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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on August 10, 1988, at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Round Hill, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct a special meeting on Friday, August 19, 1988, at 9:30 a.m., at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50. The purpose of the meeting is to make a recommendation to the Governing Board on the adoption of the 208 Plan and on the technical adequacy of the environmental documentation pursuant to Article 7 of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

August 1, 1988

By: ________________________

William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
AMENDED AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Recommendation on Certification of Environmental Impact Statement for Amendment of Water Quality Management Plan

B. Amendment of Water Quality Management Plan (Section 208 of the Clean Water Act)

C. Amendment of Chapters 36 (Interim Single Family Review System) and 20 (Land Coverage) of the Code of Ordinances to Provide For Review of Certain Residential Parcels in Tyrolian Village, Washoe County

D. Amendment of the Recreation Element of the Goals and Policies, the Code of Ordinances (Chapters 13 and 33), and the Plan Area Statements (Nos. 008, 017, 019, 022, 024A, 024B, 029, 037, 048, 057, 066, 089B, 102, 119, 129, 146, 150, 157, 162, 163, and 174) to Implement Recommendations on Recreation Persons At One Time (PAOT) As Approved by the Governing Board on October 28, 1987

E. Buehler, Amendment of Regional Plan Land Capability Overlays for Man-Modified Area, APN 07-180-05, Douglas County. (Continued to September)

F. Amendment of Chapter 91 (Air Quality Controls) (Continued to September)

G. Amendment of the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Maps for Plan Areas 001A (Tahoe City), 002 (Fairway Tract), 174 (64 Acre Tract), and 009A (Lake Forest Commercial). (Continued to September)

H. Identification of Threshold Indicators, Targets, and Related Matters, Chapter 32 (Regional Plan and Threshold Review)
V PLANNING MATTERS

A. Amendment to Boundary Between Plan Area 097 (Bijou Pines) and Plan Area 098 (Bijou/Al Tahoe) to Include APN 26-050-04 in PAS 093. Applicant: City of South Lake Tahoe

B. Amendment to Permissible Uses for Plan Area 094, Which Would Add Pre-Schools as a Special Use. Applicant: Fred C. Puliafico. Property Identification: 3260 Pioneer Trail, APN 25-510-66, El Dorado County

C. Amendment of Chapter 4 (Project Review and Exempt Activities) to Allow for a Memorandum of Understanding Between TRPA and the California Tahoe Conservancy Regarding Exempt and Qualified Exempt Activities.

VI REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

D. Public Interest Comments

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT
FAIRWAY COMMUNITY CENTER
330 Fairway Drive, Lakeside Room
Tahoe City, California

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chairman Stan Hansen called the regular July 13, 1988 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:50 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

Members Present: Mr. Reaves (present at 9:55 during agenda item IV A.), Mr. Marchio (present at 9:55 during agenda item IV A.), Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. McCurry, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Glab (present at 9:55 during agenda item IV A.), Mr. Hansen, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Harper, Mr. Thrans, Ms. Bedard, Mr. Van Wagenen (present at 10:30 a.m. during agenda item IV D.)

Members Absent: Mr. Renz, Mr. Toll, Ms. Becker, Mr. Combs

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Ms. Bedard, to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. DeMello asked that a correction be made in the June 15, 1988 minutes to amend Correspondence where it is written "hundreds of areas in the nation have received the same letter", to read "127 areas".

MOTION by Vice Chairman Hansen, to approve the June 15 APC minutes as corrected. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Status of Community Planning

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett updated the APC members on the status of Community Planning. Tahoe City Community Plan is in progress with adoption scheduled January, 1989. South Lake Tahoe is presently working on the South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Redevelopment Plan and Chapter 15 is tentatively scheduled for APC presentation in September. South Lake Tahoe is also looking at a community plan for the Wye and the industrial area and possibly a privately financed community plan for Al Tahoe.
Mr. Harper advised that a planning team for Washoe County has been formed but not officially appointed by the Board.

Mr. Reaves, representing El Dorado County, explained the process is underway and they are working on the budget. They are working with the City of South Lake Tahoe to hire an economic consultant for the first phase of work.

Mr. Thrams expressed concern of talk that the Conservancy is buying up a major portion of land in Kings Beach for public use and felt that this should be coordinated with the community planning process before that occurs.

B. Status of Redevelopment Plan for the City of South Lake Tahoe

Executive Director Bill Morgan presented a status report to APC on the redevelopment plan for the City of South Lake Tahoe. The city adopted the redevelopment plan June 28 and with that action met the statutory deadline for freezing tax increases. In August the property tax in the redevelopment plan area is frozen and any increases that occur after that time will support the redevelopment program. TRPA has yet to act on the redevelopment plan and the EIS. A number of issues have been identified and TRPA is waiting for clarification before action is taken. TRPA will continue work on Chapter 15 and the EIS and present it to APC for consideration and action in September.

Discussion followed over the concern of the sales tax failure and other funding options for redevelopment.
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C. Status of Sign Ordinance and Design Review Guidelines

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett, updated the APC on the Scenic Package. Wayne Iverson, scenic consultant, is presently reviewing documents and preparing an environmental assessment. There is some concern the committee has prepared the package in isolation and would like to present it to the public.

Discussion followed regarding the presentation of the scenic package to the public. A meeting will be hosted by the North Shore Chamber of Commerce to present the package to the public at large. It was felt the scenic package should be presented for review and comment rather than as a final document.
D. Report on Processing Land Capability/Man-Modified Amendments

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett summarized the process of land capability/man-modified amendments set forth in Chapter 20 of the Code of Ordinances. The purpose of the report is to provide guidelines and methodology for processing land capability challenges and man-modified determinations. Mr. Barrett explained how the process is also used for field verifications and land capability challenges at Lake Tahoe.

An explanation of altered lands was given. In the event the land has been altered from its natural state, a man-modified designation may be pursued. This requires an amendment to the Land Capability Overlay Map. A team of experts conducts an on-site evaluation and prepares a man-modified report. The report shall identify lands modified by man's placement of fill, dredging or grading, in so substantial a fashion as to generally exhibit the characteristics of a land capability district other than the one depicted for said lands on the TRPA Land Capability Overlays. Until findings are made, these lands are referred to as "altered lands". In determining altered lands, the following criteria was developed to identify altered lands. Altered vegetation, cuts, fills, compaction, change in hydrology, coverage and improvements.

The meeting was open for questions by the APC members.

Mr. Pyle made reference to Land Capability Amendments, specifically "the level of accuracy be better than the original SCS mapping". Mr. Pyle felt clarification was needed because we don't think you're doing a better job, you're doing a different job because of the detail. Mr. Pyle suggested using "more detail" instead of "better than". In reference to Land Capability Challenge, "This involves soil mapping based on standard Soil Conservation Service soil taxonomy criteria at a parcel mapping level which is similar to the level of detail in the IPES program." Mr. Pyle felt that when looking at larger areas, descriptive terms should be used such as square feet or acres.

Discussion followed regarding man-modified and man-altered and what was currently on the ground.
V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Amendment of the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Maps for Plan Areas 001A (Tahoe City), 002 (Fairway Tract), 174 (64 Acre Tract), and 009A (Lake Forest Commercial)

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett presented a summary of the proposed plan amendment which update and change designated land capability overlay maps for Lake Forest and Tahoe City which includes Cathedral Drive North to the Truckee River, the quarry and areas west, the area between Fairway Drive and Grove Street including the land from Highway 28 to the Lake, and Grove Street to the eastern boundary. TRPA staff found that certain areas in the community plan area belong in a land capability district other than that presently classified, while other areas require adjustments of land capability district boundaries. Because certain areas appeared altered, the Staff reviewed the evidence provided by the team of experts against the criteria for man-modified determinations. Staff concludes there is not sufficient information demonstrating a reasonable possibility the requirements of man-modification can be met. TRPA staff recommends APC approval of amendment of the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Maps for the Tahoe City community plan area.

Jerry Budy, Hydrologist, reported on the field work conducted from August to October, 1987 on the five areas in the Tahoe City community plan area. Due to the size and complexity of the area, the report was prepared for smaller areas divided by major roadways, streams or other land features. Areas exhibiting soil physical properties, drainage conditions or vegetation patterns that appeared to be different than presently mapped were more intensely examined by using soil auger borings or road cut inspections. Vegetation species and growth patterns were used as indicators of soil drainage conditions in some cases.

Mr. Budy summarized that Tahoe City ended up with an increase in the amount of land capability class 5 and a decrease of 1b (SEZ), compared to the existing map.

Ms. Unsicker questioned the two new alluvial soil types identified in the area. Is there a provision for including those or other alluvial soils that may be found elsewhere in the IPES because it defines SEZs based on alluvial soils. If there are going to be soils like this turning up in the future there ought to be some provision for including them in the definition of IPES.

Mr. Budy, explained that due to the soils wetness, not so much because they are alluvium, is the reason they were classified that way.

Mr. Sid Davis, Davis soil scientist, explained that the low lying soils of the Basin are alluvial types or some lake sediment which are depicted on most geologic maps as recent alluvium or recent lake beds. To make a statement that alluvial soils are wet ones or low capabilities is not necessarily true.
In this case we found soils within this Gr body that had properties different than what was described by the SCS map so we split them off.

Ms. Bedard asked how recent alluvium are we talking about?

Mr. Davis explained that most of these soils are probably 20,000 years and younger. Some of the old terraces may be as old as three million years.

Mr. Glab stated he had just received a letter from Mrs. Janet Patton regarding a specific parcel which is addressed to the TRPA Board members. There are specific interests that should be addressed at the time this goes to the Board and it is probably representative of a lot of things that will happen as classifications change. Mrs. Patton is in one of the very few areas in which the previous land classification was downgraded.

Vice Chairman Hansen stated he had the letter from Mrs. Patton and had assured her that a copy would be given to Mr. Morgan and the staff of the TRPA would be contacting her.

Vice Chairman Hansen opened the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Hoffman, representing the Preservation Council, Payless Drug Store, owners of property in and around the quarry, owners of water front property, Boat Works area, Hauserman properties, and the Porter’s properties. When the Goals and Policies were adopted, key policies were put in dealing with man-modification. They reflect the fact that we knew the Bailey System did not work very well and was not a suitable land use tool in areas that had been heavily impacted. By way of example relating to SEZs he quoted the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, "new development may be permitted in man-modified stream environment zones where: the area no longer exhibits the characteristics of the stream environment zone, further development will not exacerbate the problems caused by the development of SEZs, restoration is infeasible and mitigation is provided to at least partially offset the losses which were caused by modifications to stream environment zones." The Board agreed the first place to do this was in Tahoe City. In the PAS for Tahoe City, planning consideration number one says a large portion of land area classified as SEZ has a high percentage of coverage and may be eligible for a man-modified designation. We wanted a specific commitment that the agency would undertake a man-modified review of Tahoe City so when we got to the Community Planning process the issue would be put to bed.

Mr. Hoffman then presented historical data gathered by residents of Tahoe City to show the major changes that have taken place over the last 125 years. Because of the dramatic changes to rivers and roadways, altered vegetation, and major development, he said the area was definitely man-modified.
Mr. Hoffman felt the study made by the staff was not a man-modified report and requested the staff go back with the current soils data and consider the extent of historical impacts on Tahoe City in determining man-modified as relating to the Goals and Policies and ordinance criteria.

Vice Chairman Hansen asked Mr. Hoffman if you had to do a soil analysis to get to man-modified?

Mr. Hoffman explained the ordinance says you do a number of things one of which is a soil analysis. Man-modified has to do with what is on the surface, how it has been changed, altered, graded and bladed.

Vice Chairman Hansen then asked if this the first part of getting to the man-modified process.

Mr. Hoffman explained that it is a piece of the puzzle as to the extent of modifications, how they have altered the hydrology, the vegetation, and how the water courses have been changed. Man-modified as applied to the Tahoe Keys was an areawide study and it is our view that Tahoe City demands the same study.

Ms. Unsicker asked if the staff could elaborate on which particular findings could not be made to go on with the man-modified determination.

Mr. Morgan explained that the soils work that was done, and the land capability maps that we prepared, are not a description of the history of the area or what it might have been at one time. We are not referring to the pavement on top of the land, the buildings, or air that might have been there. We are talking about what we find on the ground today when we look at the soils. As Jerry Budy pointed out in the case of the gravel pit, those soils fit the same land capability description as in the original maps. Other areas, though they may have been altered, do not necessarily cause them to become man-modified. When they are altered, we have to decide what the soil type is. If the soil type is the same as it was, even though it has been altered, it is the same land capability. If the soil type has been modified by the fact that it has been altered, then it might become a man-modified issue in which case we have to determine the type of soil we find there.

In reference to the Keys, Mr. Morgan explained it was clearly an SEZ area. Because of extensive dredging and filling it was concluded it was no longer an SEZ and had changed so much it was not a natural type of soil. The land capability that so nearly resembled the area was a 6. There are areas in Tahoe City that have been altered and our crews checked the soils, but did not find the man alterations caused there to be a different soil class.

Mr. Barrett wanted to clarify the barrow pit. If you looked at the pit before SCS mapped it, it was probably a class 2 and 4. Bailey classed it a 1c. Experts have gone out there and analyzed and found a steep slope and called that a 1a, oversteepened land and unstable. A test pit was done and found it like a
hard pan, a solid rock which is not the natural soil profile. If you poured water on it, it would run off. Yes it has been altered, but what capability does it most closely resemble, a lo district which is rock.

Mr. Morgan referred to the development along the Truckee River and the definition of stream zone in the 208 plan. The current plan says anything within 100 feet from the edge of the river regardless of soil type or development remains stream zone.

Mr. Hoffman explained that according to the Goals and Policies and the rules that is exactly what man-modified is all about. Where there is an SEZ, if there have been substantial impacts to it that it no longer is functioning that way, that is what man-modified is all about. In 1981-82 Payless went through a man-modified challenge process at CTRPA and in 1982 CTRPA adopted a resolution finding that the two acres on the front part of the Payless site were man altered, a class 5. Essentially the same criteria was used to reach that conclusion.

Jeanette Holmes, Tahoe Tavern, said she was concerned about the change the amendment will have on the 64-acre tract.

Mr. Morgan explained CTRPA's report was used when preparing the report. As for the 64-acre tract, we found from our studies there is more high capability land there than originally mapped.

Carl Pendleton, owner Travel Lodge, asked if he had a total burn down of his building is he allowed to replace the same building?

Ms. Scholley, Legal Counsel, explained you can replace exactly what was destroyed with no requirements to reduce coverage. The CTRPA rules are no longer in effect, so there is no longer a requirement to reduce coverage actually on-site when there is a fire.

Mr. Pendleton wanted to know if the design would be the same as long as you did not increase the square footage?

Ms. Scholley explained the ordinance terminology is substantially similar and you could go back to the same height and coverage.

Ron McIntryre, Tahoe City resident, asked for clarification on Ms. Scholley's comment if that was true in all land classifications and zones such as an SEZ. Regardless of where you are, can you rebuild exactly like it was before without penalties?

Ms. Scholley replied yes.
Mr. Morgan commented that you can rebuild differently and keep the coverage. There is no reduction to coverage on property once it has been established, whether it has burned down or been torn down voluntarily.

Mr. McIntyre then referred to the 100 foot setback from the edge of the stream and wanted to know if reference was made to the 100 year flood plain or the current edge of the stream. Since the Truckee River is a controlled flow it is hard to determine where the 100 foot starts.

Mr. Morgan explained that it is from the edge of the defined channel. If the flood plain extends beyond that then the flood plain would define the limits of the stream zone.

Mr. McIntyre replied there was also a question as to whether or not the Goals and Policies stipulated the 100 foot or whether man made would take away the 100 foot requirement?

Mr. Morgan explained that modification cannot change the dimension to the extent modifications cannot change land capability and would apply only to the extent that you end up with a changed soil or a changed presence of water or a combination of that plus vegetation. If based on dimensions alone, you cannot change the dimension with a man-modification. These definitions have been in effect for 14 years and were not changed by the adoption of the Goals and Policies.

Ms. Bedard raised a question regarding fees. For remodification of an existing facility in an SEZ or class 1, 2 or 3, would the coverage issue make a difference in the fees?

Mr. Morgan explained if there is an excess coverage situation and modification occurs, when it reaches the point of requiring a permit there is an excess coverage mitigation program which can include payment of a fee in lieu of a coverage reduction. The greater the extent of over coverage the greater the fee. So it does make a difference what the underlying capability is when you come to modifying existing facilities.

Ms. Bedard asked what is a modification, adding on 500 sq. ft. or a second story?

Mr. Morgan stated there are a number of qualifying items. Structural changes, additions, repairs over $5,000, change in height, bulk, or additional land coverage. If the project is not exempt, it requires mitigation.

Ms. Bedard asked if someone were in an SEZ or class 1b and wanted to add a second story or do major modifications to their commercial business then the land classification could make it more costly to them and in some cases modifications or additions would not be allowed?
Mr. Morgan commented he was not aware of any instance where it would not be allowed based on the capability underlying the developed property. If coverage is over 100% on an SEZ, then as much as 5% of the construction costs would be paid as mitigation for the excess coverage. If anything less than 100%, the fee goes down to zero.

Vice Chairman Hansen asked if it was within the community plan would there be modification and mitigation, or would that be part of the community plan structure?

Mr. Morgan explained there is nothing in the ordinances that says the mitigation program is different in the community plan. However, there is a possibility the community plan could recommend and adopt amendments allowing ways of dealing with that situation.

Mr. Davis, a soil hydrologist, made reference to the seven test pits used to determine the land capabilities. The seven descriptions are typical of what is found in the area, however, we also looked at 25-30 feet of trench, we augered, used vegetation as an indicator, wetness, willows and aspens, and aerial photographs. He referred to the 100 year old alders growing out of the parking lot and the cracking of pavement which would suggest subgrade failure due to wetness.

Mr. Popoff stated that in determining SEZ it is basically the way vegetation picks up nutrients as it flows over the SEZ. Yet if you have a large area that is paved, how does that classify as an SEZ?

Mr. Davis explained it is what is beneath that area. The idea of land capability is to assess feasibly what the natural bodies were and to what extent they have been covered.

Mr. Popoff comment that having been extensively covered they are certainly not functioning as an SEZ.

Mr. Davis explained that from the standpoint of the hydrologic team it would be hydrologic group D, which means it would not accept water, so in effect the hydrologic groups, even though they are impervious, have the effect of allowing for surface runoff.

Mr. Morgan asked if pavement is treated as part of the soil that corresponds to an impervious type, is that typically low capability lands.

Mr. Davis replied it would be based on runoff, that would be a high runoff.

Mr. Morgan explained that we do not count pavement, we count the soil under it. If the soil is still characteristic of an SEZ, even though it is paved over with no vegetation, the soil still determines the existence of an SEZ.
man-modified because it is the Board's determination that requires certain commitments about mitigation. Tahoe Keys was an area wide determination and there was a mitigation commitment by the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association. In the case of Tahoe City, if it is an area wide determination there would have to be a commitment that there would be mitigation set. This is a specific set of findings and it is going to take time to put the information together on what mitigations are proposed.

Agatha Halley, representing Tahoe Tavern Property Owners Association, said she had concerns over the erosion happening at the lake front properties.

Vice Chairman Hansen explained that item should be brought up during the community planning process.

Marty Spitzer, Tahoe City resident, felt the recommendation by the APC should not be based on the fact that $8,000 has already been spent on a study and that the impact to the property owners should be considered.

Vice Chairman Hansen closed the meeting to public hearing.

Ms. Bedard asked if this puts the Commission in the position of changing the land capabilities?

Mr. Morgan explained that if approved by the Governing Board with APC's recommendations, these maps will become official. When a project is before the agency we will refer to these maps. If field verification is needed, we will go back out and be sure those boundaries are precisely where they should be. The individual has the right to challenge the land capabilities shown on the map. We would need new data to compare with what we have, but it is possible for a person to create or cause the agency to create a different land capability through the challenge process.

Vice Chairman Hansen requested APC's recommendations to the Governing Board.

Mr. Harper referenced page 7, the process of altered lands which is not identified in any ordinance or rules. That identification has resulted in some suggested changes, but not applying man-modified. If APC is to make the finding that this is man-modified, they can accept the criteria. If APC is not comfortable with that, then the report is incomplete.

Mr. Harper then made reference to page 8, Determination of Land Capability Under Man-Modification Findings, and stated if APC accepts the identification of altered lands criteria, the findings could be recommended by staff. If there is a feeling of insufficient data having been provided, and the items listed under man-modified findings should have been evaluated under altered lands criteria, the Commission's action is to identify which one of those items of information needs to be further evaluated by TRPA.
Mr. Poppoff referred to the definition of an SEZ and the key indicators one which has to do with vegetation.

Mr. Morgan replied there are a series of indicators, vegetation and soils being the physical indicators. You can have an SEZ without vegetation at all. That is the case where there is pavement.

Mr. Poppoff asked if water level below a certain depth does not have other vegetative indicators, would it be hard to classify it as an SEZ?

Mr. Budy explained that following Bailey all you need is one of the criteria, high groundwater, the correct soils, or vegetation.

Mr. Poppoff asked if the classification referred to has to do with residential parcels?

Mr. Budy explained that when the 208 plan is revised we are recommending adoption of the IPES criteria as being better in terms of setback criteria. Right now our setbacks are standard. The IPES criteria looks at setbacks differently and the way the primary and secondary indicators sort out.

Mr. Poppoff asked if when the 208 amendments are accepted could you go back and do a different map?

Mr. Budy commented that the team of experts already looked at both systems when they prepared the report. We asked them to prepare the SEZ under the Bailey System and to also give us the map under the IPES criteria.

Mary Harrington, Tahoe City resident, thought the idea of getting Tahoe City man-modified was to find a means of getting things done. Why did we do the report?

Mr. Morgan explained there are a lot of changes that were made and many of them are to the benefit of the people who own the property. It gives them a higher land capability to the extent they may wish to modify their projects and have greater flexibility to do that. To the extent it did not help them, it answered questions. It was important to know what we were working with to begin the study.

Terry Dyer, Tahoe City resident, commented on the conflicting information and why we have the "tool" if it does not have any effect on Tahoe City. If it does have an effect and there are some consequences, what are they? Mr. Dyer felt the process needed to be simplified.

Ms. Unsicker commented on the confusion over man-altered versus man-modified and did not think anybody would deny that the area has been man altered. Man-modified is a term which requires specific findings by both TRPA and the Lahontan Regional Board. Ms. Unsicker felt uncomfortable voting on
Mr. Marchio asked for an explanation between altered lands and man-modified lands.

Mr. Morgan explained that when we encounter something that is not natural, we consider it to be altered. If it is altered to the degree it qualifies as a man-modified condition using the findings, then it becomes more than altered, it becomes man-modified. If it has not been altered, there is no man-modification issue at all.

Mr. Marchio asked if in degree of disturbance altered is better than modified?

Mr. Morgan explained an altered condition could be very serious, but it might not have changed the land capability at all. For example, excavation of a pit, if excavated out of an area that is already classed as a pit and altered some more, does not make it better or worse it remains altered. One of the findings to be man-modified is that restoration is infeasible. If you have land that is badly trashed and the condition is poor but capable of being feasibly restored, it would not qualify as man-modified.

Vice Chairman Hansen referred to Tahoe Keys and that it was totally designated man-modified, yet when the Conservancy brought the Cove it is now being put back into a different state.

Mr. Morgan commented that was correct and that TRPA and Lahontan both declared Cove East to be man-modified and now find someone is prepared to restore it.

Vice Chairman Hansen asked where the definition of altered lands and the criteria to define altered lands is defined in the ordinances?

Mr. Barrett explained they had a problem with what is altered and what was not. The ordinance does not give criteria to determine whether it is natural or altered. The consultants used for land capability challenges and members of the IPES teams were asked how to determine when land is significantly altered. They determined it is a matter of professional judgement based on the indicators.

Mr. Pyle commented that either it is man-modified under the Code or it is not man-modified and we now have a set of criteria that no one has looked at before.

Mr. DeMello felt comfortable with staff’s recommendation in that altered lands covered the developed areas and these areas have vested rights for land coverage. The undeveloped lots do have a land capability and have been studied by the staff.
Ms. Bedard stated she was not comfortable with the introduction of altered criteria because it has never been discussed.

Mr. Hoefer viewed the term altered as a collective term for the changes in the land such as trees and vegetation being removed and replaced by buildings and pavement.

Ms. Unsicker stated that if there is a move toward a man-modified determination in the area, it should be done on a parcel-by-parcel basis because of the need to make findings about mitigation, feasibility, and restoration.

Mr. Pyle referenced page 19 and asked that (c) and (d) be supported by evidence.

Vice Chairman Hansen commented that better direction could have been given to staff in determining man-modified. The Community Plan asked for assistance in identifying man-modified and instead have determined those areas that are altered and have changed the terminology.

Motion made by Mr. Popoff to continue the public hearing to next month and directed the staff to complete the report and present to APC a reasoning for why certain areas in Tahoe City should not be classified as man-modified. Motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Marchio, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Glab, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Popoff, Mr. Harper, Ms. Bedard
Nays: Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. McCurry
Abstain: Mr. Reaves
Absent: Mr. Renz, Mr. Toll, Mr. Van Wagenen, Mr. Thrams, Mr. Combs, Ms. Becker

B. Identification of Threshold Indicators, Targets, and Related Matters, Chapter 32, (Regional Plan and Threshold Review)

Chief of Long Range Planning, Dave Ziegler, presented Chapter 32 identifying the means and time schedules for attaining and maintaining TRPA thresholds and other local, state, and federal standards. Mr. Ziegler explained Chapter 32 was behind schedule and stressed the need to move ahead and would like to have action taken in August as a companion to the 208 Plan by the APC and Governing Board. A summary of the provisions of Chapter 32 was given.

An index of thresholds and applicable state, federal, and local air and water quality standards to which Chapter 32 will apply was developed. Development of this index was coordinated with the TRPA Monitoring Committee and the draft Monitoring Work Program so that Chapter 32 materials and the Monitoring Work Program share a common index. An Environmental Threshold Compliance Form was also developed which displays all the information required for each threshold and standard.
Discussions followed regarding trend lines relating to interim targets, setting priorities for specific measures, and the Capital Improvements Program for attainment of standards.

Vice Chairman Hansen opened the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Hoffman, on behalf of the Preservation Council, had a concern with the target date of 2005 and how to achieve attainment. Suggested the assumptions be written up so in the future they can be referred to as to what the assumptions were and their projected target date.

Mr. Ziegler suggested that where there was cross referencing of other documents we will make sure citations are complete so that assumptions can be tracked down in the future. When making new assumptions, we will make reference in the document.

Mr. Pyle made a motion to continue the public hearing to next month. Second Mr. Harper.

C. Amendment of the Draft Water Quality Management (208) Plan and Related Draft EIS

With the 208 plan being presented at the Governing Board meeting on August 24 and 25 the APC felt a workshop while the 208 document was still in draft form was in order. A workshop was scheduled for August 3 with recommendations to be presented to APC at the August 10 meeting. A special meeting will be held August 19 for final action by APC.

David Ziegler, Chief of Long Range Planning, presented the draft 208 plan focusing on Volume I, the Water Quality Management Plan and summarized the structure and logic used in preparing Volume I.

Mr. Pyle asked why the BMP handbook was included in the 208 plan.

Mr. Ziegler explained that many supporters wanted the 208 plan to be as substantive and detailed as possible. In the process of adopting the 208 plan and getting the state's certification and EPA's approval, we plan to make it very clear that in certifying and approving the 208 plan that they are accepting the concept that in the future amendments will be made to Volumes II, III and IV.

Vice Chairman Harper asked for APC comments. There were no comments.

Vice Chairman Harper opened the public hearing. No one in the audience wished to comment.

Motion was made to continue the public hearing to next month.
VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Agency Executive Director Bill Morgan received a letter from APC member John Glab stating he was resigning effective July 31, 1988.

Motion made by Ms. Bedard to have a resolution prepared for action at August 10 APC meeting. Motion carried.

B. Legal Counsel

Agency counsel Susan Scholley advised that Judge Gamble disqualified himself from the Kelly and Newton cases in state court. Waiting for a decision from the Ninth Circuit in the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council case. No hearing on the billboard litigation in El Dorado County, it is currently scheduled for July 27. No decision from Judge Thompson in the Kelly I case on TRPA's motion to dismiss the claims with respect to the Regional Plans.

C. APC Members

Mr. Pyle asked Mr. Morgan what he found out about the Vikingsholm parking lot situation. The lot has now been closed.

Mr. Morgan explained he talked with Bob McComber who is aware of that problem. He is working with Caltrans on a solutions, but has not come up with any.

Mr. Hoefer commented on the situation at Emerald Bay and said Caltrans has a major project coming up which will close the road for a sizeable portion of time for a number of years. The forest service and the state parks also have projects. It seems this could have come together at one time.

On another matter Mr. Pyle referred to the Buehler Reclassification of Land Capability that has been on the agenda for several months and wanted to know the status.

Mr. Buty explained it was being continued until August because of new findings that were made within the last week.

Mr. Pyle presented a product called Ice B Gone deicer that is being used by Caltrans at Mammoth.

Mr. Morgan explained there would be another workshop with the road maintaining agencies to discuss the choice of materials for the winter at which time he would present Ice B Gone.

Ms. Bedard referred to the Vikingsholm situation and felt shuttle service to the Vikingsholm during the construction would be very helpful.
D. Public Interest Comments

Steve Teshara, Preservation Council, said there will be a reception for the California Air Resources Board and staff at the Tamarack Ballroom of the High Sierra, July 14, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

VII CORRESPONDENCE

None

VIII PENDING MATTERS

Vice Chairman Harper reminded the board of the 208 workshop August 3, APC meeting August 10, and special meeting of the 208 plan August 19.

IX ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Roxie Hutting
Secretary, Long Range Planning

This meeting was taped in its entirety. An one wishing to listen to the tape may call for an appointment at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

August 3, 1988

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Public Hearing and Recommendation -- Recommendation on Certification of Environmental Impact Statement for Amendment of Water Quality Management Plan and Amendment of Water Quality Management Plan (Section 208 of the Clean Water Act)

TRPA has prepared the draft water quality management (208) plan under section 208 of the federal Clean Water Act. The draft plan is in five volumes:

- Volume I: Water Quality Management Plan
- Volume II: Handbook of Best Management Practices
- Volume III: SEZ Protection and Restoration Program
- Volume IV: Capital Improvements Program for Erosion and Runoff Control
- Volume V: Summary

TRPA, a designated areawide planning agency under section 208 of the Clean Water Act, adopted a 208 plan for the Tahoe Region in 1981 ("1981 208 plan"). Nevada and California certified the plan with conditions, and EPA approved the plan, also with conditions.

At this time, TRPA proposes to amend the 1981 208 plan to make it consistent with recent amendments to the TRPA's Regional Plan, which cannot be fully implemented without the amendments. There are three key concepts in the TRPA Regional Plan which make these amendments necessary: (1) IPES, (2) new policies for the regulation of land coverage based on the concepts of base land coverage, coverage transfers, and mitigation of excess coverage, and (3) refined policies for the protection of SEZs.

The proposed 208 amendments constitute an EIS under Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, and include a discussion of impacts which is tiered off a series of environmental documents prepared by TRPA since 1980. These documents discuss the environmental, social, and economic impacts of the thresholds, the Goals and Policies, the Code of Ordinances, the Plan Area Statements, and the Regional Transportation Plan, and are included in the impact analysis by reference. They are available for public inspection at the TRPA offices.
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The 50-day circulation period on the proposed 208 amendments began on June 10, 1988, and ends on August 8, 1988, at 5 p.m. The staff plans to have the proposed amendments before the Governing Board for action in August, 1988. TRPA adoption is necessary prior to submission to the states and EPA for their concurrent review.

The impact analysis evaluates the environmental, social, and economic impacts of the proposed 208 amendments and three alternatives: (1) the No-Growth Alternative, (2) the No-Action Alternative, and (3) the Hybrid Alternative.

The No-Growth Alternative provides a baseline for comparison and represents the existing situation "on the ground," with application of the corrective and remedial measures for water quality management. The No-Action Alternative consists of implementation of the 1981 208 plan, which TRPA adopted in 1981 to protect water quality until adoption of environmental thresholds and a revised Regional Plan. The Hybrid Alternative adds several water quality programs to the 1981 plan which are absent from the 1981 plan but which TRPA is already implementing.

Volume II, the Handbook of Best Management Practices, includes sections on temporary BMPs, permanent BMPs, vegetative soil stabilization practices, shorezone practices, and miscellaneous BMPs.

Volume III, the SEZ Protection and Restoration Program, contains sections on SEZ protection and restoration policies and SEZ restoration project descriptions. Altogether, 48 separate projects are described, with a combined acreage of about 450 acres.

Volume IV, the Capital Improvements Program for erosion and runoff control, contains sections covering program history, goals and policies, priorities, institutional roles, anticipated revenues and expenses, program update process, CIF maps, and project lists.

The draft water quality management plan and related draft EIS are scheduled for a public hearing at the August 10 meeting. There will also be a special APC meeting on August 19 for further consideration of the APC recommendations. Please bring your copies of the draft 208 plan with you to the meetings. Staff will have some extra copies available for those who need them during the public hearing.

If you have any questions or comments on this agenda item, please contact Dave Ziegler or Jerry Budy at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

August 3, 1988

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Susan E. Scholley, Agency Counsel

Subject: Amendment of Chapters 36 (Interim Single Family Review System) and 20 (Land Coverage) of the Code of Ordinances to Provide For Review of Certain Residential Parcels in Tyrolian Village, Washoe County

BACKGROUND: In adopting the Goals and Policies, TRPA included the following policy:

"For parcels located in Tyrolian Village Units #1-5, for which complete applications were filed and accepted pursuant to the Agreement Between the Tyrolian Village Association, Inc. And The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Regarding Erosion Control Improvements And Reclassification Of Upper Tyrolian Village" dated May 26, 1983, an interim system shall be developed and implemented by ordinance."

Chapter 33 of the Code began implementation of the regional plan policy by setting aside unused case-by-case allocations for use by certain parcels in Tyrolian Village [§33.2.D(1)(f)]. It is important to note that only a limited number of parcels (approximately 33) are potentially affected by these amendments. Although the phrase "Tyrolian Village" is used as a shorthand reference, this ordinance does not affect all vacant parcels in Tyrolian Village. A list of the parcels which are potentially affected by this ordinance is attached as Exhibit A.

On August 21, 1987, Tyrolian Village Association, Inc. filed a complaint against TRPA in U.S. District Court, District of Nevada. The complaint alleged, among other things, that TRPA breached its "contract" with Tyrolian Village. The contract referred to is the May 1983 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which required Tyrolian Village to implement three phases of subdivision water quality improvements and which reclassified Tyrolian Village as a "potentially adequate" subdivision under Ordinance 81-5 (Case-By-Case Review) and thus permitted residential projects in Tyrolian Village to be approved under the case-by-case system. The complaint also alleges misrepresentation and unconstitutional action by TRPA.
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AGENDA ITEM IV C.
The identified group of eligible parcels are those which had a pending case-by-case application on file but which were not approved prior to the August 26, 1983 moratorium imposed by the TRPA Board. Tyrolian Village claims that, under the MOU, these pending projects are entitled to an approval under the case-by-case system. TRPA does not believe that the MOU guaranteed all pending applications an approval. In fact, TRPA completed review on 34 of the 67 applications submitted under the Tyrolian Village MOU (28 approved, 6 denied).

Attached as Exhibit B is a memorandum to the Nevada Legislative Subcommittee on the Tyrolian Village MOU which provides additional detail.

ANALYSIS: The proposed amendments are intended to further implement the regional plan policy cited above and to resolve the pending federal litigation.

Chapter 20: The amendment to Chapter 20 is necessary to allow for the creation of land coverage in land capability districts 1, 2 and 3.

Chapter 36: Although these parcels will receive IPES scores and be eligible under Chapter 37, they also have another alternative. The additional alternative is proposed in recognition of Tyrolian Village's claims and to resolve the pending litigation.

The amendments to Chapter 36 permit certain parcels in Tyrolian Village to apply for a new residential unit outside of the eligibility restrictions set by Chapter 37 and the remainder of Chapter 36.

Coverage will be mitigated by transfers of coverage as set forth in Chapter 20. The referenced Code sections are attached as Exhibit C for the reader's convenience. The coverage calculation for PUDs and the transfer provisions are basin-wide policies and their application to Tyrolian Village is therefore consistent with the regional plan.

Because the areawide coverage of Tyrolian Village is unknown, it is not possible to determine the allowable base coverage of the building envelopes and to know what amount of coverage would have to be mitigated by transfer. Assuming that only 500 square feet of each building pad is allowable base coverage, the estimated transfer fee for the remaining 2000 square feet of coverage would be $10,000. We have recommended that Tyrolian Village consider a PUD coverage survey since it will be necessary in any event under IPES and for modifications to developed parcels.

The amendment to Chapter 36 makes clear that residential projects on these certain Tyrolian Village parcels will otherwise comply with the new Code. The primary areas of effect are:
1) height  2) water quality mitigation  3) air quality

Height rules (Chapter 22) are currently more restrictive than the height ordinance in effect in Nevada in 1983. A preliminary survey of the eligible parcels indicates that most projects would have to be redesigned to meet current height limits.

The water quality mitigation fees which would have been required under the case-by-case ordinance ranged from $4,000 to $8,000. The new Code fees would be in the $725 range.

There were no air quality mitigation fees required in 1983. Under the new Code a fee of $1,000 is required for each new residential unit.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: TRPA proposes to prepare an environmental assessment to determine whether an environmental impact statement is necessary. The environmental assessment will not be initiated until the proposed amendments appear to be acceptable to the parties in litigation.

ACTION REQUESTED: In order to begin the process of working out a resolution, counsel asks that APC review and comment on the proposed amendments and open a public hearing to take testimony.

TRPA has not received any comments from Tyrolian Village or affected property owners. If such comments are received before the APC meeting, you will be so advised at the August 10 meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me.
CASE-BY-CASE APPLICATIONS IN TYROLIAN VILLAGE
WITHIN MOU BETWEEN WASHOE/TRPA TYROLIAN VILLAGE

oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821106 ..... 126-430-24
oddo/ballard.................................. 821086 ..... 126-440-10
oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821104 ..... 126-470-16
wilson,w...................................... 83546 ..... 126-490-05
ling,l........................................ 821126 ..... 126-500-05
oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821142 ..... 126-500-11
oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821140 ..... 126-500-13
oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821114 ..... 126-500-14
oddo/tulipani................................. 821092 ..... 126-510-14
oddo/tulipani................................. 821110 ..... 126-510-18
oddo/tulipani................................. 821102 ..... 126-530-09
clumm,w..................................... 821148 ..... 126-550-01
townsend,r.................................. 83548 ..... 126-550-03
diamond,j.................................... 83406 ..... 126-550-08
leuthold...................................... 821084 ..... 126-550-09
himmelright................................ 82948 ..... 126-550-12
anderson,p.................................. 821122 ..... 126-550-13
jonkman,r.................................. 83250 ..... 126-570-15
purcell....................................... 82892 ..... 126-570-18
oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821144 ..... 126-570-24
oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821088 ..... 126-570-26
oddo/tulipani................................. 821096 ..... 126-570-27
kuhnes/oddo.................................. 821090 ..... 126-570-28
meyers,c.................................... 821158 ..... 126-570-30
hawes,d.................................... 821128 ..... 126-580-04
oddo/tulipani................................. 821094 ..... 126-580-07
coburn,k.................................... 83550 ..... 126-580-11
cooper,s.................................... 821146 ..... 126-580-18
oddo/kuhnes.................................. 821112 ..... 126-580-21
oddo/tulipani................................. 821138 ..... 126-580-23
oddo/tulipani................................. 821098 ..... 126-590-07
oddo/tulipani................................. 821100 ..... 126-590-10

EXHIBIT A
MEMORANDUM

April 15, 1986

To: Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Review Activities of TRPA

From: Susan E. Scholley, TRPA Legal Counsel

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding Between Tyrolian Village Association, Inc and TRPA Regarding Erosion Control Improvements and Reclassification of Upper Tyrolian Village

BACKGROUND: After the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact was amended December 19, 1980, TRPA adopted certain amendments to its Water Quality Plan (commonly referred to as the "208 Plan" because it was adopted pursuant to Section 208 of the Federal Clean Water Act). Those amendments were adopted in TRPA Ordinance 81-5 and provided for an interim system of case-by-case review of single family homes located in land capability districts 1 - 3.

The system required classification of each subdivision in the Tahoe Basin as either "adequate," "potentially adequate," or "in need of further consideration." Only lots in subdivisions classified as "adequate" or "potentially adequate" were eligible for case-by-case review. Upon receipt of an application in an eligible subdivision, the particular lot was reviewed to determine what risk class it fell into for each of four impact factors. A high risk rating in any one of the four disqualified the lot from further consideration. (See Exhibit "B" - TRPA Case-By-Case Lot Review Criteria.)

The deadline for case-by-case applications was originally in 1982 but the application deadline was extended until May 29, 1983. The expiration of the interim review system was finally set for August 28, 1983, or the adoption of the amendments to the regional plan, whichever came first. Although the TRPA Governing Board gave first reading in July of 1983 to an ordinance extending the case-by-case processing deadline to November 28, 1983, the ordinance was never adopted.

On August 26, 1983, TRPA Governing Board adopted Resolution 83-21. Resolution 83-21 suspended all processing of pending applications and prohibited the acceptance of any new applications. Thus, the case-by-case review procedure effectively expired on August 26, 1983.

CURRENT SITUATION: Upper Tyrolian Village had been classified as a subdivision "in need of further improvements" in 1982. On May 26, 1983, TRPA and Tyrolian Village Association entered into an agreement whereby Tyrolian Village, on behalf of the property owners in Upper Tyrolian Village (Units Nos. 1 - 5), agreed to construct erosion control and drainage improvements in the subdivision and TRPA agreed to reclassify the subdivision as "potentially adequate."
The effect of the reclassification of the subdivision was to allow Upper Tyrolian applications to get beyond the first hurdle of the case-by-case review system. Some applications had been filed in 1982 and were being held pending reclassification of the subdivision pursuant to the expected agreement. Another group of applications were filed in late May of 1983.

Of the approximately 67 applications filed, 6 fell into a high risk category and were rejected, 28 were approved, and 33 applications remain on file with no action having been taken.

The MOU between Upper Tyrolian Village and TRPA called for three phases of improvements. According to Robert Ingres' testimony at the last committee meeting, Phases I and II (total cost approximately $200,000) have been completed. These first two phases were funded by an assessment on the properties in Upper Tyrolia as agreed to in the MOU. Phase III has not been started. Phase III (total cost approximately $230,000) is to be funded by the mitigation fees generated from the case-by-case approvals. Mitigation fees are fees paid to offset the water quality impacts of construction. The fee schedule was implemented through Ordinance 81-5 and the fees collected were held in trust for the counties and were earmarked for erosion control projects. Most of these mitigation fees were not collected because most of those approved did not pay their mitigation fees before May 1, 1984.

On May 1, 1984, the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, prohibited any TRPA approval of construction. The court construed that to include acceptance of mitigation fees and delivery of permits to prior approvals. Thus, the so-called 199 case-by-case approvals often discussed over the last two years in the context of the settlement of the litigation, include about 28 Upper Tyrolian Village case-by-case approvals.

If all the projects ultimately proceed and pay the required mitigation fees, the amount collected would be approximately $130,000. The average mitigation fee for the Upper Tyrolian group was $4600.

The disposition of this matter is largely dependent on the revised policies and ordinances of the TRPA. Policies being proposed today would establish a new system to consider eligibility of lands such as are found in Tyrolian Village. Most parcels would have some prospects for development in the future.
20.3 Land Coverage Limitations: No person shall create land coverage in excess of the limitations set forth in this chapter. The means to determine base land coverage, the manner to transfer land coverage and prohibitions of certain land coverage are set forth in this Section.

20.3.A Base Land Coverage Requirements: The allowable base land coverage ("base coverage") shall be determined by using the coefficients set forth in the report entitled, Land Capability Classifications of the Lake Tahoe Basin, Bailey, R. G. 1974. These coefficients are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lands Located In Land Capability District*</th>
<th>Base Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a, 1b, 1c</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lands located in Geomorphic Group I are classified land capability district 1 and are permitted one percent coverage.

(1) General Rule: Except as provided in Subparagraphs 20.3.A(2), (3) and (4), the coefficients shall be applied to the project area in accordance with Subsection 20.3.D.

(2) Parcels In TRPA-Approved Subdivisions In Conformance With The Bailey Coefficients: In TRPA-approved subdivisions where TRPA applied the coefficients on a subdivision-wide basis, and allowable coverages then were assigned to individual parcels, the assigned coverages shall be the base coverages for those parcels. The list of TRPA-approved subdivision in conformance with Bailey coefficients is Attachment D to the Goals and Policies.

(3) Parcels In Existing Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) Not In Conformance With The Bailey Coefficients: To determine the allowable base coverage for parcels within an existing PUD, the coefficients shall be applied to the entire PUD. This total allowable coverage, minus existing the common area facilities coverage, shall be divided among the individual parcels in proportion to their respective sizes whether developed or not. Public rights-of-way shall not be included in the calculation. Accordingly, the method of calculation is as follows: first, the area of public rights-of-way is not to be counted; second, allowable base...
coverage for the remaining area in the PUD is calculated; third, the amount of existing coverage of common areas is subtracted; fourth, the remaining coverage is divided among the individual parcels and common area, in proportion to size. In no case shall parcels of individual ownership be assigned an allowable base coverage of less than zero.

Example of calculation:

PUD Example: Five acre PUD (not including public rights-of-way) with 10 individual 50 x 50 parcels located in Land Capability District 4. Existing common area improvements such as parking, tennis court, and recreation center = 30,000 square feet of land coverage.

PUD size (217,800) x Coverage Coefficient (20%) = Allowable Base Coverage (43,560)

Allowable Base Coverage (43,560) - Existing Improvements (30,000) = Remaining Allowable Base Coverage (13,560)

Remaining Allowable Base Coverage (13,560) ÷ Number of Parcels (10) = Allowable Base Coverage Per Parcel (1,350)

(4) Relationship To IPES: Except as set forth in (2) and (3) above, the Individual Parcel Evaluation System ("IPES") ratings shall be used to determine allowable coverage for single family houses subject to IPES pursuant to Chapter 37.

20.3.B Transferred Land Coverage Requirements: In addition to the base coverage prescribed by Subsection 20.3.A, land coverage may be transferred to a parcel pursuant to Subsection 20.3.C. Parcels and uses eligible for transfer of land coverage are set forth in this Subsection. The aggregate of base coverage and coverage transferred shall not exceed the limitations set forth below:

(1) Residential Facilities (1 to 4 Units): The maximum land coverage (base coverage plus transferred coverage) allowed on a parcel for residential facilities of four units or less is the coverage allowed pursuant to the coefficients in Subsection 20.3.A, or as follows, whichever is greater:
(a) Maximum Parcel Coverages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Maximum Land Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4,000</td>
<td>Base Land Coverage Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>1,800 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 14,000</td>
<td>20% of Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,001 - 16,000</td>
<td>2,900 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>3,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 25,000</td>
<td>3,100 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>3,200 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 40,000</td>
<td>3,300 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>3,400 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - 70,000</td>
<td>3,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,001 - 90,000</td>
<td>3,600 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,001 - 120,000</td>
<td>3,700 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,001 - 150,000</td>
<td>3,800 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,001 - 200,000</td>
<td>3,900 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001 - 400,000</td>
<td>4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Planned Unit Developments: For parcels in planned unit developments, the maximum coverage allowed shall be 100 percent of the proposed building envelope or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less. Parcels in PUDs with five or more units per parcel are considered multi-residential and regulated pursuant to Subparagraph 20.3.B(3).

(c) Special Transfer Programs: Parcels in subdivisions with TRPA-approved transfer programs may be permitted the coverage specified by that approval. The only subdivision with such a program, as of the effective date of the Regional Plan, is Cave Rock Estates, Unit No. 3. The Cave Rock Estates, Unit No. 3 transfer program is set forth in the TRPA March 23, 1978 approval of that subdivision.

(d) Driveways: The maximum limits in Subparagraph 20.3.B(1)(a) may be increased by a transfer of land coverage for a driveway built in accordance with the standards in Chapter 27, which is to be created in connection with the construction of a single family house on an existing parcel, provided TRPA finds that:

(i) The construction will not result in a residential structure with land coverage greater than that permitted in Subparagraph 20.3.B(1) minus 400 square feet; and
July 20, 1988

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Goals and Policies, the Code of Ordinances, and Plan Area Statements to Implement Approved Recreation Recommendations

The Recommended Action

The recommended action is to review the amendments to the Goals and Policies, the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Plan Area Statements as proposed (see attached text), and recommend their adoption by the Governing Board.

Background

Subsection 13.5.L of the TRPA Code of Ordinances required a study of the allocation of recreation capacity in the Tahoe Basin. The study was conducted by a subcommittee of the APC with participation also by interested members of the public.

The committee reported the results of the study to the APC with specific recommendations for allocation of recreation capacity. The APC recommended some changes to be made and sent the report to the Governing Board with a recommendation for acceptance (Attachment A). The Governing Board accepted the recommendations of the APC regarding recreation capacity on October 29, 1987, and directed staff to prepare the Amendments to the Goals and Policies, the Code, and Plan Area Statements, to implement the recommendations.

Summary of Recommendations

The purpose of the recommendations was to clarify the relationship of the recreation subelements of the Goals and Policies and to promote consistency among the Goals and Policies, Chapter 18 uses and other provisions of the Code. The Goals and Policies divide recreation into three Subelements - Dispersed Recreation, Developed Recreation, and Urban Recreation.

Dispersed Recreation: Dispersed recreation consists of low density uses which, according to the Goals and Policies, require few or no developed facilities. Support facilities may be necessary to provide access or protect the land. The...
Goals and Policies do not call for the allocation of PAOTs (people at one time) for dispersed recreation. Dispersed recreation uses are limited by the environmental capability of the land or resource base. The committee's recommendation was to clarify that dispersed recreation and supporting facilities are not subject to PAOT limitations.

Developed Recreation: The Goals and Policies state that the Tahoe Basin is a destination for many outdoor enthusiasts. Developed recreation is generally aimed at providing facilities for those visitors. PAOT capacity was reserved, both as a target and a limitation, in order to assure that a fair share of the Basin's capacity would be available to develop outdoor recreation. These targets and limitations are set forth in Goal #1, Policy 3 for winter day use, summer day use, and overnight use. There is no recommendation to change the target/limitations numbers.

The PAOT capacities for developed recreation facilities were developed primarily through the state and federal agencies which bear the principal responsibility for such facilities. Therefore, it was recommended that the PAOT allocations should apply primarily to developed recreation facilities on state and federal lands. Exceptions include downhill ski facilities, overnight facilities, marinas and boat launching facilities, all of which will continue to require PAOTs.

The Goals and Policies state that recreational facilities should be developed in response to demonstrated need. The recommendations included the creation of pools of 1,000 overnight PAOTs and 6,761 summer day use PAOTs with a minimum of 2,000 summer day use PAOTs to be used for marina and boat launch facilities.

The pools would allow the flexibility to develop facilities where there is a demonstrated need for recreational facilities but no PAOTs have been allocated. Recreation projects would have to be consistent otherwise with the PAS, the Goals and Policies and the Code, including the recreation list, in order to draw from the PAOT pools. The recreation list, which was not envisioned at the adoption of the Goals and Policies, requires findings which eliminate the need for the details in the PASs.

Urban Recreation: Urban-oriented recreation is provided chiefly provided by local governments such as cities, counties, or public utilities districts to serve the recreational needs of the community. Some urban recreation needs could also be met by private entities. The Goals and Policies do not require PAOT allocation for urban recreation. They indicate that the local governments or service districts should anticipate the recreational demand in order to reserve public service capacity for future
expansion or development needs as determined by local residents and local governments. Therefore, it was recommended that urban recreation should not be subject to PAOT allocations. Local governments should be encouraged to prepare master recreation plans which could be integrated into a basinwide five year recreation plan.

Proposed Amendments

Staff have studied the Goals and Policies, the Code of Ordinances, and plan area statements to determine what amendments are necessary in order to implement the approved recommendations.

Goals And Policies: The introductory statement to Chapter V, Recreation Element, should be amended to provide a clearer description of the types of recreation opportunities available in the Tahoe Basin.

The recommended wording is consistent with the table of permissible uses in Chapter 18. For example, summer home tracts are classed as residential units, picnic areas and overlooks are day use areas, and urban athletic and playing fields are participant sport facilities.

The introductory statement for the Developed Recreation Subelement should be amended to clarify what constitutes developed recreation and also to be consistent with Chapter 18.

Goal #1, Policy 3, (Page V - 5, paragraph 4), the last sentence is inaccurate, and should be deleted. Under the current Code, Chapter 13 requires the type and size of each proposed recreational facility in order to be included in the five year recreation list. In addition, the sentence contradicts the first two sentences of the statement following Goal #2: "The appropriate type of outdoor recreational development should depend on demonstrated need. The rate of development should be responsive to demand," and Policy 1, "Expansion of recreational facilities and opportunities should be in response to demand." It is not possible to predict accurately what direction recreational demand will take in the future, so flexibility in planning within other regulatory constraints should be retained.

The Code of Ordinances: Chapter 13 needs to be amended to allow for the creation of PAOT pools for overnight and summer day uses. The over-all PAOT capacity will not be increased. The final sentence in subsection 13.5.L will be superseded by this action and should be deleted.

Subsection 33.6 needs to be amended to provide for
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allocation and administration of recreational capacity in accordance with the recommendations.

The Plan Area Statements: The listed changes in the plan area statements are necessary to create the PAOT pools as recommended.

Environmental Impacts

The recommended changes are administrative in nature, with a restructuring of the form of regulation. The proposed amendments would provide consistency between the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances. There would not be an increase in the number of PAOTs. Distribution and allocation of winter day use PAOTs would be unchanged, and overnight PAOTs would be somewhat changed. All recreation projects would continue to be subject to the regulations pertaining to site development which would not be changed by these amendments.

Past modeling of traffic impacts due to full development of the reserved recreation capacity indicate that a net reduction in VMTs would result. This is attributed to shortening of vehicle trips as new recreation facilities are provided near residential and tourist centers. In addition, there could be greater use of alternative transportation such as bicycles, walking or public transit.

Adoption of the proposed amendments is not expected to create any significant environmental impacts.
RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN THE CODE OF ORDINANCES

Subsection 13.5.L:

Additional Developed Outdoor Recreation: Each plan area statement shall specify the amount of additional developed outdoor recreation allowed. Additional recreational capacity shall be measured in people at one time (PAOT) for the following categories: winter day use, which includes downhill ski facilities; overnight uses, which include developed campgrounds, recreation vehicle parks, and group facilities; and certain summer day uses, which include marinas and boat launching facilities, intensive beach use except as provided to meet local urban needs, and visitor information centers. Recreation capacity beyond that amount specified in the plan area statements may be drawn from pools reserved for summer day uses and overnight uses. Such reserved capacity shall be allocated upon listing pursuant to Subsection 33.6 or to a specific plan area pursuant to 13.7.A. and shall be consistent with the targets for outdoor recreation set forth in 33.6.A.(4)(c). The pools of reserved recreation capacity shall consist of 1,000 overnight PAOT and 6,761 summer day use PAOT. (This subsection shall be reviewed for possible amendment since the study being undertaken by TRPA on the use of PAOT is completed but not later than September 1/1/1987.)

Subsection 33.6.A(4)(c):

The project is consistent with TRPA 20-year targets for outdoor recreation, which are 6,114 persons at one time ("PAOT") in overnight facilities, 6,761 PAOT in summer day-use facilities, and 12,400 PAOT in winter day-use facilities, as well as the allocations set forth in the plan area statements or the pools of reserved PAOT capacity.
33.6.B Maximum Amount and Distribution of Recreation Development: A maximum amount of recreation development is targeted and permitted for development from January 1, 1987 to December 31, 2006. TRPA shall keep a cumulative accounting of recreation allocation in persons at one time (PAOT) as applicable. The allocation and distribution shall be as follows:

1. Dispersed Recreation: Dispersed recreation and support facilities are not subject to the limitations of Section 33.6.

2. Developed Outdoor Recreation: Developed outdoor recreation is subject to the limitations of Subsection 33.6.A and the standards below:

   a. Summer Day Use: Additional summer day use capacity shall be allocated and distributed as follows:

      i. Uses subject to summer day use PAOT regulation include marinas and boat launching facilities, rural sports, golf courses, visitor information centers, off road vehicle courses, and all developed beach recreation and day use facilities owned or operated by the states’ Departments of Parks and Recreation and federal agencies. New developed cross country ski and snowmobile courses shall be planned in conjunction with and secondary to existing or new summer day use or overnight facilities. PAOT capacity shall apply to the primary use.

      ii. There shall be a pool of 6,761 PAOT for summer day use facilities. A minimum of 2,000 of the summer day use PAOT shall be reserved for expansion of marinas and boat launching facilities.

      iii) Initial PAOT allocation for summer day uses shall be made on project listing pursuant to 33.6.A, or may be initially allocated to a plan
area. The final PAOT allocation shall be set forth in the approval of the project. If the project is not completed prior to the expiration of the permit, the PAOT allocation shall expire with the permit, and the allocation shall automatically return to the pool. PAOT allocation for expansion of marinas and boat launching facilities shall require approval of a master plan except as noted in Section 16.1.

(c) Winter Day Use:

(i) Uses subject to winter day use regulation include all downhill ski facilities.

(ii) There shall be 12,400 winter day use PAOT for downhill ski areas. All winter day use PAOT shall be distributed in the plan area statements.

(iii) Administration: Expansion of use in ski areas requires the approval of a master plan pursuant to Chapter 16.

(d) Overnight Use:

(i) Uses subject to overnight PAOT regulation include developed campgrounds, group facilities, and recreational vehicle parks.

(ii) There shall be 6,114 PAOTs for overnight uses, of which 5,114 shall be distributed in the plan area statements. The remaining 1,000 overnight PAOTs may be allocated to overnight uses meeting the criteria set forth in 33.6.A and 33.6.B(a)(ii) which would be located in plan areas where there are no PAOTs specified in the plan area or the amounts specified are insufficient.

(iii) To be eligible for overnight PAOT allocation from the pool, sites must retain or be restored to an
essentially natural setting, include outdoor living amenities such as tables and fire pits, and offer access to outdoor recreational opportunities such as hiking trails, public beaches, and fishing.

(iv) Initial PAOT allocation from the reserve overnight use pool shall be made on project listing pursuant to 33.6.A, or may be allocated to a plan area. The final PAOT allocation shall be set forth in the approval of the project. If the project is not completed prior to the expiration of the permit, the PAOT allocation shall expire with the permit, and the allocation shall automatically return to the pool.

(3) Urban Recreation: Urban Recreation uses are subject to Subsection 33.6.A. Urban recreation includes outdoor and indoor recreational facilities provided or operated primarily by local governments for use by local residents. Urban recreation uses include recreation centers, participant sport facilities, sport assembly, and beach recreation and day use areas not operated by state or federal agencies and are not subject to PAOT regulation. All such uses owned or operated by the state's Departments of Parks and Recreation or by federal agencies shall be subject to summer day use PAOT standards set forth in subparagraph 33.6.B(2).

(4) Other Recreational Facilities: Other permissible recreation facilities including riding and hiking trails, undeveloped campgrounds, and outdoor recreation concessions shall be subject to Subsection 33.6.A, but shall not be subject to PAOT limitations.
Subsection 18.3:

TABLE OF PRIMARY USES

V. RECREATION

| Beach recreation               | Outdoor recreation concessions |
| Boat launching facilities     | Participant sports facilities |
| Cross country ski courses     | Recreation centers            |
| Day use areas                 | Recreational vehicle parks    |
| Developed campgrounds         | Riding and hiking trails      |
| Downhill ski facilities       | Rural sports                  |
| Golf courses                  | Snowmobile courses            |
| Group facilities              | Sport assembly                |
| Marinas                       | Undeveloped campgrounds       |
| Off road vehicle courses      | Visitor information centers   |
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FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE APC RECREATION SUBCOMMITTEE
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Attachment A. Overnight PACT Pool Criteria
Attachment B. Staff Addendum

I. INTRODUCTION

The adoption of the Plan Area Statements and the Code of Ordinances describing the recreational capacity of persons at one time (PACT) assignment as both a target and a limitation prompted considerable concern, especially among local recreation providers. Several expressed the opinion that they had not received their fair share in the allocation of available PACTs. As a result, an APC committee was appointed to study the use of PACTs. The committee and a number of interested members of the community have been meeting regularly to study recreation allocation and develop this set of recommendations.

The term PACT came from the U. S. Forest Service which uses the term to measure the normal design capacity of its recreation facilities. The term is not intended to apply to peak use which occurs occasionally.

The capacity for developed recreation identified in the Goals and Policies was primarily developed through the state and federal agencies. Therefore, the committee recommends that the PACT targets/limitations on recreation capacity should apply primarily to state and federal lands. Exceptions, which include dispersed recreation, downhill skiing facilities, overnight facilities, and marinas, are addressed in detail below.

The Goals and Policies refer to the use of PACTs only in relation to preserving a fair share of the Basin's capacity for specified developed outdoor recreation. The Goals and Policies state that public service and facility capacity for urban recreation is to be acquired and managed by local government or service districts. Therefore, the committee recommends that PACTs should not be required for urban recreation unless further study identifies a need to do so.
The committee viewed flexibility as essential in the allocation of PAOTs, but still desires to maintain stability in the allocations. The committee recommends that pools of unallocated overnight and day use PAOTs be made available for private parties to use for developed recreation projects or in Plan Areas where no PAOTs have been assigned. The Plan Areas Statements should be amended to provide for the creation of the PAOT pools. The five-year recreation list should provide a method for keeping account of how all the available PAOTS are used, and how many remain available from both those preassigned in the PASS and the pools.

II. RELATION TO THE GOALS AND POLICIES

The Recreation Element of the Goals and Policies makes it very clear that three major categories of recreation, dispersed, developed, and urban, are to be provided in the Tahoe Basin. While recreation as a whole was given a high priority, no priorities were set among the three categories.

The Recreation Element does not distinguish clearly between the types of facilities which may be considered as developed or urban recreation. The difference is that urban recreation and developed outdoor recreation are intended to serve different publics. It is important to view urban recreation as an amenity and service for local residents, both permanent and temporary. As such, urban recreation does not draw people into the basin. Development of many types of developed outdoor recreation improvements on state and federal land, on the other hand, may attract visitors to the basin. Thus, each should be subject to different reservations and limitations.

Dispersed recreation may be provided by either state, federal or local agencies. Since dispersed recreation requires little or no developed support facilities, the limitation for dispersed recreation should be the resource or land capability. Targeted miles of trail are included in the Plan Area Statements.

The committee recommends the following practices in the allocation of PAOTS:

1. **Dispersed Recreation:** Dispersed recreation and supporting facilities should not be subject to PAOT limitations.

2. **Urban Recreation:** Public recreation facilities operated by local governments or private entities (except overnight facilities, downhill ski facilities, visitor information center and, marinas and boat launching facilities) should be considered urban recreation and not subject to PAOT limitations.

3. **Developed Outdoor Recreation:** All overnight facilities, marinas and boat launching facilities, visitor information centers, downhill ski facilities, and all developed day use facilities operated by the states' Departments of Parks and Recreation and federal agencies should be considered as developed outdoor recreation and should be subject to PAOT limitations.

The findings and recommendations in this report are consistent with the Goals and Policies.
III. OVERALL RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Goals and Policies (Developed Recreation, Goal #1, Policy 3) estimate that 11% of the recreational capacity may be developed in the first 5 to 10 years of the Plan. This should be regarded as a minimum of development. Development of 25% of the reserved capacity within 5 years should be encouraged, since under-development of recreational capacity leads to deterioration in quality. Specific committee findings and recommendations with summaries for urban, dispersed, and developed outdoor recreation follow.

IV. URBAN RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Urban recreation is an important element in the quality of life for local residents. Urban-oriented recreation is chiefly provided by local governments to serve the recreational needs of the community, both residents and tourists. Local governmental providers of urban recreation in the basin include the counties, the city of South Lake Tahoe, and some public utilities and improvement districts. Some urban recreation services may be provided by private enterprise.

While there may be some overlap between the types of facilities considered as urban and developed outdoor recreation, such as beaches and playing fields, urban recreation should be defined as those facilities provided by local or private interests primarily to serve local needs. Locally-operated recreational facilities acquired via the California Tahoe Conservancy should also be classified urban recreation.

Urban recreation should not require the allocation of PAOTs. The capacity to serve urban recreational needs should be reserved by the local governments and TRPA. To determine the demand and capacity required for urban recreation facilities, local governments should be encouraged to prepare local master recreation plans. These master plans would then be integrated into a Basinwide five year recreation plan.

Urban recreation projects should be subject to the five year recreation list (Ch. 33.6) at least until the local recreation master plans have been approved.

SUMMARY:

Urban Recreation Uses: Urban recreation is defined in Chapter 2, and the uses are listed in the table of primary uses in Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances. Urban recreation includes recreation centers, participant sport facilities, sport assembly, and day use areas not operated by state or federal agencies.

PAOT Limitations: Urban recreation shall not be subject to PAOT limitations.

Five Year Recreation List: Urban recreation projects should be subject to the five year list unless exempt through an approved master plan.

Master Plans: Local recreation providers are encouraged to prepare master plans.
V. DISPERSED RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a strong demand for dispersed recreation by both visitors and residents throughout the year. Forest Service data indicate that dispersed recreation use in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit is over one million user days per year. In addition, areas managed by the states of California and Nevada, the counties, the city of South Lake Tahoe, and several utility districts in the region offer dispersed recreation.

There are over 200 miles of trails existing in the Basin. Another 278 miles of trails have been targeted in the TRPA Plan Area Statements for future development. Trails are used for hiking, riding, and cross country skiing, and many constitute a destination in themselves. Other trails are intended chiefly to offer access to points of interest in the back country or to undeveloped campgrounds.

Dispersed recreation is not without environmental impacts which need to be mitigated. Parking and access are a continuing problem for a number of dispersed recreation areas. The Regional Plan recognizes the need for mitigation and support facilities for dispersed recreation including trailheads, access trails, restrooms, and safe water supplies. Some protective measures may be necessary to prevent damage in heavily used areas.

PAOT allocation should not be required for dispersed recreation or support facilities. Listing of dispersed recreation on the five year recreation list is not required. Support facilities for dispersed recreation should be subject to the five year list and integrated into the five year Basinwide recreation plan.

SUMMARY:

Dispersed Recreation Uses: Dispersed recreation includes hiking, jogging, primitive camping, nature study, fishing, cross country skiing, rafting and kayaking, swimming, and similar uses requiring little or no development of facilities. Vehicle use of roads is also considered dispersed recreation. Dispersed outdoor recreation is defined in Chapters 2 and 18 in the Code of Ordinances.

PAOT Limitations: Dispersed recreation activities and support facilities should not be subject to PAOT limitation.

Five Year Recreation List: Dispersed recreation activities should not be subject to the five year recreation list. Support facilities and mitigation work are subject to the five year list.

Master Plans: Master plans are not required for dispersed recreation but are encouraged where appropriate.

VI. DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Developed outdoor recreation is an economic mainstay of the Tahoe Basin. The Regional Plan requires the reservation of a fair share of the total Basin capacity for developed outdoor recreation. Reserved capacity for developed outdoor recreational uses may not be preempted for other purposes.
The adopted fair share for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities is 6,114 PAOTs in overnight accommodations, 6,761 PAOTs in summer day use facilities and 12,400 PAOTs in winter day use facilities. The uses for these PAOTs are discussed later in this section.

Developed outdoor recreation projects are regional in nature (rather than urban recreation provided mainly for local residents' use) and tend to draw visitors into the Basin. They include state parks and recreation areas and federal facilities. They also include the uses specifically listed in the Goals and Policies under Developed Recreation such as visitor centers, marinas and boating facilities, downhill ski areas, and overnight recreational facilities.

The Regional Plan estimates that 11% of the additional capacity might be developed in the first five to ten years of the plan, depending chiefly upon the availability of public and private funding. A large degree of flexibility must be left to the entities implementing the plan to accommodate the vagaries of grants, budget appropriations, bond issues, and the availability of private investment.

Although state and federal agencies are the main providers of developed outdoor recreation, the private sector should be encouraged to offer public recreation to the extent that it is feasible, needed, and compatible with the Plan Area Statements and environmental thresholds.

Developed outdoor recreation projects are subject to PAOT allocation requirements. They are also subject to the five year recreation list unless they have approved master plans. Bike trails, because they are being encouraged as alternative transportation, should not be subject to PAOTs.

**Summer day uses:** Summer day use PAOTs should be pooled and not assigned to specific Plan Areas. Public developed outdoor recreation uses proposed by private enterprise should be able to draw on the PAOT pool.

Summer day use PAOTs will be used chiefly by two major types of recreation: (1) regional recreation as provided by the states and the Forest Service, and (2) boating facilities (launching ramps and marinas). These uses have been identified as growth inducing. Of the available pool of 6,761 PAOTs, 2,000 should be targeted for expansion of boating facilities, based on a survey of the marinas.

Marina operators supplied information on their present use and projected levels of expansion. All available slips were rented this summer. Photographs taken in the afternoon on Labor Day weekend (9/6/87) show that on a high use day about one third of the boats occupying commercial facilities may be in use at one time. The committee recommends three persons per boat should be assumed. Therefore, the PAOT allocation for marinas should be one PAOT per slip, based on slip use alone. Additional uses at marinas could raise the number of PAOTs required, but this should be addressed through the marina master plan criteria.

In addition to the PAOT allocation, marinas require an approved master plan before expansion can be permitted. An alternative method for measuring marina capacity may be derived in the process of developing the criteria for marina
master plans. Marinas in community plan areas must be consistent with community plans.

Winter day uses: Winter day use PAOTs are reserved for downhill ski area expansion. These PAOTs have been and should remain allocated in the PASs. Ski areas require an approved master plan before expansion can be permitted.

Overnight uses: A pool of 1,000 overnight PAOTs for campgrounds, group facilities, and RV parks should be established which private developers may be eligible to draw from and which can be used in Plan Areas where no PAOTs for additional overnight facilities have been assigned. (The committee recommends the criteria in Appendix A for establishing eligibility to draw on the pool of PAOTs for overnight facilities.)

SUMMARY:

Developed Outdoor Recreation Uses: Developed outdoor recreation as defined in Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances includes beach recreation, boat launching facilities, cross country ski courses, developed campgrounds, golf courses, group facilities, off road vehicle courses, outdoor recreation concessions, marinas, recreation vehicle parks, riding and hiking trails, rural sports, skiing facilities (downhill), snowmobile courses, undeveloped campgrounds, and visitor information centers. Permissible uses are listed in the Table of Primary Uses, and each use is defined in Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances.

PAOT Limitations: PAOTs should be allocated for developed outdoor recreation facilities according to the following standards:

1. Developed campgrounds, group facilities, and recreation vehicle parks require overnight PAOTs. Most of the overnight PAOTs are assigned in the PAS. Unassigned PAOTs from the pool may be allocated to projects in any Plan Area where the proposed project is a permissible use.

2. Skiing facilities (downhill) require winter day use PAOTs. These PAOTs are assigned in the PAS.

3. Visitor information centers and off-road vehicle courses require summer day use PAOTs.

4. Marinas and boat launching facilities require summer day use PAOTs.

5. Beach recreation, outdoor recreation concessions, golf courses, and rural sports not operated as urban recreation require summer day use PAOTs.

6. Riding, hiking, and bicycle trails (and their supporting facilities) and undeveloped campgrounds do not require PAOTs.

7. New regional cross-country ski and snowmobile courses should be planned in conjunction with existing or new summer day use facilities to promote their year round use. PAOTs should apply only to new summer day use capacity.

Five Year Recreation List: Developed recreation except riding and hiking trails are subject to the five year list unless they have approved master plans.
Master Plans: Master plans are required for downhill skiing facilities and marinas. Master plans are encouraged for the other uses where appropriate.

VII. THE FIVE YEAR LIST

The five year list pursuant to Chapter 33 should be a component of a five year recreation plan which would integrate recreation development until a Basinwide recreation program is established.

1. The list should contain the list of proposed recreation projects. If applicable, it should include the project PAOT requirement.

2. The list should include Plan Area maps with the location of proposed projects.

3. The list should include the assignment of all PAOTs by PAS for summer day use, winter day use (ski facilities), and overnight use.

4. The list should include the pools of PAOTS available for summer day use and overnight use.

5. The list should contain a running tally from project to project or amendment to amendment of the available PAOTS assigned in the PAS.

6. The list should contain running tallies of the PAOT pools available for summer day use and overnight use.

For informational purposes only, the status of recreation projects which are exempt from listing should be provided with the list. The information should be updated annually. Master plans should be reevaluated periodically.

VIII. RECOMMENDED RULES CONCERNING PAOTS

1. Definition of PAOT (people at one time): the number of people that a recreation use is designed to accommodate at a given time, a measurement of recreational design capacity. Instantaneous capacity is another term with a similar meaning which is sometimes used in recreation planning.

2. Winter day use PAOTs should apply to downhill ski facilities and should be subject to the 12,400 PAOT target/limitations as set forth in the PAS. Ski areas should be subject to the master plan requirements of Chapter 16. PAOT capacity for ski areas should apply to the design capacity taking into consideration access limitations of parking and transit, lift capacity, ski run capacity, ticket sales and other factors set forth in the TRPA ski area master plan guidelines.

3. Summer day use PAOTs should apply to developed recreation facilities in state park and recreation areas and on federal lands, including day use areas, beach recreation, marinas and boat launching facilities, golf courses, off-road vehicle courses, outdoor recreation concessions, rural
sports, and visitor information centers. Locally or privately developed public day use facilities, other than marinas and boat launching facilities, and visitor information centers, should be considered urban recreation and not subject to PACT limitations. The master planning process for marinas should address consistency with the capacity targeted for marinas and boat launching facilities.

4. Overnight PACTs should apply to developed campgrounds, group facilities, and recreation vehicle parks. Local governments and private operators should be eligible to draw on a pool of 1,000 PACTs through established criteria which focus on the need for provision of outdoor recreation. The pool would consist of PACTs previously assigned to various Plan Areas where the Forest Service had long range plans for overnight facilities. These facilities have been identified as unlikely to be funded within the next twenty years, so the Forest Service agreed that those PACTs could be made available as a pool. Overnight uses which would function as tourist accommodation units should be eligible for the provisions relating to the transfer of tourist accommodation units.

5. Properties acquired by the California Tahoe Conservancy for local operation should be considered urban recreation and not subject to PACT limitations.

6. Dispersed recreation and supporting facilities should not be subject to PACT limitations.

7. When PACTs are used as targets/limitations in the five year list or PAS, it should be understood they refer only to additional capacity which did not exist on the effective date of the Regional Plan.

8. When PACTs are used for transfer purposes, it should be understood they refer to the legally existing use for the applicable category of winter, summer, or overnight recreational use.
Criteria for Determination of Eligibility for Allocation of Overnight PAOTs for Privately Developed Campgrounds, Group Facilities, and Recreational Vehicle Parks

The purpose of PAOTs is to reserve and allocate capacity in the Basin for developed outdoor recreation. Ordinarily, outdoor recreation facilities operated by local municipalities and private enterprise are provided for local residents and incidentally for tourists and are not subject to PAOT limitations.

Overnight facilities, while they may be used by some local residents, are chiefly directed at users coming from outside the basin. Such facilities have significant environmental impacts and are, therefore, subject to certain limitations.

Developed outdoor recreation overnight facilities operated by public agencies or nonprofit organizations are limited by the number of PAOTs which are available for that development. A privately developed facility serving a comparable outdoor recreational need and otherwise meeting the same site development standards as publicly owned developed campgrounds, group facilities, or recreational vehicle parks shall be subject to overnight PAOT allocations. Overnight visitor accommodations not meeting the test as developed outdoor recreation shall be subject to the tourist accommodation allocation limitations in Chapter 33.

A pool of 1000 overnight PAOTs has been reserved for use in Plan Areas where developed campgrounds, group facilities, or recreational vehicle parks are permissible uses but no overnight PAOTs have been assigned. The pool of overnight PAOTs was derived from PAOTs which had previously been requested by the Forest Service, but which are unlikely to be funded for development within the next twenty years. Privately developed facilities shall be eligible to draw on the pool provided they meet the following criteria for developed outdoor recreational facilities:

1. The facility (developed campground, group facility, or recreational vehicle park) shall be consistent with its definition in Chapter 19;

2. The site must provide or be restored to a substantially natural setting, compatible with its surroundings. That impression must be retained to the extent feasible after development. (Examples include the Tahoe Valley and El Dorado Campgrounds);

3. The site facilities shall be designed primarily for outdoor use and furnish such equipment as tables, fire pits, and other outdoor living amenities; and

4. The site must offer access to outdoor recreational opportunities such as hiking trails, public beaches, and fishing.
At the October APC meeting, an APC member expressed concern that where multiple uses at a single recreation site are being planned, like the existing multiple uses at Taylor Creek, double PAOT allocations against the project should not be made.

Staff was directed to write an addendum to the Recreation Committee and APC recommendations to make it clear how PAOTs would be allocated to a site where a combination of recreational opportunities would be offered.

Staff Addendum:

Where recreational uses subject to PAOTs are planned and constructed separately but on adjacent sites, PAOTs would be allocated to each use separately based on its design capacity.

The recommendations by the Recreation Committee and APC specifically encourage master plans for all categories of recreation wherever applicable. The master plan for a recreation complex requiring PAOTs, such as may be planned at the 64 Acre Tract or at Spooner Summit, should include an overall design capacity based on a survey of the demand for the facilities and the land capability. Other design factors should be considered also.

At the time that a master plan is approved by the Governing Board, the PAOTs for the entire development would be allocated to the project. For projects to be developed in stages, the allocation should remain in effect for as long as the development stays substantially on schedule. The project proponent would not need to request PAOTs for each construction increment if it is consistent with the master plan.

The five year list should provide an accounting mechanism for all PAOTs, including those allocated to projects having master plans. Master plans should be reevaluated periodically to be sure that they are being implemented timely and are still appropriate.

Additional Staff Comments:

In regard to new regional cross-country ski or snowmobile courses (see page 6), new facilities of a scale which could create major environmental impacts should not be permitted. Existing or new facilities for either summer day use or overnight uses could support cross-country or snowmobile courses. PAOTs should apply to the new summer day use or overnight capacity, therefore, the winter use associated with those facilities would not be counted against winter PAOTs.

Further Staff Action Required:

Staff should prepare amendments to the Plan and Ordinances necessary to implement the recommendations. These would include amending the PASs, and Chapters 18 and 33. The amendments should be ready for consideration by the Board in January.
MEMORANDUM

August 3, 1988

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Identification of Threshold Indicators, Targets, and Related Matters (Chapter 32, Code of Ordinances)

As we have discussed at previous meetings, most recently in July, Chapter 32 of the Code of Ordinances establishes a process to identify the means and time schedules for attaining and maintaining the TRPA thresholds and other applicable local, state, and federal standards. The staff is now preparing materials pursuant to Chapter 32 for Governing Board adoption by resolution in August.

For each threshold (or applicable local, state, and federal standard) TRPA must identify a corresponding indicator, target attainment dates, interim targets and evaluation intervals, and applicable compliance measures and document the effectiveness and adequacy of the compliance measures.

The following is a brief summary of the provisions of Chapter 32:

32.3.A Indicators. TRPA shall identify indicators for each threshold, with appropriate measurement standards (i.e., units of measurement). The indicators may be regional or sub-regional.

32.3.B List. TRPA shall maintain a list of the indicators.

32.3.C Current Status. TRPA shall list the status of each indicator and, where reliable data are lacking, shall identify a program and timetable to provide reliable data.

32.3.E Additional Factors. TRPA shall identify and report on the status of additional factors (i.e., factors in addition to the listed indicators) which may be useful in evaluating threshold attainment and maintenance.

32.4.A Target Dates. Within 120 days of the effective date of the Regional Plan, TRPA shall list each threshold or standard that is in attainment, and establish target dates for attainment of all other thresholds and standards.
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32.4.B  **Interim Targets.** At the same time it sets the target dates, TRPA shall identify major evaluation intervals correlated with interim targets, using the appropriate units of measurement.  

32.5.A  **Compliance Measures.** Within 120 days of the effective date of the Regional Plan, TRPA shall maintain a list for each threshold and standard of all the compliance measures actually being implemented to attain and maintain the standard.  

32.5.B  **Effectiveness.** The list developed in 32.5.A shall show how much, and at what rate, the compliance measure is contributing (and will contribute) to attainment or maintenance of the threshold or standard. This analysis must be consistent with the target dates in 32.4.A and 32.4.B.  

32.5.D  **Adequacy.** TRPA shall ensure the attainment and maintenance of thresholds and standards on the established target dates, taking growth into account, and considering the need for supplemental compliance measures where necessary.  

32.6.A  **Supplemental Compliance Measures.** In addition to the list in 32.5.A, TRPA shall maintain a list of additional compliance measures to implement as necessary to attain and maintain the thresholds and standards.  

The staff has prepared an index of thresholds and applicable state, federal, and local air and water quality standards to which the Chapter 32 requirements will apply. Development of this index has been coordinated with the TRPA Monitoring Committee and the draft Monitoring Work Program, so that the Chapter 32 materials and the Monitoring Work Program share a common index. The index, attached, indicates whether a particular threshold or standard is in attainment, or not.  

The staff has also developed an **Environmental Threshold Compliance Form** to display the information Chapter 32 requires for each threshold and standard. Compliance Forms are being prepared for each threshold and standard in the index.  

Attached are draft Compliance Forms covering air quality, water quality, and soil conservation for your review and comment. At this time, staff proposes to focus on these three areas, since satisfying the Chapter 32 requirements in these areas is closely related to the process of amending the 208 plan. Action on the remaining thresholds (e.g., noise, vegetation, wildlife) will take place in the fall.  
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AGENDA ITEM IV.H.
This agenda item has been noticed for a public hearing at the August 10 meeting. The staff recommends that the APC make a recommendation that the Governing Board approve the attached materials, as they may be revised subsequent to the public hearing, as meeting the requirements of Chapter 32 for air quality, water quality, and soil conservation. If you have any questions or comments on this agenda item, please contact Dave Ziegler at (702) 588-4547.
INDEX:
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORMS
and MONITORING WORK PROGRAM

I. AIR QUALITY

AQ-1 CO (non-attainment)*
AQ-2 O₃ (non-attainment)
AQ-3 particulate (non-attainment)
AQ-4 visibility (not known)
AQ-5 U.S. 50 traffic volume (non-attainment)
AQ-6 wood smoke (not known)
AQ-7 VMT (non-attainment)
AQ-8 atmospheric nutrient loading (non-attainment)

II. WATER QUALITY/SOIL CONSERVATION

WQ-1 turbidity (shallow) (not known)
WQ-2 clarity, winter (non-attainment)
WQ-3 phytoplankton PPR (non-attainment)
WQ-4 tributary water quality (non-attainment)
WQ-5 runoff water quality (non-attainment)
WQ-6 groundwater (non-attainment)
WQ-7 other lakes (not known)

SC-1 impervious coverage (attainment)
SC-2 naturally-functioning SEZ (non-attainment)

III. VEGETATION

V-1 relative abundance and pattern (attainment)
V-2 uncommon plant communities (attainment)
V-3 sensitive vegetation (attainment)

IV. FISHERIES

F-1 lake habitat (non-attainment)
F-2 stream habitat (non-attainment)
F-3 in-stream flows (attainment)

V. WILDLIFE

W-1 special interest species (attainment)

* items in parentheses denote current attainment status
VI. SCENIC RESOURCES

SR-1 travel route ratings (non-attainment)
SR-2 scenic quality ratings (attainment)

VII. NOISE

N-1 single event (aircraft) (non-attainment)
N-2 single event (other) (not known)
N-3 community noise (not known)

VIII. RECREATION

R-1 high quality recreational experience (non-attainment)
R-2 fair share (attainment)
### TABLE 1

**COMPLIANCE MEASURES IN PLACE**

#### I. AIR QUALITY (see Notes 1, 2)

##### A. MASS TRANSPORTATION

- (01) South Tahoe Area Ground Express (STAGE)
- (02) Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART)
- (03) social service transportation providers
- (04) ski shuttle services
- (05) intercity bus service
- (06) waterborne excursions
- (07) waterborne point-to-point service
- (08) commercial air carrier operations
- (09) commuter/air taxi operations

##### B. NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION

- (10) bikeways
- (11) pedestrian facilities

##### C. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

- (12) employer programs
- (13) neighborhood mail delivery centers (NDCs)
- (14) home mail delivery

##### D. TRANSPORTATION-RELATED MEASURES

- (15) indirect source review/air quality mitigation
- (16) idling restrictions
- (17) vehicle emission limitations (state/federal)

##### E. NON-TRANSPORTATION-RELATED MEASURES

- (18) OHV controls
- (19) wood heater controls
- (20) gas heater controls
- (21) stationary source controls
- (22) open burning controls
- (23) BMP and revegetation requirements
Table 1
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II. WATER QUALITY/SCIL CONSERVATION (See Note 3)

A. URBAN RUNOFF AND EROSION

(01) BMP requirements, new development
(02) BMP implementation program—existing streets and highways
(03) BMP implementation program—existing urban development
(04) BMP implementation program—existing urban drainage systems
(05) capital improvements program for erosion and runoff control
(06) excess coverage mitigation program
(07) discharge standards and permits
(08) limitations on new subdivisions
(09) land use planning and controls
(10) residential development priorities (IPES)
(11) limits on land coverage, new development
(12) transfer of development
(13) restrictions on SEZ encroachment and vegetation alteration
(14) SEZ restoration program
(15) SEZ setbacks
(16) fertilizer reporting requirements

B. AIRBORNE NUTRIENTS

(17) improved mass transportation
(18) redevelopment and redirection of land use
(19) combustion heater rules, stationary source controls, related rules
(20) transfer of development

C. WASTE MANAGEMENT

(21) elimination of accidental sewage releases
(22) reduction of sewer line exfiltration
(23) discharge permits
(24) regulation of wastewater disposal at sites not connected to sewers
(25) prohibition on solid waste disposal
(26) mandatory garbage pick-up
(27) hazardous material/wastes program
(28) BMP implementation program—snow and ice control practices
(29) reporting requirements, highway abrasives and deicers
D. NATURAL AREA MANAGEMENT

(30) BMP implementation program—roads, trails, skidding, logging practices
(31) BMP implementation program—outdoor recreation
(32) BMP implementation program—livestock confinement and grazing
(33) BMP implementation program—pesticides
(34) land use planning and controls—timber harvesting
(35) land use planning and controls—outdoor recreation
(36) land use planning and controls—OHV use
(37) land use planning and controls—livestock confinement and grazing
(38) control of encroachment and coverage in sensitive areas
(39) pesticide substance and operator certification

E. LAKE TAHOE AND THE SHOREZONE

(40) control on shorezone encroachment and vegetation alteration
(41) BMP implementation program—shorezone areas
(42) BMP implementation program—dredging and construction in Lake Tahoe
(43) restrictions and conditions on filling and dredging
(44) protection of stream deltas
(45) marina master plans
(46) additional pump-out facilities
(47) controls on anti-fouling coatings

Notes

1. For detailed definitions of in-place compliance measures related to mass transportation, non-motorized transportation, and transportation systems management, see Regional Transportation Plan, Lake Tahoe Basin (TRPA, April 1988).

2. For detailed definitions of in-place compliance measures related to transportation-related and non-transportation-related phenomena, see Code of Ordinances, Chapters 91 and 93 (TRPA, 1987).

3. For detailed definitions of in-place compliance measures related to water quality and soil conservation, see the draft or final Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volumes I, II, III, and IV (TRPA, 1988).
TABLE 2
SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLIANCE MEASURES

I. AIR QUALITY

A. MASS TRANSPORTATION

(01) Short Range Transit Plan--South Shore fixed routes
(02) Short Range Transit Plan--South Shore demand-responsive zones
(03) Short Range Transit Plan--North Shore fixed routes
(04) Short Range Transit Plan--North Shore demand-responsive zones
(05) improved ski shuttle coordination
(06) Tahoe City intrazonal shuttle
(07) Kings Beach/Tahoe Vista intrazonal shuttle
(08) improved beach bus headways (summer)
(09) Kingsbury Grade fixed route service extension
(10) Zephyr Cove fixed route service extension
(11) improved Tahoe Keys-to-casino core headways
(12) North Star to Kings Beach service
(13) Heavenly Valley to Stateline people mover or aerial tram
(14) TART extension to Truckee
(15) El Dorado County fixed route service extension
(16) improved Roundhill/Nevada Beach-to-casino core headways (summer)
(17) expanded waterborne excursion service
(18) point-to-point waterborne service linking Tahoe City, Kings Beach, Incline Village, and the south shore
(19) implementation, Lake Tahoe Airport master plan
(20) south shore fixed guideway/light rail service

B. STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

(21) right turn lane, U.S. 50 west to Tahoe Keys Blvd.
(22) free right turn and signal timing, U.S. 50, Pioneer Trail to Park Ave., City of South Lake Tahoe
(23) circulation improvements, South lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan
(24) realignment, intersection of Kingsbury Grade and U.S. 50
(25) right turn lane, California 89 south to Lake Tahoe Blvd.
(26) right turn lane, Lake Tahoe Blvd. north to U.S. 50
(27) corridor improvements, U.S. 50, Kingsbury Grade-to-Loop Road
(28) corridor improvements, California 28, Tahoe City
(29) intersection improvements, California 28 and Grove St., Tahoe City
(30) realignment, California 89 south of Fanny Bridge, Tahoe City
(31) intersection improvements, California 28 and 267, Kings Beach
(32) center turn lane, Nevada 28, Lakeshore-to-Lakeshore, Incline Village
C. NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION

(33) class I bikeway, Kingsbury Grade to Roundhill
(34) class I or II bikeway, Roundhill to Cave Rock
(35) class I and III bikeway, Park Avenue and the Loop Roads
(36) completion of class II bikeway, Pioneer Trail to Meyers
(37) class I bikeway, Meyers
(38) class II bikeway, Lake Tahoe Blvd. and Upper Truckee River Rd.
(39) class III bikeway, California 89, Meyers to Luther Pass
(40) class I bikeway, Meeks Bay recreation area
(41) class I bikeway, Tahoe City to Squaw Valley
(42) class I bikeway, Dollar Hill to Incline Village
(43) class I bikeway, Incline Village to Marlette Creek
(44) class I, II, III bikeways, Incline Village local streets
(45) separate pedestrian facility, California 28, Tahoe City
(46) separate pedestrian facility, redevelopment area, South Lake Tahoe
(47) pedestrian separation, High Sierra Casino-to-Caesars Casino
(48) pedestrian facility, casino core to Kingsbury Grade
(49) pedestrian facility, Pioneer Trail, Needle Peak to U.S. 50
(50) separate pedestrian facilities, California 28, Kings Beach

D. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

(51) education programs utilizing local media
(52) transit ridership incentives
(53) casino employee van pools
(54) transit shelter and turn-out improvements
(55) automobile metering from ski area parking lots
(56) traffic signal synchronization, U.S. 50 corridor
(57) additional NDCs--south shore
(58) additional NDCs--Tahoe City, Crystal Bay
(59) additional improvements in mall delivery
(60) community plan improvements--pedestrian movement, access control, parking, system integration
(61) additional improvements--social services transportation

E. TRANSPORTATION-RELATED MEASURES

(62) alternative fuels--fleet vehicles
(63) alternative fuels--private automobiles

F. NON-TRANSPORTATION-RELATED MEASURES

(64) home weatherization/energy conservation improvement program
(65) control of upwind pollutants
(66) improved BMP implementation/enforcement program
II. WATER QUALITY/SOIL CONSERVATION

A. URBAN RUNOFF AND EROSION

(01) restrictions on rate and/or amount of additional development
(02) improved BMP implementation/enforcement program
(03) additional restrictions on fertilizer use
(04) more stringent coverage transfer requirements
(05) more stringent SEZ encroachment rules
(06) controls on outdoor water use
(07) increased funding for CIP for erosion and runoff control
(08) artificial wetlands/runoff treatment program
(09) transfer of development from SEZs
(10) improved excess coverage mitigation program

B. AIRBORNE NUTRIENTS

(11) increased idling restrictions
(12) control of upwind pollutants

C. WASTE MANAGEMENT

(13) improved exfiltration control program
(14) improved infiltration control program
(15) water conservation/flow reduction program

D. NATURAL AREA MANAGEMENT

(16) additional land use controls
(17) improved BMP implementation/enforcement program
(18) restrictions on rate and/or amount of additional development

E. LAKE TAHOE AND THE SHOREZONE

(19) improved BMP implementation/enforcement program
ENVIROI'NTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: air quality
Parameter: carbon monoxide (CO)
Standard: States and TRPA: 6 ppm (8-hr avg.)
Federal: 9.3 ppm (8-hr avg.)
California: 20 ppm (1-hr avg.)
Federal and Nevada: 35 ppm (1-hr avg.)

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Number of 8-hr and 1-hr periods CO concentration exceeds the applicable standard, at any permanent monitoring station (unitless).

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: There are four continuous CO monitoring stations on the South Shore, operated by CARB and NDEP. The four stations are: Stateline California, Lake Tahoe Boulevard, and Bijou School (CARB), and High Sierra Casino-Hotel (NDEP). Continuous data is recorded automatically and compiled by CARB and NDEP, who issue periodic data reports.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. Two one-hour or eight-hour periods in a given year with average concentrations over the applicable state, federal, or TRPA limit is considered a violation of the standard. Exceedences are expressed in number of periods exceeding the standard, number of days in which periods exceeded the standard, and concentrations which exceeded the standard. The first and second highest concentrations observed during the year are normally reported for each station. In 1986, there were 10 exceedences of the 9.3 ppm 8-hour federal standard at the Stateline-California station, and no exceedences of the 20 ppm 1-hour California standard.

5. TARGET DATE:
   Federal 8-hr standard, 1991
   Federal and Nevada 1-hr standard, in attainment
   State and TRPA 8-hr standard, 2005
   California 1-hr standard, 2005

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: See Figure AQ-1, forecast line

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:
   a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)
      Mass Transportation: 01, 04, 05, 07
      Non-Motorized Transportation: 11
      Transportation Systems Management: 12, 13
      Transportation-Related Measures: 15, 16, 17
      Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 19, 21
b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE

Exceedences of the applicable standards are most-commonly associated with cold temperatures, heavy traffic, traffic congestion, and stable meteorologic conditions (such as those seen during nighttime temperature inversions) in the vicinity of the Stateline-California station, located immediately east of the intersection of Park Avenue and U.S. 50 in the City of South Lake Tahoe. Control measures which reduce vehicular CO emissions, reduce traffic volumes at that location, or increase traffic speeds at that location on peak winter evenings are the most effective at reducing CO concentrations. With no other controls, and taking into account projected growth in the Tahoe Region, the cleaner vehicle fleet would be expected to bring about attainment of the federal standard by 2000. See Table AQ-1a for information on effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures. The measures in place will not attain the state standards in the foreseeable future.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Mass Transportation: 01, 02, 05, 09, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20
Streets and Highways: 22, 23, 24, 27
Non-Motorized Transportation: 46, 47, 48, 49
Transportation Systems Management: 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59
Transportation-Related Measures: 62, 63
Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 64

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES

Of the supplemental compliance measures, the most effective at reducing CO concentrations at the Stateline-California station will be the operational improvements which divert traffic away from the intersection of Park Avenue and U.S. 50, including the south shore redevelopment circulation improvements (23) and the right-turn lane, Pioneer Trail-to-Park Avenue (22). The right-turn lane will probably precede the redevelopment circulation improvements by several years. In a worst-case scenario, transit measures are less effective than operational improvements at reducing CO concentrations. See Table AQ-1b for information on effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures. Implementation of the supplemental measures will proceed in accordance with the Regional Transportation Plan and the TRPA Air Quality Plan. The Air Quality Plan is being revised in 1988-89.
ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: TPPA modeling using the CALINE line source dispersion model of CARB to predict carbon monoxide concentrations is documented in the FEIS: Plan Area Statements and Implementing Ordinances of the Regional Plan (TRPA, 1987) and the Final EIR/EIS, Regional Transportation Plan, Lake Tahoe Basin (TRPA, 1988). In place control measures, consisting of federal and state emission limitation, coupled with limited growth, will allow the federal standard to be met by 1995. Currently quantified supplemental control measures, primarily circulation improvements associated with redevelopment, may attain the TRPA standard by 2005. Remaining supplemental control measures, including alternative fuels, will be quantified during preparation of the post-1987 air quality plan.
### Table AQ-1a
**Compliance Measures in Place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>04,17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>13,19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table AQ-1b
**Supplemental Compliance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>'24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48,49,54, 55,62,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>05,22,27,56</td>
<td>09,10,11,15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,18</td>
<td>13,20,52, 57,59</td>
<td>46,53,58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: air quality
Parameter: ozone (O3)
Standard: Federal: 0.12 ppm (1-hr avg.)
          States: 0.10 ppm (1-hr avg.)
          TRPA: 0.08 ppm (1-hr avg.)

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Number of 1-hour periods which equal or exceed the federal, state, or TRPA standard at any of the permanent monitoring sites (unitless).

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: There are three continuous O3 monitoring stations on the South Shore, operated by CARB and NDEP. The four stations are: Lake Tahoe Boulevard and Bijou School (CARB), and High Sierra Casino-Hotel (NDEP). Continuous data is recorded automatically and compiled by CARB and NDEP, who issue periodic data reports.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: The Tahoe Region is in attainment of the state and federal standards, and not in attainment of the TRPA standard. Two one-hour periods with average concentrations which equal or exceed the state or federal standard in a given year is considered a violation of the state or federal standard. One one-hour period which exceeds the TRPA standard is considered a violation of the TRPA threshold. In 1986, the TRPA standard was exceeded once.

5. TARGET DATE: 1991

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: none, since attainment is expected by 1991

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:

   a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

      Mass Transportation: 01 through 09, inclusive
      Non-Motorized Transportation: 10, 11
      Transportation Systems Management: 12, 13, 14
      Transportation-Related Measures: 15, 16, 17
      Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 20, 21, 22
b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE

Ozone is a secondary pollutant, formed from the combination of oxides of nitrogen, hydrocarbon gases, and sunlight, and is normally found in the summer, downwind of sources of NOx and hydrocarbons, such as major highways. Ozone concentrations in the Tahoe Region may also be influenced by long-range transport of precursor compounds, such as from forest fires upwind of the Region. Since emissions of both precursors, NOx and hydrocarbons, are strongly influenced by motor vehicle emissions, compliance measures which reduce vehicle-miles-travelled (VMT) and per-vehicle emissions are the most effective at controlling ozone concentrations. See Table AQ-2a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

| Mass Transportation: 01 to 20, inclusive, except for 05 |
| Non-Motorized Transportation: 33-50, inclusive       |
| Transportation Systems Management: 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60 |
| Transportation-Related Measures: 62, 63             |
| Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 65             |

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES

The supplemental measures which reduce VMT or emissions of NOx and hydrocarbons are effective at reducing ozone concentrations. See Table AQ-2b for information on the effectiveness and costs of the supplemental compliance measures. Implementation of the supplemental measures will proceed in accordance with the Regional Transportation Plan and the TRPA Air Quality Plan. The Air Quality Plan is being revised in 1988-89.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: The combined in-place and supplemental compliance measures will reduce VMT in the Tahoe Region by 10 percent over the next 20 years, taking anticipated growth into account. Thus, emissions of ozone precursors from mobile sources will be reduced by 10 percent or more (considering the cleaner fleet and other control measures). Since ozone standard exceedences occur mainly in the summer, anticipated increases in emissions from home heating are not a factor in attainment of the ozone threshold.
Table AQ-2a
Compliance Measures in Place

Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>12,22</td>
<td>06,07,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>04,17,20</td>
<td>03,21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,14</td>
<td>10,11,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AQ-2b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33,35,63</td>
<td>17,36,38,39,44,45,48,49,50,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>06,07,08,09,10,11,14,15,16,34,37,40,41,43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,03,12,13,18,20,52,53,57,58,59,60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>02,04,19,46,47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: air quality
Parameter: particulate matter (PM$_{10}$)
Standard: federal: 50 ug/m$^3$ (ann. avg.), 150 ug/m$^3$ (24-hr mean)
                California: 30 ug/m$^3$ (ann. avg.), 50 ug/m$^3$ (24-hr avg.)

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): number of 24-hour periods exceeding the applicable federal or state standards at any permanent monitoring station (unitless); annual average PM$_{10}$ concentrations at any permanent monitoring station (ug/m$^3$)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: By December, 1989, there will be four PM$_{10}$ samplers in the Tahoe Region at the Lake Tahoe Boulevard Station (CARB collocated with TRPA), the High Sierra Hotel-Casino (NDEP) and Bliss State Park (TRPA). Continuous data will be recorded automatically and compiled by TRPA, CARB, and NDEP, who issue periodic data reports.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: The Tahoe Region appears to be in attainment of the federal standard, based on existing data which lacks a sufficient number of observations to meet established criteria for representativeness. The Region appears not to be in attainment of the California standards. Two 24-hour periods which exceed the applicable standard in a given year is considered a violation of the standard. The annual average standard is not to be exceeded in any year.

5. TARGET DATE: federal standard: in attainment
               California standard: 2005

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: Forecast line to be completed pending gathering of additional data showing exact status of attainment with respect to the California standards.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)
   
   Mass Transportation: 01 through 09, inclusive
   Non-Motorized Transportation: 10, 11
   Transportation Systems Management: 12, 13, 14
   Transportation-Related Measures: 15, 16, 17
   • Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 18 through 23, inclusive

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE

Particulate matter in this size range (less than 10 microns) is associated with emissions from natural sources (e.g., aerosols from pine tree respiration), blowing dust, motor vehicles, forest fires,
traffic, construction, oil combustion, and diesel engines from both local and transport sources. Compliance measures which reduce VMT and which bring about the revegetation or other stabilization of disturbed areas are the most effective. See Table AQ-3a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Mass Transportation: 01 through 20, inclusive
Non-Motorized Transportation: 33 through 50, inclusive, except 47
Transportation Systems Management: 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60
Transportation-Related Measures: 62, 63
Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 64, 65, 66

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES

Supplemental compliance measures which reduce VMT, which reduce blowing dust, and which reduce diesel emissions will be the most effective of the supplemental measures. These combined measures will reduce existing VMT by 10 percent, will reduce the amount of disturbed areas in the Region by 80 percent, and significantly reduce diesel emissions. See Table AQ-3b for information on the effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures. The supplemental measures will be implemented pursuant to the Regional Transportation Plan and the Air Quality Plan for the Tahoe Region. The Air Quality Plan is being revised in 1988-89.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: Despite the additional development anticipated under the Regional Plan, the in-place and supplemental compliance measures will contribute to decreases in PM$_{10}$ concentrations by reducing VMT, reducing diesel emissions, reducing blowing dust, and improving highway maintenance practices. The additional development will require additional energy for heating buildings, but combustion heater and stationary source rules will constrain increases in PM$_{10}$ from home heating. In place control measures, primarily wood stove controls and BMPs, should assure continued attainment of the federal standard while allowing growth. Supplemental control measures may be necessary to attain the stricter California standard. Source apportionment will be identified during the visibility study, and specific supplemental controls will be identified.
AQ-3, cont.
Particulate Matter - PM(10)

Table AQ-3a
Compliance Measures in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>05,06,07</th>
<th>04,15</th>
<th>01,02,14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18,22</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,20,21</td>
<td></td>
<td>03,08,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,23</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,11,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AQ-3b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>05,65</th>
<th>17,36,38,39,44,45,48,49,50,54,64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>06,07,08,09,10,11,14,15,16,34,37,40,41,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>01,03,12,13, 42</td>
<td>02,04,19,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,20,52,53,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57,58,59,60,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: air quality
Parameter: visibility
Standard: TRPA regional: 171 km, 50% of the year
97 km, 90% of the year
TRPA sub-regional: 87 km, 50% of the year
26 km, 90% of the year
California/Nevada: 30 miles (48 km) when relative humidity LT 70%

2. INDICATORS (UNITS): For regional visibility, visual range calculated from contrast measurements and measurements of light transmittance from the TRPA visibility monitoring program. For sub-regional visibility, visual range calculated from nephelometer data collected at the Lake Tahoe Boulevard station (km). For state visibility standards, visual range calculated from nephelometer data collected at Bliss State Park and Lake Tahoe Boulevard for periods in which relative humidity is less than 70 percent (miles).

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: TRPA is installing integrated visibility monitoring stations at Lake Tahoe Boulevard in August, 1988, and at Bliss State Park in September, 1988. Funds have been obtained from California and Nevada to purchase the necessary equipment and services, an expert consultant has been retained, and a technical advisory committee has been formed. The monitoring stations will include equipment to monitor meteorological, aerosol, and perception data.

The Lake Tahoe Boulevard site will be the primary monitoring location on the South Shore. The site will include a fine particle monitor; PM10 monitor, ambient nephelometer, photography, and meteorological equipment colocated with CARB's PM10 monitor and criteria monitoring equipment. The West Shore site will characterize the regional ambient air quality of the Tahoe Region, and will have all the above equipment except the photographic system and criteria monitoring.

Two camera-only locations will be used to measure long-path extinction and to allow visual monitoring of the Region. These sites will be located at the Coast Guard station at Lake Forest and at a proposed site at Echo Summit viewing north across the whole Tahoe Region.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Not known. TRPA thresholds represent conditions observed by Pitchford and Allison (1984) in 1981-82. No data have been collected since 1981-82. Any single reading which fails to meet the state standard is considered a standard violation. Violations of the TRPA threshold will be determined based on percentages of the year in which visibility fails to meet the standard.
5. TARGET DATE: Not applicable until attainment status is determined.

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: annual.

7. INTERIM TARGETS: Not applicable until attainment status is determined.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES
   a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)
      Mass Transportation: 01 through 09, inclusive
      Non-Motorized Transportation: 10, 11
      Transportation Systems Management: 12, 13, 14
      Transportation-Related Measures: 15, 16, 17
      Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 18 through 23, inclusive
   
   b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: Degradation of visibility (visual range) is a complex phenomena involving many sources of visibility-decreasing substances and atmospheric phenomena. In general, particles and gases in the atmosphere degrade visibility by scattering and absorbing light. The particles and gases originate from the clean atmosphere; industrial and agricultural emissions; atmospheric humidity; soil dust; soot; and combustion products. Compliance measures which reduce blowing dust, auto emissions, and emissions from stationary sources and combustion heaters contribute to improved visibility. [See visibility cause-effect flow chart, attached.] The monitoring program established in 1988 will provide detailed information on the causes of visibility degradation in the Tahoe Region, and allow TRPA to analyze the effectiveness of the listed compliance measures.
   
   c. SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLIANCE MEASURES (see Table 2)
      Mass Transportation: 01 through 20, inclusive
      Non-Motorized Transportation: 33 through 50, inclusive
      Transportation Systems Management: 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60
      Transportation-Related Measures: 62, 63
      Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 64, 65, 66
   
   d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLIANCE MEASURES: The monitoring program being established in 1988 will provide detailed information on the causes of visibility degradation in the Tahoe Region, and allow TRPA to analyze the effectiveness of the supplemental measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: Although the Regional Plan will allow additional development in the Tahoe Region, in-place and supplemental compliance measures will reduce contributions of substances that degrade visibility, and should be adequate to maintain visibility at levels observed in 1981-82. The monitoring program being established in 1988 will provide detailed information on the causes of visibility degradation in the Tahoe Region, and allow TRPA to further analyze the adequacy of the compliance measures.
### Table AQ-4a
#### Compliance Measures in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18,22</td>
<td>05,06,07</td>
<td>12,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17,20,21</td>
<td>04,15</td>
<td>03,08,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>19,23</td>
<td>01,02,14</td>
<td>10,11,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table AQ-4b
#### Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33,35,63</td>
<td>17,36,38,39,44,45,48,49,50,54,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>06,07,08,09,10,11,14,15,16,34,37,40,41,43</td>
<td>05,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,03,12,13,18,20,52,53,57,58,59,60,66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>02,04,19,46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relationship between air pollution sources and visibility effects

o Courtesy of L. Willard Richards
1. STANDARD

Category: air quality
Parameter: U.S. 50 traffic volume
Standard: TRPA, 7% reduction in traffic volume on the U.S. 50 corridor from 1981 values, winter, 4 p.m. to 12 a.m.

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Traffic volumes on U.S. 50 immediately west of the intersection of Park Avenue in the City of South Lake Tahoe, average peak winter day, 4 p.m. to 12 a.m., sum of both directions (number of vehicles).

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Caltrans operates a permanent traffic counter just west of the intersection of U.S. 50 and Park Avenue. Data are gathered continuously and reported annually.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. According to the Regional Transportation Plan (TRPA, 1988), daily traffic volumes at Park Avenue and U.S. 50 during peak winter periods were between approximately 36,000 and 38,700 vehicles per day in 1981. Corresponding 1987 volumes ranged from about 36,250 to 37,700 per day. The mid-point of these ranges decreased about 1 percent from 1981 to 1987.

5. TARGET DATE: 1995 (or date of implementation of redevelopment circulation improvements)

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: None

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:

   a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

   Mass Transportation: 01, 04, 05, 07, 08, 09
   Non-Motorized Transportation: 11
   Transportation Systems Management: 12, 13
   Transportation-Related Measures: 15

   b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: In-place compliance measures are inadequate to attain and maintain the threshold. Without supplemental compliance measures, given the additional development allowed by the Regional Plan, peak period traffic volumes would be expected to increase 15 percent or more from existing values. See Table AQ-5a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.
c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Mass Transportation: 01, 02, 05, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20
Streets and Highways: 23
Non-Motorized Transportation: 46, 49
Transportation Systems Management: 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures, primarily the redevelopment circulation improvements, are predicted to reduce peak period traffic volumes at the intersection of U.S. 50 and Park Avenue by 30 percent, taking into account the population growth associated with the Regional Plan. Operational improvements are the most effective means of reducing traffic volumes at the indicator location. See Table AQ-5b for information on the effectiveness and costs of the supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: As stated above, in-place compliance measures are inadequate to attain and maintain the threshold. Supplemental measures will exceed those necessary to attain and maintain the threshold. Circulation improvements associated with redevelopment are the most important supplemental measures.
**U.S. 50 Traffic Volume**

### Table AQ-5a
**Compliance Measures in Place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>08,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table AQ-5b
**Supplemental Compliance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10,15,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,20,23,46,52,59</td>
<td>13,18,53,57</td>
<td>02,19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. **STANDARD**

   **Category:** air quality
   **Parameter:** wood smoke
   **Standard:** TRPA: reduce annual emissions 15% from 1981 values

2. **INDICATOR (UNITS):** concentration of wood smoke signature element in air samples taken at Lake Tahoe Boulevard station, determined by the TRPA visibility monitoring program (see AQ-4).

3. **MONITORING SUMMARY:** Wood smoke signature element will be monitored by the IMPROVE aerosol sampler in conjunction with the TRPA visibility monitoring program.

4. **ATTAINMENT STATUS:** Not known, pending further analysis of 1981 and current filters from air quality samplers.

5. **TARGET DATE:** Not applicable, pending determination of attainment status.

6. **EVALUATION INTERVAL:** Annual.

7. **INTERIM TARGETS:** Not applicable, pending determination of attainment status.

8. **COMPLIANCE MEASURES**

   a. **MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)**

      **Non-Transportation-Related Measures:** 19, 22

   b. **EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE:** Controls on wood heaters and open burning, set forth in Chapter 91 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, are the main compliance measures TRPA will rely upon to attain and maintain the air quality threshold calling for reductions in wood smoke emissions. See Table AQ-6a for information on the effectiveness and costs of the in-place compliance measures.

   c. **SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)**

      **Non-Mobile Source Related:** 64

   d. **EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES:** Home weatherization improvements, solar heating improvements, and home energy conservation will supplement the effectiveness of the compliance measures already in place, and are expected to further reduce wood smoke emissions. See Table AQ-6b for information on the costs and effectiveness of the supplemental compliance measure.
9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: Wood heaters certified under Oregon or federal standards are capable of reducing wood smoke emissions compared to non-certified units [by what percent?]. However, additional development in the Region permitted by the Regional Plan will increase the need for home heating by approximately 27 percent. Wood heaters certified under Oregon or federal standards emit 41 to 52 percent as much smoke, by volume of fuel, as non-certified wood heaters. Catalytic equipped wood heaters are even more efficient; however, catalytic equipped wood heaters require routine maintenance to avoid significant deterioration in emissions.

By 2005, assuming that one half of the existing units and all of the new units are certified, wood smoke emissions should be no more than 82 percent of those observed in 1985.
Table AQ-6a
Compliance Measures in Place

Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AQ-6b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

Effectiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wood Smoke Emissions Forecast

Lake Tahoe Region

Year

1985 1995 2005

Relative Emissions/Growth

□ Wood Smoke  + Regional Growth

RFP Line
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: air quality
Parameter: VMT (vehicle miles travelled)
Standard: TRPA: reduce VMT 10% from 1981 value

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): VMT calculated by TRPA staff for peak summer day using QRS (Quick Response System) transportation model or equivalent model.

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: VMT is a calculated value based on the QRS travel demand forecasting model, which uses actual and estimated values for population, land use patterns, and travel characteristics to evaluate changes in VMT, traffic volumes, and travel patterns. Caltrans, NDOT, and TRPA operate a traffic monitoring network throughout the Tahoe Region used to calibrate the QRS model.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. TRPA's VMT estimate for 1985 (1.65 million) was about 3 percent lower than the 1981 estimate (1.70 million). A 10 percent reduction from the 1981 estimate results in a target VMT of 1.53 million.

5. TARGET DATE: 2005

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Two years, corresponding to updates of the Regional Transportation Plan.

7. INTERIM TARGETS: See forecast by year, attached.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

- Mass Transportation: 01 through 09, inclusive
- Non-Motorized Transportation: 10, 11
- Transportation Systems Management: 12, 13, 14

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The decrease in estimated VMT between 1981 and 1985 was probably the result of economic conditions and other conditions not related to the compliance measures in place. The TART expansion, neighborhood mail delivery centers, and home mail delivery contribute to lower VMT, but monitoring will be required to determine the extent of their contribution over time. Neighborhood delivery centers (NDCs) opened in 1986 and 1987, and limited home mail delivery began in Incline Village in 1988. The TART expansion took place in 1986. See Table AQ-7a for information on the effectiveness and costs of the in-place compliance measures.
c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Mass Transportation: 01 through 20, inclusive, except 05
Non-Motorized Transportation: 33 through 50, inclusive, except 47
Transportation Systems Management: 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The effectiveness of the individual and collective supplemental measures is set forth in the Final EIR/EIS, Regional Transportation Plan, Lake Tahoe Basin (TRPA, 1988). See Table AQ-7b for information on the effectiveness and costs of the supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: The Regional Plan will result in intensified land use and increased population in the Region. The additional travel demand generated by the Regional Plan will increase peak summer day VMT, prior to mitigation, from the 1985 level of 1.65 million to approximately 1.88 million. Considering the long-term VMT reductions of 237,000 to 375,000 due to mass transit improvements, community planning, and other improvements, the resultant ultimate VMT for a peak summer day would be 1.64 to 1.50 million, compared to the threshold target of 1.53 million. Long-term traffic monitoring and modeling will be necessary to determine progress toward threshold attainment and maintenance.
Table AQ-7a
Compliance Measures in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>05,06,07</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03,08,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,13,14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AQ-7b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost:</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>33,35</td>
<td>17,36,38,39,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,45,48,49,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>06,07,08,09,</td>
<td>10,11,14,15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,34,37,40,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,03,12,13,</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>02,04,19,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,20,52,53,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57,58,59,60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: air quality
Parameter: atmospheric nutrient loading
Standard: reduction in direct DIN load on Lake Tahoe from atmospheric sources by approximately 20 percent of the 1973-1981 annual average

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): annual average concentration of particulate NO$_3$ at the Lake Tahoe Boulevard air quality monitoring station (ppm)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: The IMPROVE aerosol sampler will be used to determine annual average concentrations of particulate nitrate (NO$_3$) at the Lake Tahoe Boulevard station. TRPA will install the IMPROVE sampler in August, 1988. Data will be analyzed bi-weekly and reported annually.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. Appel and Tokiwa (1984) estimated average nitrate concentrations in the South Shore. These data will be used as a surrogate for the 1973-1981 annual average, which is not known. Although there are no more-recent data, there is no evidence on which to base a conclusion that the concentrations have declined by approximately 20 percent. VMT in the Region has decreased about 3 percent since 1981, indicating that nitrate concentrations may have decreased slightly.

5. TARGET DATE: 2005

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual.

7. INTERIM TARGETS: See Figure AQ-8, forecast line

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Mass Transportation: 01 through 09, inclusive
Non-Motorized Transportation: 10, 11
Transportation Systems Management: 12, 13, 14
Transportation-Related Measures: 15, 16, 17
Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 20, 21

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: Although the compliance measures in place may have had a small positive impact on atmospheric deposition of DIN on Lake Tahoe, they will not attain and maintain the threshold without supplemental compliance measures. See Table AQ-8a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.
c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Mass Transportation: 01 through 20, inclusive
Non-Motorized Transportation: 33 through 50, inclusive, except 47
Transportation Systems Management: 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61
Transportation-Related Measures: 62, 63
Non-Transportation-Related Measures: 64, 65, 66

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The combined in-place and supplemental compliance measures will reduce peak summer day VMT in the Tahoe Region by about 10 percent. Motor vehicles are the dominant in-Region sources of atmospheric DIN. In-Region NOx emissions will be decreased, over time, by more than 10 percent, due to VMT reductions, the cleaner vehicle fleet, and other programs such as improvements in home heating. Controls within the Region are estimated to reduce direct deposition of DIN by about 2 to 4 percent. Control of pollutants from upwind areas (65) will be necessary to attain and maintain the threshold standard. See Table AQ-8b for information on the effectiveness and costs of the supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: With cooperation from upwind areas to reduce the transport of nitrate-nitrogen into the Tahoe Region, the Regional Plan will attain and maintain the TRPA threshold. The CARB should provide TRPA with periodic progress reports on programs to reduce NOx emissions in areas upwind of the Tahoe Region.
### Atmospheric Nutrient Loading

#### Table AQ-8a
Compliance Measures in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost: Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>05, 06, 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17, 20, 21</td>
<td>04, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03, 08, 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01, 02, 14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table AQ-8b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost: Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33, 35, 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17, 36, 38, 39, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 54, 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 14, 15</td>
<td>41, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16, 34, 37, 40, 05, 61, 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01, 03, 12, 13, 18, 20, 52, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02, 04, 19, 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality
Parameter: turbidity, shallow waters of Lake Tahoe
Standard: TRPA: Decrease sediment load as required to attain turbidity values not to exceed 3 JTU in littoral Lake Tahoe. In addition, turbidity shall not exceed 1 JTU in shallow waters of Lake Tahoe not directly influenced by stream discharges.

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): turbidity at locations in littoral Lake Tahoe depicted on the attached map (JTU)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: According to the Thresholds Study Report (TRPA, 1982), the Joint Studies Group measured turbidity in JTU at 14 locations in the shallow waters of Lake Tahoe between 1965 and 1975. Turbidity ranged from 0.10 to 1.60 JTU. There are no recent data on turbidity. TRPA will monitor turbidity at selected locations in the littoral zone starting in the first quarter of FY 88-89, in conjunction with annual compliance reviews of the shorezone. (See Monitoring Work Program.)

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Not known.

5. TARGET DATE: Not applicable at this time, pending determination of attainment status.

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual.

7. INTERIM TARGETS: Not applicable at this time, pending determination of attainment status.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01 through 15, inclusive
Waste Management: 28, 29
Natural Area Management: 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in-place include the main water quality compliance measures of the Regional Plan. BMP requirements, capital improvement projects, and SEZ restoration projects are the most effective compliance measures. See Table WQ-1a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.
c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01, 02, 04, 05, 08, 09, 10
Natural Area Management: 16, 17, 18
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 19

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures will augment the effectiveness of the measures already in place, but will not contribute as much to the attainment and maintenance of the threshold as the measures already in place. See Table WQ-1b for information on the effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: Based on: (1) reported efficiencies of approximately 90 percent for BMPs for control of sediment, (2) an anticipated reduction of approximately 80 percent in disturbed areas or "soft coverage," and (3) application of full BMPs to all additional development in the Region, future sediment loading to the littoral zone of Lake Tahoe should be substantially lower than current loading. Although additional monitoring is necessary to determine the status of compliance with the thresholds, the trend in littoral zone turbidity should be positive. If future monitoring reveals threshold exceedences and stable or declining water quality, supplemental compliance measures will be implemented.
### TABLE WQ-1a
Compliance Measures In Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost: Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>07, 08, 09, 11, 13, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44</td>
<td>15, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37</td>
<td>30, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>06, 10, 28, 45</td>
<td>01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 14, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE WQ-1b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost: Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01, 04, 05, 10, 16, 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>02, 08, 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17, 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENIRONMENTAL Threshold COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality
Parameter: clarity, winter, pelagic Lake Tahoe
Standard: TRPA: average Secchi depth, December-March, shall not be less than 33.4 meters. California: Secchi disk transparency shall not be decreased below levels recorded in 1967-71 based on a comparison of seasonal and annual mean values.

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Secchi depth, December - March average; TRG index station (meters)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: The Tahoe Research Group conducts regular monitoring of Secchi depth at the TRG index station, approximately once every 10 days.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. Secchi depths have shown a gradually decreasing trend over the period of record, although clarity has improved from a low value in 1983 in 1984, 1985 and 1986.

5. TARGET DATE: 2006 or beyond

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: Pending completion of a dynamic water quality model for Lake Tahoe, currently the subject of research and development, a realistic, measurable interim goal is a reduction in the rate of decline in pelagic zone clarity, based on diminishing nutrient loads from tributary streams, groundwater, and atmospheric sources. See Figure WQ-2, short-term forecast line.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01 through 16, inclusive
Airborne Nutrients: 17, 18, 19, 20
Waste Management: 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28
Natural Area Management: 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 42, 43, 44, 46

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in-place include the main water quality compliance measures of the Regional Plan. BMP requirements, capital improvement projects, SEZ restoration projects, and fertilizer management programs are the most effective compliance measures. See Table WQ-2a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.
c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01 through 10, inclusive
Airborne Nutrients: 11, 12
Waste Management: 13, 14, 15
Natural Area Management: 16, 17, 18
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 19

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures will augment the effectiveness of the measures already in place, primarily in the area of reducing airborne nutrients. See Table WQ-2b for information on the effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: The Study Report for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (TRPA, 1982) discusses a range of possible thresholds for nutrient loading reductions designed to achieve the desired clarity of pelagic Lake Tahoe and conform to state nondegradation standards. Although it acknowledges a large degree of uncertainty in predicting future water quality conditions, the Study Report recommends a threshold standard of a 25 percent reduction in annual loads of dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) to Lake Tahoe. The draft Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region (TRPA, 1988) concludes that the in-place compliance measures will bring about the desired reductions in nutrient loads from tributary streams and from groundwater, but that supplemental measure 12, control of upwind pollutants, will be necessary to achieve the desired reductions in nutrient loads and subsequent improvements in pelagic zone clarity. Implementation of reductions in upwind pollutants will require action from the California Air Resources Board and other entities. If monitoring reveals that water quality trends do not achieve the short-term goals (see Interim Targets), TRPA will implement additional supplemental measures or make other adjustments in the Regional Plan package.
### TABLE WQ-2a
Compliance Measures In Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>07,08,09,11, 15,16,32,34, 24,26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,23,25,38, 35,36,37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,43,44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>06,10,28,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,03,04, 12,17,18,20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05,14,21,22,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE WQ-2b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>03,06</td>
<td>01,04,05,10, 11,16,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>02,07,08,09, 13,14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE WQ-2

SHORT-TERM FORECAST LINE:
WINTER SECCHI DISK DEPTH, PELAGIC LAKE TAHOE

[To be completed and delivered to APC under separate cover.]
ENIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality
Parameter: phytoplankton primary productivity (PPR), pelagic Lake Tahoe
Standard: TRPA; annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity shall not exceed 52 gc/m^2/yr. California: algal productivity shall not be increased beyond levels recorded in 1967-1971, based on a statistical comparison of seasonal and annual mean values.

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): phytoplankton primary productivity, annual average, measured at the TRG index station (gC/m^2/yr)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: The Tahoe Research Group conducts regular monitoring of PPR at the index station approximately every 10 days.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. PPR at the index station has been steadily increasing over the period of record. From 1983-1986, PPR has been over 100 gC/m^2/yr, roughly twice the target rate.

5. TARGET DATE: 2006 or beyond

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: Pending completion of a dynamic water quality model for Lake Tahoe, currently the subject of research and development, a realistic, measurable interim goal is a reduction in the rate of increase in pelagic zone primary productivity, based on diminishing nutrient loads from tributary streams, groundwater, and atmospheric sources. See Figure WQ-3, short-term forecast line.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01 through 16, inclusive
Airborne Nutrients: 17, 18, 19, 20
Waste Management: 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28
Natural Area Management: 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 42, 43, 44, 46

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in-place include the main water quality compliance measures of the Regional Plan. BMP requirements, capital improvement projects, SEZ restoration projects, and fertilizer management are the most effective compliance measures. See Table WQ-3a for information on the effectiveness and costs of the in-place compliance measures.
c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01 through 10, inclusive
Airborne Nutrients: 11, 12
Waste Management: 13, 14, 15
Natural Area Management: 16, 17, 18
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 19

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures will augment the effectiveness of the measures already in place, primarily in the area of reducing airborne nutrients. See Table WQ-3b for information on the effectiveness and costs of the supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: The Study Report for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (TRPA, 1982) discusses a range of possible thresholds for nutrient loading reductions designed to achieve the desired primary productivity of pelagic Lake Tahoe and conform to state nondegradation standards. Although it acknowledges a large degree of uncertainty in predicting future water quality conditions, the Study Report recommends a threshold standard of a 25 percent reduction in annual loads of dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) to Lake Tahoe. The draft Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region (TRPA, 1988) concludes that the in-place compliance measures will bring about the desired reductions in nutrient loads from tributary streams and from groundwater, but that supplemental measure 12, control of upwind pollutants, will be necessary to achieve the desired reductions in nutrient loads and subsequent improvements in pelagic-zone algal productivity. Implementation of reductions in upwind pollutants will require action from the California Air Resources Board and other entities. If monitoring reveals that water quality trends do not achieve the short-term goals (see Interim Targets), TRPA will implement additional supplemental measures or make other adjustments in the Regional Plan package.
### TABLE WQ-3a
Compliance Measures In Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost:</strong> Low</td>
<td>07,08,09,11, 13,23,25,38, 42,43,44</td>
<td>15,16,32,34, 35,36,37</td>
<td>24,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>06,10,28,46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,03,04, 05,14,21,22, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,17,18,20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE WQ-3b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost:</strong> Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>03,06</td>
<td>01,04,05,10, 11,16,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>02,07,08,09, 12</td>
<td>13,14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WQ-3, cont.
Primary Productivity, Pelagic Lake Tahoe

FIGURE WQ-3

SHORT-TERM FORECAST LINE:
PRIMARY PRODUCTIVITY, PELAGIC LAKE TAHOE

[To be completed and delivered to APC under separate cover.]
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality
Parameter: tributary water quality
Standard: California: total nitrogen, total phosphorus, and total iron, (ann. avg.) (See Table WQ-4a.)
Nevada: soluble phosphorus not to exceed 0.007 mg/l (ann. avg.);
soluble inorganic nitrogen not to exceed 0.25 mg/l (ann. avg.)
TRPA: attain a 90th percentile value for suspended sediment of 60 mg/l.

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): annual average concentrations of appropriate constituents in any tributary stream for which states have established standards (mg/l); 90th percentile suspended sediment concentrations for any tributary stream (mg/l)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: The USGS and the Tahoe Research Group currently monitor nine tributary streams: Trout Creek, Upper Truckee River, General Creek, Edgewood Creek, Ward Creek, Third Creek, Incline Creek, Glenbrook Creek, and Logan House Creek. Blackwood Creek and Snow Creek have been monitored in recent years, but are not being monitored at the present time. The period of record varies from stream to stream.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS:

a. California Tributary Standards

Total Nitrogen: Not known. Data for total nitrogen have not been reported for California streams in the TRG/USGS monitoring program.

Total Phosphorus: For streams in the TRG/USGS monitoring program, non-attainment. For all other streams in California, not known. Total phosphorus concentrations from monitored streams draining developed areas generally exceed the standard by a factor of about 2.

Total Iron: For streams in the TRG/USGS monitoring program, non-attainment. For all other streams in California, not known. Total iron concentrations for monitored streams in California generally exceed the standard by an order of magnitude.

b. Nevada Tributary Standards

Soluble Phosphorus: Streams in the TRG/USGS monitoring program appear to be at or near attainment, based on a very short period of record. Additional monitoring will be necessary to confirm this. For all other streams in Nevada, attainment status is not known.
Total Soluble Inorganic Nitrogen: Streams in the TRG/USGS monitoring program appear to be in attainment, based on a very short period of record. Additional monitoring will be necessary to confirm this. For all other streams in Nevada, attainment status is not known.

c. TRPA Suspended Sediment Threshold

Annual average concentrations of suspended sediment for streams in the TRG/USGS monitoring program are generally less than 60 mg/l. However, 90th percentile data have not been reported. Attainment status is not known.

5. TARGET DATE:

a. California Tributary Standards

Total Nitrogen: To be completed, pending determination of attainment status.

Total Phosphorus: 2006

Total Iron: To be completed, pending review of the California total iron standard.

b. Nevada Tributary Standards

Pending additional monitoring, Nevada streams generally appear to be in attainment of the Nevada tributary standards.

c. TRPA Suspended Sediment Threshold

To be completed, pending additional analysis of suspended sediment data.

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: For California total phosphorus standard, see Figure WQ-4, forecast lines.
8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01 through 16, inclusive
Waste Management: 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29
Natural Area Management: 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in-place include BMP requirements, capital improvement projects, SEZ restoration projects, and fertilizer management programs, which will have beneficial impacts on tributary water quality. See Table WQ-4b for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01 through 10, inclusive
Waste Management: 13, 14, 15
Natural Area Management: 16, 17, 18

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures will augment the effectiveness of the measures already in place, but will not contribute as much to the attainment and maintenance of the threshold as the measures already in place. See Table WQ-4c for information on the effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: The adequacy of compliance measures for tributary water quality is discussed in the draft Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volume I (TRPA, 1988). Application of BMPs and the Capital Improvements Program for erosion and runoff control will improve tributary water quality throughout the Tahoe Region. The TRPA suspended sediment threshold and the California standard for total phosphorus appear to be attainable in the long term. The California total iron standard should be reviewed.
TABLE WQ-4a
Compliance Measures In Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>07,08,09,11,13,15,23,38</td>
<td>16,25,29,34,35,36</td>
<td>24,26,32,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>28,30</td>
<td>06,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,03,04,05,14,31</td>
<td>21,22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE WQ-4b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>03,06</td>
<td>01,04,05,10,16,18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>02,07,08,09</td>
<td>13,14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRIBUTARY WATER QUALITY

FIGURE WQ-4

FORECAST LINE:
TOTAL PHOSPHORUS CONCENTRATIONS, CALIFORNIA TRIBUTARIES

[To be completed and delivered to APC under separate cover.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Nitrogen</th>
<th>Phosphorus</th>
<th>Total Iron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>90th</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavenly Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Creek</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Truckee River</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Lakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Leaf Lake</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Creek</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Creek</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Creek</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallac Creek</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonely Gulch Creek</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks Creek</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Creek</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mckinney Creek</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madden Creek</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Crk.</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Creek</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Creek</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griff Creek</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Creek</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson Creek</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnelain Crk. 0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Nevada has established uniform criteria for all waters in terms of soluble phosphorus and total soluble inorganic nitrogen, not to exceed an annual average mean of 0.007 and 0.25 mg/l, respectively.

b These objectives have been extracted from Table II-9 of the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Plan, State Water Resources Control Board, October, 1980. This footnote is a part of that table and is presented here for completeness. The water quality objectives presented here are derived from those contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Lahontan Basin (State Water Resources Control Board and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, 1975) with the following modifications. Several of the narrative objectives applying to waters of Lake Tahoe proper, are clarified.
ENvironmental ThRESHOLd CoMMIliance FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality
Parameter: runoff water quality
Standard: TRPA threshold--discharges to surface water (90th percentile):
  Dissolved inorganic nitrogen: 0.5 mg/l
  Dissolved phosphorus: 0.1 mg/l
  Dissolved iron: 0.5 mg/l
  Suspended sediment: 250 mg/l
1981 208 plan/SWRCB Water Quality Control Plan--discharges to surface water:
  Total nitrogen as N: 0.5 mg/l
  Total phosphate as P: 0.1 mg/l
  Total iron: 0.5 mg/l
  Turbidity: 20 JTu
  Grease and oil: 2.0 mg/l
Note: for discharges to groundwater, see WQ-6

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): concentration of applicable constituent in samples of surface runoff (localized surface flow from rainfall and snowmelt draining small sub-watersheds) at point of discharge to surface waters (mg/l)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Surface runoff is monitored in response to research, evaluation, or compliance needs by the TRPA, LRWQCB, the California Tahoe Conservancy, and other agencies.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. See draft Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volume I (TRPA, 1988). Observed 90th percentile concentrations of nitrate, dissolved phosphorus, and dissolved iron in four studies from 1969 to 1982 equalled or exceeded the TRPA and state guidelines for discharges of runoff to surface waters. Urban runoff exceeded the TRPA and state guidelines for discharges to surface waters in greater than 90 percent of the samples taken. The 90th percentile concentrations for dissolved phosphorus exceeded the guidelines for discharge to surface waters by a factor greater than 10.
5. TARGET DATE: 2005 or beyond

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: None

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 11, 16
Waste Management: 26, 28, 29
Natural Area Management: 30, 31, 32, 38
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 40, 41, 45

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in-place include the main water quality compliance measures of the Regional Plan. BMP requirements, capital improvement projects, SEZ restoration projects, and fertilizer management are the most effective compliance measures. See Table WQ-5a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10
Natural Area Management: 17
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 19

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures will augment the effectiveness of the measures already in place, but will not contribute as much to the attainment and maintenance of the threshold as the measures already in place. See Table WQ-5b for information on the effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: According to the draft Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volume I (TRPA, 1988) untreated surface runoff will generally not meet the TRPA and state guidelines for discharge to surface waters. Discharges to surface waters should either be eliminated or treated prior to discharge.
WQ-5, cont.
Runoff Water Quality

### TABLE WQ-5a
Compliance Measures In Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>07,11,38,40</td>
<td>16,26,29,32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30,41</td>
<td>06,28,45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,03,04,05,31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE WQ-5b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>03,05,06</td>
<td>04,10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17,19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>02,07,08,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality
Parameter: groundwater
Standard: TRPA: Surface water infiltration into the groundwater shall comply with the Uniform Regional Runoff Guidelines, below. Where there is a direct and immediate hydraulic connection between ground and surface waters, discharges to groundwater shall meet the guidelines for surface discharges—see WQ-5. Uniform Regional Runoff Guidelines for discharges to groundwater:

- total nitrogen as N: 5 mg/l
- total phosphate at P: 1 mg/l
- total iron: 4 mg/l
- turbidity: 200 JTU
- grease/oil: 40 mg/l

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): concentration of applicable constituent in samples of surface runoff (localized surface flow from rainfall and snowmelt draining small sub-watersheds) at point of discharge to groundwater (mg/l)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Surface runoff is monitored in response to research, evaluation, or compliance needs by the TRPA, LRWQCB, the California Tahoe Conservancy, and other agencies.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. According to the Threshold Study Report (TRPA, 1982) 90th percentile concentrations met the TRPA and state guidelines for discharges of runoff to groundwater, with the exception of runoff from urbanized areas, which exceeded the dissolved phosphorus guideline by a factor of about 2.

5. TARGET DATE: 2005

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: None
8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 11, 16
Waste Management: 26, 28, 29
Natural Area Management: 30, 31, 32, 38
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 40, 41, 45

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in-place include the main water quality compliance measures of the Regional Plan. BMP requirements, capital improvement projects, SEZ restoration projects, and fertilizer management are the most effective compliance measures. See Table WQ-6a for information on the effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10
Natural Area Management: 17
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 19

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures will augment the effectiveness of the measures already in place, but will not contribute as much to the attainment and maintenance of the threshold as the measures already in place. See Table WQ-6b for information on the effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: According to the draft Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volume I (TRPA, 1988) discharges of surface runoff to groundwater, with application of BMPs and limits on impervious coverage, will generally meet the TRPA and state guidelines for discharges to groundwater, although runoff from heavily urbanized areas of the Region should be pretreated prior to infiltration.
TABLE WQ-6a
Compliance Measures In Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>07,11,38,40</td>
<td>16,26,29,32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,41</td>
<td>06,28,45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01,02,03,04,05,31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE WQ-6b
Supplemental Compliance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost: Low</td>
<td>03,05,06</td>
<td>04,10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02,07,08,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality
Parameter: other lakes
Standard: TRPA and Nevada: for other lakes in Nevada, the standards are as for tributary streams (see WQ-4). TRPA and California: The Water Quality Control Plan Report for the North Lahontan Basin (SWRCB/LRWC, 1975) and the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (SWRCB, 1980) set general objectives for all surface waters for color, taste and odor, floating material, suspended material, settleable material, oil and grease, biostimulatory substances, sediment, turbidity, pH, dissolved oxygen, bacteria, temperature, toxicity, pesticides, chemical constituents, and radioactivity. They also set numerical standards for certain water bodies for total filterable residue (total dissolved solids), chloride, sulfates, sodium, boron, total nitrogen, total phosphorus, and fecal coliform. Numerical standards are set for Fallen Leaf Lake, including total nitrogen (0.20 mg/l ann. avg.) and total phosphorus (0.005 mg/l ann. avg.; 0.010 mg/l 90th percentile). No other lake in California, other than Lake Tahoe, is assigned numerical standards.

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Annual average or 90th percentile concentrations of applicable constituents from samples of the other lakes in the Tahoe Region for which the states have established numerical standards (normally mg/l).

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: From 1974 to 1976, EPA and USGS conducted limited monitoring of Fallen Leaf, Lilly, and Gilmore Lakes. Fallen Leaf Lake easily met the total nitrogen standard. Little or no monitoring has been conducted since 1976. TRPA will monitor selected lakes on a survey basis in FY 88-89.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Not known, pending additional data collection.

5. TARGET DATE: To be determined, pending additional data collection.

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: To be determined, pending additional data collection.
8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 08, 09, 11, 13
Waste Management: 21, 22, 24, 28, 29
Natural Area Management: 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in-place are the main water quality compliance measures of the Regional Plan. See Table WQ-7a for information on effectiveness and costs of in-place compliance measures.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 02, 08
Waste Management: 13, 14,
Natural Area Management: 16, 17
Lake Tahoe and the Shorezone: 19

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: The supplemental compliance measures will augment the effectiveness of the measures already in place, but will not contribute as much to the attainment and maintenance of the threshold as the measures already in place. See Table WQ-7b for information on the effectiveness and costs of supplemental compliance measures.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: Without additional data collection, the adequacy of the in-place and supplemental measures is not known. Unless water quality monitoring programs reveal specific problems in the future, the quality of the other lakes should equal or exceed the applicable state standards.
### TABLE WQ-7a
**Compliance Measures In Place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost: Low</th>
<th>Cost: Medium</th>
<th>Cost: High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>08,09,11,13, 24,32,38,40, 43,44</td>
<td>34,35,36,37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>28,30,41</td>
<td>29,45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>01,02,03,04, 05,21,22,31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE WQ-7b
**Supplemental Compliance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Cost: Low</th>
<th>Cost: Medium</th>
<th>Cost: High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>17,19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>02,08</td>
<td>13,14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality/soil conservation
Parameter: impervious coverage

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Additional land coverage, by project (sq. ft.)

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Additional land coverage is monitored by TRPA as part of the project review process, and recorded in the Tahoe Environmental Geographic Information System (TEGIS) on a parcel-by-parcel basis, in accordance with Chapter 38 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Attainment. The TRPA Code of Ordinances (Chapter 20) limits all additional land coverage to the Bailey coefficients, either directly or by virtue of a coverage transfers within a related hydrologic area.

5. TARGET DATE: Not applicable.

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: Not applicable.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 06, 11, 13
Natural Area Management: 38

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies and Code of Ordinances limit additional land coverage to the Bailey coefficients, either directly or by transfer within the related hydrologic area.

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (See Table 2)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 04, 10
d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: If monitoring programs show that coverage mitigation programs are not as effective as planned, TRPA may make adjustments in the excess coverage mitigation program.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: The Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Plan Area Statements and Implementing Ordinances of the Regional Plan (TRPA, 1987) and the draft Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region (TRPA, 1988) document the adequacy of the compliance measures in place to attain and maintain the threshold for impervious coverage.
ENVELOPMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: water quality/soil conservation
Parameter: naturally-functioning SEZ
Standard: TRPA: Preserve naturally-functioning SEZs in their natural condition; restore all disturbed SEZ lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands; restore 25 percent of SEZ lands identified as disturbed, developed, or subdivided, to obtain a 5 percent total increase in the area of naturally-functioning SEZ lands.

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Area of naturally-functioning SEZs (acres).

3. MONITORING SUMMARY: Disturbance in SEZs is monitored by TRPA as part of the project review process, and recorded in the Tahoe Environmental Geographic Information System (TEGIS) on a parcel-by-parcel basis, in accordance with Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinances.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Non-attainment. TRPA Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinance implement prohibitions on SEZ disturbance in accordance with the threshold standard. However, it will take several years to reach the target of 25 percent restoration in developed, disturbed, and subdivided (i.e., urbanized) portions of the Region.

5. TARGET DATE: 2005

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Annual

7. INTERIM TARGETS: See Figure SC-2a, forecast line.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES

a. MEASURES IN PLACE (see Table 1)

Urban Runoff and Erosion: 13, 14

b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The restoration threshold was based on the feasibility of restoring SEZs in the urbanized portions of the Tahoe Region. Disturbance in the urbanized areas includes filling, grading, draining, encroaching, displacing vegetation, altering drainage, blocking channels, and channelizing. TRPA (1977) and Morris (1981) showed that SEZs are effective for removing sediment and nutrients from surface runoff. Natural treatment capability is reduced where development causes channelized flows. Channelized SEZs may actually increase sediment and nutrient loads through concentration of surface runoff. Artificial and restored SEZs will provide many of the same benefits as natural SEZs, but may be less
effective at treating surface runoff, especially during the first few
years of operation. For additional discussion, see the draft Water
Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volume III (TRPA,
1988).

c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES (see Table 2): 05, 09

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: More stringent SEZ
encroachment rules could increase the net effectiveness of the SEZ
restoration program. Transfer of development from SEZs would add to
restoration acreage. The most cost-effective choice would be to add
more stringent SEZ encroachment rules.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES: There are approximately 17,700 acres of
SEZ in the Lake Tahoe Region. There are approximately 1,200 acres of SEZ
needing restoration work on National Forest land. There are about 4,400
acres of SEZ lands that have been disturbed, developed, or subdivided,
representing about 50 percent of the SEZ lands in private ownership. The
threshold calls for restoration of 25 percent of the 4,400 acres, or about
1,100 acres of disturbed, developed, and subdivided SEZs. TRPA estimates
that over 1,100 acres will be restored by a combination of (1) completed
projects, (2) restoration projects on the TRPA list, (3) large projects,
and (4) small projects of the California Tahoe Conservancy, Forest Service,
and Nevada Division of State Lands. For additional detail, see the draft
Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volume III (TRPA,
1988).
SC-2, cont.
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[To be completed and delivered to APC under separate cover.]
August 2, 1988

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment to Boundary Between Plan Area 097 (Bijou Pines) and Plan Area 098 (Bijou/Al Tahoe) to Include APN 26-050-04 in PAS 098

Amendment Description: The City of South Lake Tahoe is requesting that the boundary between Plan Area 097 (Bijou Pines) and 098 (Bijou/Al Tahoe) be adjusted to include El Dorado County APN 26-050-04 in Plan Area 098 (see Attachment A).

Current Needs: The amendment is being requested by the City to allow TRPA to consider a proposal to establish a low cost, government assisted, child care facility for up to 60 children on the parcel.

Current Plan Area Statement Provisions: The government assisted child care facility being proposed falls under the definition of a social service organization in the TRPA Code. Social service organizations are included under the use classification of public service, therefore there is no requirement for commercial square footage.

Social service organizations are prohibited in Plan Area 097, which has a land use classification of residential. The land use classification for Plan Area 098 is commercial/public service and social service organizations are an allowed use. For more detail on Plan Area Statements 097 and 098 see Attachment B and C, respectively.

Existing Land Use: The subject parcel currently contains a 2,250 square foot building that is used as a Boy Scout Hall and rented, since September, 1985, by Continuing Development Incorporated for child care services. The parcel also contains 3,991 square feet of parking (seven spaces) and driveway area, 929 square feet of deck and ramp and a 225 square foot restroom facility.

Proposed Project: The City proposes to place a relocatable, 960 square foot building on the parcel. Hours of operation will be from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The number of parking spaces is to be increased from seven spaces, including two handicapped spaces, to ten spaces.
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Surrounding Uses: The subject parcel is located immediately adjacent to the City of South Lake Tahoe/El Dorado County administrative and recreation complex located north of Al Tahoe Boulevard and east of U. S. Highway 50 in Al Tahoe. Community baseball and soccer fields are located immediately adjacent to the subject parcel to the north. The City of South Lake Tahoe's Community and Leisure Service Center is located directly across Rufus Allen from the subject parcel. Residential parcels abut the subject parcel to the east.

Land Capability: The subject parcel is shown on the TRPA Land Capability Maps as a level 7, allowing 30 percent base land coverage.

Impact Analysis: To determine the extent to which the proposed amendment may have an adverse impact on the environment, staff has evaluated the potential impacts on land, air, water, plant life, animal life, noise, light and glare, land use, natural resources, risk of upset, population, housing, transportation/circulation, public services, energy, utilities, human health, aesthetics, recreation, and archeological/historical.

Staff has concluded that the amendment will not result in a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

1. The amendment effects only the subject parcel.

2. The existing uses on the subject parcel are similar to and consistent with the existing uses in Plan Area 098, and inconsistent with the existing uses in Plan Area 097.

3. Any significant expansion or modification of the existing uses on the subject parcel requires issuance of a TRPA permit. A TRPA permit cannot be issued unless TRPA finds that the project will not result in a significant environmental effect or that any potential significant effects will be mitigated to less than a significant level.

Environmental Document: Based on the impact analysis included in the preceding section, staff has determined that a finding of no significant effect is appropriate.

Chapter 6 Findings: Three findings are required by Section 6.4 of the Code prior to amendment Plan Area Statements or Plan Area Maps. The findings, and identification of facts and rationales upon which they are based, are set forth below. The findings are also based upon the EIS prepared for the Plan Area Statements and Maps and the findings made pursuant to Article VII(d) prior to their adoption.

1. The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded: The proposed amendment will not, in itself, result in the creation of impacts. Any development activity with the potential to significantly effect a threshold is a project. No project may be approved by TRPA unless it is found that the project will not cause an environmental threshold to be exceeded.
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2. Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable to the region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards: Projects approved by TRPA must meet the air and water quality standards set forth in the TRPA Code. The EIS for the Code establishes that these standards are consistent with federal state and local air and water quality standards.

3. The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds: The proposed amendment has no effect on the provisions of the Regional Plan, which, in the EIS for the Plan, have been determined to be necessary to achieve and maintain the Thresholds.

Ordinance 87-9 Findings: Ordinance 87-9 does not require any special findings prior to amendments to Plan Area Statements or Maps.

Staff Analysis of Proposed Amendment: Staff considers it to be appropriate to include the subject parcel in Plan Area 098 for the following reasons.

1. There are legally established existing uses on the subject parcel that are more similar to and consistent with the existing uses in Plan Area 098. The existing uses on the subject parcel function as part of the City/El Dorado County administrative and recreation complex; and therefore, should be included in the Commercial/Public Service Plan Area.

2. Since the subject parcel has access to U. S. Highway 50 without passing through a residential area, traffic generated from uses on the parcel will not directly effect the adjacent residential area.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that, based on the information and analysis contained in this report, the APC recommend that the TRPA Governing Board approve the proposed amendment as described in the section of this report entitled Amendment Description and as shown on Attachment A.
PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification                 RESIDENTIAL
Management Strategy                    MITIGATION
Special Designation                    NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: The Bijou Pines area is located east of the Al Tahoe subdivision between Highway 50 and Johnson Boulevard. Access to this area is generally from Rufus Allen Boulevard. This Plan Area is located on TRPA map G-17.

Existing Uses: The existing use of this area is generally residential. The area is approximately 90 percent built out.

Existing Environment: This area is 12 percent SEZ lands and 88 percent low hazard. The area is currently 40 percent covered and 23 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: The area should continue to be residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. There are drainage problems in the SEZ areas.
2. There is deteriorating housing stock in the older subdivisions in this area (Bijou Pines Subdivision).

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The Bijou Pines Subdivision should encourage rehabilitation while maintaining the summer tract character.
2. Existing drainage problems should be addressed, specifically in the Bijou Pines Subdivision.

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

General List: The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area:

Residential Single family dwelling (A).

PAS 097 -- BIJOU PINES
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Public Service

Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), local post offices (S), and day care centers (S).

Recreation

Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).

Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment/management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).

MAXIMUM DENSITIES: Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS: Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 0 units.

MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 55 CNEq.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION: The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time:

SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT  WINTER DAY USE 0 PAOT  OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by the Surface Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 of Volume I of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.
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3. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program.
(To be completed.)
PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification
COMMERCIAL/PUBLIC SERVICE

Management Strategy
REDIRECTION

Special Designation
PRELIMINARY COMMUNITY PLAN AREA

TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:

1. Existing Development

PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA
(SA #1 only)

SCENIC RESTORATION AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area is located along Highway 50 from Bijou Creek to Trout Creek. Including the adjoining areas along Al Tahoe Boulevard. This area is located on TRPA maps G-17 and G-18.

Existing Uses: The uses in the area are diverse. The major uses include large motels, two schools, a sewer plant, a college site, government offices, a recreation center and campground, a marina and boat ramp, public beach, and several shopping centers. The area is 65 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The area is 10 percent SEZ and 90 percent low hazard. The land coverage is 35 percent with an additional 15 percent disturbed. The shorezone tolerance districts are 1 and 4.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should be developed to provide regional commercial, recreational and public services for the South Shore.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Development encroaches on Bijou Creek and Trout Creek.

2. This area has traffic congestion problems.

3. Status of the mobile home park on Rufus Allen is undetermined.

4. This area contains part of the Caltrans bypass right-of-way.

5. This area needs improved access to the beach areas.

6. Scenic Roadway Units 34 and 35 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 31 are in this area and the roadway units are targeted for restoration as required by the scenic threshold. There have been significant scenic improvements in the area.
SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The commercial strip from Al Tahoe to Bijou along Highway 50 should be redirected through an adopted Redevelopment Plan or Community Plan. Commercial uses will be limited to Special Area #1 at Bijou, at Harrison Street and at Al Tahoe Boulevard.

2. Future development and planning should consider improved access to beach areas and needs to strengthen visual ties with the lake.

3. Flooding problems at Lyons and Rufus Allen need to be addressed.

4. The trailer units in the trailer park on Rufus Allen should be converted to affordable housing consistent with the requirements of the plan. A roadway connecting Rufus Allen with Treehaven should be considered.

5. The American Legion Tract should be considered for designation as a Historical District. Property owners in this area should be encouraged to maintain or upgrade the existing structures to keep them in a "rural" Tahoe style.

6. Community cultural facilities should be considered in Redevelopment Plans and Community Plans.

7. Uses not compatible with scenic restoration should not be located on the Highway 50 corridor.

8. The TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency will evaluate all or portions of this Plan Area for a Special Designation as Eligible for Redevelopment Plans after substantial progress has been made toward implementation of the redevelopment plan in PAS 089, 091 and 092.

PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

General List: The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area.

Residential

Employee housing (S), nursing and personal care (S), residential care (S), single family dwelling (S), and summer home (S).

Commercial

Nursery (S), amusements and recreation services (S), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), outdoor amusements (S), schools - pre-schools (S), and vehicle storage and parking (S).

Public Service

Cemeteries (S), churches (A), cultural facilities (A), day care centers (S), government offices (A), local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (A), local public health and safety facility (A), membership organizations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (A), schools - college (A), schools - kindergarten through secondary (A), social service organizations (A), pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (S),
Recreation

Day use areas (A), recreation center (A), participant sports facilities (A), sport assembly (S), beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (A), cross country skiing courses (S), developed campgrounds (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), marinas (S), recreational vehicle park (S), riding and hiking trails (S), and visitor information center (A).

Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), nonstructural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (A), structural wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).

Special Area #1: The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1.

Residential

Employee housing (S), mobile home dwelling (S), multiple family dwelling (S), nursing and personal care (S), residential care (S), single family dwelling (S), and summer home (S).

Tourist Accommodation

Bed and Breakfast (A), hotels, motels and other transient dwelling units (A), timeshare (hotel/motel design) (S), and timeshare (residential design) (S).

Commercial

Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (S), building materials and hardware (S), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (S), service stations (A), amusements and recreation services (S), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), outdoor amusements (S), animal husbandry services (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), construction services (S), financial services (A), health care services (A), laundries and dry cleaning plant (S), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), schools - business and vocational (S), schools - pre-schools (A), secondary storage (S), printing and publishing (S), small scale manufacturing (S), and vehicle storage and parking (S).

Public Service

Churches (A), cultural facilities (A), day care centers (A), government offices (A), local assembly and entertainment (A), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organizations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), public utility centers (S), regional public health and safety facilities (A), schools - kindergarten through secondary (S), social service organizations (A), pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).
Recreation

Day use areas (A), participant sports facilities (S), beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), marinas (S), and visitor information center (S).

Resource Management

Same as General List.

Shorezone: Within the specified shorezone tolerance district, the following primary uses may be permitted in the backshore, nearshore, and foreshore. Accessory structures shall be regulated pursuant to the regulations applicable to the primary use upon which they are dependent in accordance with Chapter 18. The following structures may be permitted in the shorezone as an allowed (A) or special (S) use only if they are accessory to an existing, allowed use located on the same or adjoining littoral parcel.

Tolerance Districts 1 and 4

Primary Uses

Water oriented outdoor recreation concessions (A), beach recreation (A), water borne transit (A), boat launching facilities (S), tour boat operations (A), safety and navigation facilities (A), and marinas (S).

Accessory Structures

Buoys (A), piers (S), fences (S), boat ramps (S), floating decks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines.

MAXIMUM DENSITIES: Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwelling</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Dwelling</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Home</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel or lease site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Housing</td>
<td>As per the limitations above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hotel, Motel and other

Transient Units

- with less than 10% of units with kitchens 40 units per acre
- with 10% or more units with kitchens 15 units per acre

Timeshare

As per the limitations set forth in this table

Recreation

Recreation Vehicle Parks 10 sites per acre

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 0 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 60 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 50 corridor is 65 CNEL.

**ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION:** The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time:

SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT WINTER DAY USE 0 PAOT OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

**IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS:** The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by the Surface Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 of Volume I of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.

3. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program. (To be completed.)

4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway 50 corridor. (To be completed.)
MEMORANDUM

August 1, 1988

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment to Permissible Uses for Plan Area 094 To Add Pre-Schools as a Special Use. Applicant: Fred C. Puliafico. Property Identification: 3260 Pioneer Trail, APN 25-510-66, El Dorado County

Amendment Description: The applicant, Fred C. Puliafico, owner of El Dorado County APN 25-510-66, is requesting that the general list of permissible uses for Plan Area 094 (Glenwood) be amended by adding pre-schools as a special use.

Current Needs: The amendment is being requested to allow TRPA to consider as a project a proposal to increase the hours of operation for, and number of children attending an existing pre-school located on the subject property (see Attachment A).

Current Plan Area Statement Provisions: The Land Use Classification for PAS 094 is residential and the management strategy is mitigation. Pre-schools are not listed as either an allowed or special use and are, therefore, a prohibited use in PA 094. For additional information on PAS 094, see Attachment B.

Code Provisions: Section 18.1.C establishes that uses legally commenced prior to the effective date of the Regional Plan, July 1, 1987, which would be prohibited if new, are nonconforming uses. Section 18.5.B(3) prohibits the expansion or intensification of an existing nonconforming use. The proposal to increase the number of children attending the pre-school is an intensification of use due, primarily, to the associated increase in vehicle trips.

The addition of pre-schools as a special use under the general list of permissible uses in PAS 094 will allow the TRPA to accept and consider the proposed project. However, the project may be approved only if the required findings are made for a special use. These findings, which are set forth in Subsection 18.1.B, are as follows:
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1. The project, to which the use pertains, is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which, and surrounding area in which, it will be located.

2. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners.

3. The project, to which the use pertains, will not change the character of the neighborhood, detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable planning area statement, community plan and specific or master plan, as the case may be.

Recent Land Use History: In March, 1986 the uses on the subject property consisted of a church and other related accessory uses. On March 13, 1986 TRPA authorized the establishment of a pre-school on the subject property. The pre-school was limited to 33 children and hours of operation from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Approved plans show that the entire building, 2,184 square feet, was to be used for a combination of classrooms and activity areas. On April 27, 1986 TRPA approved the placement of a sign on the subject property reading "Under The Magic Pine Tree Children Center." On January 7, 1987 TRPA authorized the pre-school to extend its hours of operation from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Establishment of Commercial Square Footage: When TRPA authorized the establishment of a pre-school on the subject property in March, 1986, pre-schools fell under the definition of "Child Care Nurseries", which was classified as a "Public/Quasi-Public" use. Due to the Public/Quasi Public classification no allocation of commercial square footage was required, even when, in April, 1986, operation of the pre-school by the church ceased and the pre-school became one of the child care facilities operated by Under The Magic Pine Tree.

Under the current TRPA Regional Plan pre-schools, which are defined as "establishments used for the care of more than 12 children residing elsewhere", are classified as a commercial use. Since the subject pre-school was legally commenced prior to the effective date of the Regional Plan, the building area authorized for pre-school use, 2,184 sq. ft., is now existing commercial square footage. Action taken on the requested amendment has no bearing on the 2,184 sq. ft. now being recognized as commercial square footage.
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Surrounding Uses: The subject parcel is approximately 5.2 acres in size, with 126 feet of frontage on Pioneer Trail. Single family residential parcels of generally 1/3 acre in size abut the subject property to the south. The subject parcel abuts a 3.65 acre residential parcel to the east and Pioneer Trail and Saddle Road to the west and north, respectively. West of Pioneer Trail and directly across from the subject parcel there is a 3.14 acre residential parcel. North of Saddle Road and directly across from the subject parcel there are four residential parcels ranging in size from 1.6 acres to approximately 9,000 sq. ft. To the southeast of the subject parcel there is undeveloped forest land. The predominant use in PA 094 is single family residential. There is, however, a 60 unit mobile home park in PA 094.

Land Capability: The subject parcel is shown on the TRPA Land Capability Maps as a level 4, allowing 20% coverage.

Impact Analysis: To determine the extent to which the proposed amendment may have an adverse impact on the environment, staff has evaluated the potential impacts on land, air, water, plant life, animal life, noise, light and glare, land use, natural resources, risk of upset, population, housing, transportation/circulation, public services, energy, utilities, human health, aesthetics, recreation, and archeological/historical.

Staff also recognized that the amendment would allow other pre-schools to be proposed in PA 094.

Staff has concluded that the amendment will not result in a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

1. The existing pre-school is recognized as a legally established non-conforming use and may be continued.

2. To expand the existing pre-school or establish a new one a public hearing must be held and TRPA must make the findings set forth in Subsection 18.1.B. (See Code Provisions section of this report).

3. Any significant expansion of the existing pre-school or establishment of a new one is a project requiring issuance of a TRPA permit. A TRPA permit cannot be issued unless TRPA finds that the project will not result in a significant environmental effect or that any potential significant effect will be mitigated to less than a significant level.

Environmental Document: Based on the impact analysis included in the preceding section, staff has determined that a finding of no significant effect is appropriate.

8/1/88
Chapter 6 Findings: Three findings are required by Section 6.4 of the Code prior to amending Plan Area Statements or Plan Area Maps. The findings, and identification of facts and rationales upon which they are based, are set forth below. The findings are also based upon the EIS prepared for the Plan Area Statements and Maps and the findings made pursuant to Article VII(d) prior to their adoption.

1. The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded: The proposed amendment will not, in itself, result in the creation of impacts. Any development activity with the potential to significantly affect a threshold is a project. No project may be approved by TRPA unless it is found that the project will not cause an environmental threshold to be exceeded.

2. Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable to the region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards. Projects approved by TRPA must meet the air and water quality standards set forth in the TRPA Code. The EIS for the Code establishes that these standards are consistent with federal, state and local air and water quality standards.

3. The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds: The proposed amendment has no effect on the provisions of the Regional Plan, which, in the EIS for the Plan, have been determined to be necessary to achieve and maintain the Thresholds.

Ordinance 87-8 Findings: Ordinance 87-8 does not require any special findings prior to amendments to Plan Area Statements of Maps.

Staff Analysis of Proposed Amendment: Staff considers it to be appropriate to include Pre-Schools as a special use in Plan Area 094 for the following reasons:

1. There is a legally established pre-school existing in the plan area.

2. There are existing parcels in PA 094, including the subject parcel, that have characteristics different than typical residential parcels, such as size and location. These unique characteristics may provide the bases on which to make the special use findings to allow the existing pre-school to expand or a new pre-school to be established.

3. The location of pre-schools in close proximity to major residential areas and adjacent to major arterials, such as Pioneer Trail, can result in reduced vehicle trips and miles traveled.
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4. If properly designed, including adequate buffers, pre-schools can be compatible with residential uses.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that, based on the information and analysis contained in this report, the APC recommend that the TRPA Governing Board approve the proposed amendment as described in the section of this report entitled Amendment Description and as shown on Attachment C.
PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowable (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

GENERAL LIST: The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area (except as noted in Special Area #1):

RESIDENTIAL

Single family dwelling (A).

COMMERCIAL

Schools - Pre-school (S)

PUBLIC SERVICE

Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), and local post offices (S).

RECREATION

Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment/management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).

Special Area #1: The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1.

All the uses listed on the General List plus the following additions:

Residential

Mobile home dwellings (A).
PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL
Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area is located near Pioneer Trail between Glenwood and Blackwood Avenues and is located on TRPA maps H-17, H-18, G-17, and G-18.

Existing Uses: This residential area includes newer single family dwellings (both subdivisions and mobile home parks). The area is 65 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The lands are classified as 25 percent high hazard, 30 percent SEZ, 15 percent moderate hazard and 30 percent low hazard. The land coverage is 20 percent with an additional 25 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT:

This area should continue to be residential, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. The SEZ has been altered by the development of single family housing.
2. A conflict exists between the need to make improvements to Pioneer Trail because of increasing traffic and the existing residential character of the area.
3. The future status of a Caltrans right-of-way through this area is uncertain.
4. Drainage problems exist in the area.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Pioneer Trail improvements must be compatible with the neighborhood.
2. Senior citizen housing should be encouraged in this area.

PERMISSIBLEUSES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE Uses and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.
**General List:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area (except as noted in Special Area #1):

- **Residential**
  - Single family dwelling (A).

- **Public Service**
  - Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), and local post offices (S).

- **Recreation**
  - Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).

- **Resource Management**
  - Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment/management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).

**Special Area #1:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1.

All the uses listed on the General List plus the following additions:

- **Residential**
  - Mobile home dwellings (A).

**MAXIMUM DENSITIES:** Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Dwellings</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 0 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 CNEL.

**ADDITIONAL DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION:** The following are the targets and limits for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities specified in Chapter 13 to be located within this Plan Area. Specific projects and their timing are addressed in the TRPA Five-Year Recreation Program pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities allowed are measured in persons at one time:

SUMMER DAY USES: 0 PAOT  WINTER DAY USE: 0 PAOT  OVERNIGHT USES: 0 PAOT
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: The capital improvement and other improvement programs required by the Regional Goals and Policies Plan for this area shall be implemented. The improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Improvements required by the Surface Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 of Volume I of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.

3. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program. (To be completed.)
PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allows (A) or must be con- sidered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

GENERAL LIST: The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area (except as noted in Special Area #1):

RESIDENTIAL

Single family dwelling (A).

COMMERCIAL

Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), and local post offices (S).

PUBLIC SERVICE

SCHOOLS - Pre-school (S)

RECREATION

Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment/management (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).

Special Area #1: The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1.

All the uses listed on the General List plus the following additions:

Residential

Mobile home dwellings (A).
MEMORANDUM

August 2, 1988

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Memorandum of Understanding, California Tahoe Conservancy

Attached is a copy of the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California Tahoe Conservancy and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency regarding exempt and qualified exempt activities pursuant to Subparagraph 4.8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Subparagraph 4.8 of the Code provides for amendments to exempt those activities of public and quasi-public entities set forth in Memoranda of Understanding between TRPA and such entities. A public hearing on this matter is scheduled for the August Governing Board meeting.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AND
CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

AUGUST 1990

The following will direct the California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy) and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) in determining procedures for proposed Conservancy activities, outlining exempt activities, and providing for the required accounting of coverage as a result of activities authorized under this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This MOU is executed pursuant to Subparagraph 4.8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code).

All activities described herein shall be consistent with the Regional Plan package of TRPA as adopted by Ordinance No. 87-8, and as it may be subsequently amended. It is understood that activities exempt under this MOU shall not result in a net increase in land coverage on a project area or an increase in vehicle trips as defined in Section 4.3.B of the Code of Ordinances. It is also understood that all projects undertaken pursuant to this MOU shall comply with applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances other than the procedural provisions replaced by this MOU.

I. PROCEDURES FOR PROPOSED CONSERVANCY PROJECTS

Activities covered under this MOU shall be processed according to the procedures outlined herein. The Conservancy agrees to provide TRPA with appropriate project applications for activities not exempt under this MOU.

II. EXEMPT ACTIVITIES

The following activities, in addition to those exempt per Section 4.2 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, are exempt from review by TRPA.

A. RECREATION PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Operation of recreation sites, facilities, and existing activities provided the capacity of the recreation area in PAOTS does not increase.

Operation of visitor information and interpretative services.

Landscaping and revegetation.

B. SIGNING

Informational or regulatory sign installation.
C. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Inventory, protection, maintenance, and disposition of cultural resources in accordance with the Code and applicable State and Federal laws and procedures.

D. ROADS AND TRAILS

Maintenance of existing roads, trails, bridges, and related structures subject to Chapters 4.2.A(6) and 4.3.A(6) but not including projects in the shorezone.

E. STRUCTURES

Demolition of structures, except historical structures.

Structural repair or remodeling less than $5,000 per year which does not result in excavation or backfilling in excess of that described in Section 4.2.A(6) and Section 4.3.A(6), additional land coverage, an increase in the dimensions of a structure (including height), a change of use, an increase in commercial floor area, or an increase in density.

F. FISH AND WILDLIFE

Protection of wildlife habitat and fisheries without construction or stream modification.

Establishment of wildlife viewing stations.

G. FIRE PROTECTION

Fire prevention.

H. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND MONITORING

Monitoring of streamflows, water quality, and sedimentation.

I. Erosion Control and Restoration Activities

Installation of erosion control measures such as retaining walls not exceeding 60 feet in length and sediment basins not exceeding 150 square feet in size, swales, rock slope protection, rock-lined ditches, fences, and willow wattling.

Revegetation and restoration of disturbed areas of one acre or less.
K. MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES

Temporary activities, not involving construction consistent with Chapter 7, Subsections 7.5 and 7.6, on California State lands.

Land surveys, corner recovery, remonumentation and land-line posting.

Maintenance of existing dams with no change in holding capacity, subject to the limitations of TRPA Code Subsections 4.2.A(6) and 4.3.A(6)

III. QUALIFIED EXEMPT ACTIVITIES

The following activities are not subject to review and approval by TRPA provided the Conservancy certifies on a TRPA form titled "Qualified Exempt Form" that the activity does not result in the creation of additional land coverage, or relocation of land coverage and is in conformance with the applicable provisions of the Code including BMP retrofit and excess coverage mitigation requirements. These exemptions do not apply to concessionaire-operated activities. This form shall be submitted to TRPA at least one working day before the activity commences. This list is in addition to those activities deemed "Qualified Exempt" per the TRPA Code, Subsection 4.3.

A. RECREATION PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Replacement of fences, roads, and utilities in existing recreation and special use sites provided the use is an allowed use pursuant to Chapter 18, TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the replacement is not considered an expansion.

B. ROADS AND TRAILS

Minor reconstruction, relocation, or rerouting of roads, parking lots, trails, bridges, and easements necessary to protect the environment or eliminate a safety hazard. (Special attention should be directed to Chapter 20 of the Code).

C. CONSTRUCTION

Excavation and backfilling pursuant to Subsection 4.3.A(6) for quantities up to 100 cubic yards, except for water wells.

Undergrounding of utilities -- less than 500 lineal feet. Does not include work in SEZ's.

Overhead telephone lines, power lines under 10 kv, and service connections under one mile in length if entirely on State land, at least 100 feet from private land and with no impact on wildlife. This does not include construction of access roads in low capability lands.

New water lines under 500 feet in length except in SEZ's.
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D. FISH AND WILDLIFE

Fish and wildlife habitat enhancement activities except for stream or lake modification.

E. FIRE PROTECTION

Prescribed burning when accomplished under established air quality standards. (Special attention should be directed to Chapters 72 and 91 of the Code.)

F. EROSION CONTROL AND RESTORATION ACTIVITIES

Installation of erosion control measures such as retaining walls exceeding 60 feet in length and sediment basins exceeding 150 square feet when not visible from the shore of any lake or from any roadway for which a scenic threshold rating has been established or from class 1 bikepaths or from a developed recreation site.

Restoration of stream environment zones (SEZ).

Revegetation and restoration of disturbed areas exceeding one acre in size.

G. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

All timber removal activities may be undertaken directly by the Conservancy so long as they are activities other than those defined as "substantial" in Section 71.3.1 of the Code, and the work is performed under the supervision of a registered professional forester employed by the California Department of Forestry (CDF) or the United States Forest Service (USFS). Such activities shall otherwise be consistent with Chapter 71 of the Code and may include, but not be limited to:

- Timber stand improvement projects, pruning, thinning, removal of hazardous, dead, dying, or diseased trees, and disposal of wastes through the issuance of wood permits, chipping, slash burning, and scattering.
- Tree, shrub and grass planting, fertilizing, and irrigating in accordance with Best Management Practices.
- Protection and enhancement of rare, endangered, threatened, sensitive, and special interest plant associations.
- Fuelwood sales and wood permits.
- Commercial timber sales consistent with Chapter 71 of the Code.
H. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND MONITORING

Installation of instruments for weather, snow, precipitation, air and water monitoring purposes in connection with natural resources, environmental, or safety monitoring programs.

I. MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES

Commercial filming.

IV. TREATMENT AND ACCOUNTING OF COVERAGE FOR ACTIVITIES COVERED BY THIS MOU

It is recognized by the Conservancy and TRPA that aforementioned exempt activities may result in the use of coverage or the need to mitigate existing excess coverage. Most of the activities, however, involve restoration and result in the need to "bank" or otherwise account for, the coverage or disturbed land restoration.

Chapter 38 of the Code provides for the Accounting, Tracking, and Banking of coverage in conjunction with Chapter 20. The Conservancy agrees to report to the Executive Director of TRPA quarterly on all activities resulting in a change in coverage or lands restored for all parcels so affected. The Conservancy shall report all coverage transactions consistent with the guidelines and requirements of Chapter 38 of the Code. TRPA shall provide the specific worksheet(s) for use by the Conservancy.

Coverage or restored land credits which are " bankers" shall be available for use by the Conservancy consistent with all applicable provisions of the TRPA Code.

Any activity set forth in Part III shall become a project requiring TRPA review under the terms of this agreement if found by TRPA staff that such a project has a significant cumulative or individual affect on the environment.

This MOU shall become effective when signed by both parties. It may be terminated or modified at any time by agreement of the parties, and may be terminated by either party or alone by giving sixty (60) days notice in writing to the other.

Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Executive Director
California Tahoe Conservancy

Date

Date
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129