and petitions shall be consolidated.

27. Within three years of adoption of this policy, the Division of Water Rights shall review every diversion for use identified in the Report on Water Use and Water Rights, Lake Tahoe Basin (State Water Resources Control Board 1979) as taking place under non-existent or obscure water rights and shall make appropriate recommendations for action by the State Water Board.

28. Within five years of adoption of this policy, the Division of Water Rights shall review every permit or license for diversion for use in the Lake Tahoe Basin, including review of compliance with permit and license conditions and consistency with this policy, and make appropriate recommendations for action by the State Water Board.

29. Within six years of adoption of this policy, the Division of Water Rights shall prepare a comprehensive report on water use and water rights in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

30. Once the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency implements the program of water use monitoring called for in the agency's Regional Plan Goals and
Policies, and requires water purveyors to meter, record and report their diversions, the Division of Water Rights shall prepare annual reports on water use within the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

31. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region, shall issue or revise waste discharge requirements in accordance with this policy within one year of its adoption, and within six months after the State Water Board adopts any alternative allocation pursuant to paragraph 13.

GENERAL PROVISIONS


33. The provisions of this policy are adopted as part of state policy for water quality control. Any water quality control plan adopted or amended by the State Board or the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region, shall conform to this policy.

34. The provisions of this policy relating to waste discharge requirements are also adopted in furtherance of the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan, and shall be implemented by the State Board and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region.

35. It is also the intent of this policy to implement the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act by providing for use of the Final Environmental Impact Report of the Policy for Water Allocation in the Lake
Tahoe Basin as a program environmental impact report on pending water right applications and petitions in the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. This policy is adopted in consideration of the cumulative impacts of increasing water use in the Lake Tahoe Basin and is intended to provide for incorporation into specific application and petition approvals feasible alternatives and mitigation measures identified in the final environmental impact report.

36. For all water right applications or petitions for change in place of use, purpose of use, or point of diversion in the Lake Tahoe Basin, this policy and the Final Environmental Impact Report: Policy for Water Allocation in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be entered in the record as part of the staff recommendation, but shall not preclude consideration of other testimony. A qualified witness or witnesses familiar with this policy and the Final Environmental Impact Report shall be available to testify and be cross-examined regarding the policy and environmental impact report at any hearing where the policy and environmental impact report are made part of the record.
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 16, 1984

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Glenbrook Shorezone Master Plan

Attached is a copy of the Glenbrook Shorezone Plan. The development of this plan was coordinated by the Nevada Division of State Lands in cooperation with numerous individuals and agencies which have interest, concern, or jurisdiction over matters affecting Glenbrook Bay. The intent of the plan is to serve as a guide for the management and future use of the Bay. This will be accomplished by requiring all shorezone proposals to be in conformance with the plan.

The latest draft of the Glenbrook Plan Area Statement establishes a policy that the Glenbrook Shorezone Plan will be used as a guide for reviewing development in the Shorezone. Staff hesitates to incorporate such a statement pending approval of the Glenbrook Shorezone Plan by the Governing Board.

Pam Wilcox of the Nevada Division of State Lands will be available at the meeting to give a brief presentation and to answer any questions concerning the plan. Following the discussion, staff would like the Board to decide the status of the Glenbrook Shorezone Plan relative to its role in reviewing shorezone-related projects at Glenbrook.
GLENBROOK BAY SHOREZONE PLAN

PURPOSE

In recent years substantial changes have been taking place in the Glenbrook area. Development of some private properties has brought in new people to the area and created new demands for shorezone facilities and uses. The physical development of the Glenbrook area is being done in conformance with an adopted master plan; however, this master plan does not include activities and facilities for the shorezone and Glenbrook Bay. Proposals for water related facilities and uses have generated controversy among the various property owners and agencies involved at Glenbrook. Lack of a shorezone plan which satisfies the concerns of all interests has also caused difficulties for permit approving agencies and for those seeking permits. This has polarized the various groups and individuals having a common interest in the beneficial use and protection of the community and Glenbrook Bay.

To overcome this polarization of interest and to provide a plan useful to permitting agencies, it was felt that a shorezone planning effort should be at least attempted. With the goal of trying to get a shorezone plan that met the concerns of all involved and providing direction for future decisions affecting Glenbrook Bay, an initial meeting of all interests was arranged. During this meeting, which was held in Glenbrook, on April 15, 1983, a planning process called "coordinated resource management and planning" was introduced to those present. A key feature of coordinated planning is that the plan will address actual issues identified for the area and the plan recommendations and proposals addressing those issues will be adopted only if all participants agree with each recommendation and proposal.

Meeting times and locations for the planning group were:

April 15, 1983 Lakeshore House, Glenbrook
May 28, 1983 VFW Meeting Room, Carson City
June 27, 1983 VFW Meeting Room, Carson City
July 18, 1983 VFW Meeting Room, Carson City
February 3, 1984 VFW Meeting Room, Carson City

PROBLEMS

During the initial meeting of the planning group on April 15, 1983, the purpose of the plan and the process to be used in developing the plan was explained. To provide a focus for the planning effort and to provide a base for plan objectives, individuals in the planning group identified problems they personally felt were significant relative to the shorezone and bay. Some of the problems mentioned seem contradictory, and indeed are; however, each represents an actual problem as perceived by a participant or group of participants.

The problems identified (in order of identification) were:

1. loss of tranquility and atmosphere in Glenbrook;
2. the area could become commercialized;
3. old pilings are boating hazards;
4. there is a liability problem associated with the pilings;
5. every property owner probably wants a boat buoy;
6. there is a need to comply with TRPA regulations;
7. the proposed boat hoist on the "community pier";
8. extension of the existing pier;
9. availability of gasoline for boats at Glenbrook;
10. old pilings should be preserved;
11. too many buoys;
12. noise pollution by motor boats;
13. accessibility for fishermen;
14. protection of fish habitat;
15. pier access needed for boats during low water periods and peak season;
16. not enough buoys available to meet demand; and
17. depth of water at end of pier during low water periods is not known.

OBJECTIVES

Planning objectives were preliminarily developed based on comments made and problems identified during the initial meeting held on April 15, 1983. The preliminary objectives were discussed during the May 27, 1983, meeting, modified and accepted as plan objectives.

1. Preserve the character and atmosphere of the bay.
2. Determine the future of pilings considering their historic and aesthetic value.
3. Minimize the effects of noise caused by motor boats on the tranquility of the bay.
4. Establish the desirable number and locations of boat mooring buoys, now and for the foreseeable future.
5. Establish desirable locations of swimming areas and swim lines and floats, now and for the foreseeable future.
6. Establish desirable number and location of piers, and determine the size and configuration for each pier, now and for the foreseeable future.
7. Identify types of watercraft that should be beached, and areas of beaching.
8. Identify areas of prime fish habitat and develop appropriate protective measures.
9. Develop a plan compatible with all relevant laws and regulations including TRPA regulations and allowing reasonable access to the bay from littoral parcels.

SUB-COMMITTEES

To facilitate the planning process two sub-committees were formed to look into specific areas of concern. The sub-committees were charged with the responsibility of developing preliminary recommendations for their area of concern and submitting their recommendations to the entire planning group for consideration, modification, and agreement. The sub-committees, duties and membership were:

Buoy, Swim Area, Pier, and Watercraft Committee

Burt Avery (Co-Chairman)
Dave Dobbins (Co-Chairman)
Jim Brinton
Ted Frantz, Nevada Department of Wildlife
Pat Henshaw
Fritzi Huntington
Ron Nahas
Representative, Nevada Division of State Lands
Representative, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

This committee was charged with development of recommendations which address, for both the present and foreseeable future: (1) the desirable number and locations of boat mooring buoys; (2) desirable locations of swimming areas, swim lines, and swim floats; (3) the desirable number and locations of piers, and the size and configuration of each pier; and (4) the types of watercraft that should be beached, and the areas of beaching.

Pilings and Cribbings Committee

Shelly Nahas (Chairperson)
John Bryan
Sharon Dobbins
Dick Doty
Ted Frantz, Nevada Department of Wildlife
James R. Herz, M.D.
Ron James, Nevada Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology
Representative, Glenbrook Cabana Owners Association
Representative, Nevada Division of State Lands
Representative, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

The pilings and cribbings committee was formed to look at all aspects of the piling and cribbing issue with specific attention to: (1) the degree of hazard associated with the various groups of pilings and cribbing; (2) their historic use; and (3) their aesthetic value.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUB-COMMITTEES

Preliminary recommendations were then developed by the two sub-committees appointed by the planning group during meetings usually held at Glenbrook. The preliminary recommendations were discussed by the entire planning group at both the June 27th and July 18th meetings. Recommendations were modified as appropriate by the planning group with conflicts eliminated where necessary. The recommendations for the shorezone of Glenbrook Bay agreed upon by the planning group are included as Appendices B and C.

Some problems and objectives identified earlier in the process were not addressed. Some of the items thought to be problems initially were later decided either to be: not as significant as first thought; resolved by solution of another problem; not having a solution; or beyond the authority or scope of the planning effort.

Likewise, some of the objectives are not addressed specifically in the plan. Beaching of watercraft, for example, was later determined to be an individual property owner's responsibility. Fish habitat was evaluated by a sub-committee; however, it was determined that most of Glenbrook
Bay is not prime fish habitat. Glenbrook and Slaughterhouse Creeks are recognized as important fish spawning areas and were considered as such in all plan proposals.

HISTORICAL USE OF PILINGS AND CRIBBINGS

Part of the character and beauty of Glenbrook Bay lies in the numerous old wood pilings and remnants of historic structures found along and in the Bay. A primary concern of this plan is the retention and protection of as many of the historic features found in the area as is reasonably possible. To facilitate this, the former use and historic significance of each feature had to be identified when such information was available.

According to the Nevada Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology, the pilings have general historical importance as reminders of the role the lumbering activity at Tahoe had in the Comstock-era. Lumber from the Tahoe Basin was used for construction of the Comstock mines and buildings and the Virginia and Truckee Railroad. These pilings are all greater than one hundred years old and are some of the only remains at Tahoe of an industry which contributed to Nevada's admittance to the Union, and was of national significance.

The historical use of wood pilings and stone cribbings in Glenbrook Bay are as follows (from south to north):

1. The rock cribbings at the far south end of the Bay are the remains of the original saw mill built in 1861 and used by Captain Pray. Its historical significance rests on the fact that this is the site of the original settlement.

2. The long straight line of wood pilings was the site of the Glenbrook pier, over-shore store and warehouse. This pier was used for mooring fishing and other commercial vessels throughout the nineteenth century. The original store was built in 1864 on the already existing pier. The store burned in 1877 and was rebuilt on pilings which had survived the fire. It was subsequently used for many years. The hall on the top floor of the store was used for meetings and as a dance hall. In 1878, the Glenbrook Inn was built on shore in front of the pier which added to the significance of the pier and the pilings which supported it. In addition to their age, these pilings are significant in that the pier they once supported was a focal point of the changing activities in Glenbrook Bay. The pier served the commercial and tourist activities well into the twentieth century, surviving the passing of the Comstock-era lumbering activity, fire, and then becoming useful in the tourist trade at Tahoe. The pilings remaining are reminders of the commercial importance of the lake during various historic periods and may be considered to have historical significance beyond that of any other structures in the Bay.

3. The curved set of pilings was apparently a breakwater for harboring the Meteor and probably other boats which came to moor in the Bay. As with all the pilings described in this section, these date from a period before 1870. It appears that a mill pond which served a lumber mill known as Mill Number Two was attached to, and extended north from, these pilings. Closer to the shore from the curved set of pilings are a few more pilings which may have served as foundations for over-water buildings.
4. The diagonal line of pilings farther to the north was the site of a mill pond serving the much larger Mill Number One. This building was apparently at least partially over the water and was probably supported by the pilings now existing there. Also, the pilings of this group supported a pier and railroad bed. The railroad extension onto the pier was used as a switch-back and for the dumping of logs, which had been cut from the mountains behind Glenbrook, into the Lake. This railroad, called the Carson and Tahoe Lumber and Flume Company Railroad, served as a vital link for the Carson and Tahoe Lumber and Flume Company, bringing cut timber up to Spooner Summit where the wood was then flumed down to Carson City.

5. Farther north is a square set of wood pilings. These pilings apparently also served as a mill pond and probably also supported a building associated with the lumbering and milling business.

6. The most northerly set of pilings is a "T" shaped group. It is likely that they also had something to do with the lumber and milling activity of Comstock-era Glenbrook, as they show up clearly in photographs taken in the 1870's. During the workshop sessions one participant, a long-time resident of the area, reported that he recalled rails existing on the pilings, indicating that these pilings were also associated with railroad activity.

THE PLAN

The recommendations developed by the planning group are the basis for the Glenbrook Shorezone Plan. From the recommendations, specific plan proposals have been developed to serve as a guide for changes which may take place in the uses and facilities available at Glenbrook Bay. All proposals will be evaluated for conformance with this plan.

It must be pointed out that those parties who participated in the development of this plan did so on a voluntary basis, and voluntarily agreed to abide by its provisions. The plan places no new legal encumbrances or additional permitting requirements upon any of the participants.

The plan should simplify application for the addition, alteration, or removal of structures, piers, pilings, buoys or other related features at Glenbrook Bay or along the shorezone. However, it does not remove the obligation to apply for necessary permits or approvals required by agencies which have jurisdiction at Glenbrook Bay.

PILINGS

As part of the planning process, the pilings located in Glenbrook Bay were evaluated. Considered in the evaluation were historic and aesthetic values and the hazards presented by each piling or group of pilings. The following provisions are based upon the surveys made and the consensus developed in discussions by the planning group.

1. Pilings in the Bay which have been identified as being a clear hazard to swimming and boating safety may be removed with the necessary permits/approvals. These hazardous pilings are indicated on the map included as part of this plan. Generally, pilings considered hazardous include:
A. submerged pilings within designated swim areas;

B. isolated submerged pilings in hazardous locations;

C. those pilings located south of the community pier which are between the three pilings that have metal rods in them and the west (lakeward) end of the pier, in order to allow access to both sides of the pier;

D. the first group of seven deteriorated pilings located west (lakeward) of the community pier, which may be hazardous to boats passing the end of the pier;

E. submerged pilings in that group of pilings located south of the community pier and shoreward of those identified in (C) and (D) above which clearly constitute a significant hazard to boaters and swimmers as determined by a committee of all interest groups in the Bay;*

F. certain hazardous pilings which are located within the rectangular group of pilings and associated rock cribbing near the cabanas. These unsafe pilings are those which are located between the cribbing and the shore, except the northernmost line of pilings, which should be retained in its entirety. This will allow swimmers to use the cabana swim area, and will also allow boat access to the cabana beach from the south.

2. Pilings in the Bay which should be retained are generally those which are associated with historic uses and structures and which have not been specifically identified for removal. Specifically, those pilings which should be retained are:

A. the group of isolated pilings to the north of Yellow Jacket Point, which serve as a warning of the many submerged rocks in the vicinity. These pilings should be marked as a navigational hazard;

B. the pilings which are remnants of the historic community pier located west (lakeward) of the Glenbrook Inn, except those pilings identified in 1.C., 1.D. and 1.E., above;

C. those pilings within and those lakeward of the group of cribbings which are located westerly of the cabana area, plus the line of pilings located along the

* On March 12, 1984, such a committee met to consider a request from Shelly Nahas (Turner) that the plan be amended to allow the removal of all the pilings in this group (approximately 17 pilings). The minutes of that meeting are included as Appendix D. After considerable discussion of the issue, no consensus was reached. The Nahas company feels that the hazards and liability associated with these pilings close to the pier are so great that they should all be removed. However, Fritz Huntington and the State Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology did not agree. They would be willing to see all the submerged pilings in this group removed, but feel that the historicity of the pilings is clearly established and outweighs the hazard of those that are above the water and clearly visible. They also feel that more could be done to protect the public from any hazard (life guards, guard rails, insurance, and signing). It was agreed that the plan would record the meeting and the lack of consensus on this issue.
northerly end of the group of cribings and which extend eastward toward the cabana area;

D. the "T" shaped group of pilings located north of the cabana area;

E. the semi-circular group of pilings which form a portion of the boundary of the existing swimming area north of the community pier.

3. Existing cribbing in the Bay should be retained for historic purposes and to provide fish habitat.

**BUOYS**

1. A buoy field containing twenty-four (24) buoys, twenty (20) of which will be the proprietary property of the Glenbrook Property Owners Association, may be established southeasterly of the cabana area as shown on map 2 of this plan. This buoy field should be symmetrical to the swim area proposed shoreward of the buoy field. The distance between the proposed buoy field and the swim lines of the proposed swim area should be sufficient to allow safe boat passage for sail boats through the area.

Four (4) buoys of this buoy field are to be the proprietary property of the four (4) cabana owners now with buoys in this general area. Their ownership rights shall be permanent, yet transferable at their option, between cabana owners.

2. Buoy fields for individual littoral property owners fall outside the scope of the plan and will be considered on their own merits.

3. Proposals for new buoy fields, or an addition to the field mentioned above, should be reviewed by a committee comprised of representatives of the various interests and property owner groups of the Glenbrook community, with the recommendation of the committee presented to all reviewing and permitting governmental agencies and boards.

**SWIM AREAS**

1. The existing swim area north of the community pier should be retained with no change.

2. A swim area located in the vicinity of the former cabana beach may be established as shown on map 2 of this plan. A swim raft and swim line floats may be included as part of the development of the swim area.

3. A new swim area may be established in the vicinity of the new cabana area. Establishment of this swim area may necessitate removal of some pilings as specified under the section of this plan dealing with pilings. The actual design of the swim area is to be developed through mutual consideration of persons who may be directly affected by the design of the swim area, including adjacent property owners, following removal of the pilings approved for removal and considering the need to allow boat access to the cabana beach. A swim raft and swim line floats may be included as part of the development of the swim area.
4. A fourth swim area may be considered in the China Garden beach area when a demonstrated need for such an area is established. The merits for establishment of this swim area should be evaluated by a committee comprised of representatives of the various interests and property owner groups of the Glenbrook community; a representative of the Nevada Department of Wildlife is to be included as a member of the committee. In considering the need for the swim area the committee should consider the need to protect Slaughterhouse Creek and its fishery.

PIERS

1. A landing may be added to the south side of the existing community pier as space allows between preserved pilings and the pumphouse, similar in size and construction to the present landing on the north side of the pier, providing the pilings mentioned in item I.C. under PILINGS are removed and appropriate permits obtained.

2. For the present, no additional modifications or extensions should be allowed to the community pier, including boat hoists, except the landing discussed above. A future review of this pier may be made by a representative committee of the various interests and property owner groups in the Glenbrook community to evaluate the adequacy of the pier and landing space. However, extensions and/or additions which may be approved in the future, if any, are to be designed to preserve the remaining historic pilings.

3. No additional piers should be constructed on the community beaches, including the China Garden beach area.

4. Individual private piers should be kept to a minimum and allowed only where there is a special need (i.e., where littoral properties are inaccessible to the lake for boating purposes due to the terrain). Multiple ownership piers serving as many littoral property owners as possible are preferable to individual private piers. Pier applications may be reviewed by a representative committee of the various interests and property owner groups in the Glenbrook community for appropriateness and need.

5. All pier owners shall be entitled to repair or replace their piers when necessary in accordance with existing regulations.

BREAKWATERS

1. Studies should continue to determine if the rock breakwater at the north end of the bay is having a detrimental effect on beaches to the south. If detrimental effects are apparent based on the studies, appropriate action to correct the negative effects should be explored.

2. New breakwaters within the Bay will not be allowed.

WATERCRAFT

1. The types of boats that may be beached in each area should be determined by the owners of the affected littoral properties.
PLAN AMENDMENT

This plan was developed to serve as a guide for property owners, permitting agencies, and interest groups involved in Glenbrook Bay. While it is not intended to be legally binding, it is hoped that the commitments made to the planning effort will continue as a commitment to use the plan to guide and develop the use of Glenbrook Bay.

Plans should be reviewed periodically and amended, if necessary. Needs and concepts will change with time. Plans and proposals which are appropriate now may not be suitable in the future. To keep the plan viable and contemporary, it is suggested that a plan review committee comprised of the interests represented in the initial planning group be convened at appropriate times in the future to reevaluate the plan, revise it if necessary, and reaffirm the commitment to the plan and the planning effort. An annual or biennial review should be sought. Since many of the participants in the planning process have been, and will be in the future, able to better participate during the summer season, future reviews should be held during summer months, whenever possible.
APPENDIX A

Plan Participants

Participation in the planning process was excellent. During the process, which included four general meetings in which all property owners and concerned governmental agencies were invited, and various sub-committee meetings, many individuals and agencies provided input, review, and comment. The following list indicates all known participants who attended at least one general meeting. Many on the list participated actively in all meetings and were instrumental in developing the consensus reflected in the plan recommendations.

(listed alphabetically)

Tom Atkinson, Nevada Department of Wildlife, Reno
Burt Avery, Atherton, California
Alice Becker, Nevada Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology, Carson City
Barbara Benge, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento
Lorraine Brinton, Glenbrook
Jim Crafts, Glenbrook
Jane Daiss, Glenbrook
R. Daiss, Glenbrook
Mike Del Grosso, Nevada Division of State Lands, Carson City
Jill Derby, Glenbrook
Dave Dobbs, Glenbrook
Sharon Dobbs, Glenbrook
Chris Doty, Glenbrook
Dick Doty, Glenbrook
Kristina Elfving, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, South Lake Tahoe
Dorothy Esser, Glenbrook
William Esser, Glenbrook
Ted Frantz, Nevada Department of Wildlife, Smith, Nevada
Georgia Fults, Glenbrook
Chester Gydk, Glenbrook
Greg George, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, South Lake Tahoe
Pat Greenwood, Glenbrook
Rob Greenwood, Glenbrook
James Hamrick, Nevada Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology, Carson City
Dorothy Heise, Gardnerville
Patricia Henshaw, Glenbrook
William Henshaw, Glenbrook
James R. Herz, M.D., Reno
James Hind, Glenbrook
Mable Hoffman, Nevada Division of State Lands, Carson City
Fritzi Huntington, Carson City
Daniel Jackson, Atherton, California
Ron James, Nevada Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology, Carson City
Robert Jepson, Carson City
Mrs. Robert Jepson, Carson City
Robert Lambie, Glenbrook
Keith-Ann Marien, Nevada Division of State Lands, Carson City
Jack Mckittrick, Glenbrook
Bob McQuivey, Nevada Department of Wildlife, Reno
J.H. Miller, Jr., Glenbrook
Ron Nahas, Glenbrook
Shelly Nahas, Glenbrook
Virginia Reniers, Glenbrook
Jim Robertson, Glenbrook
Heather Schoeneman, Glenbrook
Dave Simpson, Glenbrook
Nancy Stewart, Glenbrook
John Sullivan, Glenbrook
Pamela B. Wilcox, Nevada Division of State Lands, Carson City
APPENDIX B

Recommendations of the Pilings and Cribbings Committee

It is the consensus that while certain groups of pilings in the Bay should be retained for their historic, aesthetic and protective value, others that constitute an obvious hazard to swimming and boating safety should be removed. It is understood that removal or alteration of any of these structures will not proceed without those permits required by law or regulation.

1. All submerged pilings located within designated swimming areas are hazardous to swimmers and may be removed.

2. Isolated submerged pilings may be removed.

3. The group of isolated pilings to the north of Yellow Jacket Point have served, both historically and at present, as a warning of the many submerged rocks between that spot and the shore. They should be retained and marked as a hazard to navigation.

4. The existing community pier in front of the Lakeshore House presently allows boat access only on its northern side, due to the pilings on the south side, which are remnants of the historic Glenbrook pier. Many of these pilings are badly deteriorated and/or submerged. Those pilings from (but excluding) the three pilings with metal rods in them out to the end of the pier may be removed. (The metal rods may be removed if desired for safety reasons.) The rock cribbing and pilings from the three pilings with the metal rods to the shore should remain, although submerged pilings that are so situated as to be a hazard to boaters or swimmers may be removed. At the end of the pier, the first group of approximately seven deteriorated pilings may be removed to allow boat access around the pier. The rest of the pilings out to the end of the historical pier should remain.

5. The rectangular group of pilings and associated rock cribbing near the cabanas may be altered to provide increased safety for swimmers and boaters, but the cribbing and the general rectangular outline of the pilings should be retained. Generally, the pilings between the cribbing and the shore may be removed, with the exception of the northernmost line of pilings, which should be retained in its entirety. Additional pilings may be added if necessary at each end of the lines of cribbing, in order to mark them adequately.

6. All other groups of pilings associated with historic uses and structures should be retained.
APPENDIX C

Recommendations of the Buoy, Swim Area, Pier and Watercraft Committee

1. BUOYS

The desirable number of buoys recommended are the present 20-buoy field plus a 20-buoy field lakeward of the proposed swim area opposite the former cabana beach, symmetrically positioned relative to the swim area.

Four additional buoys in this new field are additionally recommended, provided a mutually acceptable written agreement can be executed between the Glenbrook Homeowners Association and the four cabana owners, wherein permanent rights and control of these four buoys is granted them, and they conform to the buoy pattern as a whole.

Some extra space is recommended between the buoy field and swim ropes (perhaps fifty extra feet) to accommodate small boat travel along the lake front and sailboats leaving the beach storage area to the north.

The committee hopes and believes the new buoy field may fully satisfy all-future buoy field needs for the Glenbrook Homeowners Association. Should a demonstrated permanent need for more community buoys be established at some, future date, this committee, or similar representative committee of the Glenbrook community as a whole, should review this need and establish a recommendation acceptable to the community.

2. SWIM AREAS

The committee recommends that the three swim areas currently in place or proposed, of size and location as shown on the map, be adopted as part of this plan.

The first swim area exists north of the pier. The second swim area is the former cabana beach. The third is in front of the new cabanas, and protrudes into the piling pattern. The design of this swim area should be developed by mutual consideration of all persons directly affected by the swim area design after the pilings approved for removal are removed. Each swim area is understood to have one swim float.

The China Garden beach area has not demonstrated a need for a swim area. At such time as a demonstrated need is established, the merits of this fourth community swim area could be considered. Should this swim area receive approval, it is recommended that swim lines be omitted, and only a swim float be allowed, considering the size of this area, space needed for beaching boats, and creek outlet. Protection of the creek and its fishery should be required as part of the approval.
3. **PIERS**

The committee recommends a boat landing be added to the south side of the existing pier, similar in size and construction to the present such landing on the opposite (north) side of the pier, providing the pilings now recommended for removal on the south side are approved for removal. This would double the landing capacity of the pier. It is further recommended that no further extension or modification of the pier be made, including boat hoists. A future review of this pier could be made by this or a similar representative committee to evaluate the adequacy of the pier and landing space, if agreed essential and acceptable to the community, to make provision for needed additional landing space.

The committee recommends no additional piers on the community beaches, including the China Garden beach area. It is further recommended additional individual private piers on the bay be kept to a minimum, and only allowed where there is a special need (i.e., where a littoral property is inaccessible to the lake for boating purposes due to terrain) with multiple ownership piers serving as many littoral property owners as possible being encouraged.

Aggressive pursuit of the present study of the rock breakwater at the north end of the Bay is encouraged. The study is to determine whether the breakwater is having a detrimental effect on the beaches to the south. Should this be established, action for removal is recommended.

4. **WATERCRAFT**

Owners of lake frontage properties should establish what types of boats should beach on their property, and where. The Glenbrook Homeowners Association has such a policy for their community beaches.
APPENDIX D
Glenbrook Piling Committee Meeting
March 13, 1984

MINUTES

Present:

Alice Becker, Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology
Fritzi Huntington, Glenbrook
Ron James, Division of Historic Preservation and Archeology
Keith-Ann Marien, Division of State Lands
John Turner, Glenbrook
Shelly Nahas Turner, Glenbrook Company
Pam Wilcox, Division of State Lands

Pam Wilcox opened the meeting and asked that everyone present state his concerns.

Shelly Turner requested that the Glenbrook Shorezone Plan be amended to allow for the removal of all the pilings immediately south of the pier. She discussed their (Glenbrook Company) concerns as they relate to the liability. She indicated that the Glenbrook Home Owners Association (GHOA) was also concerned, as is the Coast Guard. Shelly has received a letter from the Coast Guard stating that the pilings are navigational hazards. She also indicated that the Coast Guard will consult with them regarding marking all the pilings that are not removed.

Glenbrook Company has requested an emergency permit from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) seeking removal of these pilings and all others identified for removal in the Glenbrook plan. A meeting has been scheduled for March 19 at TRPA to discuss the emergency permit with Agency Staff.

Fritzi Huntington was concerned that the letter to TRPA from Glenbrook Company's attorney did not accurately represent the facts. She indicated that the hazard survey was done in 1977 not 1974. (Point of fact, the study was done November 18-19, 1976.) Fritzi also expressed a concern that her group had agreed to the plan and, if they were already changing it, then her group might want to reopen the buoy field question.

Shelly indicated that it was not her intention to keep changing the plan; however, in light of the new information (information they were not aware of during the planning process) regarding a pending lawsuit at Timbercove Marina, they are more concerned than ever about the liability. They are not proposing to remove all the pilings but are requesting only those that are most hazardous. The most congested areas are the areas that they feel have the more hazardous pilings.

Alice Becker indicated that the historicity of the pilings is well documented and that they were important and are significant. Alice did not feel all of the alternatives have been explored and suggested that the committee explore the following:

1. Life guards
2. Guard rails
3. Insurance
4. Signs

It was pointed out that the Shorezone Plan is not really legally binding, but the agencies
will review projects according to the plan, and it is hoped all private parties will also act according to it.

No consensus was reached regarding Shelly's request to remove all the pilings south of the pier, although it was agreed that those pilings which are submerged can be removed. The plan will indicate the disagreement.
MEMORANDUM

October 16, 1984

To:       The TRPA Governing Board

From:     The Staff

Subject:  Draft Plan Area Statements

Included in this mailing are drafts of the Plan Area Statements for Placer, Washoe, Douglas, and El Dorado Counties. The Plan Area Statements for the City will be available next month. Each of these drafts reflects the comments and recommendations of the review committees; however, there may still be some drafting modifications to be made in a few of the Placer and Douglas County Plan Area Statements. Corrections to these drafts are now being pursued with the respective local planners.

The public has commented on the Plan Area Statements at the APC meetings. In response to these comments, the APC has suggested that staff try to work out any problems with the affected individual/party. Staff is to report back to the APC on the progress made towards resolving the problem(s). To date, this affects only five Plan Areas.

Because the staff and committees have tried to resolve most of the identified issues at the committee level, it is not likely that the Board will be deluged with a lot of unresolved issues. However, some issues are likely to persist which can only be dealt with by the Board. To help make the best use of the Board's time, staff suggests that the Board act as a clearinghouse for the issues that cannot be worked out at the staff or APC levels. With this approach, the Board could accept public comments and direct any identified issues back to the staff and APC for resolution. Staff would then report back to the Board on how the issues are resolved and also identify those issues which cannot be resolved by the staff/APC.

Plan Area Statements affected by this process will be amended and new draft pages forwarded to the Board. A complete and up-to-date packet of Plan Area Statements can be kept by replacing the old pages with the new pages as they are received. Hopefully, this replacement system will help avoid the need to duplicate the entire package for subsequent meetings. Binders for holding the Plan Area Statements will be provided at the Board meeting.
MEMORANDUM

October 16, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board

From: The Staff

Subject: Code of Ordinances

The APC is continuing to review the staff drafts of the proposed Code of Ordinances. To date, four chapters of the Code (Land Use, Grading, Resource Management, Air Quality) have been cleared by the APC for Board committee review. The APC has decided to continue their review of the remaining five chapters despite some concern that litigation proceedings may eventually unravel some of their efforts.

The Governing Board Land Use Committee is now in the process of reviewing Chapter 2 of the Code. However, committee meetings to discuss the land use provisions have been temporarily postponed due to concern that work on this and possibly other chapters of the Code should be discontinued or redirected pending further clarification and resolution of litigation issues.

Staff would like some discussion by the Board on this subject to help provide staff with some direction for proceeding with review of the Code.
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October 11, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board

From: The Staff

Subject: Change of Regular Meeting Date

Because of the holiday schedule this winter, the regular meeting date in December falls on December 26, the day after Christmas. The Compact permits the meeting date to be changed one time a year and requires that such change be publicly noticed. Should the Governing Board wish to change the December meeting date to the third Wednesday of the month (December 19), such action is requested this month so that adequate notice can be given.
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MEMORANDUM

Date: October 11, 1984

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Gary D. Midkiff

Subject: Agency Legal Support

Pursuant to Governing Board direction, I have further examined available alternatives for legal support including the following:

1. Status quo
2. a. status quo with adjustment to rates for Partner v. Associate
   b. status quo with adjustment to rates based on type of work performed
3. Status quo with maximum cost contract
4. Status quo with Gary A. Owen for major litigation and retainer for Susan Scholley's services on Administration and Enforcement
5. Obtain legal support from California and Nevada Attorneys General
6. Total in-house legal counsel
7. Partial in-house counsel with outside counsel for major litigation

The following discussion on the above listed options provides as much information as is presently available regarding each option and associated costs. However, due to the nature of options 1-5 which relate to the contractual arrangement with Gary Owen's firm I am unable to provide any costs data at this time. If the Governing Board wishes to pursue any of these options, I recommend that a committee be created and authorized to work with me to negotiate with the firm of Shaw, Heaton, Doescher, & Owen, Ltd. the details and costs of various options and return with a recommendation.

Option 1 - Status Quo

Continued contract with Shaw, Heaton, Doescher, and Owen for all legal support provides full representation at a cost of $65/hour will a projected increase to possibly $80/hour in July, 1985.

Advantages: Provides continuity with a firm highly knowledgeable regarding the history of Tahoe, TRPA and its statutory responsibility, Plan, Ordinance, etc.
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TRPA Governing Board - Agency Legal Support
October 11, 1984
Page Two

Disadvantages: Due to major litigation, plan and ordinance completion, project review and enforcement requirements for legal support, costs are increasing and are likely to continue to increase for the foreseeable future.

Option 2 - a. Status quo with adjustment to rates to reflect difference in experience and knowledge between Partners and Associates in the firm.

Advantages: Depending on the rate differential there may be a fairly substantial savings due to the fact that Susan Scholley, the Associate, is knowledgeable on TRPA issues and can handle many Administrative, Project Review, Enforcement and minor litigation matters at the lower rate.

Disadvantages: Unless the rate differential is substantial, this would be more expensive than having an in-house staff counsel to handle similar issues.

Option 2 - b. Status quo with adjustment to rates based on type of work performed, (e.g., a rate for Administrative items, ordinance review, meeting attendance, Enforcement meetings, letters; a rate for Enforcement litigation, courtroom time, etc.).

Advantages: May be substantial savings depending on the rate differential and exact categories covered by which rate.

Disadvantages: Creates a timekeeping and accounting workload for both Attorney and Agency which, unless the rate difference is substantial, could defeat the purpose due to increase Administrative costs to the Agency.

Option 3 - Status quo with a maximum cost contract for all legal services.

Advantages: This option offers perhaps the greatest protection to the Agency in terms of controlling legal costs, since theoretically a contract would provide an hourly rate with no minimum # of hours but a ceiling on total costs but no limit on the amount of time the attorneys would spend.

Disadvantages: Due to the difficulty in predicting the amount of time legal counsel would be required to spend in defending the Agency any Attorney would be reluctant to consider such a contract.
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Option 4 - Status quo for major litigation with a retainer for Susan Scholley's services on a more or less full-time basis. This option would be based on a retainer or fee designed to cover the Firm's costs and a small profit but less than the present $65/hour paid for Susan and all associated support.

Advantages: While a full-time situation is not the normal use of a retainer, this option provides for a situation closest to the status quo while providing for a possibility of substantial savings to the Agency.

Disadvantages: Due to the full-time, or nearly so, demand for legal support on Administrative, ordinance review, enforcement and related items this would amount to a TRPA staff attorney working for Gary Owen's firm with no substantial benefit to the firm.

Option 5 - Obtain legal support from California and Nevada Attorneys General for all Agency needs.

Not a viable option at this time based on response to inquiries by the Staff and Governing Board members.

Option 6 - Total in-house legal counsel.

This option would require a Chief Counsel and 2 Associate Counsel positions, 2 legal secretaries, office space and equipment, extraordinary support costs including Bar fees, Library, continuing education, insurance etc.

Costs of this option while somewhat difficult to estimate would be approximately:

Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Counsel</td>
<td>$50 - 50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Counsel</td>
<td>30 - 40K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Associate</td>
<td>25 - 30K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95 - 120K/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Sec @$17K

$34K/yr

Benefits @ approx 20%

31K/yr

Overhead

50K/yr
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Bar fees, Continuing Education, Insurance, Library Additional Office Space Additional Word Processing Equipment 2 stations ($30,000) 7,500/yr 7,500/yr 7,500/yr $250+ $250+

Advantages: Due to having salaried attorneys on staff, the overall costs would at least be controllable as opposed to an hourly rate with no ceiling on total hours or costs.

Disadvantages: In addition to costs for office space, overhead, equipment, secretarial and other support the unpredictable nature of the Agency's legal support needs makes it difficult to justify a full legal staff beyond the immediate future. This unpredictability may make it difficult to attract and keep the caliber of staff we desire. Space considerations are also a factor in that our present offices do not include adequate space for 5 additional staff members.

Option 7 - Partial in-house counsel with outside consulting counsel for major litigation.

This option is a mixture of several options previously discussed. As conceived, it includes the possibility of a TRPA staff counsel position responsible for Administrative, Project Review, Enforcement and related items including minor litigation. This staff counsel would then work with consulting counsel on major plan related, inverse condemnation or other litigation on an as needed basis.

The costs of this option are estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Counsel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$35K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits @ 20%</td>
<td>7K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>21K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar fees, continuing Education</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$43,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $80,500                           |       |
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ADVANTAGES: Due to the large volume of workload in the foreseeable future in the subject areas discussed above, this option provides a potential savings of substantial proportions.

DISADVANTAGES: There may be some delay in finding a qualified attorney and subsequently in bringing the chosen party up to speed on the complex and controversial issues involved. In addition, due to the experience and knowledge of present counsel, there may be, even with a close and cooperative working arrangement, some difficulty in providing adequate communication to avoid disagreements in interpretation of the Compact, Regional Plan and Ordinances. It may take some time for the Board to become as confident in a new staff counsel as they are in the representation presently provided.
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 16, 1984

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Allocation of Transportation Development Act Funds

The TRPA has been designated by the Secretary of the California Business and Transportation Agency as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the California portion of the Tahoe Basin. Under this designation, TRPA is charged with administration of the Transportation Development Act. The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides two major sources of funds for public transportation through regional planning and programming agencies. The first is the county Local Transportation Fund (LTF). The second is the regional State Transit Assistance Fund (STA).

**LTF**

The TDA (SB325) established the LTF, a source of financial support for public transportation, by allowing the counties to impose a one-quarter percent sales tax. The revenue generated from this tax is collected by the Board of Equalization and returned to the county of origin to be deposited in a local transportation fund. Funds are allocated to cities and counties based upon population. The regional transportation planning agencies administer these funds within their specified areas.

Claims may be filed for the funds by transit operators for operating costs or capital requirements, by cities and counties for transit services under contract; or by cities and counties for streets and roads. The LTF priority is transit.

Prior to approving any claims for streets and roads out of the LTF, the RTPA must comply with Section 6658 of the TDA regulations. The regulations require the RTPA to do the following:

1. Insure the planning process includes specific items as required;
2. Hold public hearings to receive testimony on the issue of unmet transit needs;
3. Define "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet"; and
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4. Adopt by resolution a finding of:
   a. no unmet needs;
   b. no unmet needs reasonable to meet; or
   c. there are unmet needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet.

If b, the RTPA must specify why the unmet needs are not reasonable to meet.

If c, then the unmet needs must be funded before any allocations are made for streets and roads.

Staff will present further information regarding these provisions at the Governing Board meeting and will be prepared to answer any questions at that time.

STA

The STA fund program was created under Chapter 161 of SB620. The program provides a second source of TDA funding for transit and streets and roads. Funds for the program are derived from the statewide sales tax. The money is appropriated to the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency for allocation by formula to each Regional Transportation Planning Agency. The allocations from the Secretary are deposited in each regional entity's STA fund.

The process for allocation and payment of funds from the STA fund is very similar to that for LTF. STA funds are not, however, apportioned within regions by population.

30% of the STA funds are allocated to the regions based upon transit operator revenues, and must be allocated back to each transit operator.

The remaining 70% of the STA funds are allocated to the regions on the basis of population. These funds are available for allocation to claimants for either transit or street and road purposes.

Unlike the LTF, the STA fund is not apportioned by the RTPA on the basis of population. The RTPA may approve use of all remaining STA funds by one claimant.

The staff recommendations for the LTF and STA apportionments are based upon the above mentioned guidelines and the Regional Plan Goals and Policies.
Staff Recommended Allocation of STA Funds

Available $113,193.00

Claimant
City of South Lake Tahoe:

The City has a claim submitted for $75,000. This money is to be used to augment the maintenance and operations of the STAGE Bus system.

$25,445 is to be used for funding a bus maintenance worker. $49,505 is to be used for maintenance and operation expenses.

Claimant
County of Placer

The County of Placer is requesting $37,000 in STA funds to augment the operation and maintenance of the TART bus system.

Claimant
Tahoe Transportation District (TTD)

The TTD is requesting $23,424 to use as match money for a Section 18 grant application.

The TTD is also requesting $15,000 to help fund the sales tax election. This money is to reimburse the counties of Placer and El Dorado.

Claimant
County of El Dorado

The County of El Dorado is requesting $38,196 in STA funds for an asphalt overlay on Pioneer Trail between Elks Club Drive and Busch Drive.

$188,620.00

Short Fall $ 75,427.00
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The staff recommendation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>$56,992.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Bus System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Placer</td>
<td>$32,777.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TART Bus System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD</td>
<td>$23,424.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Section 18 Match Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Funding to reimburse election costs</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of El Dorado</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt overlay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$113,193.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Fall</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff Recommendations for Allocation of LTF Funds

**Placer County funds available are:**

- TRPA Administrative Costs: 2,500.00
- TRPA 3% planning costs: 5,208.00
- Amount available to County: 165,904.00
- The County of Placer has requested LTF funds for the operation of TART: 165,904.00

**Balance:** -0-

**El Dorado County funds available are:**

- TRPA Administrative Costs: 2,500.00
- TRPA 3% planning money: 10,835.00
- Amount available to county: 347,846.00
- Based upon population estimates, 26.31% of the population is in the unincorporated portion of El Dorado County. 73.69% of the population is in the City of South Lake Tahoe.

**City of South Lake Tahoe Portion Available:**

- The City of South Lake Tahoe has requested LTF funds for STAGE: 256,328.00
- Balance: -0-

**Unincorporated portion of El Dorado County available funds:**

- The County of El Dorado has requested LTF funds for the Dial-A-Ride program which provides services to low-income, elderly, and handicapped: 46,545.00
- The County of El Dorado has also requested LTF funds for the purpose of drainage and pavement repair on Lake Tahoe Blvd: 61,000.00
- Balance: ($16,027.00)
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Staff Recommendation:

The staff recommendation is to approve all claims with the exception of the $61,000 requested by the County of El Dorado for the repair of Lake Tahoe Blvd.

Before TRPA can allot any of these funds to the Lake Tahoe Blvd. project, we must conduct the Unmet Needs Hearing as was stated earlier. The TRPA cannot by law distribute LTF money for streets and roads until the Unmet Needs Hearing has been conducted.
MEMORANDUM

October 16, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board

From: The Staff

Subject: Resolution Programming UMTA Section 18
Grants for the Tahoe Region

Every fiscal year, there is a California statewide program of projects funded through UMTA Section 8 grants. Section 18 funds are to be used by transit operators and districts for the purposes of administration and operations. Historically, the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) has been the only transit agency which has asked for the funds allocated to the Tahoe Region. The same is true for this fiscal year.

The 1984-85 Section 18 funds apportioned to the Tahoe Basin are in the amount of $17,223. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, TRPA must program these funds in order that they may be available to transit districts and operators. A resolution from the Board must be sent to Caltrans regarding this matter by November 9, 1984.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Show Cause Hearing: City of South Lake Tahoe, Unauthorized Expansion of Service at the South Tahoe Airport

Property Owner: City of South Lake Tahoe

Violation Description: In early May of 1982, TRPA staff approved an El Dorado County request for 15 scheduled Air California flights per week to the Lake Tahoe Airport. These flights were limited to 3 per day Wednesday thru Sunday. The approval was based on the ability of the airport to maintain a 24 hour Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) below the 60 dBA set for the Lake Tahoe Airport as adopted under the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities Report. Approval was also based upon the ability of the Air Cal jet DC-9-80 to achieve the 84 dBA single event noise threshold. This was determined using Advisory Circular 36-3B published by the Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration.

The City of South Lake Tahoe has since the May, 1982 approval become the owners and operators of the Lake Tahoe Airport. The City contends that they have prior approval from TRPA for 19 flights per week. However, the last approval staff can locate is for 15 flights per week.

In early April, 1984, the City circulated a negative declaration to increase Air Cal operations from 19 - 29 flights per week. TRPA staff responded to the negative declaration and contacted the city staff. It was the position of the Agency, that any increase in flights would have impacts upon traffic, VMT, changes in CNEL levels and potentially increase the chance of toxic spills. For these reasons, TRPA felt that this constituted a project and needed review of the Agency.

On May 17, 1984, staff's Chief of Project Review sent a certified letter to the City Manager requesting the City to rescind any unauthorized increase in Air California flights. Article VI(1) of the TRPA Compact states that any person who violates any ordinance or regulation of the Agency is subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $5,000 per day for each day on which such a violation persists.

On May 1, 1984, Air California increased their operations to 29 flights per week as stated in their contract with the City of South Lake Tahoe.

On May 26, 1984, TRPA posted, against the City of South Lake Tahoe, a Cease and Desist Operations Order at the Lake Tahoe Airport. However, Air California additional operations have not been rescinded.

Air Cal flights have been cut back to the previous level of service (19 flights per week) as of September 4, 1984.

The City of South Lake Tahoe contract with Air Cal for service expires and must be renewed in November at which time the City must determine the number of flights for the next year.

JB:bl
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Violation Analysis: TRPA staff has been working with the City of South Lake Tahoe and the California Attorney General's office since early April to resolve the above-mentioned violation and any future increases in air service at the Tahoe Airport. There was a considerable amount of discussion regarding whether or not the approved number of flights are based on an annual average or a specified number of flights per day. However, staff maintains that the CNEL standard is a 24 hour standard and cannot be averaged on an annual basis.

Staff has tried to be flexible with the City to increase flight service. We acknowledge that the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan calls for encouraging the use of aviation facilities as a strategy to reduce VMT in the Basin. However, for this to be effective, air services need to be coordinated with transit services. Staff proposed that the City consider an alternative to the 29 flights per week (4 flights Monday - Saturday and 5 flights on Sunday). The staff's proposal would have extended the prior approval of 15 flights per week (3 flights Wednesday - Sunday) to 21 flights per week (3 flights Sunday - Monday).

However, the City of South Lake Tahoe is committed to a contract with Air California and chose not to violate that agreement.

On June 15, 1984, staff received a report from the acoustical consultants contracted by the City of South Lake Tahoe. Staff has determined, based upon the above-mentioned report that the increase in commercial flight service will not exceed the CNEL value of 60 dBA.

On July 13, 1984, staff received a fuel spill management plan from the City. If these procedures are followed as they are outlined, staff feels that those precautions would be adequate for the present level service at the airport.

On June 21, 1984, staff received a traffic report submitted by DKS and Associates on behalf of the City. The report clearly indicated impacts associated with the increase in commercial air carrier service. These impacts are: 1) Increased deterioration of the level of service from the Y to State line; and 2) potentially increasing the existing hazardous access problems we have at the airport.

On June 30, 1984, staff received an air quality impacts analysis with respect to the increased commercial air carrier service. This analysis depicted the very worst case scenario. If the meteorological conditions and wind patterns were such that CO (carbon monoxide) impacts would be maximized, the CO levels would increase no more than 2% in areas where there are already violations.

TRPA staff has done an analysis to determine the VMT associated with each mode of travel from the airport and distributed throughout the South Shore. The analysis started with the base year 1983, when 3* daily Air Cal flights were exempted in May of 1983. Staff attempted to establish the change in VMT accompanying an addition of 2* daily flights.

*(Each flight consisting of an arrival and a departure).
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There were several assumptions made prior to the analysis. They were: 1) the vehicle mode split and occupancy based upon the June, 1984 DK# report; 2) trip distribution based upon the Lake Tahoe Airport Working Paper #1 dated August, 1984; and 3) all Air Cal flights assumed to have a 70% occupancy factor. With an increase of 2 daily flights, daily VMT would increase at the airport from 1678 to 2725. The staff reviewed incremental percents of increased shuttle service patronage and the associated VMT decreases. The staff's analysis indicates that shuttle service patronage would have to increase beyond 100% or 2 times the present level to reduce the VMT to a less than significant level. In review of the proposed mitigation package, staff feels that based upon level of service factors as time, cost, and convenience, ridership would increase by approximately 50%, therefore resulting in a net increase in VMT of 700 or 40%.

These VMT calculations are strictly site specific in nature. Based upon Dr. Edward Ghyrm's passenger survey conducted at the Lake Tahoe Airport in July, 1984, up to 69% of the air passengers surveyed indicated they would travel to the Tahoe area regardless of whether air service existed or not. Of those respondents, 33.03% would have taken private cars, 2.75% would have rented cars, 0.92% would have taken a charter bus, 3.21% would have taken a scheduled bus, 27.98% would have flown into Reno, and 0.92% would have taken a private plane. Without a detailed transportation analysis of these alternative modes of access to the Basin, it is not possible to determine finally whether a net increase in VMT will, in fact, occur.

**Alternative Governing Board Actions:** Due to the apparent imminence of settlement of this case and associated litigation at the time this report was finalized, staff was unable to finalize a complete range of alternative actions for Governing Board consideration. Staff will present those options at the Governing Board meeting.
MEMORANDUM

October 16, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board

From: The Enforcement Division

Subject: Show Cause Hearing, Unauthorized Tree Removal, Tahoe Tavern Homeowners Association

Agency staff was informed on October 3, 1984 by members of the Tahoe Tavern Homeowners Association that trees had been cut by the Association management without the benefit of the required tree removal permit. Subsequent investigation showed a number of freshly cut cottonwood trees on the property. The Association management contends that the cottonwoods were cut approximately 10 years ago, resprouted from those tree stumps, and were recently cut again, leaving fresh stumps. On October 15, 1984, the Association management showed Agency staff three examples of wood cut from the tree stumps. They showed sproutings from old cut trunks, all measuring less than six inches in diameter.

Agency staff feels that the Association's contention may have merit and agrees with them that a continuance of this matter to the November Governing Board is warranted. A continuance will allow the Association time to secure evidence such as photographs showing the size of the trees prior to their being cut and statements from the firm which cut them. Staff is not convinced that all the trees were less than six inches in diameter (the minimum size requiring a permit) and will research the matter further. A report will be presented at the November Board meeting.