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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 Wednesday, May 12, 1993, at the Tahoe Sands Inn Convention Center, 3600 U.S. 50, South Lake Tahoe, California. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

May 3, 1993

By: ____________________________
    David S. Ziegler
    Executive Director
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tahoe Sands Inn Convention Center
3600 U.S. 50, South Lake Tahoe, California
May 12, 1993
9:30 a.m.

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Amendment of Chapter 30, Design Standards, to Implement Scenic Resource Thresholds From Public Recreation Areas

B. Amendment of Chapter 35, Bonus Unit Incentive Program, and Chapter 43, Subdivision Standards, Relative to Multi-Residential Bonus Units and Allocations

V. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Discussion on Employee Trip Reduction Program

B. Discussion on Parking Ordinance

VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

D. Public Interest Comments

VII. PENDING MATTERS

VIII. RESOLUTIONS

IX. ADJOURNMENT
April 29, 1993

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 30, Design Standards to Implement Scenic Resource Thresholds From Public Recreation Areas

Proposed Action: Staff proposes to amend Chapter 30 of the Code to implement scenic quality thresholds from public outdoor recreation areas as called for in the 1991 Evaluation of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and the Regional Plan (91 Evaluation). Related minor amendments to Chapter 12, Regional Plan Maps and Chapter 32, Regional Plan and Threshold Review will be necessary to complete implementation. Proposed Chapters 30 and 12 ordinance language is located in Attachment A. Proposed Chapter 32 language (amended threshold compliance form) is located in Attachment B. Due to the complexity of the amendments, staff will present the information to the Advisory Planning Commission over the course of two meetings. The May, 1993 meeting will focus on Chapter 30 amendments. The June, 1993 meeting will include follow-up discussion on Chapter 30 and Chapters 12 and 32 amendments. The complete package would be presented at the June, 1993 Governing Board meeting for action.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend approval of the amendments to the Governing Board.

Background: In 1982, TRPA adopted Regional Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for several environmental values, including scenic resources. Scenic thresholds were adopted for roadway and shoreline travel route units and for specific scenic resources visible within the travel routes. Refer to excerpts from TRPA Resolution 82-11 located in Attachment B. Scenic thresholds for 37 public outdoor recreation areas and 11 bicycle trails (generally Class I trails) were to be implemented following completion of the 1982 Visual Quality Index which was in progress at the time Resolution 82-11 was adopted. The thresholds are intended to identify and protect significant views within each recreation area and off-site views seen from the recreation areas and bicycle trails. The Visual Quality Index was completed in 1983 under the title, "Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation 1983."

The 1983 report was adopted by the Governing Board as part of the 1986-87 Regional Plan package (Conservation Element, Scenic Subelement, Goal #1, Policy 1), however, implementing actions were not included in the original Code of Ordinances (refer to Attachment C).
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The 91 Evaluation recommended a detailed implementation strategy for the thresholds. The 91 Evaluation's schedule of implementation requires the scenic thresholds to be implemented by June 30, 1993. Refer to 91 Evaluation excerpts located in Attachment D. A threshold compliance form which identifies the threshold indicators and rating criteria (Scenic Resources Threshold Compliance Form SR-3) was adopted as part of the 91 Evaluation. Refer to Attachment E.

At this time, all of the pieces necessary to implement the thresholds are in place except for the ordinance amendments.

Discussion: The addition of recreation area scenic resource thresholds will provide an important control measure in terms of preserving the visual quality of recreation areas. The threshold generally covers scenic resources within the recreation area and certain resources seen from the recreation area. Outdoor recreation, including viewing natural scenery is a primary reason people choose to live and visit the Tahoe Region. The ability to maintain outstanding scenic resources visible from these areas will have positive benefits to the Region's economy over time. Similarly, the 1992 "Report of the Nevada Legislative Committee to Investigate the Functioning of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact" recommends that TRPA "...incorporate stronger scenic protection measures in the Agency's planning and regulatory activities"; (Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau Bulletin 93-11, p. vi, pp. 17-18, September, 1992). It further recognizes the importance of public outdoor recreation in the Tahoe Region and that future demand for such recreation will be important to incorporate into the Regional Plan (ibid., p. vi, p. 17).

Inventory and Evaluation of Recreation Areas

The public recreation areas of the Lake Tahoe Basin were surveyed in June, July, and September of 1983. The areas included are listed in Attachment F. Scenic resources visible from each recreation area were mapped, photographed, and described in narrative text. The resource components that were identified, mapped, and photographed include: (1) views of the lake and natural landscape from the recreation area; (2) special landscape features, such as streams, beaches, rock formations, topographical features, and special vegetation patterns or areas; and (3) man-made features within the recreation area.

The 37 recreation areas are arranged in the order they would be seen in a counter-clockwise drive around the lake starting at Nevada Beach on the east shore of the lake. The narrative on each recreation area begins with a brief description of the scenic character of the area followed by a list of the identified features and their individual numerical ratings. These features are keyed to the "Scenic Resources" map of the area and each feature is also keyed to color slides. The next section divides the major elements that comprise the scenic resource into two categories: elements that contribute to the scenic quality and elements that detract from the scenic quality. This is followed by recommendations for preserving or upgrading the scenic quality...
of the recreation area. These recommendations relate to specific portions of
the scenic viewshed which are delineated on the "Visually Sensitive Areas"
maps. Refer to Attachment G for a sample recreation area scenic resource
evaluation, map and threshold ratings.

Inventory and Evaluation of Bikeways

Eleven bikeways were evaluated during the summer and fall of 1983. Bicycle
trail segments included in the evaluation are listed in Attachment F. Weather
during all evaluations was clear and sunny. Each unit was travelled by
bicycle. Standardized rating forms were used to evaluate components of the
bikeway units, and notes regarding scenic quality were made.

Photographs of the bikeway unit scenic components were not taken, because with
the exception of two short units (Al Tahoe and Tahoe Valley) scenic resources
in all the units were documented with photographs in the Scenic Resource in-
ventory prepared for the Environmental Thresholds Study. Reference to these
photographs are made wherever applicable.

Scenic Resource Evaluation Methodology

The methodology of this study has adopted many of the principles and
procedures used in the threshold study, although changes have been made to
accommodate differences in the viewer’s position. In the threshold study the
inventory and evaluation of the scenic resource were based on travel route
segments (i.e., shoreline and roadway units), with the viewer moving through
the landscape in either a car or boat. The viewer’s position and the scenic
units were transient and constantly changing. In the present study the
scenic units are made up of the recreation areas, and in contrast to the
roadway and shoreline units, are separate, well-defined, and static. The
viewer thus has more time to take in the scenery and can therefore see more
detail and make finer distinctions. Another effect is that the viewer’s
surroundings play a more important role in the viewing experience. The
study’s evaluation system responds to these new conditions.

The study’s methodology has three phases: resource inventory, resource evalu-
ation, and policy formulation. In the resource inventory phase, field surveys
of each recreation area were conducted to identify the elements of the scenic
resource. The individual subcomponents that comprise the scenic resource were
mapped, photo-documented, and described in narrative text. This inventory
documentation will act as a baseline of the existing 1983 resources which can
be referenced when changes in the recreation area are contemplated and review-
ed during subsequent five-year Regional Plan and threshold evaluations. Refer
to Attachment G.

The subcomponents that comprise the scenic resource as seen from the public
recreation areas are:

1. Views of the Lake and natural landscape from the recreation area;
2. Special landscape features, such as streams, beaches, and rock formations, that add interest and variety to the views; and

3. Man-made features of the recreation area that influence the viewing experience.

The first two categories of subcomponents respond to the natural elements in the landscape. Both categories were also used in the threshold study. The third category responds to the built environment within the recreation area and has been added to account for the effect of the viewer's context upon the viewing experience. Since the viewer is stationary, or nearly so, within the recreation area, much greater attention is paid to the immediate environment. The viewer's surroundings become an integral part of the viewing experience, influencing the overall sense of scenic quality (e.g., viewing a scene from a crowded parking lot and viewing it from a secluded beach are very different visual experiences). This category was included to reflect the visual impact that the man-made elements within the recreation area have on the viewer.

In the resource evaluation phase of the study, scenic quality ratings based on sets of visual criteria were assigned to each subcomponent. The purpose of these criteria is to allow comparative evaluations of the scenic resources within each recreation area and among the different recreation areas, and to make possible recommendations for maintaining and improving the scenic quality of the area.

Four criteria are used to evaluate the scenic quality of the subcomponents in the "views" and "natural features" categories. The criteria are (1) unity; (2) vividness; (3) variety; and (4) intactness. The criteria, which were used in the threshold study and many other scenic resource studies, are generally standardized criteria for evaluating landscape quality.

Unity can be expressed in a landscape by a dominant land form with coordinat- ed, subordinated surrounding parts, by a single well-defined enclosure, or a set or series of strong features. A unified landscape is one in which the visual resources join together to form a single, coherent, harmonious visual unit. Vividness can be expressed by contrasting elements, such as color, line, and shape, marked differences in related elements or repetition of similarities. The visual quality of vividness can also be described as distinctiveness. Variety usually refers to numerous or different parts seen together. Variety can also be described as richness. Intactness describes the degree to which a landscape retains its natural condition, or the degree to which modifications emphasize or enhance the natural condition of the landscape.

Originally a fifth criterion, uniqueness, was introduced to create another level of examination and create a more sensitive evaluation of the resource. Uniqueness can express the frequency with which certain landscape characteristics occur. Unique subcomponents have characteristics which are unusual and would rarely, if ever, be encountered in another landscape setting. In an area such as Lake Tahoe where the overall scenic quality of the landscape is
so high, this criterion was intended to make distinctions between landscapes possessing high scenic value but relatively common individual characteristics, and those landscapes possessing both high scenic value and highly unusual or distinctive characteristics. TRPA’s 1986 Draft Scenic Quality Implementation Program (adopted in 1989 as the SQIP) and the 91 Evaluation recommend dropping the uniqueness criterion from the threshold since it was not used on either the travel route rating or scenic quality thresholds. Although the uniqueness criterion is important to the recreation areas, and relates to the experience of the recreation uses, the uniqueness criterion is most important in distinguishing one recreation area from another. For this reason it was determined that conformity of rating systems among the roadway and shoreline units and recreation areas was preferable to retaining the uniqueness criteria.

Scenic quality ratings for the man-made features of the recreation area are based on a set of four different visual criteria. These criteria were selected because they specifically respond to the visual character of the built environment rather than the natural environment. The four criteria for evaluating the scenic quality of the man-made features are: (1) coherence; (2) condition; (3) compatibility; and (4) design quality. Coherence describes the degree of relationship between man-made elements that is visually apparent. A coherent built environment is one in which all the man-made elements have some characteristic or quality which visually unifies them into a harmonious whole. Some of the elements that can affect coherence are architectural style, building materials, color, massing, and siting. Condition refers to the physical status of a man-made element. It reflects the amount of care that has gone into the construction and maintenance of the facility. Compatibility refers to the ability of the man-made element to co-exist with the natural landscape without detracting from it. Man-made elements that are highly compatible blend into their surroundings and defer to the forms, colors, and textures of the natural landscape. Design quality refers to the degree of visual interest inherent in a man-made element due to its built character. An element with high quality design appeals to the eye because of the uniqueness or care exhibited in its form, massing, detailing, and/or materials. The Chapter 32 Threshold Compliance Form, SR-3, will be amended to add the man-made environment rating criteria. (Shown in Attachment E).

Each subcomponent was evaluated against each of the criteria and assigned a numerical rating between one and five. The ratings, ranging from a total of four to twenty, are intended to express comparative scenic quality ratings of high, moderate, and low values, and should not be mistaken for absolute measurements of scenic quality. A rating of five indicates high scenic quality; a rating of four indicates good scenic quality; a rating of three indicates moderate scenic quality; a rating of two indicates fair scenic quality; and a rating of one indicates poor scenic quality.

In the third element of the study, policy formulation, recommendations and guidelines for the protection and improvement of the scenic resource as viewed from the recreation areas were developed. This procedure had two steps, the first of which was the identification of factors which contribute to and detract from the scenic quality. The purpose of this step was to provide a list
of specific data to bridge the gap between the abstract numerical standards and the concrete information required to make site-specific planning decisions. This step specifies those landscape elements which require protection and those which require mitigation.

The second step was the actual formulation of guidelines for the protection or improvement of the scenic quality of each recreation area. These guidelines fall into two categories: those which recommend actions external to the recreation area and those which recommend actions within the recreation area itself. Those guidelines dealing with lands external to the recreation area are planning oriented and are prospective in nature. They are meant to be tools to aid in the protection of existing resources. These guidelines have been organized according to areas that present a shared set of landscape characteristics as viewed from the recreation area. The second set of guidelines is more design oriented and is meant to assist those agencies responsible for the recreation areas by suggesting ways to improve the scenic quality of the recreation area through maintenance, rehabilitation and redesign of existing facilities.

TRPA's existing project review process will be the primary means by which to disclose, analyze and mitigate impacts to the threshold.

Projects will generally be found to maintain or improve the existing threshold rating for the applicable scenic resource(s) when TRPA finds that they are consistent with the recommendations for preserving the scenic quality listed at the end of each recreation area or bike trail segment. Conditions of project approval may be used to implement the recommendations where necessary.

Environmental Analysis: Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in the proposed action and proposes a finding of no significant effect (FONSE) because no potential adverse environmental impacts were identified. The proposed action will enhance the Regional Plan's regulatory control measures which protect significant scenic resources.

Required Findings: Several findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed action. The findings and brief statements of rationale on which the findings may be made are set forth below.

Required Findings: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed amendments:

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

1. Finding: 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.
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Rationale: The amendments will enhance implementation of the Regional Plan by conserving significant views of scenic resources from public outdoor recreation areas and bicycle trails. This is called for in TRPA Resolution 82-11 which adopted the thresholds, in Chapter IV, Conservation Element, Scenic Subelement of the adopted Regional Plan (excerpt shown in Attachment C), and in the '91 Evaluation.

2. Finding: That the project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The amendments are designed to attain and maintain scenic resource environmental thresholds by identifying and conserving significant views of scenic resources. The amendment will add regulatory control measures to the Regional Plan which are designed to protect the scenic resources.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state and 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 Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: Not applicable. Project applicants will continue to be subject to the Regional Plan package, including maintenance of applicable air and water quality standards.

4. Finding: The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: For the reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Regional Plan will continue to achieve and maintain the threshold.

B. Ordinance 87-8 Findings: Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 requires the following findings prior to Code amendments. The proposed amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. The required findings and their rationales are:

1. The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. For the reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Code amendment is consistent with the Compact and with attainment and maintenance of the thresholds.

2. One of the following findings:

a. There is a demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan package, and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds; or
b. 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; or

c. Legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code; or

d. Technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code; or

e. The provision to be amended has been shown, through experience and time, to be counter-productive to or ineffective in attainment or maintenance of the thresholds; or

f. Implementation of the provision sought to be amended has been demonstrated to be impracticable or impossible because of one or more of the following reasons:

(1) The cost of implementation outweighs the environmental gain to be achieved;

(2) Implementation will result in unacceptable impacts on public health and safety; or

(3) Fiscal support for implementation is insufficient and such insufficiency is expected to be a long-term problem.

Rationale: Staff recommends Finding b for the following reasons: The Regional Plan package presently has no regulatory control measure to conserve significant views of scenic resources seen from public outdoor recreation areas and certain bicycle trails. The Code amendments will provide the control measure necessary to ensure the scenic resources are conserved. TRPA’s 1982 resolution adopting the environmental thresholds recognized the importance of the scenic resources and the need to protect them. The amendment is designed to implement an important part of the thresholds which were not implemented upon adoption of the 1986 Regional Plan package.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
Attachment A

Implementing Scenic Quality Thresholds From Public Recreation Areas

April 27, 1993

Chapter 30 Amendments:

30.12 Scenic Quality Standards: All projects and activities shall comply with the following standards:

30.12.A Roadway and Shoreline Unit Scenic Quality: The project shall not cause a decrease in the numerical ratings assigned to roadway or shoreline units, including the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the 1982 Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in Tables 13-3, 13-5, 13-8 and 13-9 of the Study Report for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, October 1982. The criteria for rating scenic quality as identified in the study report cited herein shall be used to determine if a project will cause a decrease in the numerical rating.

30.12.B Roadway and Shoreline Unit Travel Routes: The project shall not cause a decrease in the 1982 roadway or shoreline travel route ratings as shown in Tables 13-6 and 13-7, respectively, of the Study Report for the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, October 1982. The criteria for rating travel routes as identified in the study report cited herein and as further explained in the report entitled A Scenic Analysis of Principle Travel Routes In The Lake Tahoe Region, 1970, shall be used to determine if a project will cause a decrease in the numerical rating.

30.12.C Public Recreation Areas and Bicycle Trails: The project shall not cause a decrease in any numerical subcomponent threshold rating or total threshold rating assigned to a scenic resource identified in the 1983 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation and shown in the Environmental Threshold Compliance Form, SR-3. Prior to approving a project which may potentially affect an identified scenic resource, TRPA shall find that the project is consistent with applicable recommendations for preserving scenic quality of the affected recreation area or bicycle trail found in the 1983 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation.
Chapter 12 Amendments:

12.2.B Regional Plan Overlay Maps: The following series of overlay maps at a scale of 1" = 400' and 1" = 2,000' are the Regional Plan Overlay Maps.

(8) Scenic Units Overlay: The scenic units overlay maps indicate the location of the roadway units, the shoreline units, the recreation areas, and the bicycle trails established by the scenic thresholds. Scenic highway corridors, including specific urban, transition and natural corridor designations are also identified.

Please Note: Proposed Chapter 32 amendments to Threshold Compliance Form SR-3 are shown in Attachment E.
Attachment B

Excerpt From 1982 TRPA Resolution Adopting Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (Resolution 82-11, Adopted August 26, 1983)

April 27, 1993

SCENIC RESOURCES

Roadway and Shoreline Units

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each unit, including the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in Tables 13-3, 13-5, 13-8 and 13-9 of the Draft Study Report.

Maintain the 1982 ratings for all roadway and shoreline units as shown in Tables 13-6 and 13-7 of the Draft Study Report.

Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below and shoreline units rated 7 or below.

Other Areas

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Maintain or improve the visual quality of views from bike paths and outdoor recreation areas open to the general public. Upon completion of the 1983 Visual Quality Index, this standard shall become a numerical standard.

Built Environment

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, to insure the height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signing and other design elements of new, remodeled and redeveloped buildings be compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreational values of the region.
Scenic quality is perhaps the most often identified natural resource of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Basin affords views of a magnificent lake setting within a forested mountainous environment. The unique combination of visual elements provides for exceptionally high aesthetic values. The maintenance of the Basin’s scenic quality largely depends on careful regulation of the type, location, and intensity of land uses. Environmental thresholds provide the basis for selecting appropriate strategies for maintaining scenic quality. Scenic resource thresholds are listed below:

**ROADWAY AND SHORELINE UNITS**

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each unit, including the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in Tables 13-3, 13-5, 13-8 and 13-9 of the Draft Study Report.

Maintain the 1982 ratings for all roadway and shoreline units as shown in Tables 13-6 and 13-7 of the Draft Study Report.

Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below and shoreline units rated 7 or below.

**OTHER AREAS**

**MANAGEMENT STANDARD**
Maintain or improve the visual quality of views from bike paths and outdoor recreation areas open to the general public. Upon completion of the 1982 Visual Quality Index, this standard shall become a numerical standard.

The following goals and policies directly address the issue of maintaining or restoring the natural scenic quality of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Attainment of the scenic thresholds is expected to be a long-term goal and achieved incrementally over the next 20 years.

**GOAL #1** MAINTAIN AND RESTORE THE SCENIC QUALITIES OF THE NATURAL APPEARING LANDSCAPE.

As with many of the Region’s natural resources, the scenic qualities of the Basin are vulnerable to change. Modifying the natural scenic features of the Basin is a by-product of development, but such impacts
need not be devastating. A coordinated effort that incorporates architectural design and location considerations in the project review process is a useful means for promoting scenic and aesthetic values. Policies to achieve this goal are consistent with the adopted environmental thresholds.

POLICIES:

1. ALL PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SHALL EXAMINE IMPACTS TO THE IDENTIFIED LANDSCAPE VIEWS FROM ROADWAYS, BIKEPATHS, PUBLIC RECREATION AREAS, AND LAKE TAHOE.

The impact of development on the landscape views and scenic qualities of the Tahoe Region should be considered as part of the project review process. Conditions should be placed on project approval in a manner capable of mitigating any likely impacts. Impacts shall be evaluated against specific management directions provided for each identified landscape view. Management and remedial criteria for each roadway and shoreline unit shall be updated through appropriate studies so they are consistent with the format and detail of the 1983 scenic analysis of the recreation areas, Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation, 1983, Wagstaff and Brady.
## Attachment D

### 91 Evaluation Excerpts Regarding

**Scenic Resource Thresholds From Public Recreation Areas**

**April 27, 1993**

1. **Summary of Table of Recommendations**

#### Scenic Resources

a. **Travel route ratings (TRRS)**
   - Ratings of five roadway units and four shoreline units have decreased. These do not attain the threshold standard.
   - Decreased ratings are found in transitional (urban-rural) areas.
   - TRPA make, and encourage, greater use of the Design Review Guidelines.
   - TRPA should consider separate threshold attainment criteria for urban, rural, and transitional areas.

b. **Scenic quality ratings**
   - Ratings of five natural features have decreased. These features do not attain the threshold standard.
   - One of the five features is visible from a roadway. The other four are visible from Lake Tahoe.
   - TRPA should review the Regional Plan in the areas of setbacks, setbacks, height, exempt activities, and activities in the shorezone.
   - TRPA should consider the elimination of "composite" ratings.

c. **Public recreation areas**
   - TRPA has not adopted numerical standards completed in 1983.
   - TRPA should adopt numerical scenic quality ratings for natural features seen from bike paths and outdoor recreation areas open to the general public.
2. Appendix B, Schedule of Implementation

A. Scenic Resources

1. Amend Chapter 22 of the Code, Height Standards, to: clarify the definition of maximum height, redefine additional height, amend the table of maximum building and structure heights, and revise the findings necessary to permit additional height for buildings and structures. (Completion Date: June 30, 1994)

2. Amend Chapter 30, Design Standards, to: (a) clarify when design standards must be implemented; (b) clarify parking lot landscaping requirements; (c) revise setback provisions for structures adjacent to travel routes including Lake Tahoe; (d) revise exterior lighting standards; and (e) make other clarifications. (Completion date: June 30, 1994)

3. Adopt numerical scenic quality ratings for individual scenic features visible from bike paths and outdoor recreation areas open to the general public. TRPA proposes to implement the public recreation area scenic quality thresholds in the same manner as the scenic quality ratings. (Completion date: June 30, 1993)
ATTACHMENT E
Recreation Area Scenic Threshold Compliance Form
Adopted April, 1992

Index No.: SR-3

ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE FORM

1. STANDARD

Category: Scenic quality
Parameter: Bike paths and outdoor recreation areas scenic quality rating
Standard: 1983 scenic quality rating (varies by resource)

2. INDICATOR (UNITS): Scenic quality rating as measured by a unitless total subcomponent rating of relative scenic quality of specific visual resources (also referred to as subcomponents) visible from 37 public outdoor recreation areas and from 11 Class I and Class II bike paths. Resource components include: views of the Lake and natural landscape from the recreation area or bike path; special landscape features such as streams, beaches, rock formations, topographical features and special vegetation patterns; and man-made features within the recreation area. The relative value of each-resource-visible-from-a-given-recreation-area or-bike-path-lake views, natural landscape views from the recreation areas or bike path, and special landscape features within the recreation area is measured using the following criteria:

a. Unity
b. Vividness
c. Variety
d. Intactness

Each criterion is scored using a unitless index from 1 (poor) to 5 (high). The threshold rating is the sum (i.e., subcomponent total) of criteria scores with a possible range of 4 to 20.

The relative value of man-made features within the recreation area is measured using the following criteria:

a. Coherence
b. Condition
c. Compatibility
d. Design quality

Each criterion is scored using a unitless index from 1 (poor) to 5 (high). The threshold rating is the sum (i.e., subcomponent total) of criteria scores with a possible range of 4 to 20.

Threshold ratings for all resources are contained in the Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation, 1983 and associated worksheets.
3. MONITORING SUMMARY: None to date. Annual photographic monitoring of selected resources is recommended. Annual monitoring would closely track potential adverse effects of development on resources. Data regarding the effects of incremental changes to the resources due to development activity could be used as a predictive tool in future project evaluations.

4. ATTAINMENT STATUS: Proposed threshold languages require maintenance or improvement of the scenic quality threshold rating (i.e., subcomponent total rating as listed in the resource worksheets) assigned to all scenic resources. Since the 1983 ratings were developed, the effects of new land use or development activities on identified resources are not known. At the time of implementation all resources are in attainment with the threshold (i.e., non-degradation standard).

5. TARGET DATE: None established at this time.

6. EVALUATION INTERVAL: Comprehensive reevaluation of all roadway and shoreline scenic resources every five years with the next evaluation in 1996.

7. INTERIM TARGETS: None established at this time.

8. COMPLIANCE MEASURES:

   a. MEASURES IN PLACE: 01 through 13, inclusive identified for SR-1 and SR-2 above plus the following measure.

      (14) Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation, 1983 including recommendations for preserving the scenic quality within the viewshed of each recreation area and bike path.

      The recommendations fall into two categories: those which recommend actions external to the recreation area and those which recommend actions within the recreation area itself. Those dealing with lands external to the recreation area are planning oriented and are proscriptive in nature. They are meant to be tools to aid TRPA in the protection of existing resources. They have been organized according to areas that present a shared set of landscape characteristics as viewed from the recreation area. The second set of recommendations is more design oriented and is meant to assist those agencies responsible for the recreation areas by suggesting ways to improve the scenic quality of the recreation area through maintenance, rehabilitation and redesign of existing facilities. Implementation of both sets of recommendations must occur during the project review process in order to meet the intent of the threshold and meet the nondegradation standard in 30.12.C of the Code of Ordinances.

   b. EFFECTIVENESS OF MEASURES IN PLACE: The compliance measures in place include the primary ordinance standards and recommend guidelines addressing physical design and site planning. All measures in place must be implemented as part of the project review and approval process in order to maintain the scenic quality of identified resources.
c. SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: None established at this time.

d. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURES: Not applicable.

9. ADEQUACY OF COMPLIANCE MEASURES

The adequacy of compliance measures is generally expected to protect and conserve the scenic quality of individual resources. Implementing recommendations contained in the section of each recreation area and bike path evaluation entitled "Recommendations for Preserving the Scenic Quality" must occur as part of the project review process in order to maintain scenic quality ratings. Since the majority of resources are located on recreation lands managed by public agencies, many of the activities may be carried out in the operations and management of the facilities not subject to TRPA review (i.e., exempted under Chapter 4). It will be incumbent upon them and their concessionaires not to inadvertently degrade the resources through operations and management activities.
Attachment F

Recreation Areas and Bicycle Trail Segments
Included in the 1983 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Inventory

April 27, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area No.</th>
<th>Area Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nevada Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zephyr Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cave Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sand Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hidden Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ski Incline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Incline Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burnt Cedar Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kings Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Moondunes Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agatam Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Patton Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lake Forest Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lake Forest Campground and Boat Launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tahoe State Recreation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tahoe City Commons Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Granlibakken Ski Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>William Kent Beach and Campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kasplan Picnic Area and Campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Homewood Ski Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tahoe Ski Bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sugar Pine Point State Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Meeks Bay Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Meeks Bay Campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>D. L. Bliss State Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Vikingsholm/Emerald Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Eagle Falls Picnic Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Eagle Point Campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fallen Leaf Lake Campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Baldwin Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Taylor Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Kiva Picnic Area/Tallac Historic Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Camp Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pope Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Reagan Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Carson Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tahoe Basin Bikeways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Unit</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Roadway Unit</th>
<th>Bikeway Class</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City to River</td>
<td>Tahoe City PUD</td>
<td>42, 43</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>North Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City to Dollar Point</td>
<td></td>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>North Shore (Truck River)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Tavern</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>West Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside to Timberland</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberland to Tahoe Pines</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Pines to Tahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>9, 10, 11</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>34, part of 35</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>South Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Tahoe Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Valley to City of South Lake Tahoe City Limits</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Valley Route</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>I&amp;II</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe to Tallac Creek</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>South Shore (El Dorado National Forest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. ZEPHYR COVE

Zephyr Cove is located on the east shore of the lake about four miles north of Stateline at South Lake Tahoe. The land is owned by the U.S. Forest Service, but the recreation area is operated by private concessionaires. The recreation area is open year round for swimming, picnicking, camping, and boating.

The entry to Zephyr Cove is directly off Highway 50 and leads down to a pier approximately at the midpoint of the cove. The majority of the development within the recreation area is clustered around the entry drive and the foot of the pier. Several small structures have been erected near the pier to sell food, rent boats, etc. A large paved area is provided for parking just north of the entry drive along Highway 50.

The pier acts as a locus of activity and also divides the recreation area into two distinct sections. To the north of the pier, a narrow strip of beach backed by conifer forest curves around and tapers to a rocky promontory which forms the northern edge of the cove. This beach appears to be less intensively used than the beach south of the pier, and is closely associated with the camping and picnic sites located in the conifer forest adjacent to it. On the other hand, the beach to the south is broader, more varied in its configuration, and more heavily used. In contrast to the low-lying peninsula on the north, the southern peninsula rises steeply from the lake to form Zephyr Heights directly south of the beach. This peninsula, like the northern one, has a dense forest cover; however, unlike that peninsula, which shows few signs of development, Zephyr Heights reveals fairly heavy residential development, particularly near the top of the slope. To the west, the view of the lake is defined by the two peninsulas which define the cove. The view terminates with the backdrop formed by the dramatic peaks surrounding Emerald Bay. To the east, toward the entry, a low forested ridge is visible beyond Highway 50. There is nothing particularly distinctive about this ridge, but it also shows no signs of human disturbance.

Zephyr Cove - Components

Views From The Recreation Area

2.1. View of the lake from the foot of the pier (Photo #37-43)

Subcomponent Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intactness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Rating</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. View of the lake from the north end of beach (Photos #32-36)

Subcomponent Ratings

Unity 5
Vividness 4
Variety 4
Intactness 4
Threshold Rating 17

2.3. View of the lake from the south end of beach (Photos #26-31)

Subcomponent Ratings

Unity 5
Vividness 3
Variety 4
Intactness 3
Threshold Rating 15

Natural Features of Zephyr Cove

2.4. Sandy beach (Photos #36-38,31)

Subcomponent Ratings

Unity 4
Vividness 4
Variety 3
Intactness 4
Threshold Rating 15

2.5. Conifer forest (Photos #52,53)

Criteria Ratings

Unity 3
Vividness 3
Variety 3
Intactness 4
Threshold Rating 13
2.6. Small stream just north of pier (Photo #56)

Criteria Ratings

Unity 4  
Vividness 4  
Variety 3  
Intactness 4  

Threshold Rating 15

Man-Made Features of Zephyr Cove

2.a. Pier and concession buildings (Photos #44-49)

Subcomponent Criteria Ratings

Coherence 1  
Condition 2  
Compatibility 1  
Design Quality 1  

Threshold Rating 5

2.b. Parking area north of entrance (Photos #50-55)

Subcomponent Criteria Ratings

Coherence 2  
Condition 2  
Compatibility 1  
Design Quality 1  

Threshold Rating 6

2.c. Picnic area (Photos #52,57)

Subcomponent Criteria Ratings

Coherence 3  
Condition 3  
Compatibility 4  
Design Quality 3  

Threshold Rating 13
2.d. Entry treatment (Photos #51,55)

Subcomponent Criteria Ratings

Coherence 2
Condition 2
Compatibility 2
Design Quality 2
Threshold Rating 8

Summary: The high scenic value of the views and natural features of Zephyr Cove has been decreased by onsite and offsite development. Structures on Zephyr Heights do not blend well with their surroundings, giving a much greater sense of human presence on the south end of the recreation area than on the north. The poor handling of facilities (infrastructure and buildings) within the recreation area also detracts from the natural setting.

Elements That Contribute to the Scenic Quality of Zephyr Cove

A. The view west across the lake to the rocky peaks on the west shore.
B. The sandy beach on either side of the pier.
C. The enclosed, sheltered character of the cove and the manner in which the peninsulas enframe and focus the view of the lake.
D. The dense stands of conifers that border the back edge of the beaches.
E. The verticality of Zephyr Heights and the silhouette of the ridgeline against the sky.
F. The rocky isle at the north end of the cove with lone conifer growing on it.
G. The small stream environment north of the access road.

Elements That Detract From The Scenic Quality of Zephyr Cove.

A. Structures which rise above the ridgeline of Zephyr Heights disturb the natural lines of the ridge by creating gaps in the vegetation and by silhouetting the structure against the sky.
B. Structures on Zephyr Heights whose color hue and/or value contrast with rather than blend into the surrounding landscape distract the viewer's attention from the natural landscape. This is especially true of structures with light-colored or reflective roofs.

C. Structures on Zephyr Heights visible because of the removal of tree cover or because they rise above it, disturb the texture and pattern of the forest cover, calling attention to themselves.

D. The lack of consistent architectural style and quality in the concession structures, in addition to poor siting, makes the area appear visually cluttered and confusing, and competes with the lake view for attention.

E. The unscreened mass of cars in the parking area creates visual conflict with the natural environment because of the bright colors and reflective surfaces.

F. The overhead telephone and power lines create visual interference between the viewer and the natural landscape.

G. The silver-colored cyclone fencing which defines the limits of the recreation area does not blend well with the natural environment.

Recommendations for Preserving the Scenic Quality Within the Zephyr Cove Viewshed

A. Zephyr Heights/Zephyr Point

1. Structures should not extend above the ridgeline. Tree removal for structures should not create gaps in the vegetation along the ridge top.

2. Existing trees should be preserved and used as a visual screen between structure(s) and major public use areas.

3. Structures should not be allowed to rise above the forest canopy.

4. Use of reflective building materials should be restricted and use of materials which blend into the surrounding landscape encouraged. Hues should fall within a range of natural colors that complements rather than contrasts with the existing vegetation and earth tones. Values should be equal to or darker than those of surrounding colors. These guidelines should apply to all visible surfaces of structures including roofs, siding, fences, etc. (Photos #26,27,32,33,38,39)
B. Northern Peninsula of Zephyr Cove

1. Siting of development in this area should preserve and use existing trees as a visual screen between structure(s) and major public use areas. Structures should not be visible from beach area.

2. Piers and other development should not be permitted along shoreline.

3. Development should not be allowed to rise above forest canopy.

4. Use of reflective building materials should be restricted and use of materials which blend into the surrounding landscape encouraged. The color hues should fall within a range of natural colors that complements rather than contrasts with the existing vegetation and earth tones. As a rule, color values should be equal to or darker than those of surrounding colors. These guidelines should apply to all visible surfaces of structures including roofs, siding, fences, etc. (Photos #30,31,36,43)

C. Zephyr Cove Recreation Area

1. Setbacks should be developed between parking and recreation areas to buffer these conflicting activities. Parking areas should be landscaped to visually screen parking and break up expanse of larger parking lots. (Photos #50,51,55)

2. Concession buildings should be rehabilitated to improve their compatibility with each other and to decrease visual clutter. Their functional organization should be reevaluated since the existing siting of buildings appears haphazard. An architectural style or treatment should be adopted which can be applied to all structures to unify them visually, and a consistent and shared style of signage should be adopted by all concessionaires. (Photos #44-49)

3. Telephone lines should be buried whenever possible. (Photos #46,52,53,55)

4. Cyclone fencing should be painted or vinyl-coated with a color more compatible with the natural environment. (Photo #36)
May 3, 1993

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: Susan E. Scholley, Special Projects Attorney

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 35, Bonus Unit Incentive Program, and Chapter 43, Subdivision Standards, Relative to Multi-Residential Bonus Units andAllocations

PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is to amend Chapter 43 to permit a limited number of multi-residential bonus units to be subdivided over the next four years and to make a related amendment to Chapter 35 which changes the number of points needed for bonus units if the residential project is to be subdivided and is not low cost housing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the proposed action with the caveat that the number of multi-residential bonus units available for subdivision for the next four years be limited to 200 units.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS: The proposed amendments are as follows:

Chapter 43 amendments:

43.4.C Multi-residential Bonus Units and Allocations: Multi-residential projects which received development rights ("bonus units") under Section 35.2 after January 1, 1993, or multi-residential allocations under Subsection 33.2.C, shall not be permitted to subdivide or convert the multi-residential units except as follows:

(1) Affordable housing projects using multi-residential bonus units may be permitted to subdivide subject to the restrictions in Subsection 43.4.D below. Multi-residential bonus units assigned to affordable housing projects shall be exempt from the limitations in subparagraph (2) below.

(2) For the period ending December 31, 1996, no more than 200 multi-residential bonus units shall be approved for subdivision. Bonus units shall be deemed used and counted against this limitation at the time of subdivision approval. The number of multi-residential bonus units eligible for subdivision after December 31, 1996, if any, shall be reviewed in conjunction with the proposed 1997-2001 residential allocations.
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43.4.D Affordable Housing: Subdivision of affordable housing projects, where the units were exempt from the residential allocation system, may be permitted provided TRPA finds that the resultant use qualifies as affordable housing, and appropriate deed restrictions or other covenants running with the land are recorded to document the restriction of units to affordable housing.

43.4.E Low Cost Housing: Subdivision of low cost housing projects, as defined in Subsection 41.2.F and subject to the limitation in subparagraph 43.4.C(2) above, may be permitted provided TRPA finds that the resultant use qualifies as low cost housing and appropriate deed restrictions or other covenants running with the land are recorded to document the restriction of units to low cost housing.

Chapter 35 amendments

35.2.C Determination of the Number of Bonus Units:

(1) ...
(2) ...
(3) Post-1987 Projects Proposing Subdivision of Units: In order to subdivide a post-1987 multi-residential project which does not meet the standards for low cost housing as defined in Subsection 41.2.F, the score received pursuant to Subsection 35.2.D shall be multiplied by a factor of .67.

BACKGROUND: The APC made recommendations on the new ordinances for subdividing post-1987 projects in January of 1993. At that time staff recommended, and the APC concurred, that projects using multi-residential bonus units should not be permitted to subdivide. At the Governing Board hearing, the Board adopted the proposed ordinances as recommended by the staff and APC but agreed to reconsider the prohibition on subdividing multi-residential bonus units.

At the February hearing, the Board did not amend the ordinances but directed staff to present information regarding the need for multi-residential housing and the current housing situation. Further, the Board was divided regarding the appropriateness of a limited exemption.

Because the staff is recommending amendments to Chapter 43 (and related amendments to Chapter 35), the matter has been brought back to the APC for its input and recommendation.

DISCUSSION: Based on the testimony at the Board hearings and discussions with the attorney for the Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, staff is prepared to recommend a limited and short-term exception from the current prohibition on subdividing multi-residential units. The change in staff’s recommendation is based on the limited number of multi-residential bonus units made available for subdivision, which is 200 out of the total of 1600. The new recommendation is also based on the exemption being limited to four years so that TRPA can reassess the need and situation in four years as part of the
next five-year review and allocation table.

Also, the recommended amendments completely exempt affordable housing units from the limitations on subdivision. Subdivision of affordable housing units, provided they remain affordable, is consistent with the intent of the plan and ordinances to provide affordable housing for rent or sale. Finally, the amendment to Chapter 35 increases the number of points a project must earn for bonus units which are to be subdivided and which do not qualify as low-cost housing. Currently ten points are currently required for each bonus unit. The proposed multiplier of .67 would translate into a requirement of 15 points for each bonus unit.

Although staff hoped to reach a negotiated compromise with the Preservation Council on this issue, the Council does not concur in the limitation of 200 bonus units for the next four years. Initially they had proposed a total exemption of 400 units over the next fifteen years and they continue to advocate a larger exemption. Their research found that the number of units in Incline Village which were in areas already substantially subdivided and mapped for multiple units under the Incline Village Master Plan is approximately 260.

Given these numbers and the limited number of allocations in each jurisdiction, TRPA staff continues to recommend a "go slow" approach to exempting multi-residential bonus units from the prohibition on subdividing. The recommended number of 200 represents 17% of the total allocations for the next four years and 77% of the Incline Village parcels which the Preservation Council identified as the problem.

The 1983 EIS on the Regional Plan and the more current TBAG study found a lack of low cost housing in the Region. The Preservation Council does not dispute the existence of the problem. Staff believes that the provision of the four year period and the recommended 200 units represent an appropriate compromise. Furthermore, committing more units up front will limit the discretion of the Agency in the future should it be able to, or wish to, take a more aggressive approach toward housing problems.

If there are any questions regarding this item, please contact Susan Scholley at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

May 4, 1993

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Discussion on Employee Trip Reduction Program

The Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP) includes a transportation control measure that requires employers of commercial and retail development to implement trip reduction programs. Employer-based trip reduction is a program of measures designed to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from employment sites. Volume III, page 13-14 of the RTP-AQP states:

"TRPA shall propose for adoption ordinances requiring employers and commercial or retail developments to implement trip reduction programs. Employer-based trip reduction programs should achieve an average employee vehicle ridership of 1.5 employees per vehicle. This average vehicle ridership may be achieved through car-pooling, vanpooling, employee shuttles, public transit programs, or promoting non-vehicular transportation. Commercial and retail employers are urged to form or join Transportation Management Associations (TMA) to help develop and implement trip reduction plans and programs."

As outlined in Volume III, p. 3, of the RTP-AQP, Employer-Based Trip Reduction Programs should include the following elements:

1. An evaluation of current average vehicle ridership as determined by an employee survey of at least months in duration;
2. Designation of an employee transportation manager and coordinator;
3. A description of incentives, services and marketing programs to be offered to employees;
4. Budgets for employer's trip reduction program;
5. A statement of average weekly staff hours devoted to the trip reduction programs;
6. A statement of commitment to plan implementation;
7. Public transit information relative to the work site;
8. Geographic and demographic data pertinent to site-specific trip reduction planning and
9. An evaluation of the incentives, services and marketing programs in the trip reduction plan from previous years.
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Volume III, p. 3, of the RTP-AQP, Goals and Policies encourages the establishment of Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) in the Tahoe Region. TRPA staff have worked with the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (TNT-TMA) in developing an agreement which directs the TNT-TMA to draft a trip reduction ordinance pursuant to the RTP-AQP.

As a B-List requirement of the 1991 Evaluation Report, TRPA is required to adopt an employer-based trip reduction ordinance by June 30, 1993. The TNT-TMA draft trip reduction ordinance is scheduled for completion on June 30, 1993. Once the TNT-TMA draft ordinance is complete, TRPA staff will review the draft ordinance and supplement additional information as necessary towards the development of a regionwide trip reduction ordinance.

Over the past year, TRPA staff have worked with staff from the Placer County Transportation Commission (PCTC) and other local jurisdictions to develop an employer-based trip reduction ordinance and will utilize information from the PCTC ordinance to supplement the regionwide trip reduction ordinance.

Currently TRPA staff, through the review of commercial and public service applications, typically require employer-based trip reduction measures as conditions of project approval. Examples of projects recently approved by the TRPA Governing Board requiring employer-based trip reduction programs include the Barton Memorial Hospital and Lake Tahoe Unified School District expansion plans.

No action is required from the Planning Commission at this time. If you have any questions concerning this agenda item, please contact Keith Norberg at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

May 4, 1993

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Discussion on Parking Ordinance

The Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP) for the Lake Tahoe Region includes a control measure that proposes for adoption a parking management ordinance. Volume III, p. 14 of the RTP-AQP states:

The parking management ordinance should set the minimum and maximum number of parking spaces required for employees and patrons of commercial and retail uses. The number of required parking spaces shall be sufficient to meet the minimum needs of the use in order to reduce the amount of off-site or otherwise illegal parking. The minimum number of parking spaces to be provided for employees may be reduced through the implementation of employer-based trip reduction programs.

Volume III, p. 15 of the RTP-AQP also states:

The parking management ordinance shall include requirements for paid parking in parking lots and parking structures open to the public. Proceeds from these parking fees could be used to subsidize the employer-based trip reduction programs and patron shuttle systems.

In December of 1987, the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission approved new parking requirements based on a staff survey of local jurisdiction parking requirements for specified land uses. Currently, staff is reviewing this information and has requested proposals from consultants to develop the parking management ordinance. As a B-List requirement of the 1991 Evaluation Report, TRPA is required to complete the parking management ordinance by June 30, 1993.

No action is required from the Planning Commission at this time. If you have any questions concerning this agenda item, please contact Keith Norberg at (702) 588-4547.
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