TRPA
GOVERNING BOARD
PACKETS

FEBRUARY
1991
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
NOTICE OF MEETINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on February 27, 28, 1991, commencing at 10:00 a.m. on the 27th and at 10:30 a.m. on the 28th, at 195 U.S. Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Nevada, the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting. The official agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on February 27, 1991, at 8:30 a.m. in the same location, the Finance Committee will meet to discuss receipt of the January financial statement and the monthly check register, needs assessment for a new TRPA office building, a procedure for collateralizing TRPA investments, revisions to the FY 90-91 budget, release of air quality mitigation funds to Placer County for TART, release of State Transit Assistance Funds to the City of South Lake Tahoe for STAGE, receipt of the Transportation Development Act audits for FY 89-90, and two requests by El Dorado County for release of water quality mitigation funds.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on February 27, 1991, at 8:30 a.m. in the same location, the Legal Committee will discuss an increase in outside counsel fees, settlement of TRPA v. Wassner, and settlement of potential litigation regarding the Tahoe Mariner, Washoe County.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that, at the conclusion of the February 27, 1991 session of the Governing Board meeting, the retirement committee will meet to discuss the benefit year and calendar, to review the annual report from the fund administrator, and to establish a process for selection of a new plan administrator.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on February 28, 1991, at 9:00 a.m. in the same location, the Capital Financing Committee will meet to hear a report by Caltrans (Pat Weston) on California funding programs; and to discuss the second administrative draft, Water Quality Program Financial Plan; the work program; and other capital financing matters.

Date: February 19, 1991

David S. Ziegler
Executive Director

NOTE: Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Tahoe Valley and Al Tahoe, California.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BODY

TRPA Office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Nevada

February 27, 1991 10:00 a.m.
February 28, 1991 10:30 a.m.

All items are action items unless otherwise noted.

OFFICIAL AGENDA

I  PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

III APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV APPROVAL OF AGENDA

V  CONSENT CALENDAR (see page 3)

VI PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF ORDINANCES

A. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, to Adopt MOU Between TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe for Review of New Single Family and Multi-Residential (Up to Four Units) Structures

VII PLANNING MATTERS

A. Movement of the Individual Parcel Evaluation System Line - Wednesday, February 27, 1:30 p.m.

B. Workshop - Wednesday, February 27, 2:30 p.m.
   1. Roles and Responsibilities
   2. September 1991 Evaluation of Regional Plan Package
   3. Allocations of Residential Development in 1992 and Beyond
   4. Future Workshop Schedule

VIII COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND BOARD ACTION

A. Finance Committee
   1. Receipt of the January Financial Statement and Check Register
   2. Revision to the FY 90-91 Operating Budget
   3. Collateralization of TRPA Investments
B. Legal Committee
1. Increase in Outside Legal Counsel Fees
2. Settlement of TRPA v. Wassner
C. Capital Financing Committee
D. Retirement Committee

IX ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
A. Appointments to Committees
B. Appointment of Two California Lay Members to the Advisory Planning Commission
C. Status of Program of Work for FY 90-91

X REPORTS
A. Executive Director
1. Status Report on Processed Projects
2. Status Report on MOU Between TRPA and Other Entities Having Jurisdiction in the Shorezone
3. Other (No Action)
B. Agency Counsel
1. Status Report by Counsel Gary Owen
C. Governing Board Members (No Action)

XI RESOLUTIONS
A. For Former Governing Board Members
B. Establishing Committees of the Governing Board

XII PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

XIII ADJOURNMENT
CONSENT CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nevada State Parks, Entrance Station and Extension of Floating Boat Dock at Cave Rock State Park, File #590-100-00/87-2, Douglas County APN 03-090-03</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Release of Water Quality Mitigation Funds to El Dorado County, $10,000 for Lake Tahoe Demonstration Garden at the Lake Tahoe Community College</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Release of Water Quality Mitigation Funds to El Dorado County, $25,000 for Marshall Trail Erosion Control Project</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Release of Air Quality Mitigation Funds to Placer County for TART</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Release of State Transit Assistance Funds to South Lake Tahoe for STAGE</td>
<td>Adoption of Resolution</td>
<td>23-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Receipt of Transportation Development Act Audits for FY 89-90</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
<td>27-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bank of Stockton, Change in Commercial Operation/Special Use Determination, Douglas County APN 11-070-16</td>
<td>Approval With Findings And Conditions</td>
<td>46-53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These consent calendar items are expected to be routine and noncontroversial. They will be acted upon by the Board at one time without discussion. The special use determinations will be removed from the calendar at the request of any member of the public and taken up separately. If any Board member or noticed affected property owner requests that any item be removed from the calendar, it will be taken up separately under the appropriate agenda category.
Four of the members of the governing body from each State constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the agency. The voting procedure shall be as follows:

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

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

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

- Article III(g) Public Law 96-551
Project Name: Cave Rock State Park, Floating Dock Reconstruction and Extension

Application Type: Boat Launching Facility

Applicant: Nevada State Parks

Applicant's Representative: John Munoz, Nevada State Parks

Agency Planner: Coleen L. Shade, Associate Planner

Location: Douglas County, U. S. Highway 50, Cave Rock

Assessor's Parcel Number/Project Number: 03-090-03, 590-100-00/87-2

Project Description: The proposed project involves the reconstruction and extension of an existing 6 foot x 24 foot floating boat dock. The existing dock will be widened to 8 feet and extended to 102 feet of total length. The proposed 56 square foot fee booth, which will be winterized for year-round use, will replace the existing portable 16 square foot fee booth. The proposed fee booth will be located in an island in the middle of the existing access road, which will include landscaping, irrigation and a flagpole. The paved entrance will be widened at this location to allow two way traffic. Two additional parking spaces will be constructed in the public right-of-way for the use of the on-duty State Park staff. The applicant has received an Occupancy Permit from the Nevada Department of Transportation for the above improvements in the right-of-way. The project includes 3 landscaped picnic sites with 2 picnic tables, 2 barbecue grills, and a trash enclosure in each. The proposal also includes a courtesy light at the launch ramp. Water, electrical and telephone will be connected at the existing comfort station and run underground along the east side of the road to the proposed fee booth.

Site Description: The proposed project is located at Nevada State Park's Cave Rock Unit. This unit contains both backshore and 1a land capabilities. The existing facilities include a small 4 foot x 4 foot portable fee booth, comfort station, 19 auto and 41 auto/trailer parking spaces, a 96 foot x 40 foot concrete boat ramp, and a 6 foot x 24 foot floating dock. The foreshore consists of sand with small and large boulders scattered throughout and is mapped as fish feeding and escape cover habitat.

Issues: The proposed project involves the reconstruction and expansion of a nonconforming floating boat dock (based upon fish habitat) and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:
1. **Scenic Shoreline 27 - Lincoln Park is within this Plan Area:**

   The Scenic Shoreline Unit has a travel route rating of 8 which is in attainment with the scenic quality standard. Staff has determined that the proposed project, as conditioned, will not degrade the scenic threshold.

2. **Scenic Roadway Unit 29 - Cave Rock is within this Plan Area:**

   The Scenic Roadway Unit has a travel route rating of 23 which is in attainment with the scenic quality standard. Staff has determined the proposed project, as conditioned, will not degrade the scenic threshold.

3. **Fish Habitat:**

   The proposed project is within mapped feeding and escape cover habitat. This has been confirmed by the TRPA biologist. It is staff's determination that the proposed project, which includes a 78 foot increase in length of the floating dock within the protective rock jetty, will have no additional negative impact to the fisheries in this area.

---

**Staff Analysis:**

A. **Environmental Documentation:** The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in order to assess the following environmental issues: water quality, littoral processes, fisheries and fish habitat, backshore stability, on-shore wildlife habitat, and Tahoe Yellow Cress, *(Rorippa subumbellata)* habitat evaluation. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the IEC will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

B. **Plan Area Statement:** The project is located within Plan Area 62, Cave Rock. The Land Use Classification is Residential and the Management Strategy is Mitigation. Agency staff has reviewed the Plan Area Statement and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed activity is designated as an allowed use in this Plan Area.

C. **Land Coverage:**

1. **Land Capability District:**
The mapped land capability of the project area is class la and backshore.

2. **Existing Coverage:**

   To be determined upon receipt of a revised site plan.

3. **Proposed Coverage:**

   The project proposes no new coverage. The project proposes the relocation of coverage in the public right-of-way. Staff has included the relocation findings required in subsection 20.5.C TRPA Code of Ordinances (see Required Findings section below).

4. **Allowed Coverage:** The land capabilities for this project area allow one (1) percent coverage. Allowed coverage shall be determined upon receipt of revised site plan, as required in the special conditions, that delineates the project area.

5. **Coverage Mitigation:** The applicants shall be required to mitigate any excess land coverage pursuant to Section 20.5.A(3) of the TRPA Code.

**D. Recognition of Multiple-Use Facility:** By approving the project, the TRPA Governing Board shall be recognizing the facility as multiple-use. The boat launching facilities at this site serve the general public.

**E. Design Standards for Multiple-Use Floating Docks:** Facilities recognized by TRPA as Multi-Use may deviate from design standards (subsection 54.8.D(1) of the TRPA Code). Subsection 54.7.B.(1), Floating Dock and Platform Design and Construction Standards, of the Code states that floating docks shall not exceed an area of 100 square feet or a dimension along any side of 15 feet. The proposed extension will bring the total length of the floating dock to 102 feet and the width will not exceed 8 feet.

**F. Shorezone Tolerance District:** The subject parcel is located within Shorezone Tolerance Districts 2 and 5. The project, as conditioned, complies with the shorezone tolerance district standards.

**G. Location Standards for Multi-Use Floating Docks:** The existing boat ramp and floating dock are located within a man-made lagoon in mapped fish feed and escape cover habitat. The existing structure does not comply with 54.4.A.(5) location standard. This standard states that the setback for floating docks shall be 5 feet for existing structures and 20 feet for new. The setback lines shall be established by measuring the applicable distance inward from each property line along the high water line. From this point, a set back line shall be projected lakeward and perpendicular to the
tangent of the shoreline. The proposed dock runs almost parallel with the natural shoreline. Facilities recognized as Multiple-Use by the TRPA Governing Board, Subsection 54.8.D(1) of the TRPA Code of Ordinance, are allowed to deviate from this location standard.

H. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 20, 50, and 52 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the required finding may be made.

1. The project is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and Maps, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs.

   a. Land Use: The applicant will be required to apply BMPs to the project area. This project will not affect the allowed land use on the site. Floating docks and platforms are allowed accessory structures in the Plan Area for this project site.

   b. Transportation: The proposed floating dock extension will not adversely impact transportation in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Floating docks located within the limits of the TRPA-approved pierhead line have been determined not to pose a threat to navigation. The proposed extension does not exceed the length of the man-made lagoon, and therefore, does not extend out into open water where it could potentially have a negative impact on navigation.

   c. Conservation: The project, as conditioned, is consistent with the fisheries, shorezone, and scenic supplements of the Conservation Element of the Goals and Policies. The project is located in Scenic Shoreline Unit 27 and Scenic Roadway Unit 29 which have acceptable scenic ratings. Staff has determined that the floating dock location, color and design will not degrade the shoreline scenic rating. Fisheries are discussed further in Finding 7, below.

   d. Recreation: This project will not adversely impact public recreation on Lake Tahoe. The project provides continued public access to Lake Tahoe. In addition, the project will not interfere with public access along the shoreline nor top-line fishing and is consistent with the Recreation Element of the Goals and Policies.
e. **Public Services and Facilities:** This project does not affect public services or facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

f. **Implementation:** This project is consistent with the Implementation Element of the Goals and Policies. The project requires no new PAOTs.

2. **The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.**

   The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Checklist: Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

3. **Wherever Federal, State, or local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the TRPA Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.**

   (Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

4. **The relocation is to an equal or superior portion of the parcel or project area.**

   Based upon staff’s site inspection and other available information, it is the determination of staff that the portion of the project area from which the relocated land coverage will originate is similar in slope, soil fragility, and amount of disturbance as that portion which is proposed to receive the land coverage.

5. **The area from which the land coverage was removed for relocation is restored in accordance with Subsection 20.4.C.**

   7000 square feet of land coverage has been removed in the public right-of-way. This area has been revegetated in accordance with TRPA requirements.

6. **The relocation is not to Land Capability Districts la, lb, lc, 2, or 3, from any higher numbered land capability district.**

   The relocation of land coverage is occurring within the same land capability district (Land Capability District la).
7. **This project will not adversely impact:** (1) littoral processes; (2) fish spawning; (3) backshore stability; and (4) on-shore wildlife habitat, including wildfowl nesting areas.

Based on the IEC, TRPA staff has determined that the project, as conditioned, will not impact littoral processes, backshore stability, or any on-shore wildlife habitat. In addition, the project complies with all applicable standards regarding development standards in fish habitat. Code Interpretation 88-4 states that expansions of existing structures must comply with all development standards with the possible exception of the placement standards pertaining to stream inlets and fish habitat areas. If the existing structure does not comply with these two placement standards the expansion is not required to comply.

8. **There are sufficient accessory facilities to accommodate the project.**

The project is an accessory structure to an allowed use and the primary use facilities are capable of accommodating the proposed project.

9. **The project is compatible with existing shorezone and lakezone uses or structures on, or in the immediate vicinity of, the littoral parcel; or that modifications of such existing uses or structures will be undertaken to assure compatibility.**

The project is a compatible accessory use to an allowed use and is compatible with other accessory uses (piers) in the vicinity.

10. **The use proposed in the foreshore or nearshore is water-dependent.**

This floating dock is located in the foreshore and nearshore of Lake Tahoe and is water-dependent.

11. **Measures will be taken to prevent spills or discharges of hazardous materials.**

This approval prohibits the use of wood preservatives on wood in contact with the water. Storage of hazardous materials will not be allowed on the floating dock. Spray painting and the use of tributyltin (TBT) will be prohibited.

12. **Construction and access techniques will be used to minimize disturbance to ground and vegetation.**
The applicant shall not be permitted to store construction materials on the beach. Construction of the floating dock and installation of the pilings will be via barge from Lake Tahoe or from the existing boat ramp. Disturbance to the ground or vegetation shall be prohibited. Final plans shall include provisions to protect the backshore.

13. **The project will not adversely impact navigation or create a threat to public safety as determined by those agencies with jurisdiction over a lake's navigable waters.**

The floating dock extension will not extend beyond TRPA's pierhead line and will not impact navigation on Lake Tahoe, or create a threat to public safety. This project must also be reviewed by Nevada Division of State Lands and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. These agencies make their own public safety findings.

14. **TRPA has solicited comments from those public agencies having jurisdiction over the nearshore and foreshore and all such comments received were considered by TRPA prior to action being taken on this project.**

Comments from the agencies having jurisdiction were solicited as part of the review of this project. No adverse comments were received from any of the above agencies.

15. **The structure does not cause significant shoreline erosion or interference with sediment transport.**

The proposed project is located within a man-made lagoon protected by a breakwater. The proposed extension does not extend beyond the existing breakwater and therefore would not additionally impact sediment transport.

16. **The project is in compliance with the scenic threshold.**

Based upon an on-site review, and other available information, staff has determined that the project, as conditioned, will not degrade the scenic threshold.

17. **The structure has not been unserviceable for more than five years.**

The structure has been continually serviceable.

18. **The project does not increase the extent to which the structure does not comply with the development standards.**
The project involves the reconstruction and extension of a nonconforming floating dock (based on fish habitat) and does not increase the extent to which the structure does not comply with the development standards.

19. **The expansion complies with all applicable standards.**

The floating dock extension complies with all applicable standards for multi-use facilities. Code Interpretation 1988-4 clarifies Section 52.3.G(1), (2), and (3) to state that expansions of existing structures must comply with all development standards with the possible exception of the placement standards pertaining to stream inlets and fish habitat areas. The project is located in fish feeding and escape cover habitat, however, staff has determined, based upon an on-site inspection, that the placement standard for fish habitat is not applicable.

20. **The project complies with the requirements to install BMPs as set forth in Chapter 25.**

Conditions of approval insure that all required BMPs will be installed.

21. **The project complies with the design standards in Section 53.10.**

The proposed floating dock extension, as conditioned, shall be composed of non-glare earth tone or wood tone materials to minimize reflectivity.

**H. Required Actions and Findings:** Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions and findings based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

I. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section G above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect.

II. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment S and Q.

2. Prior to commencement of construction the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied.

   a. The site plan shall include:
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CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 1
(1) The following revised land coverage calculations:

   (i) Project Area.

   (ii) Existing land coverage differentiated between on-site and off-site. Existing coverage should include the off-site dirt parking that was removed and revegetated.

   (iii) Proposed land coverage. Both on-site and off-site land coverage to be delineated.

(2) The property lines and project area shall be clearly delineated on the site plan.

(3) Land capability district and backshore boundaries.

(4) A note indicating that all barren areas and areas disturbed by construction shall be revegetated in accordance with the TRPA Handbook of Best Management Practices. Application of a mulch may enhance vegetative establishment.

(5) Temporary erosion control structures located downslope of the proposed upland construction area. Temporary erosion control structures shall also be placed downslope of permanent BMP facilities while the BMPs are under construction.

(6) Vegetation protective fencing around the entire upland construction site.

(7) Parking barriers, where necessary, to limit parking to approved hard surfaces only.

b. The security required under Standard Condition A.3 of Attachment S shall be determined upon the applicant's submittal of the required Best Management Practices plan and related cost estimate. Please see Attachment J, Security Procedures.

c. The applicant shall submit plans, cost estimates and an installation schedule for the installation of all required water quality improvements (BMPs) for the entire project area. All required BMPs outside of the construction site boundary up to a minimum of five percent of the estimated...
construction cost of the project, as well as all required BMPs inside the construction boundary, shall be installed prior to project completion. The balance of the required BMPs shall be installed as follows: At least 50 percent of the BMPs shall be installed within five years and 100 percent within ten years, as determined by an estimate of the cost of the BMPs.

d. The final construction drawings shall have notes indicating conformance to the following design standards for color:

(1) **Color:** The color of this structure shall be compatible with the surroundings. Subdued colors in the earthtone and woodtone ranges shall be used for the primary color of the structure. Hues shall be within the range of natural colors that blend, rather than contrast, with the existing vegetation and earth hues. Earthtone colors are considered to be shades of reddish brown, brown, tan, ochre, umber and sand.

e. The final construction drawings shall have notes indicating conformance with section 30.8 of the Code, Exterior Lighting Standards.

f. Final construction drawings shall conform to all the applicable design standards of Section 54.4.8, TRPA Code of Ordinances, and all other applicable TRPA design standards.

g. The applicant shall submit a landscape plan for TRPA's review and approval. Said plan shall incorporate elements that screen the new entrance/fee station and the parking area as viewed from the Lake and Highway 50.

h. The applicant shall submit a construction schedule prior to commencement of construction. This schedule shall identify dates for the following: when installation of temporary erosion control structures and turbidity screens will occur; when construction will start; when construction slash and debris will be removed; when installation of all permanent erosion control structures will occur; and when construction will be completed.

i. Final construction drawings shall have notes containing the following information:

(1) All work on the floating dock extension
shall be performed by a rubber-tired barge from the lake or from the boat ramp reducing lake bottom disturbance.

(ii) All construction work shall be restricted to the existing and proposed floating dock "footprint." Footprint of the floating dock shall be defined as that area directly below the floating dock.

(iii) Any lake bottom disturbance shall be corrected using handrollers to reconsolidate any disturbed shorezone sediments.

(iv) All disturbed lake bottom cobbles and boulders shall be returned to their natural state, preferably in a contiguous manner consistent with the natural setting, not stacked.

(v) The removal and installation of all pilings shall utilize cassions. Disturbed sediment and turbidity shall be allowed to settle before removal of any cassion.

(vi) Tarps shall be placed under the pier during construction to prevent falling debris from entering the lake.

(vii) Storage of construction materials shall be prohibited on the beach or within 50 feet of the beach bluff.

j. The applicant shall submit 3 sets of final construction drawings and upland site plans to TRPA.

3. Fertilizer use on this property shall be managed to include the appropriate type of fertilizer, rate, and frequency of application to avoid release of excess nutrients and minimize use of fertilizer.

4. The adequacy of all required BMPs as shown on the final construction plans shall be confirmed at the time of the TRPA pre-grading inspection. Any required modifications, as determined by TRPA, shall be incorporated into the project permit at that time.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 1
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5. This approval is based on the applicant’s representation that all plans and information contained in the subject application are true and correct. Should any information or representation submitted in connection with the project application be incorrect or untrue, TRPA may rescind this approval, or take other appropriate action.

6. The use of wood preservatives on wood in contact with the water is prohibited and extreme care shall be taken to insure that wood preservatives are not introduced into Lake Tahoe. Spray painting and the use of tributyltin is prohibited.

7. Disturbance of the lake bed materials shall be kept to the minimum necessary for project construction.

8. Best practical control technology shall be employed to prevent earthen materials from being resuspended, as a result of the floating dock construction and placement of pilings, and from being transported to adjacent lake waters. The applicant shall install a turbidity screen around the entire construction site (in the water) prior to construction. This screen may be removed upon project completion only upon a satisfactory inspection by TRPA to insure that all suspended materials have settled.

9. The discharge of petroleum products, construction waste and litter (including sawdust), or earthen materials to the surface waters of the Lake Tahoe Basin is prohibited. All surplus construction waste materials shall be removed from the project and deposited only at approved points of disposal.

10. No containers of fuel, paint, or other hazardous materials may be stored on the pier.

11. Gravel, cobble, or small boulders shall not be disturbed or removed to leave exposed sandy areas, before, during, or after construction.

12. Only the boulders designated on the site plan to be moved shall be moved. Boulders shall be moved to an approved location.

13. The applicant shall submit post-construction photos within 30 days of the project completion date, demonstrating any resultant impacts to scenic quality as viewed from 300 feet from shore looking landward and to lake bottom conditions as viewed from the subject parcel.
14. Any Rorippa subumbellata plants identified onsite shall be located, fenced and flagged with vegetative protection fencing to avoid disturbance during construction.

15. No raking of the beach or shoreline shall be allowed before, during, or after construction.

16. There shall be no removal or relocation of native plants, unless under the direction of a qualified botanist recognized by the Nevada Division of State Lands and/or Nevada Department of Wildlife.
MEMORANDUM

February 13, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Release of Water Quality Mitigation Funds to El Dorado County, $10,000 for Lake Tahoe Demonstration Garden at the Lake Tahoe Community College

El Dorado County requests the release of $10,000 in water quality mitigation funds for use on the Lake Tahoe Demonstration Garden. The $10,000 will provide augmentation to the $265,366 already spent on the project. This project is used to demonstrate various erosion control and revegetation techniques and evaluate their effectiveness. This is a high priority project within El Dorado County. Agency staff has participated in both conceptual and pre-design meetings and is familiar with the project. Based on these factors, TRPA staff recommends release of the $10,000.

Conditions:

1. The County shall use the funds only for the Lake Tahoe Demonstration Garden.

2. The County shall keep complete records of all funds expended on the project and how they were used. Such records shall be made available for review and audit by the TRPA upon written request.

If you have any questions or comments on this agenda item, please contact Dan Greenlee at (702) 588-4547.

DG:rd
2/13/91

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 2.
January 28, 1991

Mr. Dan Greenlee, Associate Planner
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Subject: Lake Tahoe Demonstration Garden

Dear Dan:

Please agendize a request from the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors to release $10,000 from the Water Quality Mitigation Fund for the Lake Tahoe Demonstration Garden constructed on the Lake Tahoe Community College (LTCC) campus. Issue a check to El Dorado County and the County will then cut a check to STPUD/LTCC.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jim Haen
Supervising Civil Engineer

JFH/bt

m\trpa\garden.fnd
MEMORANDUM

February 13, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Release of Water Quality Mitigation Funds to El Dorado County, $25,000 for Marshall Trail Erosion Control Project

Summary

El Dorado County requests the release of $25,000 in water quality mitigation funds for use on the Marshall Erosion Control Project located in Montgomery Estates (see attached letter). The $25,000 will provide augmentation to the $125,000 El Dorado County has received from the California Tahoe Conservancy. This project is a high priority within the County’s list of erosion control projects. Agency staff has participated in both conceptual and pre-design meetings and is familiar with the project. Based on these factors, TRPA staff recommends the release of $125,000 to cover the additional erosion control measures.

Conditions

1. The County shall use the funds only for the Marshall Erosion Control Project.

2. The County shall keep complete records of all funds expended on the project and how they were used. Such records shall be made available for review and audit by the TRPA upon written request.

If you have any questions or comments on this agenda item, please contact Dan Greenlee at (702) 588-4547.

DG:rd
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CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 3.
December 19, 1990

Mr. Don Greenlee, Senior Planner  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 1038  
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Subject: Marshall Erosion Control Project (JN 95121)

Dear Dan:

The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors has authorized the request of $25,000 in Water Quality Mitigation Funds for the Marshall erosion control project.

The project is located in Montgomery Estates and includes timber wall and slope revegetation. The $25,000 will augment a California Tahoe Conservancy grant of $125,000. The project is 90% complete and will continue into 1991.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jim Haen  
Supervising Civil Engineer

JFH/bt  
cc: Joy Martin  

jn\trpa\request.25K
MEMORANDUM

February 13, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: Agency Staff

Subject: Release of Air Quality Mitigation Funds to Placer County for TART

Placer County is requesting the release of $123,000 to be used as matching funds for an UMTA grant awarded to the County for the purchase of three new transit coaches. These vehicles will be put into service on California Routes 89 and 267, providing transit service to Truckee from the North Shore of Lake Tahoe.

As of the end of December, 1990, TRPA was holding Placer County air quality mitigation funds in the amount of $339,608. From this amount, $16,385 was released to Placer County in January to provide support for the County's TART system. Approval of this claim for Placer County will leave a balance of approximately $200,223 in the County's air quality mitigation fund.

Staff Recommendation

TRPA staff has reviewed Placer County's claim for consistency with the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan. The claim is consistent with the Goals and Policies of the RTP for expansion of public transportation services to Truckee.

Staff recommends the Governing Board approve Placer County's request for release of air quality mitigation funds being held by TRPA for Placer County in the amount of $123,000 to be used as matching funds for UMTA grant funds awarded for the purchase of three new transit coaches to be placed into service serving Truckee from the Tahoe Region's North Shore.

If you have any questions in regard to this agenda item, please call Leif Anderson at (702) 588-6782.

2/13/91
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MEMORANDUM

February 13, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Release of State Transit Assistance Funds to South Lake Tahoe for STAGE

TRPA was designated by the State of California as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Region. Under this designation, TRPA is responsible for the administration of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds which are made available to support public transportation services. There are two sources of funds provided by the TDA: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), and the regional State Transit Assistance Fund (STA).

The STA fund program was created under Chapter 161 of the Statutes of 1979 (SB 620). The program provides a second source of TDA funding for transit and streets and roads. Funds for the program are derived from the statewide sales tax program. The money is appropriated to the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency for allocation by formula to each RTPA. The allocations are deposited in each RTPA’s STA fund account. The STA fund is not apportioned by the RTPA on the basis of population. The RTPA may approve use of all STA funds by one claimant. RTPA staff recommendations for the allocation of STA funds are based on the TDA Rules and Regulations, and the objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Goals and Policies.

The amount of STA funds available for allocation to eligible claimants in the Lake Tahoe Region for FY 1990-91 is $49,965. Eligible claimants were notified of the availability of the STA funds on October 23, 1990. Placer County submitted a claim for a total of $40,000 to support the extension of TART services to Truckee from Tahoe City. On January 23, 1991, the Governing Board approved $30,000 for allocation to Placer County, leaving a balance of $19,965 available for allocation during this fiscal year.

2/13/91
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CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 5
The City of South Lake Tahoe has submitted a claim for $30,000 for capital improvements to the STAGE maintenance facility and to offset increased operating costs for the STAGE system.

Staff Recommendation

Staff has reviewed the claim submitted by the City of South Lake Tahoe. The claim is consistent with the Transportation Development Act Rules and Regulations and is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan Goals and Policies.

Staff recommends adoption of the attached resolution approving the allocation of the balance of the FY 1990-91 STA funds in the amount $19,963 to the City of South Lake Tahoe for capital improvements and increased operating costs to the City of the STAGE system.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 91-__

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE ALLOCATION OF FY 1990-91
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO THE CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE ($19,965)

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is designated by the State
of California as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the California
portion of the Lake Tahoe Region, and is responsible for the allocating State
Transit Assistance (STA) funds for the Tahoe Region; and

WHEREAS, the STA fund is a discretionary fund and may be allocated at
the discretion of the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for public
transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS, there are STA funds in the amount of $19,965 available for
allocation during FY 1990-91 to eligible claimants in the Tahoe Region; and

WHEREAS, TRPA has received an application for STA funds in the amount
of $30,000 from the City of South Lake Tahoe to provide for capital improvements
and increased operating costs of the STAGE system; and

WHEREAS, the required findings of Article 5, Section 6754 of the
Transportation Development Act Rules and Regulations have been made as follows:

Subsection 6754(a)

1. The claimant's proposed expenditures are in conformance with the
   Regional Transportation Plan.

2. Fares charged by the transit claimant are sufficient to meet farebox
   ratio requirements applicable to the claimant.

3. The claimant is making full use of available UMTA funds.

4. The sum of the claimant's allocations from LTF and STA funds do not
   exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive.

5. Priority consideration was given to claims to offset reductions in
   federal operating assistance, unanticipated increased costs for fuel,
   to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet
   high priority regional public transportation needs.

Subsection 6754(b)

1. The operator has made a reasonable effort to implement any recommended
   productivity improvements.

2. The operator is not precluded from employing part-time drivers or from
   contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a
   franchise or license.
3. The claimant has submitted certification that the claimant is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency that FY 1990-91 STA funds in the amount of $19,965 be released to the City of South Lake Tahoe to provide for capital improvements and increased operating costs of the STAGE system.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this _____________ day of February, 1991, by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

__________________________
W. P. Cronk, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEMORANDUM

February 13, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Receipt of Transportation Development Act Audits for FY 1989-90

Section 6661 and Section 6751 of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Rules and Regulations require that an annual fiscal and compliance audit of the financial statements of the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and the State Transit Assistance (STA) fund be completed. These audits are to be conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by either the State Controller or by a certified public accountant, or a public accountant who is not an officer or employee of the Agency.

The required audits of LTF and STA funds held by El Dorado County and administered by TRPA have been completed by the CPA firm of Kafoury, Armstrong, Bernard and Bergstrom. The audits were conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Copies of the LTF and STA audits are attached for your review.

The LTF audit report shows an unreserved fund balance for El Dorado County of $740,885 at the close of the 1989-90 fiscal year. These funds are being maintained by the County in the El Dorado County LTF trust fund.

The auditor reported one possible exception with compliance to TDA Rules and Regulations. It was noted that El Dorado County did not provide TRPA with an estimate of the money available by February 1. The estimate of money available was not dated until February 15, 1990. This fiscal year, the County provided TRPA with the estimate of funds on January 29, 1991.

The STA fund audit shows a balance of $445 as of the end of FY 1989-90. These funds will be added to the FY 1991-92 apportionment of STA funds to be allocated by TRPA upon approval of the Governing Board.

The STA audit found that the administration of the STA fund complied with all statutorily required rules and regulations of the TDA.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Governing Board receive the LTF and STA audit reports for the year ending June 30, 1990. If you have any questions, contact Leif Anderson at (702) 588-6782.
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CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM 6.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
EL DORADO COUNTY
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND
June 30, 1990
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND
JUNE 30, 1990
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Independent Auditor's Report

To the Governing Body of the
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

We have audited the component unit financial statements of the El Dorado County Local Transportation Trust Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as of June 30, 1990, and for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the component unit financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the El Dorado County Local Transportation Trust Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as of June 30, 1990, and the results of its operations for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Our audit was made for the purpose of forming an opinion on the component unit financial statements taken as a whole. The financial information listed as supplementary data in the table of contents is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the component unit financial statements of the El Dorado County Local Transportation Trust Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the component unit financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

Carson City, Nevada
August 9, 1990
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND
BALANCE SHEET
JUNE 30, 1990
(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR JUNE 30, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$746,592</td>
<td>$668,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIABILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to claimants - Note 3</td>
<td>$5,707</td>
<td>$7,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND BALANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved for performance audit - Note 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreserved</td>
<td>740,885</td>
<td>654,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>740,885</td>
<td>660,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities and Fund Balance</td>
<td>$746,592</td>
<td>$668,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE  
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1990  
(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Funds</td>
<td>$568,405</td>
<td>$509,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$52,353</td>
<td>$54,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$620,758</td>
<td>$564,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXPENDITURES       |          |          |
| Intergovernmental: |          |          |
| Payments to claimants: |          |          |
| City of South Lake Tahoe-STAGE | $384,212 | $359,427 |
| City of South Lake Tahoe-Performance Audit | $12,500 |          |
| El Dorado County   | $1,004   | $151,062 |
| Tahoe Regional Planning Agency       | $32,180   | $29,200   |
| Dial-a-Ride        | $110,624 | $80,099  |
| Total Expenditures | $540,520 | $619,788 |

| Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues over Expenditures | $80,238 | $(55,395) |

FUND BALANCE, July 1  
$660,647  
$716,042  
FUND BALANCE, June 30  
$740,885  
$660,647

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
NOTE 1 - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies:

**Reporting Entity:**

The Local Transportation Trust Fund was created pursuant to the Transportation Development Act (the Act), Section 29530 of the California Administrative Code. The fund is used to account for Local Transportation monies allocated and transmitted to claimants as directed by Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Revenues to the Local Transportation Trust Fund are derived from 1/4c of the retail sales tax collected statewide. The 1/4c is returned by the State Board of Equalization to each county according to the amount of tax collected in that county.

Payments from the Local Transportation Trust Fund are made by the El Dorado County auditor, but only in accordance with written allocation instructions issued in compliance with the Act by the Regional Transportation Planning Agency. In accordance with the criteria established by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, the Local Transportation Trust Fund is a component unit of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

**Basis of Accounting:**

The Local Transportation Trust Fund is accounted for using the modified accrual basis of accounting as defined by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB). This method provides for recognition of expenditures at the time liabilities are incurred, while revenues are recorded when measurable and available to finance expenditures of the fiscal period. Available is defined as being due and collected during the current period or within 30 days after year end. When revenues are due, but will not be collected within 30 days after year end, the receivable is recorded and on offsetting deferred revenue account is established.

**Cash:**

Cash balances of the Local Transportation Trust Fund are combined with those of El Dorado County and, to the extent practicable, invested as required by Section 29530 of the California Administrative Code.

**Budgets and Budgetary Accounting:**

The Local Transportation Trust Fund is not required to prepare an annual budget.
NOTE 2 - Compliance with Laws and Regulations:

The Local Transportation Trust Fund conformed to all statutory and regulatory constraints on its financial management during the year, with the following possible exception:

- Section 6620 of the California Administrative Code requires the County to provide the Local Transportation Planning Agency with an estimate of the money available by February 1. The estimate of monies available was not dated until February 15.

NOTE 3 - Due to Claimants:

The amount reported as "Due to Claimants" represents the unpaid balance of allocations to El Dorado County for Dial-a-Ride.

NOTE 4 - Fund Balance:

The portion of fund balance denoted as "Reserved for performance audit" represents the amount of 1988-89 resources that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency allocated for a performance audit of the 1989-90 fiscal year. A performance audit is required every three years.
**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

**EL DORADO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND**

**SCHEDULE OF ALLOCATIONS, DISBURSEMENTS AND AMOUNTS DUE TO CLAIMANTS BY PURPOSE**

**FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1990**

*(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1989)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS</th>
<th>99233.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>99246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99233.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99260.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocations:**

| City of South Lake Tahoe - STAGE | $ -     |
| City of South Lake Tahoe - Performance Audit | $ -     |
| El Dorado County Tahoe Regional Planning Agency | 1,004   |
| Dial-a-Ride                        | 15,000  |
|                                    | 4,431   |

| Total                              | $ 4,431 |
|                                    | 17,180  |

| Total                              | $106,193 |

**Disbursements:**

| City of South Lake Tahoe - STAGE | $ -     |
| City of South Lake Tahoe - Performance Audit | $ -     |
| El Dorado County Tahoe Regional Planning Agency | 1,004   |
| Dial-a-Ride                        | 15,000  |
|                                    | 4,431   |

| Total                              | $ 4,431 |
|                                    | 17,180  |

| Total                              | 100,486 |

**Amounts due to claimants:**

| El Dorado County - Dial-a-Ride     | $ -     |

| Total                              | $5,707  |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$384,212</td>
<td>$359,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>151,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>29,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110,624</td>
<td>80,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$540,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>$619,788</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$384,212</td>
<td>$359,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>151,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,180</td>
<td>29,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104,917</td>
<td>72,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$534,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>$612,171</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,707</td>
<td>$7,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
Independent Auditor's Report
on Compliance with Transportation Development Act.
California Administrative Code and the Rules and Regulations
of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

To the Governing Body of the
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

We have audited the component unit financial statements of the El Dorado County Local Transportation Trust Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as of and for the year ended June 30, 1990, and have issued our report thereon dated August 9, 1990.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the component unit financial statements are free of material misstatement.

Compliance with laws and regulations applicable to the El Dorado County Local Transportation Trust Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is the responsibility of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency management. As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the component unit financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of the Funds compliance with the Transportation Development Act, California Administrative Code and the rules and regulations of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

The results of our tests indicate that, with respect to the items tested, the El Dorado County Local Transportation Trust Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency complied, in all material respects, with the provisions referred to in the preceding paragraph, except as indicated in Note 2. With respect to items not tested, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that the Fund had not complied, in all material respects, with those provisions.

This report is intended for the information of the Finance Committee and management. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

Carson City, Nevada
August 9, 1990

Kafoury, Armstrong, Bernard & Bergstrom
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND
June 30, 1990
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Kafoury, Armstrong, Bernard & Bergstrom  
Certified Public Accountants

Independent Auditor’s Report

To the Governing Body of the  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

We have audited the component unit financial statements of the State Transit Assistance Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as of June 30, 1990, and for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the component unit financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the State Transit Assistance Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as of June 30, 1990, and the results of its operations for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Our audit was made for the purpose of forming an opinion on the component unit financial statements taken as a whole. The financial information listed as supplementary data in the table of contents is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the component unit financial statements of the State Transit Assistance Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the component unit financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

Kafoury, Armstrong, Bernard & Bergstrom

Carson City, Nevada
August 9, 1990
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND  
BALANCE SHEET  
JUNE 30, 1990  
(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR JUNE 30, 1989)

### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments</td>
<td>$9,378</td>
<td>$7,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIABILITIES</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to claimants - Note 3</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>5,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND BALANCE</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445</td>
<td>2,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Liabilities and Fund Balance** | $9,378 | $7,983 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1990
(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1988-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1989-90</td>
<td>6,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>6,725</td>
<td>3,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |      |      |
| EXPENDITURES   |      |      |
| Intergovernmental: |      |      |
| Payments to claimants: |      |      |
| Placer County   |      | 2,532|
| City of South Lake Tahoe | 4,733|      |
|                | 9,118| 2,532|
| Excess (deficiency) of Revenues over Expenditures | (2,393) | 650 |

| Fund Balance, July 1 |      |      |
|                      | 2,838| 2,188|
| Fund Balance, June 30 | $445 | $2,838|

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
NOTE 1 - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies:

**Reporting Entity:**

The State Transit Assistance Fund was created pursuant to Article 6.5 of the California Public Utilities Code. The fund is used to account for State Transit Assistance monies allocated and transmitted to claimants as directed by Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Continued existence of this fund is contingent upon funds being appropriated by the State of California General Fund and the availability of Spillover Revenues from the State Transportation and Development Account. In accordance with the criteria established by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, the State Transit Assistance Fund is a component unit of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

**Basis of Accounting:**

The State Transit Assistance Fund is accounted for using the modified accrual basis of accounting as defined by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB). This method provides for recognition of expenditures at the time liabilities are incurred, while revenues are recorded when measurable and available to finance expenditures of the fiscal period. Available is defined as being due and collected during the current period or within 30 days after year end. When revenues are due, but will not be collected within 30 days after year end, the receivable is recorded and an offsetting deferred revenue account is established.

**Cash:**

Cash balances of the State Transit Assistance Fund are combined with those of El Dorado County and, to the extent practicable, invested as required by Section 6750(c) of the California Administrative Code.

**Budgets and Budgetary Accounting:**

The State Transit Assistance Fund is not required to prepare an annual budget.

**NOTE 2 - Compliance with Statutes and Regulations:**

The State Transit Assistance Fund conformed to all statutory and regulatory constraints on its financial management.

**NOTE 3 - Due to Claimants:**

The amount reported as "Due to Claimants" represents the unpaid balance of fiscal year 1990 allocations to claimants.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUND
SCHEDULE OF ALLOCATIONS AND
AMOUNTS DUE TO CLAIMANTS BY PURPOSE
FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1990
(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR JUNE 30, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,933</td>
<td>$5,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocations:
- Placer County:
  - Fiscal year 1987-88
  - Fiscal year 1988-89
  - Fiscal year 1989-90
- City of South Lake Tahoe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$2,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1987-88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1988-89</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>2,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1989-90</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,933</td>
<td>$5,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts due to claimants:
- Placer County
- City of South Lake Tahoe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$5,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,933</td>
<td>$5,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Auditor's Report
on Compliance with Transportation Development Act,
California Administrative Code and the Rules and Regulations
of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

To the Governing Body of the
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

We have audited the component unit financial statements of the El Dorado County State Transit Assistance Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as of and for the year ended June 30, 1990, and have issued our report thereon dated August 9, 1990.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the component unit financial statements are free of material misstatement.

Compliance with laws and regulations applicable to the El Dorado County State Transit Assistance Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is the responsibility of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency management. As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the component unit financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of the Funds compliance with the Transportation Development Act, California Administrative Code and the rules and regulations of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

The results of our tests indicate that, with respect to the items tested, the El Dorado County State Transit Assistance Fund of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency complied, in all material respects, with the provisions referred to in the preceding paragraph. With respect to items not tested, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that the Fund had not complied, in all material respects, with those provisions.

This report is intended for the information of the Finance Committee and management. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

Carson City, Nevada
August 9, 1990
Kafoury, Armstrong, Bernard & Bergstrom
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: Bank of Stockton, Change in Commercial Operation/Special Use Determination

Application Type: Commercial.

Applicant: Bank of Stockton.

Applicant's Representative: Steven T. Walther and James P. Pace.

Agency Planner: Jim Hamilton, Senior Planner.

Location: 680 Kingsbury Grade, Douglas County.

Assessor's Parcel Number/Project Number: 11-070-16

Project Description: The applicant proposes to recommence commercial operations within an existing 1,000 square foot commercial building. The intended use for the building will be a professional office, which is listed as a special use in Plan Area Statement (PAS) 082, Upper Kingsbury. Proposed activities for the building include real estate sales and property management. There are no structural or other changes proposed for the building. The applicant does intend to landscape the area around the building once a special use permit is obtained.

In November 1990, the Governing Board approved Ordinance No. 90-26 amending Plan Area 082 to include Professional Offices as a permissible use within the PAS.

Site Description: The project site consists of a single 1,000 square foot commercial building and related parking, located on the corner of Benjamin Drive and Kingsbury Grade. The parcel slopes approximately 3% through the building site. There is a 6 foot high curbside which runs across the parcel behind the existing building.

Issues: The proposed project involves a special use and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:

1. Special Use:

   The project involves the commencement of a new special use, professional office, within PAS 082, Upper Kingsbury. To approve the project the Governing Board must make findings 4, 5, and 6, of Section D, below.
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2. **Special Policy #2 of the PAS states:** "Commercial development shall be limited to parcels whose use was commercial on the effective date of the plan. Change in use shall be limited to neighborhood serving uses which reduce vehicle miles traveled."

In November 1990 the Governing Board determined that the use of this commercial building as a real estate and property management office can be found to be neighborhood serving, due to the large number of condominiums, multiple family dwellings, and vacation rentals in the Upper Kingsbury neighborhood. The office building has been an existing component of the neighborhood for a number of years, and was existing on the effective date of the Regional Plan.

3. **Air Quality Mitigation Requirements:**

Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program, recognizes existing daily vehicle trip ends (DVTEs) generated by the most recent permanent use which existed for more than 90 consecutive days within the previous 24 months preceding submission of a complete application to TRPA for a change in use.

The subject building has been vacant since August 1988, hence no DVTEs may be recognized for the proposed use and all trip ends must be mitigated. The expected vehicle trips would be the same as the previous real estate use which occupied the site in 1988. Based on the TRPA adopted Trip Table, a professional office would generate 35 daily vehicle trips when used as a real estate office. In accordance with Section 93.3 of the Code, the applicant will be required to pay a mitigation fee of $350.00 to offset the regional and cumulative impacts of the proposed project.

4. **Parking:**

The applicants will be required as a condition of approval to provide information which shows that the existing parking on the site meets the minimum parking standards of Douglas County as required by the Project Review Interim Rules Section 4.20 - Parking Standards.

**Staff Analysis:**

A. **Environmental Documentation:** The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the completed IEC will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

B. **Plan Area Statement:** The project is located within Plan Area 082 - Upper Kingsbury. The Land Use Classification is Residential and the Management Strategy is Mitigation. Agency staff has reviewed the subject Plan Area.
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and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed activity is listed as a special use.

C. Land Coverage:

1. Land Capability District:

   The mapped land capability district of the project area is class 1a. The total project area is approximately 19,638 square feet.

2. Allowed, Existing, and Proposed Coverage, and Coverage Mitigation:

   The proposed project involves a change in commercial operation within an existing commercial building. No new coverage or modifications to the existing facilities are proposed. Because the project involves no structural or other modifications to the site beyond those currently exempt under Chapter 4 of the Code, there is no requirement for coverage calculations or excess coverage mitigation.

D. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6 and 18 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

1. The project is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.

   (1) Land Use: The project will not affect the allowable land use on the property. Professional offices are a permitted special use within Plan Area 082 - Upper Kingsbury. In order to approve the project the Governing Board must make special use findings 4, 5, and 6, below. Provided the Governing Board makes these findings, the project is consistent with the Land Use Element of the Regional Plan.

   (2) Transportation: The project, as conditioned, will provide mitigation of all traffic and air quality impacts in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. There is no aspect of the project which would adversely affect implementation of the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan.

   (3) Conservation: There is no aspect of the project which would adversely affect implementation of the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan.
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(4) **Recreation**: There is no part of the project which would affect the Recreation Element of the Regional Plan.

(5) **Public Service and Facilities**: The building is currently serviced by existing water and sewer connections, and there is no part of the project which would adversely impact the Public Services and Facilities Element of the Regional Plan.

(6) **Implementation**: This project does not require any development allocations, and there is no part of the project which would adversely impact the Implementation Element of the Regional Plan.

2. **The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.**

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

3. **Wherever federal, state or local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(g) of the TRPA Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.**

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

4. **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.**

The real estate/property management office will occupy an existing commercial structure on a single parcel, which was previously occupied by a similar use in 1988. The proposed use will provide services for the large number of vacation rentals and multi-residential dwellings within the immediate area.

5. **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.**

There is no evidence that the proposed use will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, or enjoyment of property in the
neighborhood or region, and the neighborhood serving character of the use is expected to assist in attainment of Regional VMT and air quality thresholds.

6. 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.

The project, as proposed, is consistent with the special policies of the plan area statement, does not require the allocation of commercial floor area, and will occupy a space in an existing commercial building. As such, the character of the neighborhood will not be altered. Previous Governing Board action to amend the plan area statement (PAS) has indicated that the proposed use - professional offices - is consistent with the purpose of the PAS.

E. Required Actions and Findings: Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions and findings based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:

I. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section D above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect.

II. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, subject to the following conditions:

A. The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment Q.

B. Prior to commencement of the proposed use the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

(1) Any landscaping of the site which is not exempt pursuant to Chapter 4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, will require submittal of a landscape plan designed in accordance with the standards required in Sections 30.7 and 81.7 of the Code for TRPA review and approval.

(2) The applicant shall pay an air quality mitigation fee of $350.00 to offset the regional and cumulative air quality impacts of the project based on $10.00 per additional vehicle trip.

(3) Fertilizer use on this property shall be managed to include the appropriate type of fertilizer, rate, and frequency of application to avoid release of excess nutrients and minimize use of fertilizer.

(4) This approval is based on the permittee's representation that all plans and information contained in the subject
application are true and correct. Should any information or representation submitted in connection with the project application be incorrect or untrue, TRPA may rescind this approval, or take other appropriate action.

(5) The existing sign shall not be relocated, replaced, or otherwise modified, without TRPA approval.

(6) By acceptance of this permit, the applicant acknowledges that the TRPA has amended its sign ordinance and that the amended sign ordinance includes new standards for signs which will require removal, modification, or amortization of non-conforming signs.

(7) The applicant shall provide evidence that existing onsite parking for the purposed use meets the requirements of the TRPA Interim Rules, Section 4.20 - Parking Standards.
MEMORANDUM

February 14, 1991

To: Governing Board

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Proposed Amendment to Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, to Adopt Memorandum of Understanding Between TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe (CITY)

Staff proposes an amendment to Chapter 4 of the Code of Ordinances to exempt certain residential construction activities reviewed by the City of South Lake Tahoe (CSLT) from TRPA review.

Description and Discussion

TRPA is required by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact to regulate activities within the Tahoe Basin which may have a substantial effect on the natural resources of the Basin. The Compact, Article VI(a) allows TRPA to define what activities are exempt from TRPA review. This proposed amendment to Chapter 4 will provide for the review and approval of new single and multiple family residential structures (4 units or less) within the city limits of South Lake Tahoe to be conducted by the City. As stated in the attached MOU, the City will be required to review these residential activities pursuant to all applicable TRPA Code requirements. With the understanding that all applicable TRPA regulations will be complied with and enforced by the City, the construction of new single and multiple family structures (4 units or less) within the City of South Lake Tahoe shall be considered qualified exempt activities pursuant to Chapter 4 of the TRPA Code.

The City Council of South Lake Tahoe held a public hearing on January 22, 1991 at which time the Council moved to approve the subject MOU as proposed. The APC held a public hearing on February 13, 1991, and voted unanimously to pass on to the Governing Board a recommendation to approve the proposed Code amendment.

Proposed Ordinance Amendment

Staff proposes to amend Chapter 4, Section 4.4 of the Code as follows:

4.4 *Reserved*

Activities Reviewed by Local Government: This Chapter may be amended to exempt certain residential activities which are reviewed and approved in accordance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances by a local government pursuant to a memorandum of understanding.
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Memo to the Governing Board
MOU Between TRPA and
South Lake Tahoe
Page Two

4.4.A. MOU with City of South Lake Tahoe: The following residential activities reviewed and approved by the City of South Lake Tahoe are exempt from TRPA review and approval upon execution of an MOU with the City of South Lake Tahoe as set forth in Appendix __ to this Chapter.

Environmental Documentation

The proposed amendment provides for the review and approval by the City of certain residential activities pursuant to the terms of the MOU. In order to be considered qualified exempt under Chapter 4 of the TRPA Code all such activities conducted under the MOU must be consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances. Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), and based on the checklist recommends a finding of no significant environmental effect.

Chapter 6 Findings

Section 6.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires TRPA to make four findings to amend the Code of Ordinances. These findings, and brief statements of fact and rationales upon which the findings are based, are set forth below.

A. The project (ordinance) is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs;

The activities described in the proposed MOU will be reviewed, approved and inspected by the City consistent with the provisions of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and the Code. The MOU will allow for better utilization of City and TRPA staff time as well as avoid the duplicative review process currently experienced by the City, TRPA and the public. The proposed MOU is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan.

B. The project (ordinance) will not cause environmental thresholds to be exceeded;

Activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU will still be consistent with the provisions of the Regional Plan and Code. The activities will be reviewed by the City in accordance with all applicable TRPA regulations and are limited to only new single and multiple family structures (4 units or less) located on vacant parcels having IPES scores above the line of eligibility for development and/or, in the case of multi-family, on land capability districts 4-7. Unusual residential activities which currently
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require Governing Board review and/or a scenic analysis shall be reviewed by TRPA and are not exempt under the MOU. Therefore, the activities will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded. This finding is also based on the Article V(g) checklist completed for the proposed amendment.

C. 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 (ordinance) meets of exceeds such standards;

Activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU are subject to the standards of the Regional Plan and Code. This finding is also based on the Article V(g) checklist completed for the proposed amendment.

D. The Regional Plan and all of its elements as implemented through the Code, rules and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

As explained under findings A, B, and C, above, the Regional Plan will continue to attain and maintain the thresholds.

Article VI(a) Findings

Article VI(a) states,

The Agency shall prescribe by ordinance those activities which it has determined will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, space, or any other natural resources in the region and therefore will be exempt from its review and approval.

As discussed above, all activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU will be reviewed and inspected consistent with the Regional Plan package, including the TRPA Code and Plan Area Statements. The proposed MOU will not result in an increase in development since all activities will be subject to the residential allocation system. Based on the fact that these activities will be consistent with the Regional Plan and the limitations set forth in the MOU, the proposed Code amendment will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, space, or other natural resources in the region.

Ordinance 87-8 Findings

Subsection 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 requires TRPA to make one of several findings in order to amend the Code of Ordinances. The applicable required finding, and brief statement of fact and rationale upon which the finding can be made, is set forth below.
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A. The provision to be amended has been shown through experience to be counter-productive or ineffective and the amendment is designed to correct the demonstrated problem and is an equal or better means of implementing the Regional Plan Package and complying with the Compact.

The review and inspection of new single and multiple family residential activities is currently conducted by both the City and TRPA pursuant to each of their respective regulations. Consequently each agency reviews the same set of construction plans and performs numerous site inspections for the same project. This duplicative process not only consumes a considerable amount of time for both agencies, but also requires substantial coordination in terms of permit conditions and the review and inspection process in general. It is the desire of both agencies to provide a regulatory structure which is consistent and makes the most efficient use of public resources. As stated above, all activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU will be reviewed and inspected in accordance with both City and TRPA regulations. In addition, Subsection 2.50 of Ordinance 87-8 provides that the finding(s) required by Subsection 2.40 are not intended to limit TRPA’s authority to add policies or ordinances to make existing policies and ordinances more effective. The proposed ordinance amendment and MOU provides for an equal or better, as well as a more effective means of implementing the Regional Plan Package and complying with the Compact.

Staff and APC Recommendation

Staff and the APC recommend that the Governing Board approve the attached MOU and adopt the amending ordinance by taking the following actions:

1. Make the finding that the proposed amendment will not have a significant effect on the environment and the required Chapter 6 and Chapter 87-8 findings; and

2. Adopt the proposed amendment to Chapter 4, as described in the section of this memorandum entitled proposed ordinance amendment, and adopt the proposed ordinance.

Please contact Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, at (702) 588-4547 if you have any comments or questions on this agenda item.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AND
THE CITY OF SOUTH LAKE

February 1991

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into this day of February, 1991, by and between the TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (TRPA), through its Executive Director as authorized by the Governing Board, and the CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, (CITY), by and through its Mayor, as authorized by the City Council.

All activities described in this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) shall be in accordance with the Regional Plan package of TRPA as adopted by Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended from time to time. All activities undertaken by CITY pursuant to this MOU shall comply with applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs), and all provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code), as it may be amended from time to time, except for the procedural provisions replaced by this MOU, and such guidelines as may be adopted by TRPA.

This MOU sets forth the responsibilities of the parties with regard to the processing of permits for new construction of single or multiple-family residential structures not exceeding four units, in accordance with the desire of the parties to provide a regulatory structure which is consistent with the most efficient possible use of public resources.

RECITALS

A. TRPA is required by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, Cal. Govt. Code 66801; NRS 277.200) to regulate activities within the Tahoe Basin which may have a substantial effect on the natural resources of the Basin. The bistate Compact, Article VI(a) requires TRPA to define which activities are exempt from TRPA review and approval.

B. Given the existing comprehensive regulatory structure of CITY as it pertains to construction of new residential structures within the City of South Lake Tahoe, and consistent with the mandate of the Compact to defer land use regulation to local government wherever feasible, CITY and TRPA agree that CITY shall review construction of new single and multiple family structures (four units or less) to be constructed within the City limits of CITY. Such review by CITY shall include application of all applicable TRPA regulations, including specifically the residential allocation limits, to new residential construction projects otherwise subject to TRPA review. As long as the applicable TRPA regulations are being complied with and enforced, such activities shall be deemed a qualified exempt activity under TRPA regulations.

IT IS NOW THEREFORE UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED BY THE PARTIES:

1. With the exception of those applications requiring TRPA Governing Board approval (Chapter 4, Appendix A) or TRPA scenic review (Chapter 30), all applications for new construction of single and multiple family residential structures (four units or less) located on vacant parcels within the City limits...
of South Lake Tahoe are hereby exempt under Chapter 4 of the TRPA Code and shall
be reviewed by CITY.

2. CITY shall administer, in accordance with the provisions of this agreement, all standards of the TRPA Code as applicable to construction of new residential projects, as authorized by this MOU.

CITY shall utilize the TRPA Project Review Conformance Checklist in its review of projects, as authorized by this MOU. A copy of said checklist is attached hereto and incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

CITY shall coordinate with TRPA to determine whether there have been any previous TRPA actions with regard to the subject parcels and the effect of any such action on the pending applications.

3. CITY shall be authorized to collect application and mitigation fees, security deposits, and other designated fees on behalf of TRPA in accordance with fee schedules to be provided to CITY by TRPA. Such fee schedules shall be sufficient in detail to provide specific information concerning fee calculation to assist CITY in performing fee collection activities. Furthermore, CITY shall be authorized to retain a percentage of all application fees collected to offset CITY's costs of administering the provisions of this MOU. Such percentage shall be mutually agreed upon in writing by TRPA and CITY, and may be amended from time to time by mutual agreement of the Executive Director and City Manager.

All mitigation fees collected by CITY on behalf of TRPA pursuant to this MOU shall be paid to TRPA on a monthly basis under procedures mutually agreed upon by the finance officers of the parties hereto.

4. Prior to CITY receiving any application for review or permit issuance for structures as authorized by this MOU, the property owner/applicant shall secure from TRPA an IPES score and coverage verification for all new single family residential projects or a Bailey land capability verification for construction of any new multiple family residential projects. Such verification shall be obtained in written form from TRPA to be submitted to CITY by applicant.

5. Nothing in this MOU shall be construed to limit the authority of CITY to administer state or local regulations or to impose reasonable conditions of approval on any application. Further, nothing in this MOU shall be deemed to limit the land use regulatory powers of either CITY or TRPA.

6. The CITY and TRPA staff shall review quarterly the implementation of this MOU and shall report to their respective governing boards following such reviews.

7. In carrying out the intent of this MOU, CITY and TRPA shall adhere to all provisions contained within TRPA Code Chapter 38 relating to accounting and tracking of coverage, allocations, and any other applicable procedures. All project accounting and tracking shall be completed by CITY and transmitted to TRPA to be included in its permanent accounting and tracking records. In carrying out the provisions of this MOU, CITY shall utilize tracking forms
provided by TRPA to record all inspections, verifications, and other project review activities. CITY shall submit completed tracking forms to TRPA on a monthly basis.

8. CITY shall perform compliance inspections on behalf of TRPA to ensure that the residential projects permitted under this MOU are constructed in accordance with the plans previously submitted and approved.

CITY shall have authority and responsibility to take any and all necessary steps to enforce the standards of the TRPA Code as authorized by this MOU.

In the event litigation is undertaken by CITY to enforce provisions of the TRPA Code, CITY shall notify TRPA legal counsel in advance of filing an action.

Upon final inspection, if the project has been constructed in accordance with the permit, CITY shall be authorized to release the security deposit to the project applicant.

9. Any exempt activity set forth herein shall be considered a project requiring TRPA review if the Executive Director determines that, because of unusual circumstances or failure to comply with this MOU, the activity may have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space, or any other natural resource of the region.

10. This MOU shall continue until sixty (60) days' written notice of termination is given by either party. Both parties hereby agree to cooperate in good faith to carry out the provisions of this MOU to achieve the objectives set forth in the Recitals herein.

11. None of the duties set forth in this MOU shall be assigned, transferred or subcontracted by City without the prior written approval of TRPA.

CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE

Norm Woods, Mayor

Dated: __________________________

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

David S. Ziegler, Executive Director

Dated: __________________________
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 91-

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING
CHAPTER 4 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING
AGENCY RELATING TO THE EXEMPT ACTIVITIES; PROVIDING FOR A MEMORANDUM
OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AND THE
CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE TO EXEMPT CERTAIN ACTIVITIES FROM TRPA REVIEW;
AND OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO.

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as
follows:

Section 1.00  Findings

1.10  It is necessary and desirable to amend Ordinance No. 87-9, as
amended, by amending Chapter 4 in order to implement the Regional
Plan of the Agency, as amended, pursuant to Article VI(a) and
other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning
Compact, as amended ("Compact").

1.20  The Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") has conducted a public
hearing on the amendment to be adopted by this ordinance. The
APC recommended adoption of the amendment. The Governing Board
has also conducted a noticed public hearing on this amendment to
the Code. At said hearings, oral testimony and documentary
evidence were received and considered.

1.30  The provisions of this ordinance are intended to further
implement Chapter 4 of the Code, and not substantially affect the
regulatory provisions of the Code and have been determined not to
have a significant effect on the environment, and thus are exempt
from the requirement of an environmental impact statement
pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.

1.40  The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this
ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Section 6.5 of
the Code and Articles V(g) and VI(a) of the Compact and the
findings required by Ordinance 87-8. The Governing Board further
finds that such findings are supported by substantial evidence in
the record, and a preponderance of the evidence as to the
Ordinance 87-8 findings.

1.50  The amendments to the Code adopted by this ordinance continue to
implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that
achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold
carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.60  Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial
evidence in the record.
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Section 2.00 Amendment of Chapter 4 of the Code of Ordinances

Chapter 4 is hereby amended to add a new section 4.4 and subsection 4.4.A as set forth below:

"4.4 Activities Reviewed By Local Government: This Chapter may be amended to exempt certain residential activities which are reviewed and approved in accordance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances by a local government pursuant to a memorandum of understanding.

4.4.A. MOU with City of South Lake Tahoe: The following residential activities reviewed and approved by the City of South Lake Tahoe are exempt from TRPA review and approval upon execution of the MOU with the City of South Lake Tahoe as set forth in Appendix ___ to this Chapter.

Section 3.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendment to the Code adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to effect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion of this ordinance or amendments is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance, or the amendment to the Code, shall not be affected. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendment are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.00 Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective 60 days after the date of its adoption or the execution of the MOU by the City of South Lake Tahoe, whichever is later.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held ________________, 1991, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

W. F. Cronk, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
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MEMORANDUM

February 19, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Susan E. Scholley, Special Projects Attorney

Re: Movement of IPES Line

BACKGROUND: At the January 1991 meeting, staff presented its recommendations on two (vacant lot equation and compliance) of the four findings needed to lower the IPES line. The two remaining findings relate to installation of additional monitoring and progress in implementing the capital improvement program (CIP) for water quality. Attached as Exhibit A are the findings from Chapter 37 of the Code for lowering the IPES line and the 208 Plan excerpts relating to the monitoring and CIP findings.

MONITORING

§37.8.C(1)(b) Finding: The monitoring program for that jurisdiction is in place pursuant to Chapter 32 and the TRPA monitoring plan.

208 Plan: The monitoring program must be "in place." "In place" is defined as physically located on selected tributaries, with established procedures, and with samples having been collected for at least one representative water year. The 208 Plan also speaks to the goals of the program and gives an estimate of the size of the program.

Discussion: For background, a brief summary of water quality monitoring activities in the Tahoe Region is attached as Exhibit B.

After state and federal approval of the amended 208 Plan in June of 1989, TRPA staff began to implement the additional monitoring which was required to move the IPES line (aka IPES-related monitoring). Specifically, TRPA staff proposed to add two upstream stations on five of the ten streams monitored at the mouth by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). See page 6 in Exhibit B for the location of the monitors. The TRPA Monitoring Committee desired a more extensive addition to the monitoring program but, given the financial constraints and the benefit to coordinating with the longterm USGS monitoring program, TRPA felt the two upstream stations were consistent with the 208 Plan and the direction of the Monitoring Committee. 
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Further, the addition of the upstream stations was conditioned upon the local jurisdictions' agreements to contribute to the cost of the new stations. All the counties and the City of South Lake Tahoe committed funds in 1989, with the exception of Placer County. The program was implemented on four streams in the participating counties in October of 1989 (Incline, Edgewood and Trout Creeks, and the Upper Truckee River). Placer County has since committed to participate and the additional upstream stations on Ward Creek will be added this spring; sampling has already begun.

The two upstream stations on the selected tributaries consist of permanent instream flow monitors. Sampling frequency is not as intensive as the mouth monitoring but, as stated in the 208 Plan, is geared toward spring snowmelt and fall storm events.

As a supplement to the permanent upstream stations, TRPA contracted with an independent lab to conduct synoptic sampling in Douglas County. The synoptic sampling occurred from March 30 to June 29 in 1990 at ten selected sites on Edgewood Creek.

The 208 Plan states that samples must be collected for one representative water year to establish a baseline. The term "representative" was intended to exclude an abnormal year such as a drought or very wet year. The snowpack, snowfall and precipitation statistics for the past year are not normal and are not even within a reasonable range of normal.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** TRPA staff believes that the two permanent upstream stations on the four streams in October 1989 satisfy the IPES requirement for additional monitoring. However, the League, the California Attorney General's office and the State Water Resources Control Board (Cal. SWRCB) and Lahontan staffs disagree. Although there is skepticism as to its benefit, the addition of the synoptic monitoring appears to allay these parties' concerns. Accordingly, TRPA staff is proposing to continue the synoptic monitoring program in Douglas County and to expand it to the other counties. It must be noted that the purpose of the IPES-related monitoring is not to test IPES specifically, but rather to supplement the overall monitoring program in the Basin.

Because of the severity of the drought, last year was not a representative water year and thus the monitoring finding cannot be made in any county. There was general agreement among the Committee members that the term "representative" may not be necessary and TRPA staff recommends amendment of the 208 Plan to delete the term and to emphasize the commitment to a long term improvement in the monitoring program.
WATER QUALITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROGRESS

§17.8.C.(l)(c) Finding: Demonstrable progress is being made on the Water Quality CIP for that jurisdiction.

208 Plan: The 208 Plan provides for two alternative findings:

1. That funding is committed and there is a strong likelihood that construction will commence on one or more high priority projects in the current or upcoming year and that one or more high priority projects was constructed in the current or previous year. (A high priority project is one with substantial water quality benefit.); OR

2. That the jurisdiction's performance on SEZ restoration and water quality CIP projects is consistent with the 208 Plan benchmarks. The benchmarks are expenditure and restoration goals for the period 1998 through 1991:

- Douglas County: $2.9 million
- Washoe County: $3.9 million
- Placer County: $7.6 million
- City of SLT: $10.0 million
- El Dorado: $7.8 million

SEZ Restoration - Restore 400 acres

Discussion: As to the second alternative finding, with the help of the county staffs, TRPA staff has compiled a CIP list for Douglas and Washoe Counties. The California counties' totals were estimated by TRPA staff and have not been reviewed in detail. The totals, including projected 1991 projects, are:

- Douglas County: $5.6 million (See Exhibit D for details)
- Washoe County: $4.1 million (See Exhibit E for details)
- Placer County: $6.27 million
- El Dorado: $6.08 million
- City of SLT: $8.42 million

Estimates of SEZ restoration to date are approximately 50 acres, with a possible 50 more acres of restoration projected for completion by 1991.

With respect to the first alternative finding, the counties have made significant commitments and progress in implementing the Water Quality CIP and are to be commended. There was not agreement at the Committee level on which
projects were high priority because the Committee felt detailed information on each project would be needed. This alternative finding was therefore not pursued although TRPA staff felt it likely that the first alternative finding could be made for each county.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The first alternative finding could probably be made for all the counties but consensus would require a significant expenditure of staff time. The second alternative finding cannot be made for any county because of the rate of progress in the area of SEZ restoration. Given the five-year goal of 400 acres and the projected 100 acres restored, it cannot be said progress is consistent with the benchmark.

The Committee felt that the inability to make the monitoring finding obviated the need for such an effort but they recommended that TRPA staff articulate the criteria for substantial water quality benefit so as to facilitate the effort next year.

APC RECOMMENDATION: The APC recommended acceptance of the staff recommendations outlined above.

ACTION REQUESTED: Staff recommends the following action plan with respect to lowering the IPES line:

1. Direct staff to prepare and notice amendments to the 208 Plan regarding the monitoring finding (delete "representative" and emphasize long term commitment).

2. Direct staff to compile another year (FY 89-90) of compliance statistics prior to setting numerical performance standards.

3. Direct staff to begin review of CIP projects in Washoe and Douglas Counties in anticipation of being able to lower line if 208 Plan amendments approved and certified.

4. (Optional) Direct staff to reconvene Consensus Building Workshop and discuss revision of vacant lot equation.
POOR QUALITY ORIGINAL (S) TO FOLLOW
(f) If the value established under (e), above, is within the zone established in (b), above, then the initial numerical level shall be set at the value established under (e), above. If the value established under (e), above, is outside the zone established in (b), above, then the initial numerical level shall be set at the numerical value of the zone boundary that is closest to the value established under (e), above.

376C Lowering Numerical Level Defining Top Ranked Parcels:
Provided TRPA makes the findings required under Subparagraph (i) of this Subsection, the numerical level defining the top ranked parcels in any jurisdiction shall be lowered, on an annual basis commencing on January 1, 1990, to include in the top rank a number of parcels equal to the number of parcels in that jurisdiction that used allocations during the previous year in accordance with Chapter 33.

(1) Required Findings: The numerical level defining the top ranked parcels shall not be lowered unless TRPA makes the following findings with respect to the applicable local jurisdiction:

(a) All parcels included in the top rank are otherwise eligible for development under the applicable state water quality management plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (208 plans) and other legal limitations;
(b) The monitoring program for that jurisdiction is in place pursuant to Chapter 32 and the TRPA monitoring plan.
(c) Demonstrable progress is being made on capital improvement programs for water quality within that jurisdiction;
(d) The level of compliance with conditions of project approvals within any jurisdiction is satisfactory; and
(e) For any jurisdiction, the number of parcels having scores below the level defining the top ranked parcels, divided by the number of parcels in that jurisdiction that were identified as sensitive by TRPA on January 1, 1986, does not exceed the following percentages:
Property owners may appeal their parcel's rating to an independent body of qualified experts not involved in the initial field evaluation of that parcel. These independent experts shall apply the IPES criteria, and their decision shall be final unless the property owner appeals to the TRPA Governing Board. The Board may change a rating only upon finding that the IPES criteria were not applied correctly.

TRPA shall rate all vacant residential parcels numerically and rank them from most suitable to least suitable, by jurisdiction. TRPA shall also establish a level in the ranking immediately above the most sensitive parcels, based on recommendations from the IPES technical committee. Only parcels above this level, as it may be subsequently adjusted, comprise the "top rank" and may pursue a building permit (Goals and Policies, p. VII-6).

The numerical level defining the top rank for any jurisdiction shall be lowered annually by the number of allocations utilized in that jurisdiction during the previous year, provided that the following conditions are met (Goals and Policies, pp. VII-6, -7):

--- all parcels in the top rank are otherwise eligible for development under state water quality plans and other legal limitations,

--- a monitoring program for that jurisdiction is in place as set forth in the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement of the TRPA Goals and Policies,

--- demonstrable progress is being made on the Capital Improvements Program for water quality within that jurisdiction,

--- there is a satisfactory rate of reduction in the inventory of vacant parcels; the IPES line shall not move down in any jurisdiction unless the number of parcels below the line in that jurisdiction, compared to the number deemed sensitive on January 1, 1986, does not exceed 20 percent in El Dorado and Placer Counties, or 33 percent in Washoe and Douglas Counties, and

--- the level of compliance with conditions of project approvals within that jurisdiction is satisfactory.

With respect to the requirement that a monitoring program be in place in a given jurisdiction, the Goals and Policies require TRPA to monitor representative tributaries to provide a basis for evaluating the relative health of the watershed within which development is contemplated and progress toward meeting thresholds. The monitoring program will monitor stream flows and
concentrations of sediments and dissolved nutrients to determine annual pollutant loads. This monitoring program shall be in place in a local jurisdiction, and shall establish baseline water quality conditions, before the numerical level defining the top rank for the jurisdiction is lowered (Goals and Policies, p. VII-25). The term "in place" means that a TRPA-approved monitoring system, with established procedures and responsibilities, is physically located on the selected tributaries, and samples have been collected and analyzed for at least one representative water year.

The location of sampling sites, frequency of sampling, and financial responsibilities for monitoring will be set forth in TRPA's Monitoring Program pursuant to the Goals and Policies (p. VII-25) and the TRPA Code of Ordinances (section 32.10), based on the recommendations of the TRPA Monitoring Committee. The objectives of the monitoring program are to:

1. Characterize the water quality of streams draining affected residential areas in relationship to the overall water quality observed in the watershed,

2. Identify short-term changes in water quality from affected residential areas, and

3. Ensure that TRPA and state water quality standards are being attained and maintained.

The monitoring program will include quality control and quality assurance (QA/QC) procedures to ensure that the data accurately represent the actual water quality conditions.

Monitoring will normally occur not only at the mouths of streams, but also at locations in closer proximity to residential subdivisions. While the stream mouth monitoring will generally cover the entire year, monitoring at other locations higher in the watershed will be geared toward the spring snowmelt period and the fall storm season to contain costs. In addition to the presently established monitoring stations, TRPA estimates that 30 to 40 additional stations will be required throughout the Region to support the IPES conditions.

With regard to the requirement that demonstrable progress is being made on the Capital Improvements Program within a given jurisdiction, TRPA's evaluation will be based on the programs adopted in Volumes III and IV of the 208 plan, including lists of SEZ restoration and capital improvement projects for erosion and runoff control, with priority designations, for each jurisdiction. Pursuant to the Goals and Policies, TRPA has established benchmarks against which the progress can be evaluated (Goals and Policies, p. VII-26). These benchmarks are found in Section I, Chapter VII of this volume, Plan Evaluation and Revision.
To make a finding of demonstrable progress in a local jurisdiction, TRPA will review the progress of that jurisdiction over a three-year period covering the previous year, the current year, and the upcoming year. For the demonstrable progress criteria to be met, TRPA must make one of the following findings: (1) funding is committed and there is a strong likelihood that construction will commence on one or more high priority watershed improvement projects in the current or upcoming year and construction of one or more high priority projects has taken place in the previous or current year, or (2) the performance of the local jurisdiction on implementation of SEZ restoration and capital improvement projects is consistent with progress necessary to meet the benchmarks established on pp. 183 and 184. In this context, the term "high priority project" means a project with a substantial water quality benefit.

To determine whether the level of compliance in a jurisdiction is satisfactory, TRPA will evaluate: (1) the percentage of projects which commenced construction three or more years earlier but which have not had their securities returned for water quality-related practices, (2) the number of projects which are behind approved schedules in project approvals for BMP retrofit, compared to those on schedule, (3) the number of projects which required TRPA issuance of cease and desist orders for failure to observe conditions of approval within the previous fiscal year, as compared to the number of projects inspected, and (4) the number of projects on which violations remain unresolved, compared to the number resolved. TRPA will review compliance data at the end of the 1989 building season, and will then set specific numerical performance standards for the four criteria above. The specific numerical performance standard shall reflect TRPA's goal of achieving a very high level of compliance with conditions of project approval.

Since it is possible (though unlikely) that individual appeals of IPES scores may result in a significant shift in the number of single-family parcels eligible to pursue construction permits by virtue of being in the top rank, TRPA shall, in a given local jurisdiction, and provided that IPES appeals increase the size of the top rank in that jurisdiction by three percent or more, subtract the number of parcels added to the top rank by appeals during the first year from the number of parcels which would be added to the top rank any year that the IPES line is lowered, until the number of parcels added to the top rank by appeals equals the number of parcels which would have been added to the top rank due to the lowering of the IPES line.

For TRPA to approve a project on a parcel rated and ranked by IPES, the parcel must be served by a paved road, water service, sewer service, and electric utility. However, Chapter 27 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances sets forth provisions for waiver of the paved road requirement, as provided for in the Goals and Policies (p. VII-8).
A BRIEF SUMMARY OF LAKE TAHOE'S SURFACE WATER QUALITY MONITORING PROGRAM
INTRODUCTION

Surface water quality monitoring in the Lake Tahoe Basin requires the support and services of a variety of agencies and personnel. In 1981, the Lake Tahoe Interagency Monitoring Program (LTIMP) was established to acquire and disseminate water quality data. The major partners have been the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), California Department of Water Resources (CDWR), United States Geological Survey (USGS), Tahoe Research Group from University of California-Irvine (TRG), Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU), Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB), and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

Until FY 87-88, funding for this program was provided by the USGS, SWRCB, and USFS with matching support and services provided by TRP. Starting in FY 87-88, TRPA was able to match USGS dollars and expand the monitoring network. For FY 88-89 and 89-90, current TRPA obtained additional funds from California and Nevada and was able to greatly expand the monitoring program and provide assistance for several of TRP's projects.

USGS/TRG

The USGS/TRG monitoring network has expanded from a low of four streams in 1984 to 10 in 1990 (five on the Nevada side and five on the California side). This expanded network monitors approximately 46 percent of the Lake Tahoe tributary drainage (Table 1). This program includes monitoring at or near the mouths of all 10 tributaries (Table 1, Figure 1) plus eight additional stations on four tributaries (two per tributary) located above and midway through the developed portion of the watershed (Figure 1). These additional sites are located on Incline, Edgewood, and Trout Creeks, plus the Upper Truckee River.

The nutrient parameters monitored are listed in Table 1. These allow for full definition of nitrogen and phosphorus speciation. In addition to these listed nutrients, suspended sediment and continuous streamflow are also monitored at each of the 18 sites.

Sampling frequency is variable and in response to streamflow dynamics. During peak runoff conditions, when the bulk of the nutrients and sediments are transported, sampling frequency can be as often as daily or more often. During low flow conditions, sampling decreases to once every two-three weeks.

This monitoring network allows the USGS/TRG to:

1. estimate daily, monthly, and annual loading values at the various monitoring sites;
2. characterize the water quality of streams draining residential areas; and
3. evaluate the impacts that residential areas have on water quality.
USFS

The USFS conducts its own water quality monitoring program. For Water Year 1987 (WY 87: October 1, 1986 through September 30, 1987), the USFS monitored 15 sites. These included 14 streams, one roadside drainage, and Lake Le Conte in Desolation Wilderness (Figure 3).

The USFS performs monitoring to assess the impacts that USFS management activities have on water quality. The sites are located above and below the management activity under investigation.

Their monitoring program consists of two sampling periods in addition to sampling during storm events. Water samples are analyzed for: specific conductivity, pH, alkalinity, total nitrogen, suspended sediment, nitrate, nitrite, total phosphorus, dissolved phosphate, and streamflow.

Great Basin Laboratories

TRPA contracted with Great Basin Laboratories (GBL) to perform additional water quality monitoring at 10 sites located on Edgewood Creek (Figure 4). Monitoring of the 10 sites was conducted three times per week for the period March 30, 1989-June 29, 1989.

This program was designed to supplement the existing tributary monitoring performed by the USGS and TRPA. Information from GBL's monitoring will be integrated into their program and allow for a better understanding of the impacts of residential development on tributary water quality.

Collected samples were analyzed for temperature, pH, electrical conductivity, turbidity, ammonia, total nitrogen, nitrate, nitrite, ortho-phosphate, total phosphorus, and suspended sediment. Flow measurements were taken at the time of each sample collection.

It is anticipated that a synoptic monitoring program of this sort will be implemented on other tributaries in the Basin.

Miscellaneous

There are several additional surface water monitoring efforts going on in the Tahoe Basin. The Lahontan Board monitors and receives monitoring data from erosion control projects and as part of waste discharge requirements. TRPA has recently required Incline Village and Glenbrook golf courses to perform monitoring to determine their impacts on water quality.

Marinas are required to submit substrata and water column monitoring reports, and Ski Incline has been required to have a water quality monitoring program since July, 1986. Monitoring includes both surface monitoring of Incline Creek plus monitoring of several drop inlets that serve as collection points for drainage from various parts of the ski resort.
In-Lake Monitoring

The TRG has conducted a variety of limnological and water quality studies at Lake Tahoe since 1959. As part of these studies, TRG measures primary productivity rates (PRR) of algae and water clarity. They have collected data from their Index and Mid-lake stations since 1968 and 1973, respectively.

Both stations are located in the pelagial or deep water zone of Lake Tahoe, where water depth exceeds 150 meters. The littoral zone or near-shore zone is the water area around the lake less than 30 meters in depth.

Data is collected at approximately 10-day intervals at the Index Station and 14-day intervals at the Mid-lake Station. Data is collected and analyzed for areal concentrations of nitrate nitrogen and total dissolved phosphorus for both stations. Secchi depth readings are also recorded at both sites, while pH is only measured at the Index Station.

TRG re-instituted their littoral zone periphyton (attached algae) monitoring during 1969. The algae in this area of the lake respond quickly to localized nutrient additions carried by streams and groundwater and reflects local loading sources from the adjacent watersheds.

Sampling is performed at six sites, during each of the eight months during the year that encompass the algae's growth and decline. Sampling is performed at the 0.5 and 2 meter depths.

In addition, turbidity measurements are made at each of the periphyton sites on each sampling event.

TRG is also performing in-lake nutrient processing research to try to determine the following key questions:

1. what level of annual nutrient additions to Lake Tahoe will result in a cessation of the increases in algal growth and improvement in water quality;
2. how long does the Lake take to respond to changes in nutrient additions;
3. permanent burial rates for sediments and nutrients; and
4. the fate of the more complex forms of nutrients.

Additional studies and monitoring are being done in the Tahoe Basin, but those listed above represent the major work being done on surface water quality monitoring.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co.</th>
<th>USGS Site Number</th>
<th>River</th>
<th>Drain. Chan. Area (sq mi)</th>
<th>Drain. Chan. Length (mi)</th>
<th>Basin Elevation (ft)</th>
<th>Basin % of Total</th>
<th>Flowshed % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>336790</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Trout C at mouth</td>
<td>40.97 12.20 3.36</td>
<td>6225 7760 13880</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>336780</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Trout C at S Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>40.40 16.70 3.78</td>
<td>6235 7920 10060</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>336610</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U. Truckee, S Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>54.80 19.45 2.84</td>
<td>6225 7920 10060</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>336615</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>General C. at mouth</td>
<td>7.80 5.00 3.82</td>
<td>6240 7860 8720</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>336605</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blackwood C. at mouth</td>
<td>7.80 5.00 3.82</td>
<td>6240 7860 8720</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>336604</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ward C. at mouth</td>
<td>9.70 5.90 3.85</td>
<td>6290 7040 8880</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa</td>
<td>336698</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Third C. at mouth</td>
<td>9.70 5.90 3.85</td>
<td>6290 7040 8880</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa</td>
<td>336700</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Incline C. at mouth</td>
<td>5.70 4.90 1.45</td>
<td>6250 8400 9220</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>336730</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glenbrook C. at mouth</td>
<td>7.30 5.50 1.90</td>
<td>6280 7710 8810</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>336740</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Logan House C. at mouth</td>
<td>7.80 5.30 1.80</td>
<td>6540 8240 8820</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>336759</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Edgewood C. at mouth</td>
<td>6.90 5.10 1.70</td>
<td>6239 7830 9590</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of total Lake Tahoe watershed monitored in TIP program (flow, sediment, nutrients):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of drainage</th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Drainage:</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Surface:</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary Basins:</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada:</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1.—Location of tributary monitoring sites in the Lake Tahoe Basin.
Table 2. Nitrogen and phosphorus parameters included in lake Tahoe tributary monitoring programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient Species</th>
<th>Environmental Sources</th>
<th>Laboratory Sample Preparation or Calculation</th>
<th>Monitoring Program</th>
<th>&quot;Total&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Filterable&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Soluble&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Residue&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nitrogen Speciation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Organic Nitrogen</td>
<td>organic wastes, sewage, plant detritus, fertilizers, synthetic compounds</td>
<td>(5) - (2)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Ammonia Nitrogen</td>
<td>hydrolysis of organic nitrogen, reduction of nitrates, fertilizers, sewage</td>
<td>direct determination</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Nitrite</td>
<td></td>
<td>direct determination</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Nitrate</td>
<td></td>
<td>direct determination</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen summary determinations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Excess Nitrogen, Organic + Ammonia</td>
<td>digestion with sulfuric acid-mercuric sulfate, potassium sulfate to convert organic compounds to free ammonia</td>
<td>(1) - (2)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>X(6)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] Nitrite + Nitrate</td>
<td>hydrazine or cadmium reduction of nitrate to nitrite</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] Total Nitrogen</td>
<td>all above</td>
<td>(5) - (6) or (5) - (3) - (4)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>x(7)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phosphorus Speciation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] Organic</td>
<td>organic wastes, sewage, plant detritus</td>
<td>calculated, (4) - (3)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid hydrolyzable</td>
<td>calculated, (C) - (E)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Condensed phosphates&quot;,</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyro-, meta-, oleyl phosphates</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Orthophosphate, &quot;Reactive&quot; phosphorus</td>
<td>fertilizers, soil, rock dissolution</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(some condensed phosphates may be included with ortho in analyses)</td>
<td>EXP1: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus summary determinations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Acid hydrolyzable + Orthophosphate</td>
<td>(2) - (3)</td>
<td>sulfurous acid hydrolysis (some organs may be included in analyses)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>x(8)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Total Phosphorus</td>
<td>all above</td>
<td>persulfate oxidation</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP1:</td>
<td>x(9)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXP2: X</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

[A] Monitoring Programs:
- LTIMP: Historical LTIMP program (through September 1987).
- EXP1: Expanded Water Year 1988 program, Nevada sites.

[1] Assumes accurate representative sampling of all suspended sediment that might contain nitrogen or phosphorus.

[2] Defined as the arithmetic difference between (1) and (2).

Organic nitrogen is defined as the arithmetic difference between (1) and (2).
Phosphorus occurs in aquatic ecosystems almost solely as phosphates. These phosphates can exist in dissolved ionic form as orthophosphates, in the water column as colloidal suspensions of polyphosphates, in suspension or sediments sorbed onto, or complexed with, inorganic minerals, or in the dead organic material detritus of aquatic macro- and micro-organisms. Most commonly employed analytical procedures determine phosphorus by colorimetric measurement of dissolved orthophosphates. Classification of phosphorus species is functionally defined by the sample treatment prior to the measurement of orthophosphate concentration. None of these definitions are necessarily exact; analysis for orthophosphate may include some polyphosphates acid hydrolysis of orthophosphates may release some organically-bound phosphorus, and digestion for "total" phosphorus may not release all organically-bound phosphorus.

References:


December 17, 1990

To: IPES Line Committee
From: Susan E. Scholley, Special Projects Attorney
Re: Douglas County CIP Progress

The four-year CIP goal (1988-1991) for Douglas County is $2.9 million dollars. At the last meeting we provided a list of projects which totals $6.1 million dollars. Concern was expressed that the bulk of the expenditures were projected for 1991 rather than completed projects.

On December 11, I met with Mark Palmer (DPW) and John Renz regarding Douglas County's progress and commitments on the CIP. Following is a summary of the status of each project.

1988
Elk Point - Completed 1988; cost $42,625 pure CIP.

1989
Chimney Rock - Completed 1989; cost $104,900 pure CIP.

1990
Hubbard Road - Completed 1990; cost $127,200; pure CIP although paving cost is part of project.
North Martin Road (I) - Completed 1990; see total cost below; portion of project is road improvements which has been subtracted.

Cave Rock - Ten percent complete 1990; see total cost below; pure CIP.

1991
Cave Rock - Remaining 90 percent funded, contract awarded and commitment to NV. St. Lands (NSL) to complete by Oct. 15, 1991; total cost approx. $1,062,394; pure CIP.

North Martin Drive (II) - Revegetation funded and commitment to NSL to complete by 10/15/91; approx. total CIP cost is $61,394. Road improvements ($210,000) excluded.

Kingsbury Highlands - Funded and contract awarded with commitment to NSL to complete by 10/15/91; approx. cost is $339,183; pure CIP.
1991

Zephyr Knolls - Design 90 percent complete, condemnation underway, funded and contract to be awarded Feb. 91 with commitment to NSL to complete 10/15/91; approx. cost is $671,116; pure CIP.

Kingsbury Village - Design 75 percent complete; funded and contract to be awarded Feb. 91; commitment to NSL to complete by 10/15/91; approx. cost $1,100,453; pure CIP.

Kingsbury Summit - Same status as Kingsbury Village above; approx. cost $1,712,663; pure CIP.

Burke Creek - Design 15 percent complete; 90 percent funded (US); approx. cost is $363,103; pure TIP.

In summary, Douglas County has $4.9 million dollars committed to 1991 CIP projects, exclusive of Burke Creek. They have contractually committed to NSL that the projects will be done by October 15, 1991 and expect to meet that commitment.

Approx. $433,000 has been spent to date. Approx. $1.3 million is already awarded and projects are ready to begin May 1. Zephyr Knolls is 90 percent designed and represents approx. $670,000. Kingsbury Village and Summit projects are 75 percent designed and represent approx. $3.2 million dollars. The grand total of projects which have been completed or for which funding is committed and the project is underway (e.g. design, contract awarded): $5.6 million.
**WASHOE COUNTY**
**WATER QUALITY CIP PROGRESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$1,412,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston &amp; Stevens Parking Lot</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$321,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski Way/IVGID, R-2-1 and R-2-2</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$522,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski Incline Parking</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incline Village II</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$1,568,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,080,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

February 19, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Workshop -- Wednesday, February 27, 2:30 p.m.

Introduction

As a follow-up to the workshop conducted at the January meeting, the Governing Board will discuss four items at the February meeting. The purpose of these discussions is both to provide information to the Board and to give the Board an opportunity to give policy direction to the staff. The four items are as follows:

1. Roles and Responsibilities

In July 1990, the Governing Board approved a Five-Year Strategy covering the period July 1990 to June 1995. The purpose of the Strategy was to identify TRPA's priorities, approaches, and objectives; to establish a cornerstone for budgeting and work planning; and to provide a vehicle for strategic discussions. The Strategy includes a mission statement, as set forth in Article I of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

The staff will provide additional copies of the Strategy at the February meeting for those persons who do not have a copy. In addition, the staff has prepared a summary of problems and priorities from the Strategy (Attachment 1).

Discussion of TRPA's role and responsibilities is appropriate, in preparation for the annual update of the Strategy, which will occur later in FY 1990-91. Attachment 1 provides a handy reference regarding TRPA's current perception of its role and responsibilities, while the Strategy approved in July 1990 provides additional detail.

Prior to discussion on this agenda item, the staff will make a brief oral presentation, focusing on Attachment 1.

Agenda Item VII B.
2. September 1991 Evaluation of the Regional Plan Package

At the December 1990 Governing Board meeting, Executive Director Dave Ziegler addressed the Board on the subject of the September 1991 evaluation. That presentation covered the background of the evaluation; the structure of the evaluation process; and the schedule for the evaluation. The evaluation can be described as an audit of the entire Regional Plan, the administrative record, the technical data and monitoring, and implementation.

Committee work on the evaluation is well underway, and staff will present a draft summary report to the Board in July 1991. The evaluation report will cover both threshold-related matters (e.g., water quality, air quality) and non-threshold-related matters (e.g., streamlining, IPES).

Prior to discussion on this agenda item, the staff will distribute a handout on attainment of TRPA thresholds and related standards, and make a brief oral presentation on the handout. Comments and questions from the Governing Board will be welcomed.

3. Allocations of Residential Development in 1992 and Beyond

At the December 1990 meeting, the Board discussed allocations of residential development in 1992 and beyond. The allocation table in the Goals and Policies and Code of Ordinances is a core provision of the Regional Plan; to amend it requires special findings. In December, there was a concern that the absence of residential allocations for 1992 and beyond would contribute to a sense of alarm among those competing for 1991 allocations.

In the December packet, the staff included a draft resolution stating the Board's intent regarding residential allocations in 1992 and beyond (Attachment 2). Mr. Klein felt such a resolution would give the public some assurance but, in general, the Board felt the issue of residential allocations for 1992 and beyond should be resolved in the context of the September 1991 evaluation.

As reported at the December meeting, the staff's strategy is to begin by July 1991 to draft Regional Plan amendments and appropriate environmental documentation in response to the evaluation of the Regional Plan, so that TRPA can circulate an environmental document and take action prior to the 1992 building season. It is important that there be a nexus between the findings of the evaluation and the proposed amendments. Controlling the allocations of additional residential development is only one of many tools available to attain and maintain environmental thresholds.

Under this agenda item, the staff would appreciate any additional direction the Governing Board wishes to provide, especially in the context of the other workshop topics.
4. Future Workshop Schedule

The staff recommends the following schedule of informational briefings and workshops for the remainder of the fiscal year:

**March**
- Videotape presentation on TPFA's visibility monitoring program; discussion of air quality thresholds, state and federal air quality standards, air quality cause/effect relationships, and monitoring programs
- Discussion of administrative draft, Regional Transportation Plan update

**April**
- Briefing on water quality monitoring program, Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for erosion and runoff control, Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program, and Handbook of Best Management Practices
- Workshop on annual update of the Five-Year Strategy, focusing on mission, goals, objectives, and priorities

**May**
- Briefing on Scenic Resources Management Program and monitoring and evaluation of scenic resources

**June**
- Briefing on noise thresholds and noise monitoring program

Under this agenda item, the staff would appreciate the Board's comments and questions on this briefing schedule.

If you have any questions or comments about the planning workshop scheduled for February 27, please contact Dave Ziegler at (702) 588-4547.
SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS AND PRIORITIES
TRPA FIVE-YEAR STRATEGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Category</th>
<th>Threshold?</th>
<th>Priority Statement (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>IMPLEMENT AND MAINTAIN BMPs; RESTORE SEZs; FINANCE CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOIL CONSERVATION</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>FINANCE CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS; COORDINATE/INTEGRATE PROGRAMS AND POLICY; REDUCE AUTO EMISSIONS; REDUCE VMT; IMPROVE LOS; COMPLETE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGETATION</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>RESTORE SEZs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>RESTORE SEZs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILDLIFE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>RESTORE SEZs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>IMPLEMENT CONTROL PROGRAM; RESOLVE THRESHOLDS ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MASTER PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENIC QUALITY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL HAZARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOREZONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWAGE TREATMENT AND COLLECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SUPPLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASSIST LOCAL GOVERNMENT; AMEND REGIONAL PLAN AS APPROPRIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DROUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Problems and Priorities
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Category</th>
<th>Threshold?</th>
<th>Priority Statement (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL/HISTORICAL/ARCHITECTURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLID WASTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOXIC/HAZARDOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPILL PREVENTION AND RESPONSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Institutional and Programmatic Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE AND URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>CONTINUE COMMUNITY PLANNING, CONTINUE AND EXPAND REDEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTIONS AND FINANCING</td>
<td>FINANCE CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS; COORDINATE/INTEGRATE PROGRAMS AND POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH COST OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</td>
<td>FINANCE CAPITAL AND OPERATING COSTS OF WATER QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYNAMIC NATURE OF REGIONAL PLAN</td>
<td>MONITOR, EVALUATE, AND AMEND THE PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLEXITY OF REGIONAL PLAN</td>
<td>EDUCATE AND INFORM THE PUBLIC; DELEGATE, STREAMLINE, SIMPLIFY PROJECT REVIEW; STREAMLINING TASK FORCE; DELEGATION AGREEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE VOLUME OF INFORMATION</td>
<td>DEVELOP AND UTILIZE A GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL CHALLENGES</td>
<td>PREVENT, ANTICIPATE, DEFEND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 90-

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has adopted environmental thresholds and a 20-year regional plan for the Tahoe Region pursuant to the mandate of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233); and

WHEREAS, it is the goal of the Compact and TRPA to achieve and maintain the adopted thresholds while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities; and

WHEREAS, the regional plan and implementing ordinances included a six-year program for allocation of residential development, which program expires in December of 1991; and

WHEREAS, the environmental impact statement prepared and certified on the 20-year regional plan projected 6,000 residential units over the life of the plan; and

WHEREAS, the regional plan requires a review in 1991 of progress towards attainment and maintenance of the thresholds; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the five-year review is to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to the regional plan and ordinances to meet the goals of the Compact; and

WHEREAS, at the time of the presentation of the five-year review, TRPA shall include a recommendation on the limits, if any, of residential allocations for 1992 and beyond;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the TRPA Governing Board declares its intention and desire to conduct the five-year review in a timely manner so that the necessary adjustments and supplementation to the residential allocation program are implemented expeditiously.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Governing Board intends to provide for continued orderly residential growth in the region and will, consistent with the five-year review, adjust its regulatory program accordingly.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at its regular meeting on ____________, 1990, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

Roland D. Westergard, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEMORANDUM

February 8, 1991

To: The Governing Board

From: The Staff

Subject: Advisory Planning Commission Appointments - Expiration of Lay Member Terms

Following is a list of Advisory Planning Commission (APC) lay members and the expiration dates of their two-year terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Davis</td>
<td>September 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Hansen</td>
<td>February 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Popoff</td>
<td>February 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Brooks</td>
<td>September 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Roberts</td>
<td>December 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jepsen</td>
<td>June 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bistate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Jolley</td>
<td>March 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bev Bedard</td>
<td>December 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The terms of California lay members Stan Hansen and Leo Popoff expire the end of February 1991. Both have expressed an interest in being reappointed for another two-year term. APC lay members may be reappointed.
MEMORANDUM

February 11, 1991

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Progress Report on FY 90-91 Program of Work

At its June 1990 meeting the Governing Board approved the attached program of work for FY 1990-1991 and directed staff to make quarterly reports throughout the fiscal year to keep the Board apprised of staff's progress. The amount of progress toward completion of the approved goals and objectives contained in the Agency's Program of Work is listed in the form of percentages of completion for each objective on a division by division basis. Also in your packet, you will find a brief summary of work activities conducted on a routine basis in each division which are not specifically included in the goals and objectives, but are very much a part of the work program.

In reviewing the first and second quarterly accomplishments, it appears we are making relatively good progress toward completing the targeted objectives contained in the Program of Work. Following is a brief summary of some of the primary objectives and work accomplishments for each division during the second quarter of FY 1990-1991.

Executive Staff

The Agency's annual report was completed and the City of South Lake Tahoe has agreed to enter into an MOU to review new residential projects (4 units or less) pending TRPA approval in February 1991. Significant progress has been made in developing an aggressive public information and education program, e.g., quarterly newsletter published, several public workshops held, and monthly newspaper column published. Involvement in the community planning, master planning and redevelopment processes continues to be a high priority. Also, arrangements for a North Shore office have been established on a trial basis beginning in February 1991.
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Legal Department

Amendments to the Rules of Procedure relating to conflict of interest and the APC were completed. A draft revised personnel policy manual is nearing completion and should be presented to the Board in March or April 1991. The IPES line movement review process is scheduled to be completed in February 1991. Although a large portion of the subdivision ordinance has now been adopted, portions of the ordinance dealing with existing residential structures may not be completed until September 1991. Work on establishing a Nevada land bank has been slow due to a number of factors beyond TRPA's control. Nevada State Lands Division does not have a budget to administer such a program, and there are concerns that there may not be sufficient demand in Nevada to justify state support due to the low volume of allocations in Douglas and Washoe County. The Airport litigation and Master Plan process continues to move forward at a slow, but steady pace. Newly-enacted federal policy has now raised the issue of whether TRPA is pre-empted from regulating certain aircraft noise and operations at the Airport. Steps are currently being taken to resolve this issue with the FAA, and at the same time work is proceeding on the preparation of a Master Plan and EIS. It is anticipated that the draft EIS may take six months or more to prepare, while an additional 2-3 months may be required to reach consensus on the preferred alternative and any other unresolved issues.

Finance Department

All employee retirement plan returns for FY 1989-1990 have been completed and the quarterly valuation reports for the first two quarters should be completed in February 1991. Due to the need for additional computer hardware and technical training on the new computerized accounting system, implementation of this system has been deferred until December 1991. Work on the economic component of the 1991 Threshold Evaluation is progressing on schedule.

Management Support

All work relating to project and subject matter files and publication of the 208 Plan has been completed. Due to budget limitations on computer purchases the streamlining of the project file log-in process has been temporarily deferred. Given the Board's recent action on filing fee increases it is anticipated that this objective can be achieved in the near future. Implementation of a new telephone system has been deferred indefinitely due to budget considerations, therefore, this objective has been deleted from this fiscal year's objectives.
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AGENDA ITEM IX C.
Environmental Compliance

The report on IPES performance standards has been completed and the report relating to dredging monitoring should be completed in February 1991. The highway de-icing program is well underway and a program update will be presented to the Board in June. Several remedial actions have been initiated pursuant to Chapter 8 of the Code. Due to the apparent lack of interest by local building departments, the objective dealing with the delegation of wood heater enforcement has been deleted from this fiscal year's objectives. This objective may be better dealt with under future delegation agreements or MOUs with local governments involving the review and inspection of residential activities. The building and erosion control awards program was completed in December 1990.

Project Review

The procedures manual for EAs and EISs is nearing completion and should be completed in March 1991. Several educational workshops pertaining to the permit process were held in January and at least 3 more have been scheduled to take place during the next few months. The number of permits issued during the second quarter exceeded the number of applications received. All required training related to the implementation of MOUs with other governmental agencies during this quarter has been completed.

Long Range Planning

The schedule for completing some of the objectives dealing with the Transportation and Air Quality Plan is significantly behind. The transportation team considers this to be its top priority and will present an administrative draft plan to the Board in March. Work on the RTP has been delayed due to competing work tasks, i.e., completing the transportation model, administering current grant programs, and providing support to other divisions. Several Data Management objectives are behind schedule due to budget limitations. As a result the auto-permit processing and computer drafting programs have been deferred until next fiscal year. Community plans, though significantly behind the original schedule established several years ago, are now making steady progress toward completion. Several draft plans will be scheduled for Board review within the coming months (see Attachment A, Status Report). Progress on the 1991 threshold evaluation is satisfactory at this time. Committees have been formed, a majority of the field work has been completed, mentors are under contract, and the Steering Committee is overseeing the work plan and budget.

If you have any questions on this matter prior to the meeting, please contact Jerry Wells at (702) 588-4547.
Status Report

COMMUNITY PLANNING

Background

The decision to proceed with community planning for the commercial core areas of the Tahoe Region was a key element of the consensus that led to settlement of Regional Plan-related litigation in 1987. To be responsive to the needs and opportunities of various areas, specific community plans are being developed for designated commercials areas.

These plans will guide development in those areas for at least ten years, and will be kept up to date. The designated areas are those where commercial uses are concentrated, that are easily served by transit, that have good highway access, that have employee housing in the vicinity, and that are suitable for increased levels of commercial activity.

Accomplishments--FY 89/91

A great amount of progress has been made in community planning in the current biennium. The following list summarizes progress to date, and progress planned for the remainder of the biennium. See also the attached summary table.

Washoe County -- Incline Village/Crystal Bay

Preliminary Plan completed August, 1990
Draft Community Plan and EIS scheduled for completion in April, 1991

Douglas County -- Stateline/Lower Kingsbury/Round Hill

Preliminary Plan completed April, 1989
Draft Community Plan and EIS scheduled for completion in February, 1991
Final Community Plan and EIS scheduled for completion in July, 1991

Placer County -- Tahoe City

Preliminary Plan completed January, 1988
Draft Community Plan and EIS completed October, 1990
Final Community Plan and EIS scheduled for completion in March, 1991

Placer County -- Kings Beach/Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay

Preliminary Plan completed September, 1990
Draft Community Plan and EIS scheduled for completion in April, 1991
City of South Lake Tahoe -- Stateline/Ski Run

Preliminary Plan completed October, 1990
Draft Community Plan and EA scheduled for completion in January, 1991
Final Community Plan and EA scheduled for completion in March, 1991

El Dorado County -- Meyers

Preliminary Plan scheduled for completion in January, 1991
Draft Community Plan and EIS scheduled for completion in June, 1991

Other accomplishments during the current biennium include: preparation of economic needs assessments for all jurisdictions; completion of Geographic Information System data base for Washoe County community plan; completion of stream environment zone and soils maps for all jurisdictions; and completion of inventory of existing development and resources for all jurisdictions.
EXECUTIVE DIVISION

Summary of Work Activities

The Executive Division, consisting of the Executive Director, Deputy Director and Environmental Education Coordinator/Ombudsman, is responsible for organization, management and direction of all operations of the Agency. Working closely with the management team on a continuous basis, the Executive Director and/or Deputy Director resolve inter- and intra-agency issues, respond to requests from applicants, appellees, local government and business leaders, Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission members, legislative and congressional members, the general public, and the press.

In addition, the Division provides support and supervision to the management team and general staff in the accomplishment of their respective duties identified in the following work program and activity summaries.
EXECUTIVE DIVISION

Objectives for FY 1990-91

A. **GOAL:** Provide a highly competent and efficient organization and the leadership to accomplish the mission of the TRPA as set forth in the compact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop program of work for FY 91-92.</td>
<td>Set Goals and Objectives</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop organized training program for Agency staff.</td>
<td>Organized Program</td>
<td>5/90</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>50% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accompany Long Range Planning, Project Review and Compliance staff in field.</td>
<td>6 trips per year</td>
<td>7/91</td>
<td>Ziegler/Wells</td>
<td>5% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepare Agency Annual Report</td>
<td>Published Report</td>
<td>8/90</td>
<td>Ziegler</td>
<td>80% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Represent Agency in preparation of Community/Master Plan</td>
<td>Attend Meetings (As required)</td>
<td>7/91</td>
<td>Ziegler/Wells</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Attend meetings of chambers of commerce, TBAG, community work shops, redevelopment agencies, and similar community forums.</td>
<td>Attend Approx. 10 Meetings per Month</td>
<td>7/91</td>
<td>Ziegler/Wells</td>
<td>75% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Establish delegation of SFD review activities to local government.</td>
<td>1 Jurisdiction per year</td>
<td>7/91</td>
<td>Ziegler/Wells</td>
<td>25% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish committee to evaluate office space needs and alternative solutions.</td>
<td>Recommendation for Board Approval</td>
<td>9/90</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
<td>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conduct field trip for Governing Board members in cooperation with other agencies.</td>
<td>One Trip</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Develop new employee orientation program.</td>
<td>Completed Program</td>
<td>5/91</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Revise Agency fee schedule to reflect current costs.</td>
<td>Recommendation for Board Approval</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>0% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Establish a North Shore office to provide general public info. and application assistance.</td>
<td>Provide a min. of 1 planner, 2 days/week.</td>
<td>5/91</td>
<td>Wells/Ombudsman</td>
<td>50% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Develop an aggressive public information/education program</td>
<td>Organized Program</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Ombudsman</td>
<td>40% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prepare 5 year financial and work program strategy</td>
<td>Written Strategy</td>
<td>9/90</td>
<td>Ziegler</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pursue grants and alternative revenue sources</td>
<td>As Required</td>
<td>7/91</td>
<td>Ziegler</td>
<td>25% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Expand use of MOUs for exempt activities</td>
<td>2 MOUs per year</td>
<td>7/91</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Develop Employee Wellness Program</td>
<td>Organized Program</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEGAL DIVISION

Summary of Work Activities

In addition to the above objectives, the Legal Division will provide legal support for TRPA staff in the areas of administration, project review, litigation settlements, compliance, and long range planning. The Legal Division will continue to provide assistance to the public in matters involving legal issues or potential litigation. The Legal Division also monitors the allocation process for the Region to review all contracts and MOUs.

The Legal Division assists in the preparation of the APC and Governing Board packets, as necessary, and attends APC and Governing Board meetings.

The Legal Division oversees the defense or prosecution of pending litigation involving TRPA. Matters referred to outside counsel are coordinated through the Legal Division. Matters which are not referred to outside counsel are prosecuted or defended by the Legal Division, as applicable. Annually a report is prepared setting forth the status of each case.
LEGAL DIVISION

Objectives for FY 1990-91

A. GOAL: Provide legal support for other divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Redraft of Rules of Procedure.</td>
<td>Present Drafts for Board Adoption</td>
<td>10/90 9/91</td>
<td>Scholley Blanck</td>
<td>90% 100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) APC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Remedial Action Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prepare personnel policy manual.</td>
<td>Present Revised Manual to Board for Adoption</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Blanck</td>
<td>40% 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepare gaming ordinance.</td>
<td>Present to Board for Adoption</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Scholley</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepare IPES line movement.</td>
<td>Present to Board for Adoption</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Scholley</td>
<td>80% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prepare Subdivision Ordinance.</td>
<td>Present to Board for Adoption</td>
<td>9/91</td>
<td>Scholley</td>
<td>30% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Standardize Agency contract and justification.</td>
<td>Prepare Standards for Use</td>
<td>5/91</td>
<td>Blanck</td>
<td>0% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Facilitate the creation of Nevada land bank</td>
<td>Present Request for Designation to Board</td>
<td>1/91</td>
<td>Scholley</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. **GOAL:** Prosecute and resolve TRPA-initiated lawsuits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepare annual report of resolved and pending litigation.</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>8/90</td>
<td>Scholley</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resolve enforcement actions in Stipulation for Entry of Judgment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Blanck/Chilton</td>
<td>50% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resolve airport litigation and master plan process.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>12/91</td>
<td>Scholley</td>
<td>10% 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCE DIVISION

Summary of Work Activities

The Finance Division, consisting of two employees, is responsible for Agency accounting and finance, personnel, retirement administration, purchasing, contract administration and overall Agency budget preparation, administration, and support. This division administers all of the Agency's savings and investment accounts, as well as security deposits, mitigation, and coverage mitigation funds. Payroll and related reporting information are also the responsibility of the division. The Finance Director is also responsible for preparation of reports and agenda items for the TRPA Finance Committee. In addition to day-to-day fiscal administration, the Division is moving to implement a computerized accounting and payroll system and to update the Agency's Administrative and Fiscal Procedures Manual.
FINANCE DIVISION

Objectives for FY 1990-91

A. GOAL: Provide Timely and Accurate Financial Support, Dependable Personnel Program Support, and Assets Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Implement Computerized Accounting System to Replace Current System</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System in</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System Fully Implemented</td>
<td>12/91</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assist Preparation of Division Statements of Need and Finalize Budget Request for FY 1991-93 to Nevada and California</td>
<td>Budget Submitted</td>
<td>8/90</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to GB Complete Budget Submitted</td>
<td>9/90</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Update and Arrange for Approvals of Contract with California Resources Agency</td>
<td>Approved Contracts</td>
<td>10/90</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continue Administrative Responsibility for Agency Retirement Plan</td>
<td>Employee Returns for FY 89/90</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>75% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valuation Reports Quarterly</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports to Mgmt. Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
<td>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop and Execute Air and Water Quality Mitigation Funds Administration Agreements with Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Executed Agreements by Local Governments &amp; TRPA</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complete Final Draft of Sept. 91 Review</td>
<td>Steering Committee Economic Report</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Summary of Work Activities

The Management Support Division, consisting of seven employees and the division chief, is responsible for the following day-to-day activities:

- The Agency's telephone needs
- Clerical functions associated with project applications (assessing completeness of applications as they are submitted, logging in projects, making application files, typing correspondence, staff summaries and permits)
- Some clerical functions associated with securities (scheduling inspections)
- Typing, filing, and copying for all divisions (staff summaries, documents, correspondence, meeting packets)
- Researching and mailing mapped land capability information (using microfiche and assessor parcel books)
- Daily opening, logging in and routing of mail
- Maintaining information packets for public dissemination
- Clerical functions associated with Advisory Planning Commission, Governing Board, and committee meetings (agendas, mailings, minutes, packet typing and mailing)
- Subscriptions
### Objectives for FY 1990-91

**A. GOAL:** To provide efficient support, accurate information, and a positive image to the public and other staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project files</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Incorporate CTRPA El Dorado County files into project stacks</td>
<td>Tabs on files and on shelf</td>
<td>1/91</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>0% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Inventory files in cabinets to insure they are accurately filed and incorporate field verifications into already existing project files</td>
<td>Check once every 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evans/Frame/DeMaola</td>
<td>0% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Evaluate and streamline log-in process for files (if possible)</td>
<td>System in place</td>
<td>4/91</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>10% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Update subject matter files</td>
<td>Update complete</td>
<td>4/91</td>
<td>Frame/Duer</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inventory reading files and GB/APC packets and update storage system</td>
<td>Inventory complete and system in place</td>
<td>1/91</td>
<td>Christensen/Evans</td>
<td>20% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implement new telephone system and train Management Support staff on its use</td>
<td>System in place and training complete</td>
<td>Depends on budget</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OR**

Reevaluate message on current recording and modify as needed

<p>| Message modified | 7/90 | Christensen | 50% 100% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implement storage system for mapped land capabilities</th>
<th>System in place</th>
<th>12/90</th>
<th>Hardy</th>
<th>0% 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Insure that each member of the division has an opportunity to take field trips</td>
<td>One trip per quarter</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>30% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Publish 208 Plan</td>
<td>Published document</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Duer</td>
<td>10% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

Summary of Work Activities

The Environmental Compliance Division is responsible for providing compliance in the Lake Tahoe Region with the Regional Plan Package. The work program for FY 90-91 includes many day-to-day activities such as that listed below, which are in addition to those objectives listed in the attached work program. Following each activity, in parentheses, is a quantification of the number of activities conducted in the first two quarters of this fiscal year.

- Conducting pre-grading inspections for permitted projects (470).
- Conducting security return inspections for completed projects (596).
- Conducting inspections as needed for all active projects.
- Monitoring City of South Lake Tahoe redevelopment projects (150 hrs).
- BMP evaluations for projects and exempt activities.
- Investigating and appropriately resolving violations in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, including accepting project applications, reviewing projects for consistency with the Code, writing Notices of Violations, staff summaries for the Board, as needed, and writing permits (193).
- Responding to citizen complaints of unauthorized activities (141).
- Conducting site inspections for the Project Revise Division.
- Conducting inspections for land coverage retirement in accordance with Chapter 20, Subsection 20.3.C, TRPA Code.
- Responding to reports of discharges (sewage and other discharges) (16).
- Administering the MOUs with CDF and NDF for tree cutting (1053 permits).
- Conducting Basin-wide winterization inspections of all projects between September 15 and October 15 (Approx. 4000).
- Making findings of diligent pursuit as required (15).
- Tracking pre-grade inspections, using the computer data base, for compliance with Chapter 4, Subsection 4.12 (470).
- Tracking security return inspections, using computer data base (5107).
- Establishing inspection schedules for large-scale projects.
- Follow-up retrofitting obligations per conditions of approval (146).
- Tracking of Qualified Exempt Activities (234).
- Tracking of MOUs with USFS, Tahoe Conservancy, Nevada and California State Parks, Caltrans, NDOT, etc. (9 MOUs).

The volume of these activities in any year is difficult to anticipate due in part to the permit language which allows a project to start up to three years from permit issuance and continuing for two years or more, depending on the type of project. The number of projects which we monitor is directly related to the number of permits issued by TRPA. Additionally, it is difficult, if not impossible, to estimate the number of violations which will be discovered (most occur through citizen complaints), discharges we will investigate, and field appointments necessary to clarify project conditions, plan revisions, and TRPA procedures to permittees.

In addition, the division is responsible for the Wellness Program, Defensible Space Program, Project Review Streamlining Committee, the Hazardous Waste Task Force, off-highway vehicle enforcement, and the IVGID Timber Management Plan.

The Environmental Compliance Division is currently addressing these responsibilities with a staff of one Securities Clerk, four Associate Environmental Specialists, one Senior Environmental Specialist, and one Division Chief.
# Objectives for FY 1990-91

## A. GOAL: Provide Compliance With the Regional Plan Package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initiate Chapter 8 or 9 Remedial Actions</td>
<td>One Plan Per County</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>0% 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Dorado/CSLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluate Dredging Monitoring</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>2/91</td>
<td>Kiel</td>
<td>25% 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide Data for IPES Numerical Performance Standards</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>11/90</td>
<td>Solt</td>
<td>50% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation in accordance with Page 120 of the 208 plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide Monitoring and Enforcement of BMPs for Approved Projects</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Monitor Compliance with 2-year Completion Requirement for 1987 Project Approvals</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>12/91</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## B. GOAL: Coordinate Programs with Cooperating Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue highway De-icing Program</td>
<td>Program Update to Board</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Compliance Division - page 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct Yearly Meeting With State Forestry Agencies In Accordance With MOU</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continue Spill Response Coordination Program</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. GOAL: Provide Necessary Reporting and Tracking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop List of Projects With 5 and 10 Year BMP Retrofit Schedules</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Kiel</td>
<td>0% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Monitor for Compliance with Approved BMP Retrofit Requirements</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Complete Updating of Compliance Info. Data Section to Reflect All Inspections Done Within the Quarter</td>
<td>Quarterly Printout</td>
<td>10/90</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>100% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepare a Cost/Resource Requirements Analysis for Large Project Inspections</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>25% 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D. Goal: Provide Positive Public Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conduct Building and Erosion Control Awards Program</td>
<td>Presented</td>
<td>11/90</td>
<td>Chilton</td>
<td>50% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT REVIEW

Summary of Work Activities

The following shall serve as a supplement to the FY 1990-91 program of work and MBOs for the Project Review Division as related to the daily activities of the division.

The division currently consists of 12 full-time planning positions.

The division is divided into a residential section and a commercial/public service section. The residential section is responsible for the review of all residential structures for consistency with the Agency's Regional Plan, Rules, and Code of Ordinances. The commercial/public service section is responsible for the review of all commercial, public service, recreation, resource management, tourist accommodation and erosion control projects, i.e., new structures, additions, modifications, shorezone structures and environmental documentation. The division typically processes approximately 1,400 to 1,600 project applications per year, some of which require extensive environmental documentation (EA, EIS, etc.) and review. (Included is the review of final plans and verification of certain conditions of approval prior to acknowledgment of permit.)

In addition to processing project applications, the division is responsible for responding to public inquiries pertaining to the project review process, Rules and Regulations, Code interpretations, and general information. The division responds to approximately 5,000 to 6,000 phone inquiries, 4,000 to 5,000 counter inquiries, and 400 to 500 written inquiries per year.

Daily activities of the project review division typically include site inspections, coverage verifications, BMP evaluations, land capability and slope verifications, responding to public inquiries, technical review of projects and environmental documentation, writing staff summaries, and general project-related correspondence, issuing permits, and working directly with applicants to assist them through the permit process.
### A. GOAL: Improve Project Review Division Effectiveness and Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop procedures manual for EA and EIS preparation, certification</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>75% 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain updated code interpretation manual and index.</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintain updated project application packets in accordance with Code</td>
<td>Updated</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amendments.</td>
<td>Packets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Process the same number of permits as applications received</td>
<td>No Net Fiscal</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Backlog</td>
<td>Year Backlog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Establish and oversee interdivision project review teams for special</td>
<td>As Stated</td>
<td>As Required</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or complex projects and environmental documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conduct Project Review workshops for the general public</td>
<td>Four Workshops</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Sr. Residential/ Sr. Nonresidential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. GOAL: Improve Coordinated Review With Other Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conduct Project Review workshops with USPS, Caltrans, NDOT, and local</td>
<td>Four Joint</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Sr. Residential/ Sr. Nonresidential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public service agencies to improve quality of project applications.</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Train local government and NTRPA staff in Project Review matters</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Prior to effective date of MOU</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which are delegated through MOUs</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LONG RANGE PLANNING

Summary of Work Activities

In addition to the 24 major objectives listed below for FY 90-91, the Long Range Planning Division, with a staff of 15 full-time employees and two contract employees, is responsible for numerous day-to-day activities such as:

- land capability evaluations, verifications, challenges, and map updates; related plan amendments, as appropriate; includes land capability determinations for community planning.

- IPES: evaluate parcels, process reevaluations and appeals, conduct workshops and seminars, answer inquiries.

- miscellaneous ordinance amendments and clean-up; miscellaneous PAS amendments.

- technical assistance to Project Review Division and Compliance Division on shorezone projects, commercial projects and indirect source review, erosion control and other environmental projects, large projects requiring environmental documentation, water quality and air quality issues, Code interpretation.

- operation of the Parcel Data Base System (PDBS) and development of the Tahoe Environmental Geographic Information System (TEGIS); provision of hardware, software, systems design, and training.

- coordination of, and participation in, the TRPA monitoring committee; monitoring fund requests; preparation of monitoring agreements; review of self-monitoring reports.

- RTPA and TDA administration; transportation planning coordination; releases of air quality mitigation funds.

- traffic counts, maintenance of the transportation data base, establishment and operation of the visibility monitoring program, establishment and operation of the community noise monitoring program.

- technical assistance on processing of erosion control projects, releases of water quality mitigation funds, handling of inquiries regarding BMPs; hydrology/land capability assistance to Project Review and Compliance Divisions.

- participation in training: stress management, other management, communications skills, conflict resolutions, micro-computers, CEQA/NEPA, specialized technical training.

- public contacts, seminars, workshops, and inquiries.

- printing and publishing.
LONG RANGE PLANNING DIVISION
Objectives for FY 1990-91

A. GOAL: Implement and refine the TRPA Regional Plan package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water Quality Team

1. 208 Water Quality Commitments

   a) SEZ program evaluation Vol. III
   b) CIP program evaluation Vol. IV
   c) BMP program evaluation Vol. II
   d) Annual report
   e) Discharge points mapped
   f) Contract administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) SEZ program evaluation Vol. III</td>
<td>Update Adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) CIP program evaluation Vol. IV</td>
<td>Update Adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) BMP program evaluation Vol. II</td>
<td>Update Adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Annual report</td>
<td>G.B. Approval</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Discharge points mapped</td>
<td>E.D. Approval</td>
<td>9/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Contract administration</td>
<td>Funds Disper.</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) SEZ program evaluation Vol. III</td>
<td>Update Adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>40% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) CIP program evaluation Vol. IV</td>
<td>Update Adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>40% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) BMP program evaluation Vol. II</td>
<td>Update Adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>40% 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Annual report</td>
<td>G.B. Approval</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Discharge points mapped</td>
<td>E.D. Approval</td>
<td>9/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>45% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Contract administration</td>
<td>Funds Disper.</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>50% 65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CIP implementation

   Funds for 12/91 Target committed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>45% 45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Development additional Code/Plan amendments

   a) Natural hazards (avalanche, flood and fire)
   b) Toxic hazardous wastes/spill prevention plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Natural hazards (avalanche, flood and fire)</td>
<td>Chap 27 adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Toxic hazardous wastes/spill prevention plans</td>
<td>EPA Approval</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>90% 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Update IPES Map (Sections 37.10.A and 12.2.C(1))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIONET</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
<td>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complete Community Plans:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Tahoe City</td>
<td>Presented for adoption</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>75% 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Douglas County</td>
<td>Presented for adoption</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>50% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Washoe County</td>
<td>Presented for adoption</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>40% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Kings Beach Preliminary</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>9/90</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Kings Beach Community Plan</td>
<td>Presented for adoption</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>40% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Meyers Preliminary</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1/91</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>25% 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Meyers Community Plan</td>
<td>Presented for adoption</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>10% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Ski Run/Stateline Community Plan</td>
<td>Presented for adoption</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>40% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Master Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Heavenly Valley Ski Area Plan/EIS</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>40% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Alpine Meadows Ski Area Plan</td>
<td>E.D. approved, Work program</td>
<td>2/91</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>50% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Initiation of marina master Plans (if applications submitted)</td>
<td>Work programs approved, Cumulative study</td>
<td>4/91</td>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>90% 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Threshold indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Scenic -- secondary compliance measure</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Strain</td>
<td>50% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Fish -- P(1)</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>25% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Recreation</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>10% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
<td>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fish habitat map amendments for Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Proposed map</td>
<td>2/91</td>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>30% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed criteria amendments</td>
<td>4/91</td>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>25% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Update 5-year Rec/PS List</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/91</td>
<td>Shaffer/Sargent</td>
<td>0% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation Team

| 10. Air quality/RTP/S1P                        | Adopted                     | 1/91 | Anderson         | 40% 45%                   |
|                                               | a) Model for 81,87,97,07     |      |                  | 85% 90%                   |
|                                               | Completed                   | 10/90|                  | 75% 85%                   |
|                                               | b) Administrative draft     | 10/90|                  | 0% 0%                     |
|                                               | c) Draft EIS                | 10/90|                  | 0% 0%                     |
|                                               | d) Final EIS                | 1/91 |                  |                           |

11. Threshold Indicators

| a) Air quality indicators                     | Adopted                     | 3/91 | Damkowitch       | 35% 65%                   |
| b) Noise indicators                           | Adopted                     | 3/91 | Norberg          | 0% 15%                    |

12. Parking ordinance                         | Adopted                     | 3/91 | Norberg          | 80% 80%                   |

13. OWP                                       | Draft submitted to E.D.     | 1/91 | Anderson         | 0% 100%                   |

14. Highway 50 Access Report                  | Approved by Director        | 6/91 | Norberg          | 0% 0%                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>QUARTERLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPES Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Complete processing of IPES appeals (1989)</td>
<td>All results mailed</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Shellhorn</td>
<td>90% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete processing of IPES appeals (1990)</td>
<td>All results mailed</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Shellhorn</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Land capability mapping and SEZ delineation for CP and MP areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Heavenly Valley</td>
<td>Made-Complete</td>
<td>10/90</td>
<td>Pepi</td>
<td>95% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Meyers</td>
<td>Made-Complete</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Pepi</td>
<td>90% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) South Shore/Industrial Area</td>
<td>Made-Complete</td>
<td>12/90</td>
<td>Pepi</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. SEZ mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Floodplain mapping</td>
<td>11 US Corps. Reports</td>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>Cobourn</td>
<td>30% 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Complete field mapping</td>
<td>400 scale maps adopted</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Cobourn</td>
<td>65% 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Identification of disturbed SEZs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Cobourn</td>
<td>65% 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Team (90-91 Budget)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Annual assessor update</td>
<td>4 tapes loaded and functional</td>
<td>12/91</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>25% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Reduce data entry backlog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Coverage (data research)</td>
<td>Correct 14,000 forms</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>25% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Coverage (data entry)</td>
<td>1 week backlog 12/91</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>5% 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) HFC</td>
<td>Enter 6/7</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Quarterly Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Securities</td>
<td>1 week backlog</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>0% 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Permits-keep up-to-date inspections</td>
<td>1 week backlog</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>85% 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 20. Auto-permit processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Programming</td>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>85% 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Testing</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>20% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Implementation/reorganize</td>
<td>Install and in use for Donna</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 21. Drafting implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Person in place and drafting as per specs</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person in place and drafting as per specs</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 22. Implement quarterly assessor update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>4 agreements signed</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 agreements signed</td>
<td>6/91</td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>10% 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 23. 91 Review Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committees and Subcommittees</td>
<td>IPES-Shellhorn, Trans/RQ/Noise-Anderson, SEZ/WQ-Greenlee, Wildlife/Fish/vegetation/rec.-Shaffer, Scenic-Strain, Economic-Dana, Streamlining-Chilton, Effectiveness-Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work</td>
<td>7/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/91</td>
<td>80% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Final Summary Report</td>
<td>Report/Rec. to Governing Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Lowering IPES line report</td>
<td>Report to Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- CIP</td>
<td>Report Submit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Monitoring</td>
<td>Report Submit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Lot Counts</td>
<td>Report Submit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Compliance</td>
<td>Report Submit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: February 1, 1991
To: Governing Board
From: Agency Staff

Subject: Projects Reviewed at Staff Level and Emergency Permits Issued by the Executive Director January 1, 1991 through January 31, 1991.

### Projects Processed at Staff Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSLT/</th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
<th>Placer</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Residential</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Modification</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Coverage Verification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Coverage Transfer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Coverage Banking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorezone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBLA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects Processed at Governing Board Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSLT/</th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
<th>Placer</th>
<th>Washoe</th>
<th>Douglas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability Challenge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Actions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROJECTS PROCESSED:** 27 17 28 13 95

**Applications Received:** 36 38 19 11 104

**Operating Backlog:** 105

**Incomplete/Pending Information:** 213

**Compliance Cases Pending:** 30

AGENDA ITEM X A. I.

SO
2/1/91
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 91 -

WHEREAS Frankie Sue Del Papa, in her capacity as Nevada Secretary of State, served on the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency from January 1987 through December 1990; and

WHEREAS, as evidence of her dedication to public service, Frankie Sue will be serving the Silver State as its new Attorney General; and

WHEREAS Frankie Sue served with distinction on the TRPA Board and earned the respect and friendship of the members of the Governing Board; and

WHEREAS, while on the Board, Frankie Sue would with tact, care, and precision home in on the significance of an issue and the essential points requiring resolution; it was Frankie Sue who worked unceasingly to ensure that the Board's decisions were grounded on solid fact and complete information; and

WHEREAS Frankie Sue embodied the qualities of independence, humor, and candor; she always expressed herself with honesty and sincerity and was forthright in her approach to people and situations; and

WHEREAS Frankie Sue was a champion for the positive accomplishments of TRPA and was never shy in her support of the Agency; she worked diligently to ensure that those living, working and visiting Tahoe would understand the TRPA goals and involve themselves in their achievement; and

WHEREAS Frankie Sue has a zest for life, a ready smile and a keen sense of humor; and

WHEREAS Frankie Sue provided vigorous support for the staff and frequently found herself tempering the Board's enthusiasm and cautioning the Board on the staff's work load limitations; and

WHEREAS, because of her inventiveness and creativity, Frankie Sue encouraged others to go the extra step and to try what had not been tried before in resolving a dilemma or accomplishing a goal; and

WHEREAS one of Frankie Sue's greatest contributions has been her advocacy of cooperation between California and Nevada and her recognition of this cooperation as the key to the success of regional planning at Lake Tahoe;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board wishes Frankie Sue the best in her new role as Nevada Attorney General and thanks her for her invaluable contribution to the goals of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the future of Lake Tahoe.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this twenty-seventh day of February, nineteen hundred and ninety-one by the following:

2/19/91

AGENDA ITEM XI A.

123
WHEREAS John Cefalu, by virtue of his election to the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors, was appointed to sit on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board from January 1987 through December 1990; and

WHEREAS, because the members of the Governing Board recognized John's strong leadership qualities, they elected him to serve as their Vice Chairman for a two-year term from 1989 through 1990; and

WHEREAS, John chose not to run for reelection to the Board of Supervisors but rather to turn his attention to other matters; and

WHEREAS John represented the local community of El Dorado County with enthusiasm, concern, sympathy and understanding; and

WHEREAS John was not shy in expressing his thoughts; he was an outspoken and very articulate advocate for his constituents and was instrumental in reminding the Board of the importance of the local contribution to regional planning for the Lake Tahoe Basin; he was the champion for the hard-working folks who call Tahoe home; and

WHEREAS, while the Agency's goals as set forth in P.L. 96-551 were to encourage the wise use and conservation of the waters of Lake Tahoe and of the resources of the area around the Lake, it was Board members like John who translated that "lofty goal" into the reality of everyday decision making; he urged the Board not to lose sight of the effect of its decisions on the local economy and community; and

WHEREAS John's fiscal skills were put to good use when he was appointed to serve as a member and, ultimately, the chairman of the Finance Committee; and

WHEREAS John will be remembered for his untiring efforts to achieve a solution to transportation problems at the South Shore; and

WHEREAS John served on the Board with distinction, earning the respect of both the Board and staff members;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board hereby expresses its appreciation to John for his devoted representation of the citizens of El Dorado County in the regional planning process and wishes him well in his future endeavors.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this twenty-seventh day of February, nineteen-hundred and ninety-one by the following:

2/19/91
MEMORANDUM

February 19, 1991

To:       TRPA Governing Board
From:     Agency Staff
Subject:  Resolution Establishing Committees of the Governing Board

On January 29, 1987, the Governing Board adopted Resolution No. 87-2, establishing committees of the Governing Board and providing other matters properly related thereto. (A copy of Resolution No. 87-2 is attached.)

At this time, the staff recommends the Board adopt a new resolution, superseding No. 87-2, to bring the description of the TRPA committees up to date. A copy of the proposed new resolution is also attached.

If you have any questions about this agenda item, please contact Dave Ziegler or Julie Frame at (702) 588-4547.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 90—__

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ESTABLISHING COMMITTEES OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO

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

1. Section 2.8 of the Rules of Procedure of the Agency authorizes the Governing Board, by resolution, to create committees of the Board, describing the committees' responsibilities, how their members are to be chosen and setting forth other matters the Board deems pertinent.

2. The Governing Board of the Agency finds it necessary and desirable to adopt this resolution establishing committees of the Board relating to finance, legal matters, rules, and capital financing, describing the committees' responsibilities, prescribing how their members are to be chosen and setting forth other matters pertinent thereto.

3. On January 29, 1987, the Governing Board of the Agency adopted Resolution No. 87-2, establishing committees of the Governing Board and Providing Other Matters Properly Relating Thereto, which resolution no longer accurately describes the committees of the Governing Board.

4. On June 26, 1986, the Governing Board of the Agency adopted Resolution No. 86-13, authorizing the withdrawal of TRPA from Nevada PERS and the creation of the TRPA Employee Retirement Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Board of the Agency, by virtue of the authority conferred by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure of the Agency, as follows:

1. Resolution No. 87-2 is hereby rescinded and replaced by this resolution.

2. The Finance Committee, Legal Committee, Rules Committee, and Capital Financing Committee of the Agency Governing Board are hereby created. The responsibilities of each committee are hereinafter set forth.

3. The Administrative Committee for the TRPA Employee Retirement Plan was created by Resolution No. 86-13. The membership and responsibilities of that committee are set forth therein.
4. The responsibilities of the Finance Committee include: (a) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding Agency budgetary matters such as expenditures, receipts and financial planning; (b) reviewing periodic audits, financial statements and other similar reports and reporting periodically to the Governing Board regarding the Agency's financial condition; (c) reviewing requests for use of funds received from various state and federal entities and funds collected by the Agency and making recommendations for the disbursement thereof; and (d) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.

5. The responsibilities of the Legal Committee include: (a) consulting with the Agency's legal counsel with respect to the status of litigation involving the Agency and making recommendations to the Governing Board concerning prosecution, defense, and settlement thereof; (b) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding pursuit of legal action for enforcement of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and the Regional Plan and ordinances of the Agency; (c) reviewing and making recommendations to the Governing Board concerning requests for determinations of vested rights; (d) conferring with the Finance Committee and making recommendations to the Governing Board concerning budgetary matters involving legal counsel for the Agency; (e) hiring, retaining and evaluating performance of legal counsel for the Agency, and (f) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.

6. The responsibilities of the Rules Committee include: (a) periodically reviewing and making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding proposed amendments to the Agency's Rules of Procedure to coordinate with amendments to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, the Agency's Regional Plan and ordinances and otherwise for the proper administration thereof; (b) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding other necessary and desirable amendments to the Rules of Procedure and the Fiscal and Administrative Procedures Manual for the proper conduct of the Agency's business; and (c) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.

7. The responsibilities of the Capital Financing Committee include: (a) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding the Agency's efforts to seek outside funding sources to accompany local funding of a fair share of the Capital Improvements Program for erosion and runoff control, the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program, and the Action Element of the Regional Transportation Plan, (b) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding the adoption of financial programs and plans to implement the Capital Improvements Program for erosion and runoff control, the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program, and the Action Element of the Regional Transportation Plan, (c) monitoring, reviewing, and proposing legislation affecting the financing of the Capital Improvements Program, Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program, and Regional Transportation Plan, (d) assisting in presentation of the Agency's position with respect to such legislation, whether to individual legislators, a legislative committee, or otherwise, and (e) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.
8. The foregoing committees shall consist of at least five Governing Board members. The identity of members and chairmen of the committees of the Governing Board shall be determined by the Chairman, subject to approval by the Governing Board. Members of the Governing Board from each state shall serve on each of the foregoing committees. The Chairman shall serve as an ex officio member of all the foregoing committees of the Governing Board. The Chairman may name members of the general public to sit on the Capital Financing Committee. In the event a majority of the members of a committee is not present to constitute a quorum at a committee meeting, the member or members then present may appoint another member of members of the Governing Board present to temporarily serve on the committee in order that a quorum might be present and the committee conduct its business. Such temporary appointment shall expire at the conclusion of the meeting for which the appointment was made. Committees of the Governing Board shall act in coordination with the Agency's Executive Director or other Agency staff designated by the Executive Director. The chairman of each committee may request nonmembers of the Governing Board to join in the committee's deliberations in a nonvoting capacity.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency this _____ day of February, 1991, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

W. F. CRONK, Chairman of the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 87-2

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ESTABLISHING COMMITTEES OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO

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

1. Section 2.8 of the Rules of Procedure of the Agency authorizes the Governing Board, by resolution, to create committees of the Board, describing the committees' responsibilities, how their members are to be chosen and setting forth other matters the Board deems pertinent.

2. The Governing Board of the Agency finds it necessary and desirable to adopt this resolution establishing committees of the Board relating to finance, legislation, legal matters and rules, describing the committees' responsibilities, prescribing how their members are to be chosen and setting forth other matters pertinent thereto.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Board of the Agency, by virtue of authority conferred by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, and the Rules of Procedure of the Agency, as follows:

1. The Finance Committee, Legislation Committee, Legal Committee, and Rules Committee of the Agency Governing Board are hereby created. The responsibilities of each committee are hereinafter set forth.

2. The responsibilities of the Finance Committee include:
(a) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding Agency budgetary matters such as expenditures, receipts and financial planning; (b) reviewing periodic audits, financial statements and other similar reports and reporting periodically to the Governing Board regarding the Agency's financial condition; (c) reviewing requests for use of funds received from various state and federal entities and funds collected by the Agency and making recommendations for the disbursement thereof; and (d) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.

3. The responsibilities of the Legislation Committee include:
(a) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding amendments to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact the committee deems necessary or desirable; (b) monitoring, reviewing and proposing legislation affecting the Agency and making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding the Agency's position with respect to such legislation; (c) assisting in presentation of the Agency's position with respect to legislation affecting it, whether to individual legislators, a legislative committee or otherwise; and (d) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.
4. The responsibilities of the Legal Committee include: (a) consulting with the Agency's legal counsel with respect to the status of litigation involving the Agency and making recommendations to the Governing Board concerning prosecution, defense and settlement thereof; (b) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding pursuit of legal action for enforcement of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and the Regional Plan and ordinances of the Agency; (c) reviewing and making recommendations to the Governing Board concerning requests for determinations of vested rights; (d) conferring with the Finance Committee and making recommendations to the Governing Board concerning budgetary matters involving legal counsel for the Agency; (e) hiring, retaining and evaluating performance of legal counsel for the Agency; and (f) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.

5. The responsibilities of the Rules Committee include: (a) periodically reviewing and making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding proposed amendments to the Agency's Rules of Procedure to coordinate with amendments to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, the Agency's Regional Plan and ordinances and otherwise for the proper administration thereof; (b) making recommendations to the Governing Board regarding other necessary and desirable amendments to the Rules of Procedure and the Fiscal and Administrative Procedures Manual for the proper conduct of the Agency's business; and (c) other responsibilities assigned it by the Governing Board.

6. The foregoing committees shall consist of at least five Governing Board members. The identity of members and chairmen of committees of the Governing Board shall be determined by the Chairman, subject to approval by the Governing Board. Members of the Governing Board from each state shall serve on each of the foregoing committees. The Chairman shall serve as an ex officio member of all the foregoing committees of the Governing Board. In the event a majority of the members of a committee is not present to constitute a quorum at a committee meeting, the member or members then present may appoint another member or members of the Governing Board present to temporarily serve on the committee in order that a quorum might be present and the committee conduct its business. Such temporary appointment shall expire at the conclusion of the meeting for which the appointment was made. Committees of the Governing Board shall act in coordination with the Agency's Executive Director or other Agency staff designated by the Executive Director. The chairman of each committee may request nonmembers of the Governing Board to join in the committee's deliberations in a nonvoting capacity.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency this 29th day of January, 1987 by the following vote:

Ayes: Reed, King, Hansen, Cofalu, Pruett, Henrikson, Miller, Houghteling, Sharp, Gibbs

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: Westergard, Hibdon, Haagen, Woods

[Signature]

CHESTER GIBBS, Chairman of the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency