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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on February 13, 1991, at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.
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Executive Director
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I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
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IV PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION

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

V PLANNING MATTERS

A. Discussion of Draft Ordinances for Subdivision of Existing Residential Structures
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C. Distribution of Community Planning Reserve Commercial Allocation
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A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

D. Public Interest Comments

VII PENDING MATTERS

VIII ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

February 4, 1991

To: Advisory Planning Commission

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.

Proposed Ordinance Amendment

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

4.4 Parcel-line-Adjustments---(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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AGENDA ITEM IV A.
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
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 or 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.
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 Recommendation

Staff recommends that the APC make a recommendation to the Governing Board to approve the attached MOU and adopt the amending 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: ______________________
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WELLS?
MOU SLT
February 5, 1991

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: Susan E. Scholley, Special Projects Attorney

Re: Draft Ordinances for Subdivisions of Existing Residential Structures

BACKGROUND: At the October 1990 meeting of the APC, staff was directed to consider further the standards regarding subdivision of existing residential structures and to consult with people knowledgeable on the subject. Of specific concern was the issue of affordable housing versus incentives to upgrade units.

Andrew Strain has researched the various affordable housing policies, or lack thereof, of the counties. Staff also held a meeting of interested persons to solicit community views and ideas.

Because of the difficult issues involved, staff is presenting its ordinance amendments in narrative form first. After APC input and recommendation, staff will proceed to draft specific ordinance language.

DISCUSSION: There is general agreement that there is a lack of affordable housing in the Basin. There is not concurrence on the scope of the problem but it is more acute in the Nevada counties. Many people feel this issue is better left to local control and plans.

Planners agree that the term affordable housing needs to encompass low to middle income persons, not just low or very low.

A majority of people feel that the existing TRPA provisions for affordable housing are insufficient to encourage construction of new affordable housing.

A substantial number of people feel that nothing will be gained by denying the ability to subdivide existing residential structures and that subdivision will result in an upgrade of existing units, primarily in the area of BMP retrofit and general upkeep. Some people have argued that subdivision of existing residential structures will create opportunities for home ownership to middle income persons.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS: On the issue of affordable housing, staff believes that because of the Goals and Policies (attached), TRPA cannot ignore the issue or pass it off to the local jurisdictions without some assurance that affordable
housing is not being lost through subdivision. Further, it is clear that certain existing residential structures are not affordable housing and should be permitted to subdivide provided they meet the applicable criteria.

Therefore, TRPA staff proposes to define which residential structures are not considered affordable housing by virtue of their location (lakeshore or areas not in proximity to transit and employers) or by reason of their prior rental rates or sale price. There are varying standards for rental rates and sale prices for each county which are set by the state/federal governments.

If the structures are not considered affordable housing then the general standards regarding subdivision will apply. See Chapter 43. If the structures qualify as affordable housing then a second level of review will apply. The second level of review would determine the mitigation required to offset the loss of affordable housing. Mitigation could be in several forms: payment of an in-lieu fee (used by local government to construct new affordable housing); substitution or replacement of affordable housing; or commitment to keep subdivided units within range of low to middle income persons. The second level of review could also be accomplished at the local level if the local jurisdiction adopts and implements a housing plan which addresses the need for affordable housing. As local jurisdictions adopt affordable housing plans, TRPA could defer to local determinations regarding the status of an individual structure.

Part of the proposed amendments is an expansion of the definition of affordable housing only as used in the subdivision ordinances. Changing the definition in Chapter 2 of the Code would affect the residential allocation system (since affordable housing is exempt from allocation limits) and raises issues that cannot be addressed in the short term.

With regard to density and parking standards, TRPA staff proposes to require existing structures to comply with the Chapter 43 standards in order to be able to subdivide. This means a structure would have to be within ten percent of the permitted density and meet current parking standards. The amendments would provide for a deviation from the parking standards if appropriate mitigation can be provided. Since the current density for single family is one unit per parcel, the new standard for single family density for subdivision purposes would be the multi-residential density set forth in the applicable plan area statement. For plan area statements without a multi-residential density, the density standard would be consistent with the surrounding single family dwellings.

One minor issue is the interaction of the election of conversion of use (Code §33.7) with the subdivision ordinance. The amendments would make clear that an election of conversion of use must be made in connection with an approval to subdivide the property or else the right to the election is waived.
ACTION REQUESTED: Staff is seeking public and APC comments on the proposed direction. If the APC is satisfied with the general approach, staff would proceed to draft specific ordinance provisions.
As part of the approval, TRPA shall establish the allocation of additional commercial floor area for the period ending December 31, 1996. TRPA shall make the initial allocation of additional commercial floor area taking into consideration such factors as demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining the needed funds for implementation, compatibility with other CPs and plans, and other relevant factors. The amount initially allocated shall be from the 75 percent portion designated for local jurisdictions for planning purposes. (See Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Goal =2, Policy 4.)

8. As soon as TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed community plans, to adequately assess the cumulative impacts of development and proposed mitigation, TRPA shall distribute the remainder of the 25 percent of the additional commercial floor area. This distribution shall reward those CPs which best demonstrate the ability to achieve and maintain environmental thresholds, and have a clearly demonstrated need for the additional allocation. TRPA shall retain a sufficient reserve to adequately address the needs of CPs not yet presented for review. However, it is the Agency's goal, acting in partnership with local interests, to achieve completion of CPs by December 31, 1989 in all areas where sufficient local interest and initiative exists to do such planning. Accordingly, TRPA anticipates the allocation of the remaining unallocated floor area by that date, so long as the allocation is supported by local needs assessments.

9. Before a community plan may be approved, TRPA must certify an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the community plan, except as noted in (10) below. (In California, where the CP is to be adopted as a general plan amendment or a specific plan, a joint EIS/EIR may be utilized.) The EIS may be useful for meeting subsequent environmental documentation requirements for more specific projects consistent with the community plan.

10. Simpler and more streamlined procedures for smaller CPs with insignificant impacts may be provided for in the implementing ordinances. These procedures may allow preparation of appropriate environmental analysis and documentation other than an EIS.

7. NO NEW DIVISIONS OF LAND SHALL BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE REGION WHICH WOULD CREATE NEW DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL INCONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THIS PLAN.

This policy does not consider the following divisions of land to be inconsistent when the result does not increase the development potential permitted by this Plan:

EXHIBIT A
A. Division of land for the purposes of conveying a portion thereof to a governmental agency, public entity, or public utility.

B. Division of land for the purposes of creating cemetery lots.

C. Division of land ordered by a federal or state court of competent jurisdiction as a result of bona fide, adversary legal proceedings to which the Agency is a party. Any such division of land or approval of any other project or action resulting from such legal proceedings, shall be pursuant to an evaluation of the effect of such division or approval upon the Regional Plan, the environmental thresholds, and other requirements of the Compact. Based on the above evaluation, appropriate adjustments to the Regional Plan shall be made.

D. A modification to an existing subdivision or a lot-line adjustment or lot consolidation, which does not result in any increase in development potential, or in present or potential land coverage or density, and shall not have an adverse impact upon the health, safety, general welfare or environment of the Region.

E. Conversion of an existing structure, other than a residential structure approved by the Agency after December 19, 1980 and prior to the effective date of this Plan, to a stock cooperative, community apartment, condominium, or any other form of divided interest; which conversion does not result in any increase in development potential, or in present or potential land coverage or density, and will not have an adverse impact upon the health, safety, general welfare or environment of the Region.

F. Redivision, adjustment, or consolidation, of parcels within an existing urban area, as part of a TRPA approved redevelopment plan that does not increase development potential basinwide.

G. Division of land through condominiums, community apartments, or stock cooperatives within an existing urban area in conjunction with the approval of a project associated with an approved transfer of development, or otherwise in accordance with the provisions of this Plan. In order to subdivide a project under this provision, the project itself shall be approved prior to the approval of the division and in no case shall the division result in a greater amount, a different location, or a greater rate of development than otherwise permitted by this Plan.

8. BUILDINGS, WHETHER CONFORMING OR NONCONFORMING, WHICH ARE DAMAGED OR DESTROYED BY FIRE OR OTHER SIMILAR CALAMITY, MAY BE REPAIRED OR REBUILT WITH NO REQUIREMENT FOR REDUCTION IN COVERAGE OR HEIGHT BY WAY OF FEE OR OTHERWISE. THIS POLICY APPLIES ONLY IF THE BUILDING IS RECONSTRUCTED IN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE WITH THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURE AND, WITH NO INCREASE IN FLOOR AREA, LAND COVERAGE, HEIGHT, OR VOLUME. OTHER PROVISIONS GENERALLY APPLICABLE TO REHABILITATION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS SHALL APPLY. THIS POLICY IS SUBJECT TO THE NATURAL HAZARDS SUBELEMENT, GOAL #1, POLICY 1. SPECIAL PROVISIONS SHALL APPLY TO BUILDINGS IN THE SHOREZONE, LAKEWARD OF THE HIGHWATER LINE.
MEMORANDUM

February 5, 1991

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: Susan E. Scholley, Special Projects Attorney

Re: Movement of IPES Line

BACKGROUND: At the December 1990 meeting, staff presented its recommendations on two (vacant lot equation and compliance) of the four findings. 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.

The Governing Board considered the first two findings at its January 1991 regular meeting but will not take action until it has considered all the 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.

Further, the addition of the upstream stations was conditioned upon the local
jurisdictions' agreement 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. 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 on Edgewood Creek in Douglas
County. The synoptic sampling occurred from March 30 to June 29 in 1990 at ten
selected sites.

The 208 Plan states that samples must be collected for one representative water
year. 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 within a reasonable
range of normal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: TRPA staff feels that the two permanent upstream stations
on the four streams in October 1989 satisfies the IPES requirement for
additional monitoring in all the counties except Placer. However, the League,
the California Attorney General's office and the State Water Resources Control
Board (Cal. SWRCB) disagree. The addition of the synoptic monitoring improves
the situation somewhat although there is skepticism as to its benefit. Never-
theless, TRPA staff is confident that the monitoring program is adequate to
establish baseline data and fulfill the mission of the IPES-related monitoring.
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 will recommend amendment of the 208 Plan to
delete the term.
WATER QUALITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROGRESS

§378.C.(1)(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 1988 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

The above totals include projected expenditures for 1991. In the case of Douglas and Washoe Counties, TRPA has verified the Nevada State Lands commitment for 1991 and is comfortable in including those projections in the totals.

Estimates of SEZ restoration to date are approximately 50 acres with a possible 50 more acres of restoration in the pipeline or projected for 1991.
With respect to the first alternative finding, the counties have made significant commitments and progress in implementing the Water Quality CIP. There was not agreement 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 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.

The second alternative finding cannot be made for any county because of the lack 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.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** In order to make a final recommendation to the Governing Board, staff is seeking APC comments and recommendations. If you have any questions or desire additional background materials, please contact me.
(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.

37.8.C Lowering Numerical Level Defining Top Ranked Parcels: Provided TRPA makes the findings required under Subparagraph (1) 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 
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EXHIBIT B
INTRODUCTION

Surface water quality monitoring in the Lake Tahoe Basin requires the support and services of a variety of agencies and personnel. In 1980, the Lake Tahoe Interagency Monitoring Program (LTIMP) was established to acquire and disseminate water quality data. The major members 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-Davis, TRG, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU), Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan Board), 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 TRG. Starting in FY 87-88, TRFA was able to match USGS funding 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 TRG's projects.

USGS/TRG

The USGS/TRG monitoring network has expanded from a low of four streams in 1986 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 2). These additional sites are located on Incline, Edgewood, and Trout Creeks, plus the Upper Truckee River.

The nutrient parameters monitored are listed in Table 2. These allow for full definition of nitrogen and phosphorous speciation. In addition to these listed nutrients, suspended sediment and continuous streamflow are also monitored at each of the 16 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.
The USFS conducts its own water quality monitoring program. For Water Year 1985-86 (October 1, 1985 through September 30, 1986), the USFS monitored 11 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 concentrates on the spring runoff in addition to sampling during storm events. Water samples are analyzed for: specific conductivity, pH, alkalinity, total coliform, 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 once 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 Kjeldahl nitrogen, nitrate nitrite, ortho-phosphorus, 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 Glenbrooke 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 pelagic or deep water zone of Lake Tahoe, where water depth exceeds 100 meters. The littoral zone or near-shore zone is the water area around the Lake less than 100 meters in depth.

Data is collected at approximately 14-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-nitrite and total hydrolysable phosphorus for both stations. Secchi depth readings are also recorded at both sites, while PPR is only measured at the Index Station.

TRG re-instituted their littoral zone periphyton (attached algae) monitoring during 1989. The algae in this area of the lake responds quickly to localized nutrient additions carried by streams and groundwater and reflects local loading sources from the adjacent watershed.

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 1: Monitoring sites for Lake Tahoe Tributaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Co. USGS</th>
<th>Map Route</th>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Drain Area (sq mi)</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Basin Width (mi)</th>
<th>Elevations (feet above sea level) Lower Upper Max</th>
<th>Site Date</th>
<th>Period of Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 336790</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Trout Creek at S Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>6225</td>
<td>7760</td>
<td>10880</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 336780</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Trout Creek nr Tahoe V</td>
<td>36.70</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 336610</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U. Truckee R. at mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 336645</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>General C. at mouth</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6280</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>8720</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 336660</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blackwood C. nr Meeks Bay</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 336676</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ward C. nr mouth</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>6290</td>
<td>7040</td>
<td>8880</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa 336698</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Third C. nr Crystal Bay</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>6320</td>
<td>7170</td>
<td>10340</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa 336700</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Incline C. at mouth</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>6285</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>9220</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 336730</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Incline C. nr Crystal Bay</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 336740</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Logan house C. at mouth</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>6540</td>
<td>8240</td>
<td>8820</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do 336759</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Log area C. nr Stateline</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of total Tahoe watershed monitored in LIRP program (flow, sediment, nutrients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Drainage:</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lake Surface:</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>382%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary Basins:</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada:</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1.--Location of tributary monitoring sites in the Lake Tahoe Basin.
Figure 2. Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Monitoring Locations
<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;Dissolved&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Filtered&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Soluble&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Particulate&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NITROGEN SPECIES:</strong></td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Ammonia Nitrogen</td>
<td>hydrolysis of organic nitrogen, reduction of nitrite, fertilizers, sewage</td>
<td>direct determination</td>
<td>EXPI:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Nitrite</td>
<td>direct determination</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EXEP:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Nitrate</td>
<td>direct determination, or [(1) + (2)]</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>EXEP:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nitrogen summary determinations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Kjeldahl Nitrogen, Organic + Ammonia</td>
<td>(1) + (2)</td>
<td>digestion with sulfuric acid/mercuric sulfate/potassium sulfate to convert organic compounds to free ammonia</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>X [3]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Nitrite + Nitrate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrazine or calcium reduction of nitrate to nitrite</td>
<td>EXPI:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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>EXPI:</td>
<td>X [4]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHOSPHORUS SPECIES:</strong></td>
<td></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>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Acid Hydrolyzable &quot;Condensed phosphates&quot;, pyro-, meta-, oligo-phosphates</td>
<td>water treatment, commercial &amp; domestic detergents</td>
<td>calculated, (3) + (3)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>X</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>EXPI:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phosphorus summary determinations:</strong></td>
<td></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>sulfuric acid hydrolysis (some organics may be included in analyses)</td>
<td>LTIMP:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Total Phosphorus</td>
<td>all above</td>
<td>persulfate oxidation</td>
<td>EXPI:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

(A) Monitoring Programs:

- LTIMP: Historical LTIMP program (through September 1987).
- [*]: referred to as "soluble nitrate" in LTIMP reports.
- [**]: referred to as "total phosphorus" in LTIMP reports.
- EXP1: Expanded Water Year 1988 program, Nevada Sites.
- [***]: assumes suspended concentrations of ammonia, nitrite, nitrate, and ortho-phosphorus are negligible.

**Sampling procedures to determine water phases:**

(B) Assumes accurate representative sampling of all suspended sediment that might contain nitrogen or phosphorus.

(C) Defined as that fraction of a water sample passing through a 0.45 micron membrane filter; may include fine colloidal material.

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

**Nitrogen** dynamically changes species in aquatic systems through biochemical cycling. The process of hydrolysis of organic nitrogen to ammonia and oxidation of ammonia to nitrite and then nitrate is biologically mediated by aquatic bacteria.
Biologic oxidation of nitrogen is referred to as "nitrification" and can exert significant oxygen demands in aquatic ecosystems. Biocatalytic reduction of nitrate to nitrite to ammonia and loss to the atmosphere as gas (nitrogen or ammonia) is termed "denitrification" and can be a significant pathway for nitrogen removal from aquatic ecosystems. Direction and rates of biochemical cycling of nitrogen are functions of particular communities of bacteria, algae, and/or rooted plants and environmental conditions such as temperature, pH, oxygen concentrations, and light intensity. Ammonia exists in water in both ionic form (NH₄⁺) and as an un-ionized gas (NH₃) that, in sufficient concentration, may be toxic to fish. Laboratory determinations of ammonia include both the ionized and un-ionized forms; ambient aquatic concentrations of un-ionized ammonia (parameter code 0061Y) may be calculated from the laboratory ammonia concentration and the water temperature and pH at the time of sampling (Willingham, 1976).

Phosphorus occurs in aquatic ecosystems almost solely as phosphates. These phosphates can exist in dissolved ionic form as orthophosphate, in the water column as colloidal suspensions of polyphosphates, in suspension of bed materials sorbed onto or complexed with inorganic minerals, or in the cellular material or detritus of aquatic macro- and micro-organisms. Most commonly employed analytical procedures determine phosphorus by colorimetric measurement of dissolved orthophosphate. 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 orthophosphorus may include some polyphosphates and a hydrolysis of polyphosphates may release some organically-bound phosphorus, and digestion for "total" phosphorus may not release all organically-bound phosphorus.

References:
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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 (DFW) 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 $42,601; pure CIP.

1989
Chimney Rock - Completed 1989; cost $107,000; pure CIP.

1990
Hubbard Road - Completed 1990; cost $127,000; 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 $672,136; 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 25 percent complete; 90 percent funded (US); approx. cost is $363,193; pure CIP.

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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$1,412,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston &amp; Stevens Parking Lot</td>
<td>1990</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 4, 1991

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Distribution of Community Planning Reserve Commercial Allocation

Proposed Action: The staff is proposing that TRPA adopt a policy to guide the distribution of the 54,000 sq. ft. of bonus commercial allocation that is reserved for community plans by Subsection 33.3.C. The APC is requested to recommend to the Governing Board an appropriate policy to guide the distribution.

Background: When the Governing Board approved three of the preliminary community plans in the fall, they questioned how the 54,000 sq. ft. of the bonus reserve pool was going to be distributed since some preliminary community plans were already planning to use the reserve pool. TRPA staff brought this issue, with a list of allocation requests (Attachment A), to the Community Plan Consensus Group in December and January. A review of Subsection 33.3.C requirements and possible distribution options were discussed as noted in the Analysis section below. The group first directed staff to pursue a scoring/award system (Attachment B); but, upon review they decided it was too complex for such a small allocation. A second system based on number of community plans and a local jurisdiction determination of the distribution was suggested at the January meeting. Staff was directed to draft this option (Attachment C). The group also suggested that this issue now be brought to the APC for the appropriate policy recommendation. This staff summary is being mailed to the consensus group members and some members plan to attend the APC meeting to join in the discussion.

Analysis: The Code sets some requirements for the distribution of the bonus reserve. Subparagraph 33.3.C.1(a)(ii) indicates that:

--- That when TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed community plans to assess cumulative impacts and mitigation, it shall distribute the bonus.
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This distribution shall reward those community plans that best demonstrate the ability to achieve and maintain environmental thresholds and clearly have a demonstrated need for additional allocation.

The following options were considered by the consensus group. Option E was initially thought to best fit the criteria, but the group later added Option G as a better solution. These two options are provided in detail in Attachments B and C.

Community Plan Bonus Options

A. 5 jurisdictions equal share (20%) 10,800 s.f./40 TAUs per jurisdiction
B. Code jurisdictions equal share (25%) 13,500 s.f./50 TAUs per SLT/ED, Placer, Washoe, and Douglas
C. Weighted per Code distribution
   SLT/ED (26%) - 15,120 s.f./56 TAUs
   Placer (42%) - 22,680 s.f./84 TAUs
   Washoe (18%) - 9,720 s.f./36 TAUs
   Douglas (13%) - 7,020 s.f./26 TAUs
D. Award actual progress in 1994 Percent of CIP complete, dollars spent on CIP
E. Best plan as presented Point evaluation assigns bonus
   1992 review of 6 CPs for 40,000 s.f.
   1994 review of all CPs, add 14,000 s.f.
F. Based on current needs assessments and future growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Need</th>
<th>87-97 Res.</th>
<th>Tourist</th>
<th>Day Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLT/ED +160,000 s.f.</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>? = Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer +41,000 s.f.</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe -90,000 s.f.</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas -25,000 s.f.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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G. Weighted per number of community plans with local government awards.
   1994 reconsideration.

   SLT (5 CPs) 11,740 s.f.
   ED (1 CP) 2,350 s.f.
   Placer (10 CPs) 23,479 s.f.
   Washoe (4 CPs) 9,389 s.f.
   Douglas (3 CPs) 7,042 s.f.

It is staff's conclusion that Options A, B, and C are the simplest but do not conform to the requirements of the Code. Option D may be the safest environmental option, but would take too long and does not fit the Code requirement. Option F is complex and does not meet the environmental requirements. Option E is complex but meets the requirements of the Code.

Option G may be the most politically acceptable if it is agreed that the initial distribution is based on a need assessment (i.e., number of CPs). Some environmental criteria will need to be developed by the local government as part of the distributions requirement. TRPA may need to amend Subsection 33.3.C. if an allocation is used as suggested in #4.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the system proposed in Attachment C with the following conditions:

1. Each jurisdiction agrees to the initial split.

2. Each jurisdiction develops criteria for individual community plan distribution by May 1, 1991 so that the community plans may plan accordingly.

3. The proposed system will be simple and not require Code amendments.
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### Attachment A

#### Commercial and Tourist Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Outside CP</th>
<th>CP + 10%</th>
<th>Bonus</th>
<th>TAU's Bonus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>270,000 + 36,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>65,000 + 6,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SR</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. AT</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Y Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meyers</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>16,640</td>
<td>112,500 + 14,976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SVN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TC</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TC Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. LF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TV</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. KB</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. KB Ind.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a. Stn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>7,240</td>
<td>48,750 + 6,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b. Stn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I.V.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(15,200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I.V.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,450)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I.V.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16,560)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>33,750 + 4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. RH</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Kgsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>(13,750)</td>
<td>(9,250)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Stn</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) Indicates requests or estimates request for allocation
--- Indicates allocation used up
ATTACHMENT B

CP COMMERCIAL ALLOCATION BONUS SYSTEM

I. Procedure: Upon completion of 5 draft community plans or January 1, 1992, whichever is later, TRPA shall review request for distribution of the reserve bonus pool of commercial floor area allocations.

A. Reviewing Authority - The Governing Body of the TRPA shall distribute the reserve bonus pool to each CP after considering the recommendation of the APC.

B. Reserve for Later CPs - 14,000 sq. ft. of the 54,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor area allocation shall be reserved until three additional draft community plans are completed or until January 1, 1994, whichever is earlier.

C. Distribution of Reserve Bonus Pool - TRPA shall distribute the portions of the pool to each CP based on the criteria in II below.

D. 1994 Review - After January 1, 1994, TRPA may reconsider for redistribution the unused commercial allocations distributed from the reserve bonus pool.

II. Criteria for Distribution: TRPA shall distribute the reserve bonus based on the criteria below.

A. The CP demonstrates the ability to achieve and maintain environmental thresholds beyond the required V.g. findings requirements (10 year progress (1/2) in meeting the twenty year fairshare target is the baseline condition).

Calculations
- maximum sq. ft. = achievement of 20 year target by 1997
- proportioned allocation for partial achievement
- 500 sq. ft. or 1.5 multiplier for assured achievements

Distribution of Bonus Reserve Square Footage Table

1. Scenic - Maximum 1000 sq. ft.
   Baseline = 1/2 the difference between threshold route(s) required score and the 1987 rating(s)

2. Soils - Maximum 500 sq. ft.
   Baseline = 1/2 the 80% disturbance reduction target

Baseline = 1/2 the 25% SEZ restoration requirement,
- Maximum 1000 sq. ft.
Baseline = 1/2 application of required BMPs

4. Air Quality - Maximum 1000 sq. ft.
Baseline = 1/2 fairshare VMT target
   - Maximum 500 sq. ft.
Baseline = improvement to level of service D or better on 1/2
the intersections below LOS D

5. Recreation - Maximum 500 sq. ft.
Baseline = Increased recreation above 500 PAOTs - 100 sq. ft.
for each 100 PAOTs

Baseline = 100 sq. ft. for 1 dBA less than maximum

7. Other (Fisheries, Vegetation, & Wildlife) - Maximum for
Threshold 500 sq. ft.
Baseline = achievement of 1/2 the established threshold

B. The CP demonstrates the need for additional allocation by showing:

1. Needs assessment - the additional allocation is consistent with the
needs assessment and

2. Special projects - The allocation is needed to establish an anchor
project for the community plan or

3. Threshold related projects - the allocation is a direct incentive to
achieve a target
EXAMPLE CALCULATION FOR TAHOE CITY CP

Calculations
- maximum sq. ft. = achievement of 20 year target by 1997
- proportioned allocation for partial achievement
- 500 sq. ft. or 1.5 multiplier for assured achievements

Distribution of Bonus Reserve Square Footage Table

1. Scenic - Maximum 1000 sq. ft.
Baseline = 1/2 the difference between threshold route(s) required score and the 1987 rating(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tahoe City</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed 97</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit # 14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit # 15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit # 42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit # 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Soils - Maximum 500 sq. ft.
Baseline = 1/2 the 80% disturbance reduction target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tahoe City</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed 97</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 acres</td>
<td>16 acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline = 1/2 the 25% SEZ restoration requirement,
- Maximum 1000 sq. ft.
Baseline = 1/2 application of required BMPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tahoe City</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed 97</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEZ</td>
<td>21.5 (25%)</td>
<td>11 acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Air Quality - Maximum 1000 sq. ft.
Baseline = 1/2 fairshare VMT target
- Maximum 500 sq. ft.
Baseline = improvement to level of service D or better on 1/2 the intersections below LOS D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tahoe City</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed 97</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,709</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D+ all</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Recreation - Maximum 500 sq. ft.
Baseline = Increased recreation above 500 PAOTs - 100 PAOTs = 100 sq. ft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposed 97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City</td>
<td>400 PAOTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>645 PAOTs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total             | 500         

Baseline = 100 sq. ft. for 1 dBA less than maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed 97</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA 1</td>
<td>65 CNEL</td>
<td>58.0 CNEL</td>
<td>63.0 CNEL</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA 3</td>
<td>55 CNEL</td>
<td>52.6 CNEL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA 5</td>
<td>55 CNEL</td>
<td>52.4 CNEL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Other (Fisheries, Vegetation, & Wildlife) - Maximum for Threshold 500 sq. ft.
Baseline = achievement of 1/2 the established threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed 97</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The CP demonstrates the need for additional allocation by showing:

1. Needs assessment - the additional allocation is consistent with the needs assessment and
   *Tahoe City needs assessment = 52,000 sq. ft.

2. Special projects - The allocation is needed to establish an anchor project for the community plan or

3. Threshold related projects - the allocation is a direct incentive to achieve a target
   *Tahoe City is using the an allocation system to achieve targets.

Conclusion: Tahoe City has 3,075 sq. ft. of bonus X 1.25 bonus for assured achievements = 3,850 sq. ft. As long as this addition does not exceed 52,000 the need can be demonstrated.
Attachment C

Option G. Weight Per Number of CPs

Step 1  Create a proportional bonus account for each local jurisdiction as follows:

\[
\frac{54,000 \text{ s.f.} \times 1 \times \# \text{CPs}}{23 \text{ each jurisdiction}}
\]

Step 2  Include in each CP criteria by which initial CFA and bonus CFA would be distributed employing the overall regional goals of:

A) Consolidation of development through TDR, and
B) ETCC target achievement, and
C) Demonstrated economic need

Step 3  Include in each CP EIS. Analysis and evaluation of desired bonus CFA by location.

Step 4  Allow local jurisdictions, when they are ready, to recommend to TRPA use of the bonus CFA for specific projects allowed by a particular CP (may take a Code amendment to implement Step 4).

Step 5  Conduct 1994 Review, review success of plan implementation, ETCC target achievement and economic need; ratify bonus allocation and use or reallocate by local jurisdiction.