NOTICE OF AMENDED AGENDA
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the location of the
Wednesday, May 14, 1986, Advisory Planning Commission meeting
has been changed to the Zephyr Cove Branch of the Douglas County
Date: May 7, 1986

By:

William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Wednesday, May 14, 1986, commencing at 9:30 a.m., the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Date: May 1, 1986

By: [Signature]
William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEETING AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PLANNING MATTERS
   A. Discussion on the Tahoe Queen EIS
   B. Discussion and Recommendations Regarding Adoption of the Short Range Transit Program
   C. Discussion and Recommendations Regarding the U.S. Forest Service Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin
   D. Discussion and Recommendations on Supplement to the EIS for Regional Plan Revisions
   E. Review of Goals and Policies Revisions
   F. Bijou Community Park and Golf Course Draft EIR/EIS, Notice of Circulation
   G. Scheduling of Ordinance Committee Meetings

V REPORTS
   A. Staff
   B. Legal Counsel
      1. Tenth Stipulation Amending Order Granting Preliminary Injunction (Plan for 1986) and Resolution 86-8 Adopting 1986 Rules and Regulations and Residential Conditions of Approval
   C. Public Interest Comments
   D. APC Members

VI RESOLUTIONS

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

May 6, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Discussion on the Tahoe Queen EIS

At the April meeting of the APC, TRPA staff made a brief presentation on the status of the Tahoe Queen EIS. The draft EIS is currently in circulation, with comments due by June 3, 1986. The final EIS will be prepared and presented to the APC at the June 11 meeting.

The consultant is reviewing comments on the draft EIS which have been received to date. A summary of these comments and the first responses will be sent under separate cover when they are received from the consultant.

The APC is requested to review and present its comments on the draft Tahoe Queen EIS to the staff and the consultant at the May 14, 1986 meeting.

If you have any questions concerning this agenda item, please call either Curtis Jordan or Leif Anderson at (702) 588-4547.

AGENDA ITEM IV A.
MEMORANDUM

May 6, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Discussion and Recommendations Regarding Adoption of the Short Range Transit Program

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) contracted with ATE Management and Service Company, Inc. to update the existing Short Range Transit Program (SRTP). This work was to include the development of a service and financial plan for improving public transit service in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Elements of the SRTP update include a service plan, a financial analysis, a management options analysis, and transit plan.

The SRTP was adopted, with revisions, by the TTD Board at its May 2, 1986 meeting. This adopted SRTP is to be submitted by the TTD to the TRPA Board at its May meeting.

The SRTP contains several amendments which were approved by the TTD and are included in the document. These amendments include the following:

a. An addendum from the consultant responding to comments received on the final draft of the SRTP;

b. An addendum which was prepared by the consultant retained by the Tahoe Tomorrow Foundation detailing specific routing and schedule modifications to the outline contained in the SRTP; a detailed capital outlay schedule setting forth the required facilities and equipment needed to implement the basic plan; a detailed financial plan complementing the capital outlay schedule and providing the needed refinements to the SRTP; and a schedule of financing and capital equipment needed to provide a special casino shuttle service as a part of the overall SRTP;

c. A description of summer beach bus service to be implemented in the South Shore area; and

d. A statement adopted by the TTD Board to clarify the purpose of the SRTP and revisions to it.
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AGENDA ITEM IV B.
Memo to the APC
Short Range Transit Program
May 6, 1986

The SRTP update, as amended, identifies transit services for both the North and South Shore areas of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Transit service in the South Shore will be provided to the residents by a fixed route system which expands and modifies existing transit services. This service will extend from South Lake Tahoe into Nevada to the Round Hill area. The SRTP recommends that those areas that are not as densely populated be served with a demand-responsive type of system. Service on the North Shore is also provided by an expanded fixed route system along the existing routes, extending from Incline Village to Tahoma. Summer service would be extended to include Sand Harbor and Meeks Bay. As in the South Shore, service will be provided to the less densely populated areas by a form of demand-responsive service.

Capital and operational funding for the implementation of the SRTP is proposed to be derived from several sources. An UMTA Section 3 Grant application is currently being prepared to fund the capital equipment needs of the SRTP. A proposed sales tax to support public transportation in the Basin will be presented to the voters in September of this year. These sales tax revenues will be used to fund operational expenses. In addition, both State of California Local Transportation Funds (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds will be available to the TTD as an operating agency. Fare box revenues will also be expected to provide a significant portion of the required operating funds for the transit system. Funds to operate the visitor shuttle service will be derived from fare box revenues and from private sources.

Attached for your review are relevant sections of the SRTP Update and the adopted amendments to the SRTP. The sections of the SRTP which have been included contain a discussion of the public transit issues in the Tahoe area, Goals and Objectives, a five-year plan for implementation, which describes the service to be implemented in the North Shore. The addendums to the SRTP describe the service to be implemented in the South Shore, the capital requirements to implement the services Basinwide, and a financial summary. A copy of the base SRTP is available for your review at the TRPA office. A complete review of the SRTP update will be presented by staff at the APC meeting. The staff will then request recommendations from the APC on the adequacy of the SRTP and consistency of the SRTP with the Regional Plan, for transmittal to the Governing Board.

If you have questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Leif Anderson at (702) 588-4547.

AGENDA ITEM IV E.
POOR QUALITY ORIGINAL (S) TO FOLLOW

HIGH DESERT MICROIMAGING, INC.
1225 FINANCIAL BLVD
RENO, NV 89502
(775) 359-6980
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

FINAL REPORT

April, 1986
II. PUBLIC TRANSIT ISSUES IN THE TAHOE AREA

As an area of outstanding natural beauty, residents of the Tahoe Basin are constantly attempting to assure the protection of their environment. Vehicular traffic, congestion, noise and vehicle emissions are undesirable. Because of the area's geography, the highway roadspace is limited. The road space limitations reach a critical condition in the South Lake Tahoe, Stateline area where the density of demand for access to the casino facilities substantially exceeds system capacity in peak periods. Related congestion considerations around the lake have caused the area to look eagerly at the prospect of public transit system improvements to relieve the current situation. In this chapter the important issues surrounding public transit improvements are considered. At the end of the chapter an assessment of these issues is provided.

A. CONCERN FOR ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The Bi-State Tahoe Regional Planning Compact of 1980 placed several responsibilities upon the TRPA. These responsibilities included development of standards known as "environmental threshold carrying capacities" to be part of a Regional Plan. The Regional Plan was developed and adopted in April, 1984. The plan contains land use and transportation related policies that, when implemented, would permit additional development and population growth.

Because of air pollution caused by motor vehicle emissions, the reduction of single passenger automobile trips into and within the Basin was identified as a key element in the successful implementation of the Regional Plan. The plan considers several techniques such as carpooling, increased mass transit ridership and other mitigation measures to reduce automobile travel and consequently, emissions (see Appendix A).

The principal policy direction set in the Regional Plan was to reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) in the Basin by 10 percent of the 1981 base year values over a 20 year period. Also, to meet California carbon monoxide standards, the Regional Plan seeks to reduce traffic volumes in the U.S. 50 corridor during the winter months by 35 percent from the 1981 base year figures. For each goal public mass transportation is assigned a significant role. Twenty-four (24) percent of the reduction in VMT is to be achieved by public mass transportation programs. Other significant reductions are to be achieved by private mass transportation, ridesharing and trip reduction programs and lesser reductions by aviation, waterborne, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and neighborhood mail delivery.

Further policy direction of the Regional Plan seeks to reduce fumes from diesel engine to the extent possible to reduce particulates in the air and reduce NOx emissions.
B. TRAFFIC CONGESTION

During the peak travel months of summer and winter, heavy traffic conditions cause long travel delays in both the North Shore and South Shore of the Basin. Also, during prime periods parking facilities at beaches and campgrounds are crowded and capacity is often exceeded. These conditions contribute to environmental degradation and in general, make the Basin a less attractive area for visitors.

C. THE ROLE OF TRANSIT IN THE COMMUNITY

An effective transit system plays an important role in a region's economy, helping to maintain the existing economy as well as to expand. Transit can play an important role in the community's infrastructure. A transit system which effectively serves the needs of the Basin will focus on delivery of workers to jobs. In particular, the gaming industry has a strong interest in getting people to work. There is also a strong interest in a reliable transportation system that will be able to reach new pools of employees, get them to the job on time, and reduce the need for employee parking.

Transit also has a major role in the issue of overall economic development to the individual. Of the current ridership, a large proportion are transit dependent. To these people, transit often means the only way of getting to work, job training, educational, health care, and social opportunities.

Along with employment centers, educational facilities are scattered throughout the Basin. Some of these resources are currently served by transit, but many residents are unable to easily reach a campus at the appropriate time of day. For example, Lake Tahoe Community College has transit service for the people of South Lake Tahoe, but other Basin residents are not well served.

Of similar importance is transit service to medical facilities. The Basin's medical facilities are located in areas scattered from one another. In terms of medical needs, particularly for those who are transit dependent, medical centers require good bus service.

Because of the large number of tourists in the basin it is important that the system be attractive to the areas visitors. Accordingly the service needs to provide reasonable access to the areas tourist attractions.

D. HOURS, FREQUENCIES, TRANSFERS, SCHEDULES

Although the current transit operators provide evening, night, and weekend service, from a practical standpoint it is
not extensive. With the nearly twenty-four hour, 7 day per week casino operations, a strong demand for adequate evening, night, and weekend service must be addressed.

Along with hours of operation, frequency of operation is also a major concern. Frequencies, or headways, vary among routes and by time of day. At the present time, no common frequencies are observed along U.S. 50, the primary corridor of demand. In addition, circuitous or meandering routings create lengthy and annoying travel times.

While it is anticipated that the geographical layout of the Basin and routes of a regional transit system will require transferring, transfer waits should not be lengthy.

Relating in part to transfers, schedules of routes constitute an issue, since they are often inconsistent and difficult to remember. Proper scheduling must address both passenger requirements and operational considerations.

E. ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED

The demand responsive transportation service for disabled residents of the Basin is limited. Persons wanting service on the North Shore are served by a Volunteer Agency and lift-equipped fixed-route transit buses which are difficult for disabled persons to reach. El Dorado County and South Lake Tahoe disabled residents are served by a demand responsive service that has no lift-equipped vehicles and lift-equipped fixed-route transit buses which are also difficult for disabled persons to reach. This current situation does not provide a satisfactory accessible transit system.

F. BUS FLEET NEEDS AND MAINTENANCE

Relating to the issue of air quality, bus maintenance is an important concern. Maintenance facilities are currently limited and require modifications or replacement. Maintenance of the vehicles themselves depends upon a skilled labor force, adequate supplies and equipment.

Acquisition of new buses, whether replacements to the existing fleet or additions, is of concern to the community in a number of ways. There is a requirement that buses be accessible to the handicapped through the use of wheelchair lifts. In the cold winters, reliable heating is imperative. Destination signs must be accurate and legible. Another issue concerning buses is their size. In residential area streets with lower than average ridership, with tight dimensions for mobility, or with poor pavement, smaller vehicles may be appropriate. Conversely, where passenger loads may exceed bus
funded only by California TDA funds and fares. TART funding has been provided through fares, California TDA and LTF funds, and Washoe Regional Transportation Commission funds.

The South Shore Dial-a-Ride Service for the elderly and handicapped is administered by the El Dorado County Department of Community Services. Funding is provided from fares and California LTF funds. It is anticipated that provision of this service would become the responsibility of the TTD.

Except for the California TDA and LTF funds, the Washoe County transportation sales tax, and system fares; there are no other funds in the Basin dedicated to transit. Therefore, if transit service is to be expanded and made more effective, an expanded source of funding is necessary. The federal government has been reassessing its funding support for transit capital and operating programs with a goal of reducing or eliminating these programs. The recently enacted Gramm-Rudman legislation will almost certainly decrease the level of federal support for mass transit. Loss of federal support places the transit financing responsibility on state and local government agencies.

The Bi-State Compact that created the TTD authorized the TTD to determine and propose a transit support tax to the District voters. After considering the options available, it was determined that a sales tax would fall most equitably upon visitors and residents to support a family of transit services that would benefit both groups.

While it is expected that the TTD will be the principal transit provider in the Basin, the method of providing the service may be one of several options which include direct operation by the TTD, private contract service provision of all or part of the service, or contract management of the District's service operations.

K. TAHOE TOMORROW FOUNDATION DEMONSTRATION

The Tahoe Tomorrow Foundation's dynamic demonstration program will focus on the highly utilized U.S. 50 service corridor. With adequate marketing support the program may demonstrate favorable reductions in automobile vehicle movements. If the operation is successful, the TTD will need to consider mechanisms to assure the continuation of this high intensity service in the future.

L. LAKE TAHOE AIRPORT

The City of South Lake Tahoe is currently operating an airport facility which is along U.S. 50 and California 89 just south of the "Y" intersection. This airport is served by two regional commercial carriers and general aviation. Expansion of airport operations is
significantly constrained by environmental concerns. Additionally, the City of South Lake Tahoe indicates inadequate financial resources to sustain operations and make necessary capital improvements.

During the course of our investigation of public transit system improvements, limited consideration was addressed to the Tahoe Transportation District's potential role in airport operations. The appropriate role of the TTD and the Lake Tahoe Airport should be considered through an independent study.

M. ANALYSIS

A number of important issues confront the Tahoe Transportation District in developing an effective plan for the future. These issues focus on developing an economical approach to improved public transportation resources that will reduce automobile travel and protect the area's outstanding environment.

This primary issue is much easier to articulate than it is to achieve. Over the past twenty years our nation has invested billions of public dollars in an effort to enhance the role of public transportation. While some measurable progress in terms of capital stock and overall service capability is observed, this investment has done little to lessen our dependence on private automobile transportation.

The density of origin and destination patterns in the Tahoe Basin are sufficiently dispersed as to suggest a difficult role for public transportation. Fiscally responsible development of public transportation system capabilities at Lake Tahoe would appear to suggest a less aggressive implementation strategy than has been previously suggested in other planning documents.

Lake Tahoe airport operations have not been considered in the plan at this time. The primary focus has been on the identification and financing of appropriate public transportation improvements for the Lake Tahoe Basin.
III. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES


III. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals and objectives guide an organization in the formulation of its plans and operating policies. In consideration of the issues surrounding public transit in the Tahoe Area and past planning efforts, ATE has drafted a set of goals and objectives for the Tahoe Transportation District.

A. MISSION STATEMENT

The Tahoe Transportation District endeavors to provide safe, accessible public transit service that meet the transportation needs of the Lake Tahoe Region in an efficient, cost-effective and environmentally sound manner consistent with the Regional Plan.

Goals and Objectives

1. Provide accessible transit service seven days a week to and from major travel destinations during the morning, afternoon and evening at frequencies based primarily on demand.

Specific Objectives:

- Provide fixed-route public transportation where economically and geographically feasible to all residents of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

- Provide an intensive bus service system along the Highway 50 Corridor.

- Provide expanded Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) service by extending service areas and providing more frequent service.

- Provide a Basin-wide, summer beach/campground fixed-route scheduled bus service.

- Provide extended STAGE Transit System service into Douglas County, Nevada.

- Expand the current route network to include routes linking the North and South Shores, the Carson Valley, and the Truckee area with major employment, educational, shopping and recreational generators in the Basin.

- Provide paratransit service in Incline Village, Nevada.

- Provide service to the South Lake Tahoe Airport.
o Improve and expand neighborhood circulation to provide access to local shopping and community facilities.

o Provide extended STAGE Transit System service in the residential areas along Upper Truckee and Pioneer Trail with either fixed-route or paratransit service.

2. Provide a demand responsive transit service that effectively meets the transportation needs of the disabled residents of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Specific Objectives:

o Offer advanced reservation service without regard to trip purpose.

o Provide service Monday through Saturday from approximately 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM.

o Provide service on Sunday and holidays from approximately 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

o Provide driver sensitivity training to cover the special needs and concerns that different disability groups have while utilizing public transportation.

o Provide hearing impaired individuals access to all public information through the purchase and marketing of an adequate TDD (Telecommunication Device for the Deaf) system.

o Provide braille bus time schedules and routes to visually impaired persons upon request.

3. Provide safe, handicapped accessible, efficient pick-up points for public transit passengers.

Specific Objectives:

o Construct additional lighted bus shelters throughout the Basin at heavily used bus stops or where conditions require.

o Establish and sign transit stops at convenient and safe locations throughout the Basin.

o Establish small park and ride lots along transit routes to encourage reduction in automobile movement.
4. Assist private and public organizations in developing a rideshare program to serve the basin.

Specific Objectives:

- Establish carpool matching services with TRPA assistance with a focus on major employment centers.
- Develop a vanpool program with TRPA assistance utilizing vans serving major employers.
- Promote the use of these programs as part of the TTD marketing program.

5. Improve maintenance operations in order to minimize breakdowns and provide reliable and comfortable transit service.

Specific Objectives:

- Establish an effective preventive maintenance program including an orderly inventory and stock control program.
- Improve the training and skills of maintenance personnel through on-the-job training programs and appropriate schools.
- Improve North and South Shore maintenance facilities.

6. Provide a marketing program which is adequate to inform all visitors and residents of the Basin about available public transit services.

Specific Objectives:

- Make use of the expertise of the private sector to develop and implement public transit marketing programs.
- Provide adequate budgetary resources for marketing purposes.
- Increase the use of mass media in selling the benefits of public transportation.
- Coordinate marketing efforts with the Chamber of Commerce, Visitor's Bureau, etc. to advise prospective visitors of service availability prior to their trip to the Basin.
o Prepare programs directed to the specific needs of residents and to the specific needs of visitors.

o Provide information centers at major traffic generators and attractors.

o Install route and schedule information displays throughout the Basin.

7. Provide adequate capital equipment and new construction in order to operate an accessible public transportation system at an optimum level.

Specific Objectives:

o Purchase only lift-equipped vehicles.

o Modify the existing STAGE maintenance facility to accommodate more vehicles, provide office space, and provide alternative fuels capability.

o Replace the existing TART maintenance facility to accommodate more vehicles, provide office space and provide alternative fuels capability.

o Establish a fleet replacement program.

o Construct transit terminals as necessary to support the five-year service plan.

o Provide timetable for the purchase of all transit support equipment (i.e., supervisory vehicles, maintenance support vehicles, passenger shelters, bus stops, information displays, fareboxes, radios, pedestrian crossing improvements).

o Undertake a program to establish small park and ride lots near transit routes.

8. Implement a public transportation system in such a manner as to protect the interests and benefits of all individuals currently employed with the STAGE and TART systems.

Specific Objectives:

o Assume job security for all existing transit employees.

o Develop uniform work rules and conditions for all employees.
9. Establish an effective citizen participation program in order to ensure maximum citizen input.

Specific Objectives:

- Appoint a citizens advisory committee involving representatives from all areas of the Basin and all special need groups (such as the elderly and disabled).
- Conduct public hearings regarding any new bus service being planned, anticipated fare changes or any changes in bus routes or time schedules which will affect 25 percent or more of the ridership of a route.
- Establish an effective customer suggestion and complaint program that assures that each issue will be looked at thoroughly and the necessary action taken.

10. Operate the public transportation system in the Basin in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

Specific Objectives:

- Adopt service standards concerning passenger ridership to provide measurement techniques.
- Establish accepted accounting procedures in order to ensure the proper management and accountability of all funds.

11. Help to reduce VMT and pollution problems in the Basin by discouraging the use of private automobiles and encouraging the utilization of public transportation.

Specific Objectives:

- Initiate a marketing program emphasizing public transportation as a viable alternative and a positive step toward reducing air pollution and traffic congestion.
- Adopt a policy regarding the number of bus stops per mile realizing that the more often a bus stops, the more nitrous oxides (NO₂) are emitted into the air.
- Maintain all transit vehicles at peak fuel efficiency in order to minimize emissions.
- Evaluate the use of alternative fuel engines in buses to reduce the emission of nitrous oxides.
12. Propose long range alternatives for public transportation in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Specific Objectives:

- Work with TRPA to conduct a feasibility study for a centralized transportation center to be used by all public and private scheduled transit operators, which would serve as the customer service center for the TTD and be the focal point for all transportation information and transportation activities in the South Shore.

- Work with TRPA to conduct a feasibility study of additional grade separated pedestrian ways along U.S. Highway 50 in the Stateline casino area and other high pedestrian traffic areas.

- Work with TRPA to conduct a feasibility study for fixed guideway transit operations in the U.S. 50 Corridor along the South Shore.

13. Involve the private sector in the public transit program in the Lake Tahoe Region.

Specific Objectives:

- Afford contracting opportunities for private transportation providers to operate transit services for the District.

- Coordinate the services offered by the District with those operated by scheduled private companies (e.g. LTR, Greyhound, Aircol) in order to make transfers between systems convenient for travellers from outside the Basin.

- Coordinate transit service with shift change times of major employers.

- Coordinate transit service with ski shuttle and summer beach/campground service in order to maximize use of the shuttles.

- Invite the private sector to participate in planning new services.

- Use the marketing expertise of the private sector to sell public transit service.

- Encourage expansion of charter bus service to the Basin.
o Explore opportunities for joint use of services and facilities with private operators (e.g., terminals, maintenance facilities, dispatching, etc.).

The previous three chapter have defined the current service program, addressed public transportation issues, and proposed broad goals and objectives for public transportation improvements. The purpose of this chapter is to develop a responsible plan for responding to these considerations during the next five years.

A. THE AREA AND ITS TRANSPORTATION REQUIREMENTS

Lake Tahoe is a resort community. It is an area which enjoys demand for both winter and summer recreation purposes. The geography of the area severely limits the amount of land space available for transportation systems.

The permanent resident population of the basin is about 50,000 with virtually half of these residents living in the City of South Lake Tahoe. In addition to the scenic and recreational attractions of the basin, the availability of gaming facilities on the Nevada side of the lake further stimulates tourist demand. The average daily tourist population is estimated as 55,000 and peak periods can see this total rise to over 100,000. There is substantial seasonal fluctuation of visitor patterns with the highest periods occurring during the Christmas holidays and in mid-summer.

Traffic patterns and flow are a direct function of daily visitor traffic around the lake. During off-peak periods the existing road space is adequate to meet travel demands. However, in peak periods traffic can crawl or come to a complete stop.

The primary corridor of concern is the 7.5 mile section of U.S. 50 from Round Hill, Nevada to the junction of U.S. 50 and California 89. All traffic is funneled through the concentration of casino facilities in Stateline, Nevada. Beyond this point, the U.S. 50 corridor is dominated by strip motel and commercial establishments. The severity of traffic demand over this corridor is an item which transit improvements are intended to address. At the North Shore, summer traffic pressure can be substantial in the Tahoe City, King’s Beach and Incline Village areas.

Low density residential development prevails around the lake. As a resort area, many of the homes represent vacation residences and the owners of these homes have the income levels and personal transportation associated with vacation home ownership. Residential areas offer meandering roadway patterns. The Tahoe Basin generally indicates the type of community in which conventional public transportation services are not effective. Indeed, only the City of South Lake Tahoe demonstrates sufficient urbanized characteristics to suggest the potential for public transit service.
The issue of public transportation need is obscured by the operational frustrations of the inadequate road space in the South Lake Tahoe/Stateline area and the desire of the region to reduce automobile VMT. While it is clearly possible to achieve some improvements to the volume of transit service operated over the U.S. 50 corridor, our experience suggests that it is extremely unlikely that any set of public transportation improvements without the imposition of controls on automobile travel could economically resolve the inadequacies of a highway system problem. Furthermore, in our opinion, the imposition of sufficient automobile control strategies would be very difficult to achieve.

Accordingly, we believe the public transportation plan should focus on strategies which can respond to the community's basic requirements for service to employment, shopping, educational, and recreational facilities. This plan should build upon and utilize wherever practical the very substantial contributions to the public transportation system which are already being made by private transportation providers. Indeed, it seems evident that with more than 2,000,000 person trips satisfied by the area's public transportation resources that there is already substantial impact on the area's total transportation requirements. A concentrated effort to achieve more output from the existing resources wherever possible should prove beneficial.

For example, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency may consider a traffic system management plan for Heavenly Valley during evening peak traffic periods. This plan might involve incentives for car pools and high occupancy vehicles.

B. THE BASIC CONCEPT

A program of public transportation improvements is proposed for the Tahoe Basin in an effort to respond to the goals, objectives, and issues in an economically responsible manner. Major elements of this program include:

- Improved local service in the City of South Lake Tahoe to enhance access by residents to employment, economic and social opportunities.
- Improved local service along the North Shore with additional service frequency.
- Enhanced evening service along major travel corridors.
- Demand responsive service coverage in lower density neighborhoods.
- Enhanced accessibility of service for non-ambulatory residents.
- More effective utilization of existing public sector resources.
o Broad opportunities for private sector participation.

o Prudent use of limited public financial resources.

o Installation of street furniture, signage, and information aids to assist passengers.

The following sections of this chapter describe the plan in more detail.

C. SERVICE DESIGN

The system can be described as a variety of service projects responding to demand patterns around the lake. For ease of communication, the Tahoe Basin service area has been divided into two sections: North Shore and South Shore. Service in each section is presented in a chart (Exhibit IV-1) which is accompanied by maps (Exhibit IV-2, IV-3). The written service descriptions and maps describe basic route patterns which might be adjusted upon final implementation. Also, route numbers are used for ease of understanding and these may be changed during implementation.

The proposed services are:

North Shore

The North Shore is less densely populated than the South Shore. Peak travel occurs between King's Beach, California and Incline Village, Nevada. The primary casino in the North Shore is the Hyatt in Incline Village although some other gaming establishments are available at the state line. Because of lower densities along the North Shore, total public transit demand is less than at the South Shore. Appropriate transit services in this area are as follows:

Fixed-Route

Regularly scheduled fixed-route service will be operated between Tahoma, California and Incline Village, Nevada. From 6:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. service will operate every 30 minutes. Between 7:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. service will operate every 60 minutes. These frequencies will be used for nine months of the year. During the months of October, November, and early December service will operate every 60 minutes to match off season demand. During the summer months of June, July, and August service would be extended to Meeks Bay, California and to Sand Harbor, Nevada. Service would travel over Highway 89 and Highway 28 along the lake shore following the current route pattern. The expanded hours of service and increased frequency are expected to benefit residents and visitors.
## Exhibit IV-1

**TAHOE BASIN PROPOSED TRANSIT SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>Service Hours</th>
<th>Service Frequency</th>
<th>Days Per Week</th>
<th>TTD Buses Required</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Service Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Shore</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>6:30 a.m. - 6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Fixed-Route</td>
<td>6:00 a.m. - 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10 to Beach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total North Shore Fixed-Route</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-South Connection</td>
<td>7:15 a.m. - 11:30 p.m.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5 departs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Private Current Schedule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Shore</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>6:00 a.m. - 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20-60 (Dependent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>upon route segment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 p.m. - 6:00 a.m.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Fixed-Route</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. - 11:00 p.m.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2</td>
<td>11:00 p.m. - 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>6:30 a.m. - 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2/3</td>
<td>6:30 a.m. - 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. - 6:30 a.m.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4</td>
<td>6:30 a.m. - 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td>Service Hours</td>
<td>Service Frequency</td>
<td>Days Per Week</td>
<td>TTD Buses Required</td>
<td>Estimated Annual Service Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Fixed-Route (Cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5</td>
<td>6:30 a.m. - 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4/5</td>
<td>7:30 p.m. - 6:30 a.m.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Service</td>
<td>8:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SOUTH SHORE FIXED ROUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Responsive</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. - 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit IV-2
ATE Management and Service Company, Inc.
Tahoe Transportation District
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE SERVICE MAP
Exhibit IV-3
ATE Management and Service Company, Inc.
Tahoe Transportation District
NORTH LAKE TAHOE SERVICE MAP

MAIN ROUTE
SUMMER EXTENSION

Fixed Route
Demand Responsive Service Area

52
Demand Responsive

The need for demand responsive service at the North Shore will be evaluated through a combination of market research and public hearings to determine service type and service area. This evaluation shall include both the need for service to the elderly and handicapped, and in those areas where population densities do not warrant fixed route service. It is anticipated that the demand responsive service will be a localized service in the Incline Village, Nevada and Kings Beach, California area.

Existing services should be encouraged to continue. If new services are deemed necessary, they could be provided by the TTD, by the private sector, or a combination of both.

Ski Area Service

Ski shuttle service operation by the Alpine Meadows, Squaw Valley, North Star, Ski Incline, and other operators should continue. Efforts will be made to coordinate schedules of regular fixed-route operators with the ski shuttle buses and to promote their usage.

North Shore-South Shore

Service between the North and South Shore has previously been identified as a problem. Route operations along the western side of the lake would traverse large areas of very low population, and mountainous terrain. Indeed, California 89 is occasionally closed during the winter months. Route operations along the eastern side of the lake are far more feasible. Indeed, See Tahoe, Inc. already operates a scheduled service.

To encourage the continuation of this service, the Tahoe Transportation District should offer user-side subsidy tickets for rides between the North Shore and South Shore. These tickets could be sold at $2.50 as opposed to the standard $7.00 one way fare.

Airport Service

North Shore airport service from Incline Village, Nevada to the Reno, Nevada airport by private providers will be encouraged to continue. Efforts will be made to publicize the service and to coordinate with the fixed-route service. See Tahoe, Inc. user-side subsidy tickets would also be honored to the Lake Tahoe Airport.
Transit Centers

A North Shore transit center will be established. At Incline Village, Nevada a transfer facility will be developed to facilitate transfers between the fixed-route service, Reno airport service, ski bus service, demand responsive service, and the North Shore-South Shore connecting service. An information center will be established in the Tahoe City area. Efforts will be made to arrange for the use of existing structures and organization's - public or private - to house and staff these centers.

Fares

The base fare on the publicly operated fixed-route service would be 75 cents with a discount fare of 35 cents for juniors (under 18), senior citizens (65 and over), and disabled persons. A zonal fare would also go into effect dividing the route into three zones. Each time a passenger travels into an additional zone, an additional 25 cents would be paid (15 cents for junior, senior, and disabled). The maximum adult fare from one end of the line to the other would be $1.25 (65 cents for juniors, seniors, and disabled). Children age 5 years and younger would ride free.

South Shore

The South Shore with its higher concentration of business and residences is substantially more urban in character. Indeed, the density of trip origin and destination demand for the casino facilities in Stateline, Nevada can at peak periods give the area the characteristics of a major urban service corridor.

To respond to the public transportation requirements of the South Shore, a family of service programs are considered. Fixed-route operations focus on servicing the U.S. 50 corridor as well as neighborhood access. Demand responsive and more flexible service concepts are prescribed for lower density areas.

Fixed-Route

A primary goal of the TRPA is the use of transit improvements along the U.S. 50 corridor to reduce vehicle miles of travel (VMT) which would relieve congestion and reduce air pollution. In this plan, a system of five basic fixed-routes are used in the corridor between Round Hill, Nevada and the Highway 50/Highway 89 "Y" in South Lake Tahoe, California. Over the common portions of these routes 15 minute service frequency will be provided with evening service at 30 minute intervals, and late night services at 60 minute intervals. During summer months, service extensions would be made to Nevada Beach and Baldwin Beach. The service is summarized in Exhibit IV-I.
Route 1

This route would operate from Round Hill, Nevada along Highway 50 to the "Y", then along Highway 89, to Thirteenth Street, to Julie, to Tenth, to Tata, to Lake Tahoe Boulevard, and return to Round Hill. From 7:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. the service frequency would be 30 minutes. From 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. service frequency would be 60 minutes. Trips between 7:30 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. would be diverted via Lakeview, Fresno and Los Angeles.

Route 2

Beginning at Michelle and Kahle Drive in Nevada, the route would operate over Kahle to Highway 50, along Highway 50 to Dunlap to South Shore Drive, to Washington, to Tahoe Island, to Twelfth, to Eloise, to Fifteenth, to Venice, to Keys Boulevard, to Highway 50 for the return to the Oliver Park area. From 6:30 a.m. until 7:30 p.m. the service frequency would be 60 minutes. From 7:30 p.m. until 6:30 a.m. this route would be combined with Route 3 and operated every 60 minutes.

Route 3

From Thomas and Cottonwood in Tahoe Village, Nevada the route would operate over Meadow, to Kingsbury, to Highway 50 then along Highway 50 to Winnemucca, to Barton to Second, to South, to Melba, to "E", to Highways 89/50, to "D", to Julie, to Lake Tahoe Boulevard and return to Tahoe Village. From 6:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m., the service frequency would be 60 minutes. From 7:30 p.m. until 6:30 a.m. the service would be combined with Route 2 and operated every 60 minutes.

Route 2/3 Combination

This evening and night service route would begin at Michelle and Kahle in Oliver Park and operate along U.S. 50, to Dunlap, to Tahoe Island, to Twelfth, to Highway 89, to Lake Tahoe Boulevard, to Julie, to "D", to Highways 89/50, to "E", to Melba, to South, to Second, to Barton, to Winnemucca, to Highway 50 for the return to Oliver Park. This combination would operate every 60 minutes from 7:30 p.m. until 6:30 a.m.

Route 4

From a loop which includes Park, Pine, Stateline, Poplar, and Cedar in the motel area south of the casinos, the
route would operate over Park, to Montreal, to Chonakis, to Primrose, to Glen, to Pioneer Trail, to Ski Run, to Paradise, to Bell, to Herbert, to Blackwood, to Spruce, to Glenwood, to Pioneer, to Al Tahoe, to Tulare, to Freel Peak, to Los Angeles, to Oakland, to Modesto, to Lakeview, to Fresno, to Los Angeles, and return to the Stateline area via the reverse route. From 6:30 a.m. until 7:30 p.m. the service frequency would be sixty minutes, from 7:30 p.m. until 6:30 a.m. the neighborhood on the west side of Highway 50 would be served every 60 minutes by Route 1. From the Stateline loop to Pioneer and Al Tahoe, Route 4 evening service would operate in combination with Route 5 every 60 minutes during the 7:30 p.m. to 6:30 a.m. time period.

Route 5

From the Park, Pine, Stateline loop area, the route would operate over the same streets as Route 4 to Pioneer and Ski Run. The route would continue on Pioneer, to Black Bart, to Martin, to O'Malley, to Rubicon, to Springwood, to Dollar, to Conestoga, to Lodi, to Highway 50, to Sierra, to Fountain, and to Martin to return to the Stateline via the reverse route. From 6:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. the service frequency would be 60 minutes. From 7:30 p.m. until 6:30 a.m. the route would be combined with Route 4 and operated every 60 minutes.

Route 4/5 Combination

This evening and night service route would use the Route 4 streets from the Stateline area to Al Tahoe and Pioneer, then continue on Pioneer and use the Route 5 streets for the remainder of the route. Service would operate every 60 minutes from 7:30 p.m. until 6:30 a.m.

Summer Beach Service

Nevada Beach — a minor extension of Route 1 over Elks Point Road would be operated from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on an hourly basis during the summer months.

Baldwin Beach — an added route would be operated during the summer months from the "Y" to the beaches and campgrounds along Highway 89 to the Baldwin Beach. Service would be offered every 60 minutes between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

Routes 1, 2, and 3 are designed to offer frequent service along Highway 50 consistent with basic passenger demand patterns. The enhanced frequency of service should improve access to jobs, medical facilities, and recreational activities. Route 4 and 5 are removed from the Highway 50 in order to provide an alternative means of travelling within the City for employees and neighborhood trips.
Should the Tahoe Tomorrow Foundation be successful in receiving funds for a demonstration of high frequency service over the U.S. 50 corridor, we believe this demonstration can be placed in operation in conjunction with the basic route pattern. Higher frequency would be provided between the casino area and the U.S. 50/California 89 junction. It would only be necessary to coordinate schedules over this segment to provide the enhanced level of service.

Demand Responsive

The need for demand responsive service at the South Shore will be evaluated through a combination of market research and public hearings to determine service type and service area. This evaluation shall include both the need for service to the elderly and handicapped, and in those areas where population densities do not warrant fixed route service. It is anticipated that the demand responsive service will be a localized service in the Meyers area, the Upper Truckee area, and along Pioneer Trail. This could be in the form of purely demand responsive service or a modified fixed-route service. The latter would be scheduled service along the main streets with deviations to individual homes on pre-arranged requests.

Existing services should be encouraged to continue. If new services are deemed necessary, they could be provided by the TTD, by the private sector, or a combination of both.

Ski Area Service

Ski shuttle services offered by Heavenly Valley, Sierra Ski Ranch, Echo Summit, Kirkwood, and others will be encouraged to be continued. Efforts will be made to coordinate fixed-route services with the ski services and to promote usage of the shuttles.

Airport Service

Service from the Lake Tahoe Airport and the Reno Airport by private providers will be encouraged to continue. Efforts will be made to promote the use of these services.

Casino Transportation

The gratuitous services offered by the casinos is expected to continue. Efforts will be made to promote the use of these services as part of the family to transportation services available to the Basin.

External Basin Services

The regularly scheduled services offered by carriers such as Greyhound, LTR, Aircal, and Pacific Coast Airlines will be encouraged to continue along with the heavy use of charter buses for casino patrons. Efforts will be made to work with agencies such as the Visitor’s Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce to promote use of these transportation alternatives wherever possible.
Carpool/Vanpool

TTD will work with TRPA, Caltrans, and NDOT to implement carpool/vanpool matching and development services for Basin workers residing out of the Basin. For example, approximately 1,000 people commute from the Carson City and Carson Valley area to work at the Stateline/South Lake Tahoe area.

Transit Centers

Transit centers will be established in the Stateline-Loop Road area and in the "Y" area. These centers will facilitate transfers between fixed-route services, ski services, demand responsive services, airport services, and others. The centers will also be sources of information about transportation throughout the Basin.

Passenger Shelters, Waiting Areas, Pedestrian Crossings

TTD will work with local agencies, state agencies, and private property owners to establish comfortable and safe passenger boarding and alighting areas. Special efforts will be made along Highway 50 which offers the opportunity to attract visitors to the bus service if safe crossing of the roadway can be made to reach or depart from the bus stop.

D. MARKETING PROGRAM

A large-scale and effective marketing program is required. The mission of the marketing function is to attract new riders as well as to inform current riders of the service improvements to be phased in over the next five years.

Public information material (i.e. system maps, timetables and schedules) must be an immediate priority. The quality of these documents should be consistent with the new image of transit in the Lake Tahoe Basin. A relatively large amount of public transportation service will be available throughout the area from public and private sources. A major effort of TTD should be to make information about these services highly visible. Information should focus on questions of how to use the services, when and where they operate, how to find additional information, and other basics of public transportation. Major work on the image of public transit will be required to improve the public perception of transit at Lake Tahoe and to overcome the image that visitors may carry with them of transit in their home area.

The Tahoe Tomorrow Foundation demonstration proposes a high level of marketing support from the gaining industry. This type of private sector participation should be encouraged in the TTD's overall marketing strategy.
1. Placer County

Pg. 40, Par. 3
We are not suggesting that the dial-a-ride be exclusively for elderly and handicapped. We are suggesting that the service be available to the general public in the neighborhoods along the North Shore which the fixed route service cannot penetrate.

Pg. 57, Par. 2
We disagree. While we understand that the cost per individual trip may be higher with dial-a-ride, we do feel that it is the most reasonable approach to exploring marginal demand areas.

Pg. 62, Par. 6
We understand your desire to have TTD acquire the TART system. Given the administrative logistics of your current situation, such acquisition may prove to be the most feasible operating strategy. We do not share your opinion that TTD should be a "fully operational transit district." In our opinion, operating strategies should be reviewed carefully to minimize the actual cost.

Pg. 66, Par. 2
Our assumption of no increase in sales tax proceeds is admittedly very conservative.

Pg. 79, Par. 2
Good suggestions but beyond our present scope.

2. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Ridership Analysis
We agree that the data has been highly aggregated and does not permit any detailed review of peak usage. Such fluctuations, as suggested, were not specifically considered in developing the patronage estimates. This item would require additional analysis and an adjustment to the scope of work.

Route Selections
There are no real surprises in the route network. The routes cover existing STAGE, TART or JHK suggestions. We did not feel that a more elaborate discussion was necessary.
SRTP ADDENDUM #1

Demand Responsive Services
- Costs and performance are rolled up into the gross financial projections. Our base level of service anticipates 8,000 annual service hours at $25.00 per hour with approximately 3 rides per service hour.

Coordinate Private Operations
- We agree that this is a substantial task which is beyond our current work scope.

3. Caltrans

Is The Plan Saleable?
- We believe the plan demonstrates a more responsible use of public funds and is quite suitable.

UMT Target
- While we recognized that this was important, we did not specifically calculate UMT reductions.

"Dramatic Increase"/Acceptability
- We cannot respond to this item.

Unique Setting
- We agree that there are some very unique elements in the Lake Tahoe Area. Transit is a residential activity which responds to the characteristics of each individual community. The role and importance of public transit is directly related to the density of origin and density of destination in any given area. In our opinion, sufficient origin and destination densities do not exist in the Lake Tahoe Basin, with the sole exception of South Lake Tahoe during peak periods.

Cost Projections
- The JAK plan was based on a constant dollar projection methodology which we have used current dollars. The gross dollar costs as calculated include service, administrative support, user side subsidies, and special planning projections. The direct comparisons to current experience may be inappropriate. There is a need to reduce the financial analysis to a greater level of detail but this was beyond the resources of this project.

Marketing
- We agree with enhanced opportunity for the private sector.

4. Board Member Tom Stewart

Mr. Stewart's thoughts on the Tahoe Airport and a bypass are well taken. However, these thoughts are beyond the scope of our work.
5. Letter from Dick Milbrodt

Any direct advances which the City of South Lake Tahoe has paid on behalf of the Tahoe Transportation District should be repaid once the District secures its funding.

During the course of our study, we were advised that the property adjacent to the current limited maintenance area was being acquired through a UMTA, Section 18 grant. In our opinion, this site, in combination with the current area, would be more than adequate to meet foreseeable transit requirements. The issue of capitalization and cost reimbursement for this site will be directly related to the operating strategy adopted by the Tahoe Transportation District.

Sales tax proceeds estimates were developed in conjunction with City of South Lake Tahoe staff personnel. The assumptions made were conservative.

6. Comments from Ed Brauner

Pg. 38

The purpose of this study was to develop a short range transit plan, and accordingly, other elements of the area's transportation system were not given extensive consideration.

Pg. 50-56

The layout of service was designed to incorporate current operations with relevant elements of the JHK plan. A primary objective was to assume 15 minute service along the U.S. 50 corridor. Each of the routes was observed and timed by our staff. We recognize that variations may be incorporated in the final implementation strategy.

Pg. 57

Our discussion with representatives of the casino transportation systems indicated that the gratuitous services would be continual.

Pg. 61

There is no intention to "give" the transit vehicles to anyone. Title on the equipment could easily remain with the City of South Lake Tahoe. Indeed, the recognition of capital costs could be included in any lease or contract terms that are reached.

In our opinion, there should be a desire to reduce expenses whenever possible. The acquisition of equipment from the City of South Lake Tahoe raises certain "double jeopardy" concerns for South Lake Tahoe taxpayers. Indeed, these residents have already paid for the transit equipment through City general funds and the prospect of reacquiring this same equipment through sales tax proceeds to change ownership title may be difficult to substantiate.
Table VIII-4, Page 78 does identify an estimated value of $5 million for the City of South Lake Tahoe's assets. It is correct that this is the only strategy under which we envision a transaction taking place.

Pg. 68
The status quo assumes operations by the present provider, and there may be no appropriate role for the Tahoe Transportation District.

We recommend that the TTD contract for service.

Pg. 69
We do not believe this amount is double counted.

Table VIII-2
Prior year.

Pg. 78
We advocate only such borrowing as may be necessary during the start-up phase. All other personnel should be full-time.

Pg. 79
Contract would govern the use of equipment.

Acquisition of Existing Operator

Several comments were received concerning the acquisition of existing operators by the TTD. We understand that such acquisition has been the norm in the establishment of regional transportation agencies. Certainly, these acquisitions could be achieved in the Tahoe area. The value of these transactions should be balanced against the impact on the taxpayer. In our opinion, there is very little benefit to the taxpayer through either an acquisition of the current TART or STAGE operation. We think the effective repayment of capital cost can be readily achieved through the interlocal agreement or east/west process. We recognize that the technical and legal mechanics of achieving this are difficult and well beyond the scope of this study.
MEMORANDUM

TO: TTD Board of Directors
    TTF Board of Directors
    TTD TAC
    Ad Hoc Committee

FROM: John Gaudette

DATE: April 28, 1986

SUBJECT: TTD Capital Implementation Program

The process of plan refinement is proceeding well and I thought that it would be useful to review where we are and define the 'project' for which we are seeking UMTA capital assistance.

As noted at the last TTD meeting we are proceeding to develop two capital grant options. The first is the capital grant to implement the TTD SRTP — as amended. The second option expands the SRTP to provide more intensive service in the South Shore visitor corridor in partnership with the private sector.

The capital grant to implement the SRTP is the overriding objective to achieve the goal to make TTD operational after the anticipated successful sales tax referendum. The second option of expanding service in partnership with the private sector more directly addresses the objectives of the Regional Plan and begins to establish the cooperative working relationship between the public and private sectors that is recognized as essential to the long term viability of public mass transportation in the Tahoe Basin.

This is summarized in the following Table which has been christened the 'Pruitt' Table.

Short Range Transportation Plan

We have been working with the Ad Hoc Committee and the TAC to review and refine the adopted SRTP. Through this process we have identified two major service assumptions which, when refined, dramatically change the resources required to implement the SRTP in the South Shore. Our review noted that the average speed assumption of 20 mph contained in the SRTP is overly optimistic. Moreover we, in cooperation with ATM, reviewed the route lengths and determined that the SRTP route lengths were under estimated. The cumulative result of these two errors is that the SRTP cannot be implemented in the South Shore with the resources estimated in the adopted SRTP.

Additionally we reviewed the current practice of running buses in excess of 4,000 service hours annually and strongly recommend that bus usage in the Tahoe Basin more closely approximate the industry average of 2,500 to 3,000 bus hours per year.

The result of these changes is that we have added an additional route primarily serving the Nevada neighborhoods. This combined with the other changes results in a fleet requirement of 18 buses to meet the South Shore needs. This contrasts with the eight buses estimated as necessary in the SRTP.
TABLE I
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS

OPTION I - IMPLEMENT THE SRTP
Make TTD Operational
Provide the Capital Resources Needed for the SRTP
- Buses $2.0 million
  + 4 North Shore
  + 10 South Shore
- Maintenance Facilities
  North Shore $0.9 million
  South Shore $0.6 million
- Transportation Systems Management $0.9 million
- Purchase STAGE Assets $0.3 million
Generate Support for the Sales Tax Referendum
Refine the Financial Plan

OPTION II - EXPAND SERVICE IN THE VISITOR CORRIDOR
Establish the Basis for Continuing Private Support for Transit
Long Term Fold-In of Casino Shuttles
Additional Requirements
- Capital +2 Buses + $280,000
- Annual Operations + $300,000
- Annual Subsidy + $150,000

To Be Funded By
- Casino Bulk Purchase of Transit Tickets
- Business Purchase of External and Internal Advertising
- Business Promotional Campaign for Transit
This is the major refinement of the adopted SRTP. We have also detailed the maintenance requirements for the South Shore facility, have appraised the value of the existing STAGE fleet and have defined an ambitious TSM program for the Basin.

Together these four elements comprise the capital program to implement the SRTP. This is the minimum program for which we recommend TTD seek UMTA capital assistance.

We have also estimated the additional resources that would be required to implement more intensive service in the major visitor corridor from Kahle to Bijou. We have reviewed the proposed service levels with the casinos and they are in agreement that the proposed level of service is appropriate. This additional service would require two buses above those required to implement the SRTP and would add almost $300,000 in operating costs. We estimate that 50 percent of this additional cost would be covered from the farebox leaving an annual subsidy requirement of approximately $150,000. We have discussed specific options for private sector subsidy of this cost and expect to have firm commitments for the May 2nd presentation to the TTD Board.

This discussion and analysis supporting implementation of the SRTP will be reviewed at a joint meeting of the TAC and the Ad Hoc Committee on May 1st and their suggestions and revisions will be incorporated in the presentation to the TTD board the following day.

The conclusions of our analyses are:

1. The SRTP must be revised to more accurately reflect actual transit operating conditions in the South Shore.

2. The TTD should adopt the industry bus service standard of approximately 2,800 service hours per bus year. This will result in requiring the purchase of 4 buses and 10 buses to meet the service requirements in the North and South Shores respectively.

3. Without UMTA capital assistance the SRTP, as amended, cannot be implemented in the next five years.

4. With UMTA capital assistance the SRTP, as amended, can be implemented and still provide a fiscally prudent contingency reserve.

Attached are three Tables describing the capital program, the assumptions used for the financial analysis and the five year pro forma analysis. We will be discussing the supporting analyses with the TAC and the Ad Hoc Committee and will be prepared to discuss the analyses and conclusions with the TTD Board at the meeting on May 2nd. At that time we will also be prepared to discuss the fiscal impact of the proposed visitor corridor service. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss with any Board member the details of the implementation program for the SRTP prior to the Friday meeting.

If the TTD Board decides to proceed with submission of a capital grant by the May 15th deadline, then it will be necessary for TTD at the May 2nd meeting to amend the SRTP to include the revised routes and resources and set a date for the required UMTA public hearing which usually requires a 30 day notice. We are discussing the full range of assurances and procedural requirements with UMTA staff and expect to be able to make a more complete report at the Friday meeting.

cc: Rick Skinner
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT 
SHORT RANGE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

FLEET ACQUISITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Buses Required</th>
<th>Existing Fleet</th>
<th>Buses Retired</th>
<th>Bus Acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Corridor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total South Shore</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Division</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fleet Acquisition Cost: 14 Thirty foot buses at $140,000 = $1,960,000

MAINTENANCE FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Allowances</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Contingency (20%)</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$263,487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td>$52,697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$190,053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$506,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Shore Division Allowances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowances</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Contingency (20%)</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance Facilities Cost: $1,381,237

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Allowances</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Contingency (20%)</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Amenities</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Operation</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Shore Division Allowances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowances</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Contingency (20%)</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Amenities</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Operation</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total TSM Program: $680,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency (20%)</th>
<th>Design &amp; CM (12%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$136,000</td>
<td>$97,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TSM Costs: $333,920

STAGE ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buses</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979 GMC</td>
<td>3 Buses</td>
<td>$147,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 GMC</td>
<td>2 Buses</td>
<td>$109,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 Gillig</td>
<td>3 Buses</td>
<td>$17,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974/75 Mercedes</td>
<td>3 Buses</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAGE Acquisition Cost: $276,762

TOTAL TTD CAPITAL PROGRAM: $4,531,919
# SRTP ADDENDUM #2

## TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
### AMENDED SRTP
#### PRO FORMA BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Service</td>
<td>12,635</td>
<td>50,540</td>
<td>50,540</td>
<td>50,540</td>
<td>50,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Corridor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Division</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>19,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed Route Service Hours</strong></td>
<td>17,570</td>
<td>70,280</td>
<td>70,280</td>
<td>70,280</td>
<td>70,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Responsive Service</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>9,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Service Hours</strong></td>
<td>19,985</td>
<td>79,940</td>
<td>79,940</td>
<td>79,940</td>
<td>79,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fixed Route Bus Fleet | | | | | |
| Service Hours per Bus Year | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| South Shore Division | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| North Shore Division | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |

| Cost per Service Hour | Inflation = 5% | | | | |
| Fixed Route Service | | | | | |
| South Shore Division | | | | | |
| Resident Service | $44.00 | $46.20 | $48.51 | $50.94 | $53.48 |
| Visitor Corridor | $44.00 | $46.20 | $48.51 | $50.94 | $53.48 |
| North Shore Division | $44.00 | $46.20 | $48.51 | $50.94 | $53.48 |
| Demand Responsive Subsidy | $20.00 | $21.00 | $22.05 | $23.15 | $24.31 |

| Farebox Recovery | | | | | |
| Fixed Route Service | | | | | |
| South Shore Division | | | | | |
| Resident Service | 40% | | | | |
| Visitor Corridor | 50% | | | | |
| North Shore Division | 25% | | | | |

## CAPITAL BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Inflation = 5%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Division</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$506,237</td>
<td>$506,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TSM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$423,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Amenities</td>
<td>$134,400</td>
<td>$141,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Operations</td>
<td>$170,240</td>
<td>$176,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$276,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$276,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Budget</strong></td>
<td>$3,822,639</td>
<td>$319,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$262,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Service</td>
<td>$1,080,940</td>
<td>$2,334,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Corridor</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Division</td>
<td>$457,140</td>
<td>$911,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Responsive Service</td>
<td>$468,300</td>
<td>$202,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget</td>
<td>$1,586,380</td>
<td>$3,449,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>$1,960,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Facilities</td>
<td>$1,381,237</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>$304,640</td>
<td>$319,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE Assets</td>
<td>$276,762</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Budget</td>
<td>$3,622,639</td>
<td>$319,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$5,759,019</td>
<td>$4,032,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Sales Tax</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Service</td>
<td>$432,376</td>
<td>$933,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Corridor</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Division</td>
<td>$114,285</td>
<td>$227,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Responsive Service</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$546,661</td>
<td>$1,161,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Transit Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMTA Section 3</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources of Funds</td>
<td>$6,218,640</td>
<td>$4,131,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUMULATIVE CONTINGENCY RESERVE</strong></td>
<td>$458,621</td>
<td>$559,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fleet Maintenance Consultants, Inc.

TO: Mr. John J. Gaudette
Transportation Finance Group
602 Park Point Drive, Suite 249
Golden, Colorado 80401

FROM: Richard Drake
Project Manager

RE: Technical Memorandum No. 2
Vehicle Procurement Options

INTRODUCTION

A brief study was undertaken to explore the options available to the Tahoe Transit District to obtain buses for the transportation demonstration project and the Short Range Transportation Improvement Projects. The options that were considered are:

- Purchase new buses through competitive procurement.
- Utilize options of contracts already awarded.
- Add an option to a procurement process underway.
- Purchase used transit buses.
- Lease used transit buses.

To carry out this study FMC conducted a telephone survey with bus manufacturers, bus leasing companies, and UMTA Regional offices to discuss the options.
PURCHASE NEW BUSES

This option would require the Tahoe Transit District to develop a technical specification and supporting bid documents to support the competitive bidding process. The District would have to be prepared to evaluate the approved equals requests of the different manufacturers. It is expected that the bid process would require a minimum of four months and buses would be delivered six months after a contract award.

UTILIZE OPTIONS OF CONTRACTS ALREADY AWARDED

Transit agencies often execute contracts for new buses with an option of additional buses, usually at the same price, all of which may not be utilized. UMTA regulations permit this since the process is administered under competitive bidding guidelines. If not utilized, it is not uncommon for other transit agencies to pick up the option up to the quantity permitted by the contract between the originating agency and the bus manufacturer. While the optional buses have been contracted per the originating agency's specifications, the manufacturer may permit variations. These can be minor changes such as for different body painting, interior finishes and upholstery, or major changes including wheelchair lifts and different engines and transmissions.

While the original contract unit price is binding for the optional basic buses specified, the manufacturer may negotiate credits or additional charges for changes from the specifications. There are no firm guidelines in the process. However, substitutions of similar cost items tend to be at no or little cost while add-ons, such as fareboxes, radios, and wheel sanders can be expected to add to the unit vehicle cost. Deletions of items or systems may result in credits. For example, if TTD did not desire air conditioning and the manufacturer were willing to delete it, a credit could be expected but probably not in an amount equal to the cost of adding it.

From our contacts, it appears Neoplan is the only domestic manufacturer with an open option contract that might be available for use by TTD and permit delivery by October 1, 1986. Neoplan is starting a production of 167 buses for the Regional Transportation District of Denver, Colorado with an option of up to a total of 200. Neoplan's unit price
for RTD buses is approximately $132,000. These buses include sonders, wheelchair lifts, air conditioning, and retarders integral with the transmissions.

Neoplan's sales representative reports that it is doubtful that RTD will utilize all of its option and that Neoplan would be open to variations in non-critical lead time materials, systems, and components. However, it should be noted that these are 40 foot transit coaches so this option may not be feasible for a 30 foot procurement.

ADD AN 8-10 BUS OPTION TO PROCUREMENTS IN PROGRESS

Another method which is open to TTD is to add its 8 to 10 bus option onto another agency's advertisement for new buses. FMC is aware that Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority of Antioch, California will be advertising for a small order of buses based on Gillig specifications in the near term. The projected cost for ECCTA's buses is around $137,000 with wheelchair lifts and air conditioning. FMC learned from both Gillig and Bus Industries of America (Orion) that, should either be the successful bidder, present production schedules would probably permit inclusion of an 8 to 10 bus option.

FMC has contacted other transit agencies and found them to be open to expanding their advertisement to include an option of TTD buses as this would pose no problems and might result in a slightly lower unit price for their buses. The constraints and potential flexibility of this arrangement would be very similar to those described above for utilization of an open option on an already awarded contract. There is a potential for developing an option package specific for TTD's add-on buses. However, the advantages of pinning down these costs or credits up front might adversely affect agencies' bid prices.

PURCHASE USED TRANSIT BUSES

Should TTD be open to operating used transit buses there is a broad range of equipment available from different sources at widely varying prices. Hausman Bus Sales & Parts Company would be able to provide quantities of the following buses or ones very similar at the asking prices noted.
1976 GMC Model 4523, 35 foot, with air conditioning, without wheelchair lifts - $40,000.

1968 GMC Model 4521A, 35 foot, with air conditioning, without wheelchair lifts - $16,000.

From other contacts FMC learned that Greater Peoria Mass Transit District is being asked to divest itself of buses it currently has in excess of UMTA guidelines. GPMTD is considering selling eight 1975 GMC Model 4521, 35 foot buses without air conditioning or wheelchair lifts. No asking price has yet been established.

The Dallas Transit System has at least ten 1966 GMC Model 5303, 40 foot buses without wheelchair lifts available, some with air conditioning, for around $1,000 each. The Corpus Christi Regional Transit Authority in Texas recently purchased eighteen of these buses, finding them to be in overall good condition and quite serviceable.

An option that Hausman Bus Sales & Parts Company also offers is a purchase/buy back contract. Under this arrangement TTD could purchase the buses needed with Hausman agreeing to buy them back at a guaranteed price should TTD wish to dispose of them.

**LEASE TRANSIT BUSES**

The option of leasing new transit buses is an option at this time through General Motors Corporation. The newly announced program provides a new bus at a lease cost of approximately $2800 per month for a 60 month period with a buy out provision for $28,000. It may be possible to obtain better terms through negotiations.

Used transit buses are available with Hausman being the only reliable source known at this time. All the buses available for purchase from Hausman are available for lease. Lease rates would be negotiated based on the lease period and vehicle type.
RECOMMENDATION

While options other than new buses are available we recommend that the District purchase new 30 foot transit coaches.
Fleet Maintenance Consultants, Inc.

TO: Mr. John J. Gaudette
Transportation Finance Group
602 Park Point Drive, Suite 249
Golden, Colorado 80401

FROM: Richard Drake
Project Manager

RE: Technical Memorandum No. 3
Facility Cost Estimates

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the results of a study to define the maintenance and operations facility requirements of the Tahoe Transportation District to support a bus fleet of 25 vehicles to provide service to the south shore area of Lake Tahoe. Since the availability of sites for a maintenance facility is severely limited, the study focused on the existing site associated with the South Lake Tahoe City yard and the renovation of the structures on the site. One building is currently used as a maintenance garage and offices by the service contractor. Another adjacent facility which is in the process of being purchased by the City for transit purposes was also included. The inclusion of a vacant site immediately adjacent to the current facility was considered as an alternative.

This document is divided into three sections. The first presents discussions of the alternative site use configurations. The second outlines the background information and calculations used to determine the renovation of the existing facility at 1679 Shop Street. The third and final section establishes cost estimates for renovation of the existing facilities as well as any required new construction. An Appendix to the document provides a list of equipment and associated costs necessary for an efficient maintenance operation.
SITE CONFIGURATION

The site currently used as an operating and maintenance base is located on Shop Street off of D Street. As shown in Exhibit I Parcels B and C are the two parcels dedicated for use for transit buses. The site imposes severe limitations to circulation. Parcels D and E are used for City equipment and materials storage. Parcel A is vacant land.

The two existing buildings will be renovated; therefore, their locations and the circulation patterns around them are fixed. In addition, it is necessary to establish an area on the site for fueling, fare retrieval, and washing. These activities and their associated circulation patterns consume a great deal of space. Finally, space must be provided for parking twenty-five (25) buses. No bus can be stacked (end to end parking) due to requirements for plug in block heaters.
Several site alternatives were studied and two were selected as feasible. Alternative 1 (Exhibit 2) utilizes only parcels B and C. It is evident that although the solution is workable, it is very cramped and will tend to have some negative operational impacts. The following narrative explains the traffic flow on site under Alternative 1.

1. Buses enter the site off Shop Street and queue at the service island.

2. Buses are fueled, fluid levels are checked, and fares are pulled.

3. Buses are washed if required.

4. First eighteen buses are parked beginning in the southwest corner of the site by backing in.

5. Next five buses are backed into spaces adjacent to the west wall of the operations building.

6. The last two buses are backed into spaces adjacent to the east wall of the operations building.

It is evident from the circulation patterns established that this alternative does have several disadvantages.

- Circulation space is limited.
- Once parked, some vehicles are deadlocked.
- No employee parking is available on site.
- No area is available for snow storage.
- Ingress, egress, and maintenance building circulation are the same lanes.
The Alternative 2 site plan consists of Parcels A, B, and C. (Exhibit 3) The building locations as well as the service lane and wash areas remain the same as Alternative 1. The major changes occur in circulation patterns. The added property allows bus parking along the west perimeter of Parcel A thus avoiding deadlocking any buses. Secondly, the additional parcel allows on-site parking for twenty employees and/or visitors.

Traffic flow for Alternative 2 is as follows:

1. Buses enter the site off Shop Street and queue at the service island.

2. Buses are fueled, fluids checked, and fares pulled.

3. Buses are washed if required.

4. First ten (10) buses are parked (backed-in) on Parcel A beginning in last space to the southwest.

5. Last fifteen (15) buses are parked in next fifteen spaces.
The following advantages and disadvantages are resultant of Alternative 2:

Advantages:

- More expedient circulation
- No grid-locked vehicles
- On-site employee/visitor parking
- Segregated ingress/egress
- Proper allowance for snow storage

Disadvantages:

- Parcel A is privately owned and must be purchased.
MAINTENANCE BUILDING RENOVATION AND CONSTRUCTION

The renovation of any facility must be well planned in order to fully utilize the existing structure and its components. In addition, the structure must be capable of providing the appropriate spaces necessary to fulfill the requirements of the new facility. In order to determine the requirements of the new maintenance facility, standards that have been developed by Fleet Maintenance Consultants, Inc. from the seventy bus maintenance facilities that the firm has helped design were used for calculations.

The following areas were determined to be necessary in the facility for performance of maintenance:

- Inspection/Running repair bay(s)
- Tire shop/storage
- Brake shop/Common work area
- Parts storeroom
- Lube/compressor Room
- Battery room
- Male and female locker area and restrooms

Upon determination of the type of spaces required, calculations were performed to determine numbers of areas. The following calculations were used.

- Inspection/Running Repair Bay(s) - the standard for inspection bays for the preventive maintenance program in place at Tahoe is one bay per fifty buses; therefore, twenty-five buses will require one-half of the use of one bay.
Standards for Running Repair bays range from one bay for every fifteen buses to one bay for every twenty buses. Because of the high annual mileage anticipated for the planned service, the lower number is recommended. Under this standard twenty-five buses will require 1.67 running repair bays. Therefore, a total of two repair bays are required for the functions.

- Tire Shop/Storage - One repair bay is required for tire and brake work. The Brake Shop, Common Work Area, and Lube/Compressor Room are sized according to the types of equipment required in the area.

- Parts Storeroom - The standards for parts storage range from fifteen (15) to thirty (30) square feet per bus. Twenty square feet of storage per vehicle has been provided based upon the type of repairs that will be performed.

After completion of the above calculations, it was determined that the areas necessary for a functional maintenance facility were available in the existing facility. The next area of concern in a renovation is the availability of adequate clearances throughout the facility.

The following observations were made which resulted in several renovation decisions detailed below. (See floor plan Exhibit 4).

- Door width - Three overhead doors exist; two are 10'-0" wide and one is 12'-0" wide. A normal overhead door width for a bus maintenance facility is 14'-0". The existing structure does not allow for expansion of the door openings. Buses are currently being driven through these doors; therefore they can be used even if not desirably. Certain construction techniques and operating philosophies will aid in the use of the smaller doors.

  1) Orient repair stalls in a drive-in/back-out configuration - it is easier to back into light than a dark hole.

  2) Steering column lines - a steering column line can be painted on the pavement to guide the driver in his/her movement in or out of the repair bay.
Clear heights - The recommended clear height for running repair bays is 19'-0". This height allows full extension of a vehicle lift with clearance above the top of the bus for mechanical equipment. The existing facility does not have 19'-0" clear height. In order to attain useable clear height in Running Repair, it will be necessary to use service pits instead of vehicle lifts. Service pits will allow the same repair capabilities with lower overhead clearances.

In addition to existing structure, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems were studied. Several mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems are necessary to effectively perform maintenance. The following systems will be required in the renovated facility:

- Compressed air system.
- Vehicle exhaust system.
- Lubricant distribution system.
- Waste oil removal system.
- Relocation or addition of dedicated power sources for fixed equipment items.
- Addition or upgrade of lighting system.
- Addition of adequate drainage system.

In addition to the renovation that must take place, new construction of the following facilities must be undertaken to facilitate an efficient operation.

- Service Island - a canopied area must be constructed adjacent to the Operations building for fueling, checking fluid levels, and pulling fares. Although the structure will only consist of a canopy, lighting will be required along with lubricant piping and drainage.
Bus Washer – in order to wash buses in a limited space such as the existing site, a roll-over, gantry type washer is recommended. This washer should be enclosed in a structure with at least a roof and two walls. The enclosure with the addition of spot heating will protect the washer from freezing.

Fluid Storage Room – an enclosed, secured area is required for the storage of drums of lubricants.
FACILITY COST ESTIMATE

The following cost estimates have been determined by using Building Construction Cost Date, 1986 by R.S. Means Company, Inc. This document is a standard reference for construction cost estimating and provides factors to adjust for local conditions.

Alternative 1

Site Preparation 0.00

Drainage 40,000.00

Construction

Renovation

Pit construction (2 pits) 52,735.00
Electrical/Mechanical/Plumbing 36,444.00

General Renovation

Maintenance 19,099.00
Operations 48,000.00

New Construction

Service Island 7,676.00
Wash Building 11,528.00
Lubricant Storage 1,965.00
Tank Farm 28,650.00

Paving (Asphalt) 15,390.00

Landscaping 2,000.00

Subtotal $263,127
20% Contingency 52,625
Subtotal 321,752
Equipment (See Appendix A) 190,053
Total $511,805
SRTP ADDENDUM #2

Alternative 2

Site Preparation

Drainage

Construction

Renovation

Pit construction (2 pits) 52,735.00
Electrical/Mechanical/ Plumbing

General Renovation

Maintenance 19,099.00
Operations 48,000.00

New Construction

Service Island 7,676.00
Wash Building 11,528.00
Lubricant Storage 1,965.00
Tank Farm 28,650.00

Paving (Asphalt) 55,820.00

Landscaping

Subtotal 313,847.00
20% Contingency 62,769.00
Subtotal 376,160.00
Equipment (See Appendix A) 190,053.00
Subtotal 566,213.00
Land Acquisition
Total
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Fleet Maintenance Consultants, Inc.

TO: Mr. John J. Gaudette
Transportation Finance Group
602 Park Point Drive, Suite 249
Golden, Colorado 80401

FROM: Richard Drake
Project Manager

RE: Technical Memorandum No. 4
Estimated Value of Bus Fleet

INTRODUCTION

Fleet Maintenance Consultants, Inc. was requested to estimate the value of the bus fleet currently owned by the City of Lake Tahoe. The fleet consists of a total of 11 transit buses of which five are under lease to Area Transit Management to provide bus service to the South Shore area. The fleet inventory is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Buses</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Original Unit Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gillig</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$136,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>145,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>124,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mercedes</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mercedes</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the buses were purchased with local money from the City General Fund with the exception of the 1981 Gilligs. These buses were funded approximately 90% with California Secretary Discretionary Funds (SB 620).
FLEET STATUS

A physical survey was made of each vehicle to determine if there were any unusual body damages or other problems. Area Transit Management provided information on the accumulated mileage of each vehicle and the status of the overhaul of major components. Table 2 summarizes the fleet status.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit No.</th>
<th>Yr/Mfg</th>
<th>Current Mileage</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Transmission</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3035</td>
<td>1979/GMC</td>
<td>381,416</td>
<td>53,892</td>
<td>76,694</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3036</td>
<td>1979/GMC</td>
<td>283,493</td>
<td>original</td>
<td>138,298</td>
<td>106,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3037</td>
<td>1979/GMC</td>
<td>243,933</td>
<td>138,227</td>
<td>105,472</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3043</td>
<td>1980/GMC</td>
<td>386,013</td>
<td>Down</td>
<td>183,393</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3044</td>
<td>1980/GMC</td>
<td>302,285</td>
<td>53,777</td>
<td>191,712</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3046</td>
<td>1981/Gillig</td>
<td>301,846</td>
<td>71,605</td>
<td>136,496</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3047</td>
<td>1981/Gillig</td>
<td>251,595</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>47,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3048</td>
<td>1981/Gillig</td>
<td>229,026</td>
<td>Down</td>
<td>Down</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted two buses are in need of engine overhauls and one requires a rebuilt transmission. The City reported that action would be taken to overhaul the units before purchase by TTD. During the survey no unusual problems were observed. Additionally, it was learned that Area Transit Management is averaging 4,313 miles per month on the five vehicles that it is operating. This mileage was extrapolated to the end of the year to determine the accumulated mileage at the expected time of purchase.
ESTIMATED VALUE

The Urban Mass Transportation Administration guidelines for bus replacement were used as the basis for estimating the value of the buses at the end of 1986. Those guidelines state that the useful life of a purpose built, heavy duty transit bus is 12 years or 500,000 miles, whichever occurs first. Since the Mercedes buses were not constructed as a heavy duty vehicle, the useful life is usually eight years. Using these criteria, the estimated value of each vehicle was estimated and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

ESTIMATED VALUE OF BUSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value Determined by Age</th>
<th>Value Determined by Mileage</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to TTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3035</td>
<td>$51,023</td>
<td>45,847</td>
<td>$45,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3036</td>
<td>51,023</td>
<td>53,923</td>
<td>51,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3037</td>
<td>51,023</td>
<td>55,291</td>
<td>51,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3043</td>
<td>71,163</td>
<td>62,158</td>
<td>62,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3044</td>
<td>71,163</td>
<td>47,406</td>
<td>47,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3046</td>
<td>77,042</td>
<td>45,198</td>
<td>4,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3047</td>
<td>77,042</td>
<td>58,894</td>
<td>5,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3048</td>
<td>77,042</td>
<td>73,960</td>
<td>7,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$276,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH SHORE BEACH BUS SERVICE

The south shore beach bus service is scheduled for the summer months beginning Memorial Day and continuing through Labor Day. The beach bus will serve the area from the Tahoe Valley "Y" along Highway 89 to the forest service beaches as far out as Baldwin Beach, including service to the campgrounds along that route.

The beach bus service is designed to tie into transfer points in the regular bus system.

Similar service is planned for the Nevada Beach during the summer months on the Nevada side of the south shore.
ADDENDUM #4
TO SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN FOR THE
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

At the May 2, 1986 meeting the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors took notice of a set of revisions to the basic document. These revisions were prepared by a consultant retained by the Tahoe Tomorrow Foundation (TTF) and reviewed and reported upon by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). It was the recommendation of the TAC, concurred in by the TTD Board, that the revisions are necessary refinements to the general information set forth in the original Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) prepared by the ATE consulting firm. In addition, the Board took notice of the fact that the original transportation plan prepared in 1984 addressed primarily the need for transportation of residents of the Tahoe basin while the 1986 revision to that plan provided both a resident and tourist focus of transportation systems. The refinements recommended for adoption by the TAC offer a more complete transit service that blends together the estimated need for surface transport of the resident population of the basin, the visitors to the basin seeking access to and from the casino core and the employees of the casino core.

We believe that the refinements set forth in the addenda represent an earnest effort to achieve the environmental thresholds directed by the TRPA and are fully consistent with the long range transportation planning for the Tahoe region. It is expressly noted that this District, in conjunction with the TRPA staff, intends to provide an on-going process to monitor the results of the SRTP and to develop a comprehensive and balanced long range plan for transportation in and throughout the Tahoe basin as the SRTP is implemented.
MEMORANDUM

May 6, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: U.S. Forest Service Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (U.S. Forest Service) has developed a draft Land and Resource Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is now being circulated for public review and comment. The comment period ends June 27, 1986. All APC members have received copies of the Plan for their review.

At the May 14 APC meeting, Jon Hoefer of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit will present a 10-minute slide show on the Land and Resource Management Plan and will answer questions from the Commissioners. Also, the TRPA staff will present some initial comments on the Plan for APC consideration.

Agency staff hopes that the May 14 APC meeting will result in the identification of major issues pertaining to the Land and Resource Management Plan, for in-depth discussions at the June APC meeting. Agency staff and the Management Unit desire to complete TRPA review of this matter in June or July, 1986.

Please contact Jon Hoefer (916-544-6420) or Dave Ziegler (702-588-3296) if you have any questions on this item.

DSZ:jf
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AGENDA ITEM IV C.
MEMORANDUM

May 6, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Supplement to the Regional Plan EIS

On April 17, 1986, the TRPA began circulation of a Draft Supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement for Adoption of a Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Staff discussed the preparation of this document with the APC at both the March and April APC meetings.

Included with this packet mailing for your review and comment is a copy of the draft supplement. At the May 14 APC meeting, the staff will make a brief presentation on the supplement, answer questions from the Commissioners, and request comments and issues identification for further discussion in June. The staff anticipates there will be a special APC meeting in June after the closing of the comment period to consider recommendations to the Governing Board on the adequacy of the document.

Please contact Dave Ziegler at (702) 588-3296 if you have any questions on this issue.
MEMORANDUM

May 7, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Review of Goals and Policies Revisions

Staff will be providing you with a copy of the proposed Goals and Policies for discussion at this meeting. This is the material upon which the supplement to the EIS is based and represents a synthesis of the recommendations of the Consensus Building Workshop, earlier feedback from you and the Governing Board, and staff-initiated changes.

I will be explaining the highlights of this proposal to you and will provide some time for questions, comments, and discussion. Some fine tuning may occur subsequent to this meeting as a result of your discussion and due to feedback from others. We'll ask for your written comments by the end of the month (May 30), so they can be included in your package for the June meeting.
MEMORANDUM

April 29, 1986

To: APC Members

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Notice of Circulation - Bijou Community Park and Golf Course Draft EIR/EIS

Pursuant to Article VII(b) of the Bi-State Compact, the 60 day public comment/circulation period for the above-referenced Draft EIR/EIS began on May 12, 1986. Copies of the subject document will be hand delivered to the APC at the May APC meeting and will be mailed to the Governing Board members under separate cover. This item will be scheduled for the June 11, 1986 APC meeting at which time comments concerning the subject document can be given to staff.

Further, the subject item will be scheduled for the August 13, 1986 APC meeting for hearing regarding the technical adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS. All comments concerning the Draft EIR/EIS should be addressed to Rick Angelocci of our staff.
MEMORANDUM

May 7, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission
From: The Staff
Subject: Scheduling of Ordinance Committee Meetings

This is a reminder that the Resource Management Committee will be meeting at the TRPA office on June 2 to discuss the Shorezone Ordinance. Staff will be scheduling additional meetings of the Land Use Committee, the Resource Management Committee, and the Transportation/Air Quality Committee on May 14.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 86-8

RESOLUTION ADOPTING RULES AND REGULATIONS
IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN FOR 1986

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, as defendant in the action entitled State of California/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA, Case Nos. CIVS-84-0561, 84-0565-EJG, has entered into a stipulation exempting certain projects and activities ("The Plan for 1986") from the scope of the preliminary injunction; and

WHEREAS, in furtherance of the Court's approval of said stipulation for the Plan for 1986, the Governing Board of TRPA finds it necessary and desirable to adopt rules and regulations to further implement the Plan for 1986;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the attached 1986 rules and regulations, and exhibit thereto, shall govern and implement the Plan for 1986 and that where said rules and regulations are inconsistent with the Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure of the TRPA, said 1986 rules and regulations shall control.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the rules and regulations adopted hereby shall be effective immediately and shall be effective for the duration of the Plan for 1986.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at its regular meeting held on the 24th day of April, nineteen hundred and eighty six, by the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. King, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Pruyett, Ms. Roberts, Mr. Hibdon, Mr. Henrikson, Mr. Miller, Mr. Houghteling, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Reed, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Hansen

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Haagen, Mr. Westergard

/\s/
Chairman Stanley G. Hansen
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

AGENDA ITEM V B. 1.
CHAPTER 1 GENERAL

1.0 These Rules and Regulations (referred to as 1986 Rules & Regs) shall apply to residential allocations and projects reviewed under the authority of the Tenth Stipulation Amending Order Granting Preliminary Injunction, filed April 16, 1986 in State of California/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA, Case Nos. CIVS-84-0551, 84-0565-EJG, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California (referred to as "Tenth Stipulation") and the stipulation's exhibit "The Plan for 1986" (referred to as "1986 Plan"). To the extent these 1986 Rules & Regs are inconsistent with the TRPA's Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure, these 1986 Rules & Regs shall control. These 1986 Rules & Regs are necessary to implement the 1986 Plan.

1.1 TRPA shall determine allocation limits and which classes of projects are eligible for allocations. Distribution within those allocation limits shall be determined by the counties and city. If any county or city shall choose not to distribute allocations, then TRPA shall distribute them. The allocation limits are set forth on the following chart.

RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATION TABLE FOR A PLAN FOR 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Prior approvals</th>
<th>1983 allocations</th>
<th>1983 allocations</th>
<th>Prior approval</th>
<th>New/reissued allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8 Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 300
1.2 The following classes of projects and parcels are eligible for allocations to build within the limits set above:

a. Placer County permits which are due to expire on August 1, 1986, which have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits, have not yet commenced construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7.

b. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7, and are either in compliance with the Bailey coefficients or have been brought into conformance with the Bailey coefficients.

c. Single family dwelling projects in land capability districts 4 - 7 ("prior approvals") which were approved by TRPA prior to August 27, 1983 and which did not receive a permit prior to May 1, 1984.

d. Parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7 which received a 1983 allocation from Placer County, El Dorado County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe, have the requisite infrastructure, and are within the urban boundaries.

e. Parcels located in land capability districts 4 - 7 that have the requisite infrastructure and are within the urban boundaries.

1.3 Allocations for purposes of transfer are subject to the limits set above. The following classes of parcels and projects are eligible for an allocation to transfer but are not eligible to build:

a. Nevada case-by-case approvals for single family dwelling which were approved by TRPA prior to August 27, 1983 but which did not receive a permit prior to May 1, 1984.

b. Parcels which received a 1983 California allocation and are located in land capability districts 1 - 3.

c. Parcels located in land capability districts 4 - 7 which are either outside urban boundaries or do not have the requisite infrastructure, and which received a 1983 California allocation.

d. Placer County permits which are due to expire on August 1, 1986, which have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits, have not yet commenced construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 1 - 3.

e. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 1 - 3.

f. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7, and are not in, or cannot be brought into, compliance with the Bailey coefficients.
2.1 Upon adoption of these 1986 Rules & Regs by resolution of the Governing Board, TRPA shall notify each city and county of the 1986 Plan and shall determine which city and county has elected to implement an allocation distribution system. Written notification of an election by a county or city to distribute allocations must be received by TRPA no later than June 15, 1986.

2.2 If any county or city does not elect to distribute 1986 allocations, then the Governing Board shall establish a system of allocation distribution in that jurisdiction.

2.3 Delivery of allocations by TRPA to the counties and city shall be accomplished by providing each county and city with the number of allocation forms which corresponds to the allocation limits set forth above. The standard allocation form shall be devised by the Executive Director. After distributing 1986 allocations pursuant to their respective allocation distribution systems, the counties and city shall indicate the assessor's parcel number (APN) of the allocation recipient on the form and shall provide TRPA with a list of APN's receiving same. These forms shall then be delivered to the recipient and shall, in addition to the list, constitute evidence of receipt of a 1986 allocation.

2.4 TRPA, in cooperation with the counties and city, shall mail a notice to the last known address of each owner of record of a parcel or project which has been identified as a recipient of a 1986 allocation.

2.5 Unused or forfeited allocations shall be returned to the counties or city of origin and may be carried over into the next year's allocation.

CHAPTER 3 RESIDENTIAL PERMITS

3.1 All construction of new single family residences shall require the approval of TRPA.

a. Applications for new single family residences shall not be accepted unless they are complete. No applications shall be accepted after 5:00 P.M., December 31, 1986. Acceptance of complete applications shall be evidenced by marking the application with a TRPA stamp indicating the date of acceptance, and shall be initialed by the person confirming the completeness of the application.

b. A complete application shall consist of:

(1) A completed TRPA residential application form. The form shall be devised by the Executive Director.

(2) Proof of receipt of a 1986 allocation.
(3) A plot plan, minimum size 18" x 24", showing the property lines, the location of the proposed residence and other improvements, a north arrow, map scale, the APN, topographic contour lines with no more than two foot contour intervals, coverage calculations indicating the amount of proposed coverage, existing and new, by land capability district, and elevations showing the proposed height of the structure, or proposed excavation.

(4) An application fee.

c. TRPA may require the submittal of additional information when it is determined that more information is necessary to adequately review the project under construction.

d. TRPA shall review the project as expeditiously as possible.

3.2 Bailey land coverage coefficients shall be applied on a parcel basis except that subdivisions, or portions thereof, which are consistent with the Bailey coefficients overall and were approved by TRPA without reliance on Sections 7.83, 8.25(2), 8.25(3), 8.28, 8.34 or 9.23 of the TRPA Land Use Ordinance, may be permitted the coverage shown on the subdivision map for parcels located in land capability districts 4 – 7.

3.3 The following infrastructure requirements must be met to be eligible to build:

(a) Parcels with a Placer County permit [§1.2(a)], and parcels with 1983 California allocations [§1.2(d)] must be found to be served by at least three of the following infrastructure requirements:

1. paved roads; 2. sewer; 3. electricity; or 4. water.

(b) Pre-December 19, 1980 local permits [§1.2(b)] and prior TRPA approvals [§1.2(c)] shall be subject to whatever infrastructure requirements were applicable at the time of the original approval except as otherwise set forth herein.

(c) Other parcels [§1.2(e)] must be served by the following infrastructure requirements:

1. paved roads; 2. sewer; 3. electricity; and 4. water.

3.4 All projects shall include all necessary water quality improvements on the parcel as set forth in the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan, Vol. II, Handbook of Best Management Practices (referred to as "EMPs"). All projects shall be subject to review under the amended regional plan standards for woodstoves and heaters.

3.5 The residential height rules shall be those rules in effect on August 25, 1983.
3.6 Residential projects may be approved by the Executive Director except for residential construction in the shorezone pursuant to the TRPA Shorezone Ordinance (No. 76-3) and any other residential project which the Executive Director determines to be of such a nature as to warrant Governing Board review. Projects reviewed by the Governing Board shall be given notice pursuant to Sections 5.6 and 5.20 of TRPA Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure.

3.7 Before approving any residential project, the Governing Board or the Executive Director shall make the following findings, in addition to any other findings required by applicable Agency ordinances:

a. That the project under review shall not adversely affect the implementation of the regional plan.

b. That the project shall not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

c. That the project has been reviewed under the authority of the Tenth Stipulation and complies with the terms and conditions of the Tenth Stipulation.

3.8 Approved residential projects shall be issued a permit by the Executive Director.

a. Residential permits shall be issued on a form devised by the Executive Director and shall be signed by the Executive Director. Permits shall be mailed or delivered to the permittee no later than the fifth working day following approval. Copies of permits issued shall be sent to the appropriate county or city.

b. Residential permits shall state:

(1) The standard conditions of approval, Exhibit "A" to these 1986 Rules & Regs, shall be included by reference. Special conditions shall be set forth on the permit.

(2) The expiration date of the approval.

(3) That the permittee shall be held responsible for any and all permit conditions.

(4) That no construction shall commence until all preconstruction conditions of approval are satisfied and until TRPA receives a copy of the permit upon which the permittee(s) has acknowledged receipt of a copy of the permit and acceptance of the contents of the permit.

3.9 Notice of denial of a residential project shall be mailed to the last known address of the applicant and to the affected county or city. Notice shall be effective on the date of deposit of the notice in the United States mail, postage prepaid first class. The notice shall state the reasons for denial of the project.
3.10 In case of transfer of ownership of a parcel identified in a residential permit, the transfer of the permit shall not be effective until the new owner advises TRPA of the transfer of ownership and acknowledges receipt of the residential permit and acceptance of the contents of the permit.

3.11 Permits shall be issued for projects classified as "prior approvals" in the 1986 Plan upon proof of compliance with the original pre-construction conditions of approval, and on the further condition that construction plans comply with amended regional plan standards for heaters and wood stoves.

3.12 Permits shall expire and be void unless construction, pursuant to the terms of the permit, commences before the expiration date of the permit. However, prior approvals shall be granted a two year extension of their original expiration date pursuant to Article VI(p) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and the legal action entitled State of California/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA.

3.13 The three year construction commencement deadline shall be extended only pursuant to Article VI(p) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

3.14 Construction shall be completed within two years from the date of the required Agency pre-grading inspection. Complete construction shall be defined as a fully enclosed structure and roof, installation of all permanent drainage improvements and slope stabilizations, and revegetation of the site.

3.15 The two year construction period may be extended once for up to one year, provided the request is made in writing prior to the expiration of the two year period and the Executive Director makes either of the following findings:

a. The project was diligently pursued as evidenced by substantial construction of the residence during each building season (May 1 - October 15) since commencement of construction.

b. That events beyond the control of the permittee have prevented diligent pursuit of the project.

3.16 Notice of denial of a request for an extension pursuant to Section 3.13 or 3.15 above, shall be mailed to the last known address of the applicant and to the affected city and county. Notice shall be effective on the date of deposit of the notice in the United States mail, postage prepaid first class. The notice shall state the reasons for denial of the request.

CHAPTER 4. TRANSFERS OF ALLOCATIONS

4.1 Transfer of allocations shall only be to parcels located in land capabilities 4 - 7 inside the urban boundaries and which have the requisite infrastructure, and shall also result in the permanent dedication of the transferor parcel to open space. Allocations may be transferred between parcels in common ownership prior to acquisition of the allocation, without a requirement to dedicate or donate the transferor parcel provided the
transferor lot is located in land capability districts 4 - 7, has the requisite infrastructure, and is within the urban boundaries.

4.2 Multi-family residential projects with a pre-December 19, 1980 local permit [§1.3(e,f)], shall be allowed one allocation for each residential unit (e.g. triplex receives three allocations).

4.3 The Nevada case-by-case approvals [§1.3(a)] shall be allowed one allocation for transfer which shall not be counted in the allocations for the 1986 Plan. However, any transferred allocations shall be accounted for against subsequent years' allocations.

4.4 Transfers of allocation shall be complete no later that 5:00 p.m., December 31, 1986. Failure to complete a transfer before the deadline shall result in forfeiture of the allocation to the city or county of origin.

4.5 All transfers of allocations shall require the approval of TRPA.

   a. Applications for transfer of an allocation shall not be accepted unless they are complete. No applications shall be accepted after 5:00 p.m., December 31, 1986.

   b. A complete application shall consist of:

      (1) A completed TRPA transfer of application form;

      (2) Proof of receipt of a 1986 allocation; and

      (3) An application fee.

   c. TRPA may require the submittal of additional information when it is determined that more information is necessary to adequately review the project under consideration.

4.6 Upon determining that the proposed transforee parcel is eligible pursuant to Section 4.1 above for receipt of a transferred allocation, the Executive Director shall issue a notice of eligibility.

4.7 Only one complete transfer shall be permitted per allocation. Transfers of allocations shall not be deemed completed until the applicant has received a TRPA notice of eligibility for the transfer and the allocation form has been signed by the owners of the transferor and transforee parcels, the county or city which issued the allocation, and TRPA. The approval of both the sending and receiving county or city shall be required for intercounty transfers.

4.8 The notice of eligibility shall state:

   a. The conditions of transfer;

   b. The deadline for completion of the transfer;

4.9 Upon transfer of an allocation, a complete application for a new single family residence shall be filed no later than June 1, 1987. Failure to file a complete application by said date shall result in the forfeiture of the allocation to the county or city of origin.
4.10 Notice of denial of a transfer shall be mailed to the last known address of the applicant and to the affected city and county. Notice shall be effective on the date of deposit of the notice in the United States mail, postage prepaid first class. The notice shall state the reasons for denial of the transfer.

CHAPTER 5 APPEALS

5.1 Approvals of residences under the 1986 Plan may be appealed by filing a written notice or request for appeal with TRPA no later than fifteen (15) working days after the issuance of the permit. An appeal shall not automatically stay the permit appealed. The appellant may request, as part of the written notice of appeal, a stay of the permit and any such request shall be by affidavit or under penalty of perjury, and shall include credible evidence of the need for a stay pending a hearing on the appeal before the Governing Board at its next regular meeting. The Chairman of the Governing Board shall review any request for a stay of a permit and the evidence submitted therewith, and shall balance the equities and shall determine whether or not a stay of the permit shall be issued. Appeals shall be scheduled for the upcoming Governing Board meeting provided the Agency is able to give proper notice of the appeal.

5.2 A staff denial of a residential project, request for extension pursuant to Section 3.13 or 3.15, or transfer of an allocation, may be appealed to the Governing Board by filing a written notice of appeal with TRPA no later than ten (10) working days after the effective date of the notice of denial.

5.3 Appeals shall not be considered by the Advisory Planning Commission under Section 7.10 of the TRPA Rules & Regulations of Practice and Procedure.

CHAPTER 6 MISCELLANEOUS

6.1 Future amendments, if any, to the standard conditions of approval for residential projects, attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference, shall be made by resolution of the TRPA Governing Board.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

A. The following conditions shall be satisfied prior to commencement of any construction activity on the project site, including but not limited to, grading, excavation, and clearing of trees. Failure to satisfy these conditions of approval prior to commencement of construction activity shall be grounds for revocation of the permit.

1. The permittee shall submit final construction drawings and a plan(s) showing revegetation, slope stabilization, and drainage improvements. Revegetation, slope stabilization and drainage improvement plans shall be designed in conformance with the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan, Volume II, Handbook of Best Management Practices.

   a. The final construction drawings shall include equipment specifications in conformance with the following:

      (1) Water conservation devices shall be used on all fixtures.

      (2) Gas water heaters shall not emit nitrogen oxides greater than forty (40) nanograms of nitrogen oxide (as NO₂) per joule of heat output at sea level.

      (3) Gas space heaters shall not emit nitrogen oxides greater than forty (40) nanograms of nitrogen oxide (as NO₂) per joule of useful heat delivered to the heated space at sea level.

      (4) Only airtight woodstoves and fireplace inserts, with secondary combustion chambers, or other devices of similar efficiency shall be installed. The minimum acceptable level of technology shall be either a freestanding airtight woodstove or a fireplace insert which contains: an outside or underhome source of combustion air, airtight doors, and a heat exchanger with an electric fan assist to promote convection.

      (5) Woodstoves and fireplace inserts should be operated to minimize particulate emissions. Use only dry, seasoned wood; operate the unit with the doors closed (except when starting the fire); and do not allow a fire to smolder in the unit in a choked condition.

      (6) A list of acceptable and recommended gas space and water heaters and woodstoves and fireplace inserts is available from TRPA.

b. Revegetation plans shall show areas to be revegetated, specifications for revegetation, and fencing for vegetation protection. Only native species adaptable to the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be used for landscaping or revegetation. A list of acceptable species is available from TRPA.
c. Slope stabilization plans shall show all methods of stabilization to be used to stabilize all existing and proposed cut and fill slopes and areas otherwise denuded of vegetation. Said plans shall also show temporary and permanent erosion control devices and measures to be taken for dust control.

d. Drainage plans shall show all drainage facilities for all existing and proposed impervious surfaces and utility trenches. Drainage facilities shall be designed to be capable of retaining runoff waters for a two (2) year, six (6) hour storm. Calculations demonstrating the proposed facilities' retention capabilities may be required. Whenever possible, utilities shall occupy common trenches to minimize site disturbance.

2. The above plans shall require TRPA review to determine their compliance with the conditions set forth above and with the approved plot plan. Plans determined to be in compliance shall be so designated by TRPA and shall be incorporated as part of the approval and permit.

3. Security shall be posted with TRPA to insure compliance with the conditions of the permit. The security shall be determined by TRPA and shall be the amount equal to 150% of estimated costs of the revegetation, drainage improvements and slope stabilization plans.

4. The permittee shall submit the required air and water quality mitigation fees.

5. All local government and other public agency approvals and permits shall be obtained by the permittee.

6. Prior to any grading activity commencing, the permittee shall contact TRPA and arrange for a pregrading inspection to verify that all temporary erosion control measures and protective fencing for vegetation are in place.

7. The permittee shall return a copy of the permit form acknowledged by the permittee(s) stating that the permit was received and that the permit is understood and the contents are accepted. Acknowledgements should be returned within twenty (20) days of mailing or delivery of the permit.

B. The following conditions shall apply to construction activity on the site:

1. There shall be no grading, filling, clearing of vegetation or other disturbance of the soil onsite between October 15 and May 1 of each year.

2. There shall be no grading, filling, clearing of vegetation or other disturbance of the soil during inclement weather and during the resulting period of time when the site is covered with snow or is saturated, muddy or unstable.
3. All material obtained from excavation work shall be either contained within the foundations, retaining walls or by a similar approved means, shall be stabilized and revegetated within one year, or shall be disposed of at a site approved by TRPA.

4. Soil and construction material shall not be tracked offsite. Grading operations shall cease in the event a danger of violating this condition exists. The site shall be cleaned and the road right-of-way shall be swept clean when necessary.

5. The length of open trenches (excluding foundations) shall not exceed fifty (50) feet at the end of each working day.

6. Loose soil mounds or surfaces shall be protected from wind and water erosion by being appropriately covered or contained when active construction is not occurring.

7. All excavated material shall be stored upgrade from excavated areas. No material shall be stored in stream environment zones or other wet areas.

8. Equipment of a size and type that will do the least amount of damage to the environment shall be used. Cleaning of equipment, including cement mixers, shall be permitted if contained on the property and the affected area is revegetated.

9. Vehicles or heavy equipment shall not be allowed in stream environment zones or other wet areas unless specifically authorized by TRPA. All vehicles and heavy equipment shall be confined to the area within the vegetative protection fencing unless specifically authorized by TRPA.

10. Replanting of all exposed surfaces, as shown on the revegetation and slope stabilization plans, shall be completed within one year following the commencement of construction.

11. All trees and natural vegetation which is to remain shall be fenced for protection. Scarring of trees shall be avoided. Scarred trees shall be repaired with tree seal.

12. Revegetation of compacted dirt areas not to be surfaced shall include seedbed preparation in accord with Chapter XI, Section D, of the Handbook of Best Management Practices.

13. At all times during construction, environmental protection and control devices shall be maintained in a functioning state. Such devices include, but are not limited to, dust control devices and vegetative protection.
14. No grading, filling, clearing of vegetation, operation of equipment or disturbance of the soil shall take place in areas where any historic or prehistoric ruins or monuments or objects of antiquity are present or could be damaged by grading. If any historic or prehistoric ruins or monuments or objects of antiquity are discovered all grading, filling, clearing of vegetation, operation of equipment or disturbance of the soil shall cease until a recovery plan is approved by the TRPA.

15. All construction sites shall be winterized no later than October 15 of each year as follows:

a. Inactive winter sites shall contain erosion and drainage improvements necessary to prevent discharge from the site including, but not limited to:
   
   (1) Installation of temporary erosion controls;
   (2) Installation of temporary protective fencing of vegetation;
   (3) Stabilization of all disturbed areas;
   (4) Cleanup and removal of all construction slash and debris;
   (5) Installation of permanent mechanical stabilization and drainage improvements, where feasible;
   (6) Removal or stabilization of spoil piles.

b. Active winter sites shall comply with the following:

   (1) Installation of all permanent mechanical erosion control devices, including paving of all driveway and parking areas;
   (2) Installation of all permanent drainage improvements;
   (3) Parking of vehicles, equipment and storage of materials shall be restricted to paved areas.

16. Work shall be performed in such a manner that the project can be winterized within twenty-four (24) hours.

17. Rehabilitation and cleanup of the site following construction shall include, but not be limited to, removal of all construction waste and debris.

18. The TRPA permit and the final construction drawings shall be present onsite from the time construction commences until the final TRPA site inspection.

19. Upon completion of all the project, as a condition of the release of the security, TRPA shall conduct a final site inspection to verify that all required improvements and revegetation are properly installed and that all the conditions of the permit have been satisfied.
20. The residence shall be complete within two (2) years of commencement of construction. A complete residence shall consist of a finished shell and roof. All permanent drainage improvements, slope stabilization and revegetation shall be complete. Permittees may apply for a one-time-only one (1) year extension of the two year completion condition. Application shall be made prior to the expiration of the two year period.

21. The permittee shall allow TRPA to enter and inspect the site at any time to determine compliance with the permit.

22. VIOLATION OF ANY OF THE ABOVE CONDITIONS SHALL BE GROUNDS FOR REVOCATION OF THE PERMIT. FAILURE TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION WITHIN THE APPROVAL PERIOD SHOWN ON THE PERMIT FACE OR FAILURE TO DILIGENTLY PURSUE CONSTRUCTION WITHIN THE TWO YEAR COMPLETION PERIOD SHALL RESULT IN THE EXPIRATION OF THE PERMIT, WITHOUT NOTICE, BY OPERATION OF LAW, ON THE DATE SHOWN ON THE PERMIT FACE.
LODGED THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

APR 14 1986

No. CIVS-84-0561 EJG

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA EX REL. JOHN K.
VAN DE KAMP, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING
AGENCY, a Separate Legal Entity
Created by Bi-State Compact,

Defendant.

No. CIVS-84-0565 EJG

LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE TAHOE, a Non-
Profit California Organization,

Plaintiff

vs.

THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING
AGENCY, a Separate Legal Entity,
and DOES 1 through 100,

Defendants.

TENTH STIPULATION AMENDING
ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION AND ORDER THEREON

///
IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between the parties hereto, that the August 9, 1984 Order Granting Preliminary Injunction may be amended to allow implementation of the Plan for 1986. The Plan for 1986 is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference.

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED, by and between the parties hereto, that the August 9, 1984 Order Granting Preliminary Injunction may be amended to exempt settlement of the litigation entitled Spear, et al. v. TRPA, Case No. CV-R-85-549-BRT, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, provided the allocation for the single family residence at issue is counted against the allocations provided for in the Plan for 1986.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

DATED: April 11, 1986

Susan E. Scholley, Attorney for Defendant, TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, ATTORNEY
GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATED: 11 April, 1986

Richard M. Skinner, Attorneys for Plaintiff, PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA EX REL. JOHN VAN DE KAMP ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

///

///
Dated: April 11, 1986

E. Clement Shute, Attorneys for Plaintiff, LEAGUE TO SAVE LAKE TAHOE

TAHOE-TRUCKEE SANITATION AGENCY

Dated: ____________, 1986

John C. Weidman, Attorney for Intervenor, TAHOE-TRUCKEE SANITATION AGENCY

TAHOE SHOREZONE REPRESENTATION

Dated: April 14, 1986

William T. Chidlaw, Attorney for Intervenor, TAHOE SHOREZONE REPRESENTATION

BRIAN MC KAY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Dated: April 14, 1986

MARTA ADAMS, Attorneys for Intervenors, STATE OF NEVADA

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated and done this 15th day of Apr., 1986.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
I. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

A. Allocations

1. TRPA shall determine allocation limits and which classes of projects are eligible for allocations.

2. Distribution within those allocation limits shall be determined by the counties and city. If any county or city shall choose not to distribute allocations, then TRPA shall distribute them.

3. The allocation limits are set forth on the attached chart.

4. Unused or forfeited allocations shall be returned to the counties and city and may be carried over into the next year's allocation.

B. The following classes of projects and parcels are eligible for allocations to build within the limits set in A. above:

1. Placer County permits which are due to expire on August 1, 1986, which have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits, have not yet commenced construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7.

2. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7, and are either in compliance with the Bailey coefficients or have been brought into conformance with the Bailey coefficients.

3. Single family dwelling projects in land capability districts 4 - 7 which were approved by TRPA prior to August 27, 1983 and which did not receive a permit prior to May 1, 1984.

4. Parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7 which received a 1983 allocation from Placer County, El Dorado County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe, have the requisite infrastructure, and are within the urban boundaries.

5. Parcels located in land capability districts 4 - 7 that have the requisite infrastructure and are within the urban boundaries.

C. Allocations for purposes of transfer are subject to the limits set in A. above. The following classes of parcels and projects are eligible for an allocation to transfer but are not eligible to build:

1. Nevada case-by-case approvals for single family dwelling which were approved by TRPA prior to August 27, 1983 but which did not receive a permit prior to May 1, 1984.

2. Parcels which received a 1983 California allocation and are located in land capability districts 1 - 3.
3. Parcels located in land capability districts 4 - 7 which are either outside urban boundaries or do not have the requisite infrastructure, and which received a 1983 California allocation.

4. Placer County permits which are due to expire on August 1, 1986, which have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits, have not yet commenced construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 1 - 3.

5. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 1 - 3.

6. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7, and are not in, or cannot be brought into, compliance with the Bailey coefficients.

7. Parcels located in land capability districts 4 - 7 which are either outside urban boundaries or do not have the requisite infrastructure.

D. Rules for residential construction shall be as follows:

1. Bailey land coverage coefficients shall be applied on a parcel basis except that subdivisions, or portions thereof, which are consistent with the Bailey coefficients overall and were approved by TRPA without reliance on Sections 7.63, 8.25(2), 8.25(3), 8.28, 8.34 or 9.23 of the TRPA Land Use Ordinance, may be permitted the coverage shown on the subdivision map for parcels located in land capability districts 4 - 7.

2. To be eligible to build, parcels with a Placer County permit (B.1.), and parcels with 1983 California allocations (B.4.) must be found to be served by at least three of the following infrastructure requirements:

   (a) paved roads; (b) sewer; (c) electricity; or (d) water.

3. Pre-December 19, 1980 local permits (B.2.) and prior TRPA approvals (B.3.) shall be subject to whatever infrastructure requirements were applicable at the time of the original approval except as otherwise set forth herein.

4. Other parcels (B.5) must be served by the following infrastructure requirements:

   (a) paved roads; (b) sewer; (c) electricity; and (d) water.
5. If eligible for an allocation to build, parcels with a Placer County permit (B.1.), and pre-December 19, 1980 local permits (B.2.), may be reissued approvals, which approvals shall be valid for three years pursuant to Article VI(p) of the Compact.

6. All approvals (reissued or new) shall begin construction within the three year approval period and shall complete construction, as defined by TRPA, within two years once construction is commenced.

7. All approvals and construction shall be subject to installation of BMPs on the parcel.

8. All approvals and construction shall be subject to review under the amended regional plan standards for woodstoves, heaters, and related provisions.


10. Parcels which are eligible to build and require TRPA review, shall submit a complete application no later than December 31, 1986. Failure to do so will result in the forfeiture of the allocation.

E. Rules for transfer of residential development allocations (TDR) shall be as follows:

1. Transfer of allocations shall only be to parcels located in land capabilities 4 - 7 inside the urban boundaries and which have the requisite infrastructure, and shall also result in the permanent dedication of the transferor parcel to open space. Allocations may be transferred between parcels in common ownership prior to acquisition of the allocation without a requirement to dedicate or donate the transferor parcel provided the transferor lot is located in land capability districts 4 - 7, has the requisite infrastructure, and is within the urban boundaries.

2. Failure to complete the transfer of an allocation by December 31, 1986 shall result in forfeiture of the allocation.

3. Multi-family residential projects with a pre-December 19, 1980 local permit (C.5. & C.6.), shall be allowed one TDR for each residential unit (i.e. triplex receives three TDR's).

4. The Nevada case-by-case approvals (C.1.) shall be allowed one TDR which shall not be counted in the allocations for the Plan for 1986. However, any transferred allocations shall be accounted for against subsequent years' allocations.
II. COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

A. The following projects have been identified as pre-August 26, 1983 approvals which did not receive permits prior to May 1, 1984:

1. Blankenship Office Bldg. TRPA File No. 82156. (10,696 sq. ft.)

2. Moran Professional Office Building. TRPA File No. 82108. (2,102 sq. ft.)

3. Strong Office Building. TRPA File No. 81-1152. (3,892 sq. ft.)

B. The above projects may receive a permit upon satisfaction of the conditions of the approvals. Implementation of this agreement will cease the tolling of the approvals.

C. Addition of new commercial square footage to existing structures shall be permitted only: where ordered by a state, county or city department pursuant to a health or safety code; where such addition is found to be the only feasible way to meet health or safety codes; and then only to the minimum extent necessary to meet the code requirements.

III. PUBLIC SERVICE, RECREATION and OTHER FACILITIES

A. Applications for, and approval of, public service, recreation and other facilities or development, shall be provided for through specific exemptions from the preliminary injunction.

IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

A. The following capital improvements are expected to be either funded or constructed in the 1986 building season:

1. Water Quality and Erosion Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Expected Oct. 1986 Status</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. of Airport to Wye</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Dr.</td>
<td>Constructed 86/87</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss #3</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon Palisades</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>669,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon - Other</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Truckee I</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Truckee II</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area No. 5</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>3,933,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijou/Wildwood I</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijou/Wildwood II</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>4,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Expected Oct. 1986 Status</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan Beach I</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Road</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sierra Tract</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Street</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Erosion</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Yard</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Douglas Co.</td>
<td>182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephyr Heights</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Douglas Co.</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview - Incline</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Washoe Co.</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay - Incline</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Washoe Co.</td>
<td>591,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyland</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Point</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney Estates</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Peaks</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnelian Woods</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmont Estates</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates Drive II</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Street</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnelian Drive</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Water Tanks</td>
<td>Designed/Constructed</td>
<td>STPUD</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Water Tanks</td>
<td>Designed/Constructed</td>
<td>NTPUD</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spooner Maint. Yard</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Transportation & Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Oct. 1986 Status</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Trail to Park Avenue, Signal and Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Bus</td>
<td>Service Extension</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TART Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>TART</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 50 Demonstration Bus Project</td>
<td>Planning Study</td>
<td>TRPA, TTD, TTF</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Street</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City WYE</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Sub-station</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Postal Service</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-5-
3. SEZ Restoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Oct. 1986 Status</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perini Property</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>TCPUD</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Creek</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griff Creek #2</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Road</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Country</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Cal State Parks</td>
<td>219,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. MONITORING PROGRAM

A. The following monitoring programs are expected to be designed, funded, commenced or continued during the 1986 building season:

1. Water Quality

   a. Pelagic Zone - The Tahoe Research Group (TRG) will continue to monitor trends in Lake Tahoe's clarity and primary productivity through June 30, 1986. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board staff assists with this program.

   b. Tributary Streams - The USGS and TRG will continue to monitor pollutant loads and stream flows in five major tributary streams, consistent with past monitoring efforts, through June 30, 1986. The USFS will continue to monitor water quality at several other stations in the Tahoe Basin.

   c. Surface Runoff - The TRPA staff will make assessments of BMP applications in the field and will determine the degree of compliance with TRPA conditions of approval. All erosion control projects will have specific monitoring provisions.

2. Air Quality

   a. Carbon Monoxide - The CARB and NDEP will continue to provide continuous monitoring at their four permanent stations on the South Shore. TRPA staff will analyze the results of this monitoring in the annual Reasonable Further Progress (RFP) report. The TRPA, with assistance from Caltrans, NDOT, and the City of South Lake Tahoe, will also monitor traffic volumes on the U.S. 50 corridor, and include these results in the RFP report.
b. **Regional and Subregional Visibility** - TRPA staff, with assistance from the Desert Research Institute, will develop specifications for a monitoring program addressing regional and subregional visibility (i.e., visual range). The specifications will include technical, financial, and institutional arrangements for the operation of two integrating nephelometers and a multi-wavelength teleradiometer. (See also Nitrogen Deposition, below.)

c. **Nitrogen Deposition** - TRPA staff, using the traffic count data obtained from Caltrans, NDOT, and the City, will compute regional vehicle-miles-of-travel (VMT) for the average peak summer day, using the Agency's in-house transportation model. In addition, the staff will develop specifications covering technical, financial, and institutional arrangements for the operation of high-volume samplers to determine ambient levels of particulate nitrate and nitric acid gas. Also, the TRG will continue to monitor nitrogen deposition on the surface of Lake Tahoe with buoys placed at several locations.

3. **Scenic Quality--Roadway and Shoreline Units**

The TRPA shall prepare, through a contractor, objective standards, criteria, and procedures for carrying out the scenic quality standards of the thresholds and the Regional Plan. This information will include site-specific measures to bring nonconforming roadway and shoreline units into compliance with the scenic thresholds, and to preserve the scenic resources in all units.
# RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATION TABLE FOR A PLAN FOR 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Prior approvals</th>
<th>1983 allocations</th>
<th>1983 allocations</th>
<th>New/reissued allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>8 TTSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 300
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b) I certify that I am an employee of TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY, and that on the 14th day of April, 1986 I deposited for mailing at Zephyr Cove, Nevada, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of the attached addressed to

E. Clement Shute, Esq.
Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger
396 Hayes Street, Suite 1
San Francisco, CA 94102

Richard M. Skinner
Deputy Attorney General
1515 K Street, Suite 511
Sacramento, CA 95814

William T. Chidlaw, Esq.
Bartko, Welsh & Tarrant
One Maritime Plaza, Suite 1440
San Francisco, CA 94111

John C. Weidman, Esq.
325 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667

Marta Adams
Deputy Attorney General
201 South Fall Street, Room 221
Carson City, NV 89710

[Signature]

MARGORIE L. MC CABLEY