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NOTICE OF MEETING

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, December 14, 1994, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8118 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

December 5, 1994

By: __________________________

James W. Baetge
Executive Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Tahoe Valley and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village Club office, and the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce.
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. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (NO ACTION)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on an agenda item not listed as a Public Hearing, Project Review, or a Planning Matter Item, or on any other issue, may do so at this time. However, public comment on Public Hearing items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PROJECT REVIEW

A. Placer County Department of Public Works, Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project, Placer County, Project #530-102-93

VI. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. Amendment of Chapters 2, 6, 13, and 45, and Other Related Amendments, to Limit Subdivisions and Urban Uses to Existing Urban Areas, to Set Criteria for Subdivisions in Preferred Affordable Housing Areas, and to Set Criteria for Adding Multi-Family Residential Uses to Plan Areas

B. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 013, Watson Creek (Conservation), and Plan Area Statement 014, Cedar Pines (Residential), to Add APN 092-010-18 to Plan Area 014

C. Reaffirmation of TRPA's Regional Transportation/Air Quality Plan

D. Amendment of Kingsbury Community Plan Chapter 4 Matrix to Clarify and Modify the Irrevocable Commitment

D. Amendment of Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, for Distribution of Residential Allocations to Parcels Below the IPES Line in 1995
VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director
B. Legal Counsel
C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Horizon Casino Resort
Stateline, Nevada

November 9, 1994

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Vice Chairman Robert Jepsen called the regular November 9, 1994 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:45 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Mr. Jepsen, Mr. Ruben, Mr. Hansen (arrived at 11:30 a.m.), Ms. Baldrica, Mr. McDowell, Mr. Dodds, Mr. McCurry, Mr. Joiner, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Mudgett, Mr. Haen, Mr. Combs, Ms. Jamin

Members Absent: Mr. Hust, Mr. Barham, Mr. Popoff, Ms. Woodbeck, Mr. Thompson, Nevada Lay Member (vacant)

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Deputy Director Jerry Wells asked to change the order of the agenda so that items V.B and V.C would be heard first, followed by items VI.A, VI.B, V.D and V.A.

MOTION to approve the agenda was made by Ms. Baldrica, with a second by Mr. Dodds. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Mudgett questioned whether there would be any discussion on the status of the Water Quality and SEZ efforts. Executive Director Jim Baetge replied that Carl Hasty would be covering the whole threshold issue of water quality and soil, and what progress has been made.

Mr. Mudgett explained that the reason he asked about the Water Quality/SEZ discussion was because V.A involved the lowering of the IPES score which had to do with water quality. He requested that Carl's presentation (VI.B) precede V.A. Mr. Baetge suggested that the agenda could be flexible on this.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS - There were none.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Jamin, with second by Ms. Baldrica, to approve the October 12, 1994, APC minutes as presented. The motion carried with McCurry, Dodds, Mudgett and Jepsen abstaining.
V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

B. Amendments to Chapter 8 Provisions Regarding Correct and Complete and Original Applications and/or Signatures

Agency Counsel R.J. Nicolle advised that the Governing Board Rules Committee had met and recommended that Chapter 8 be amended to require correct, complete and original applications (with faxed or photocopied signatures) to be accepted as long as an original signature was submitted within seven days thereafter. Ms. Nicolle suggested that this recommendation was designed to deal with false applications or signatures.

Mr. Mudgett asked how often these actions occurred, and Ms. Nicolle advised that staff knew of three cases in the first part of 1994. She also suggested that there have been cases where applicants have authorization for a previous project and wanted to use that signature for a new permit.

Mr. Mudgett was very concerned that honest people were being curtailed and somehow there should be punitive measures for dishonest applicants. Mr. Gregg Lien, a frequent applicant representative, was also concerned about the problems that forgery could create for consultants, and felt that these dishonest applicants should be prosecuted. However, as a whole, he believed the consultants were credible, and possibly this would not be worth the inconvenience.

Mr. Dodds asked if the applicant could send a letter with original signature, asking the consultant to act in their behalf. Ms. Nicolle suggested that this is what had created some of the problems. In some cases, the applicant signed a very general letter and then that letter would be taken from project to project. Then the property owner would come in stating "that's not what I thought I was authorizing." Therefore, in some instances people will abuse this general letter of authorization.

Paul Kaleta agreed with the Rules Committee to make it easier to submit applications. His only concern was having to get the original signature to the TRPA within seven days. This timeframe was a little tight considering weekends and holidays. He suggested that possibly the rule could be changed from seven to 10 days.

There were no other public comments.

Mr. Joiner asked whether TRPA would consider requiring a notarized signature as a standard procedure on all applications. Ms. Nicolle advised that TRPA did not require a notarized signature. Mr. Joiner recommended that this be done. Also, if a Power of Attorney was used, the signature should be notarized. Ms. Nicolle thought this was a good suggestion.

Mr. Dodds asked whether it would matter to the staff to change the seven day requirement to 14 days. Ms. Nicolle stated that it would not matter. The seven days was just a time suggested by the Governing Board Rules Committee. Mr. Haen commented that it would be a burden on the applicant and the consultant to have to get his/her signature notarized. Typically a County Building Permit is not a notarized signature. He did not think that it was a
standard practice for other permitting agencies. Another issue was that TRPA applications require signatures of owners and often more than one owner is involved. He asked Ms. Nicolle how this situation would be handled. Ms. Nicolle stated that TRPA should have signatures of all owners. Mr. Joiner commented that his agency accepted one signature. Mr. Ruben commented that when coverage was the issue, all property owners of title should be included. A discussion continued regarding development rights and deed restrictions.

Mr. McDowell asked if the purpose of the amendment, other than an original signature, was to beat deadlines. What happened to an application that came in with a faxed signature? Did it sit on the shelf for 7-10 days until the original signature came, or did the processing begin? Ms. Nicolle commented that currently the application was considered incomplete and review was not commenced. Now the Rules Committee was recommending that the faxed signature should be sufficient to begin immediate processing.

Mr. Dodds asked that the request to extend the seven days to a longer period of time be accommodated. Ms. Nicolle stated that she would check with the staff, but she did not anticipate any problem with that request.

Mr. Haen again stated that he felt that one signature on an application with multiple owners should be satisfactory.

MOTION by Mr. Dodds to recommend to the Governing Board to adopt the proposed Code amendment with the suggested revision from 7 days to 14 days to submit the original signature. Mr. McCurry seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Amendments to Chapter 43 and Other Related Amendments Limiting New Residential Subdivisions to Existing Urban Areas

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett directed APC members to page 16 of the packet. This item was discussed at the last APC meeting, and the APC asked staff to form a workshop group. Three planners were at this workshop, and Mr. Joiner helped facilitate the meeting. The working group of approximately 20 people discussed the three objectives presented last month, including Douglas County Community Plan mitigation, subdivisions and urban boundaries, and protection of boundaries.

Mr. Barrett handed out a workshop-recommended list of proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 41, 43 and 13. He also distributed a letter from Daniel Siegel, California Deputy Attorney General, expressing concerns on some of the legal issues related to the 208 Plan.

Mr. Barrett discussed the three major areas of concern.

1. Clarify Definition of Urban Boundary and whether the urban boundary adopted in 1987 can be changed.

2. Clarify Use of Existing Urban Areas in regard to post-1987 project Subdivisions and whether they can be changed.
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A pending application requested urban designation for 80 acres at Golden Bear. The proponents wanted it to become an urban plan area so they could transfer development rights and build 80 units. In this case, urban boundaries would be expanded to allow subdivisions past the post-1987 boundary. The League and Attorney General felt very positive that the 1987 plan should remain in effect.

The proposed amendment required that any change beyond December 1984 would take some special findings.

3. Limit the Expansion of Urban Boundaries and Uses.

The third amendment would add findings to Section 13.7 (Plan Area Statements and Plan Area Maps) regulating the changes of urban boundaries.

When changing plan area boundaries the resulting description should be consistent with that of the existing plan area.

Agency Counsel R. J. Nicolle commented on Dan Siegel's analysis. She felt that even though his argument was compelling, the 208 Plan used the term "urban areas" to define a concept.

Mr. Dodds felt that the intent of the 208 Plan was to stop the urban sprawl and to recognize that there might be some need to fill in the areas where you already have roads and construction. If you redefined the word "existing" to any date in the future, it did not seem like you were holding a line on subdivisions. What was the driving force behind this? Could it be affordable housing? If so, then he objected because he was opposed to trading one threshold for another. There was a clear recognition that new subdivisions had negative impacts.

Ms. Nicolle stated that the subdivision ordinances were adopted to balance a number of different issues. The 208 Plan recognized a prohibition on creating subdivisions.

Mr. Dodds questioned the proposed December 31, 1994 date. Ms. Nicolle explained that it was basically a compromise trying to resolve an issue that could potentially be a litigation issue in the future, because "existing urban areas" was a definition that was capable of multiple interpretations.

Mr. Mudgett expressed concern with using the 208 water quality plan as a "zoning" plan.

Vice Chairman Jepsen opened discussion to the public.

Mr. Gregg Lien, representing the Preservation Council, stated his concerns about an urban boundary freeze. He did not disagree with guiding principles, but did disagree with the fine tuning of the plan. He had concerns regarding locking in a December 31, 1994 date, as well as having to wait for the five year window to come up to increase development potential. This might be unconstitutional and believed it should be a case by case issue.

-4-
Ms. Rochelle Nason, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that the single greatest protection for Lake Tahoe water quality was prevention of urban sprawl; and that was the issue before the APC at this time. Her concern was that individual property owners would want exceptions, without consideration of cumulative impacts. Ms. Nason basically supported the staff recommendation, but disagreed with the December 31, 1994 date. She suggested that the date be today (November 9, 1994).

Discussion continued among the audience and APC members regarding the effects this amendment would have on water quality.

Ms. Jamin asked if there were any applications pending that would need approval before December 31. Mr. Barrett stated that he knew of three at this time.

Mr. Dave Marlow, Staff Officer with the U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, discussed the potential impact of the proposed boundary freeze on federal land parcels. He passed out a letter from Mr. Robert E. Harris, Forest Supervisor, U.S. Forest Service, citing an example of a land transaction which the Forest Service had been working on for several years, and would have significant public benefits. But if these amendments were passed, it would essentially negate the opportunities to acquire environmentally sensitive lands in the Basin. In his letter he presented modifications to the proposed amendments. Messrs. Dodds, Hudgett, McDowell, Ms. Nicolle and Ms. Nason commented on Mr. Marlow's presentation and letter.

Consultant Paul Kaleta suggested the amendments were unnecessary, since the APC and Governing Board already had the discretion to deny proposals as they saw fit. He felt the issues were guidelines; it was not necessary to adopt them. He agreed with maintaining thresholds but believed that there was no urgency in adopting the ordinance. In this instance, no action was the best action.

Mr. Lien stated that the whole issue involved a freeze on urban areas, and subdivisions were not mentioned.

Mr. Jepsen closed the public hearing and resumed comments from the staff and APC regarding thresholds, flexibility, and the five year evaluation.

Ms. Nicolle suggested that continuance until next month might be appropriate. Mr. Barrett commented that even with a continuance, it was impossible to make everyone happy. This was not an easy decision. Ms. Nicolle reminded the APC that they had the option of sending this on to the Governing Board with a negative recommendation. Discussion continued regarding the effect a negative recommendation would have on existing property.

Ms. Baldrics asked what kind of recommendation before the Board would be considered adequate. Her concern was meeting the obligations of the APC and making a decision in a responsible fashion. After hearing all of the discussion and issues, she felt that possibly this needed to be continued to examine other issues. Ms. Baldrics asked if there is a deadline for acting on the amendment. Ms. Nicolle advised that a decision must be made by December 31, 1994, but the matter could be continued one month until the next APC meeting.
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MOTION made by Mr. Mudgett to continue until December. Mr. Haen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:50 p.m. and reconvened at 2:10 p.m.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

B. Staff Presentation on Water Quality and Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) Restoration Efforts

Mr. Carl Hasty, Senior Planner and Program Manager for the Water Quality Team, passed out an outline of the Water Quality Program, which he discussed in its entirety. Mr. Hasty also presented an overview of the problem and displayed a graph of the clarity of the lake.

The APC discussed stream monitoring, parcel retrofit, grant funding and water quality workshops. Other topics included the effect of water quality on fisheries, the need to address BMP needs for individual parcels, BMP maintenance and TRPA's role.

No action was taken.

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

D. Amendment of Chapter 82 Regarding Use and Distribution of Mitigation Funds

Mr. Carl Hasty, Senior Planner, presented information concerning the amendments which would allow the utilization of the interest from mitigation funds to be used for water quality planning. He recommended retaining the services of Larry Benoit to assist with this program.

Mr. Dodds suggested this amendment would mean less money for mitigation projects. Mr. Hasty stated that while this may be true, it would get money into the Basin for more projects, and will allow TRPA and others to update needs and costs more efficiently. Mr. Dodds asked how much money was involved and Mr. Hasty advised that to staff one person for two years it would cost approximately $70,000 - $80,000. The Public Works Department supported this program.

Mr. Mudgett questioned whether there was information available on projects for which the money would be used. Mr. Hasty restated that many of these projects have monitoring requirements. Before the project was completed, it was monitored for one to two years. That information is available, but he was not certain how conclusive it was.

Since there were no further comments, Vice Chairman Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION was made by Mr. McMurry to adopt the proposed amendment. Seconded by Mr. Haen. The motion carried unanimously.

A. Lowering the IPES Line in Douglas County
Ms. Susan Scholley, Special Projects Attorney, presented her summary of the five required findings for lowering of the IPES line in Douglas County.

The APC discussed the movement of the line related to water quality trends. Ms. Scholley explained that on an annual basis, lowering the IPES line was purposely separated from the results of the monitoring program or the results of capital improvements projects that were installed.

Mr. Scholley advised that there were two environmental documents on the IPES system. One was part of the adoption of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies in 1987, and the other when the Environmental Impact Statement was prepared on the 203 Plan, which incorporated the IPES system. Last year was the first time the IPES line was lowered. At this point, it was only being lowered in Nevada. California did not meet the vacant lot equation requirements.

In Finding 5., Compliance with Project Conditions, Criteria #4, Ms. Scholley noted that Douglas County did not meet the "% of Violations Unresolved" criteria, as originally stated in Ms. Scholley's report. She asked the APC members for direction on the CIP and BPM Retrofit Schedule Findings and suggested that the APC not prevent this from going to the Governing Board. She would figure out whether or not there was a problem and resolve it before the Board meeting. If it could not be resolved, she would hold the matter until December.

Since there was no further comments, Mr. Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION was made by Mr. Mudgett to accept Ms. Scholley's recommendation. Mr. Haen seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Mr. Wells spoke on behalf of Mr. Baetge, who had to leave early. President Clinton had tentatively appointed a new Governing Board Member Peter Chase Neumann, an attorney in Reno. Mr. Wells also announced that the NTRPA would conduct interviews on November 15, 1994 to fill the position vacated in December by Mr. Wayne Chimarusti, the Nevada-at-Large member.

Mr. Wells also discussed the resolution regarding the bikeway serving the entire lake. Mr. Baetge distributed the resolution earlier in the meeting. Mr. Wells advised that staff would be looking for legislative sponsors in both California and Nevada. Mr. Dodds, Mr. Mudgett and Ms. Baldrica discussed some of the pros and cons of a bike trail, such as safety and water quality matters. Mr. Wells commented that whatever was proposed, it would have to meet all thresholds.

B. Legal Counsel

Agency Counsel R. J. Nicolle introduced Judy Mcintire, Executive Assistant, who will be part of the team now attending APC meetings and taking minutes. She explained the need to relieve Sue Mikanovich of some of the responsibility of attending every meeting, so she could focus on in-house legal needs.
In the lawsuit, Anderson v. TRPA, Susan Scholley was able to negotiate and reach agreement that there was no liability for TRPA in the case. In the Tahoe Keys Homeowners Association v. TRPA, Susan Scholley was also able to get this lawsuit dismissed. In Peterson, et al. v TRPA, Mr. Peterson is coming forth with a settlement offer to this month's Governing Board and hopefully it will be resolved at that time.

C. APC Members

Mr. Combs commented that the North Tahoe Community Plans were available for review. The environmental plans should be available in December.

VII. ADJOURNMENT - Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Judy McIntire
Clerk to the Commission

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (702) 588-4547. In addition, any documents submitted at the meeting may be reviewed at the TRPA office, 308 Dorla Court, Elks Point, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

December 5, 1994

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: TRPA Staff

SUBJECT: Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project

-------------------------------

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the project. The required actions and recommended conditions of approval are attached (Attachment A) in the Governing Board Staff Summary.

Background: In August 1994, the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) reviewed and recommended certification of the Revised Final EIR/EIS for the Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project. At the August 24, 1994 Governing Board meeting the Governing Board unanimously certified the Revised Final EIR/EIS document. The Advisory Planning Commission and the Governing Board agreed that the Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project should be brought back to the APC for review prior to consideration by the Governing Board.

TRPA staff will give a brief summary of the proposed project and conditions at the APC meeting, with the intention of taking the project to the Governing Board on December 21, 1994 for approval. If you have any questions concerning this item, please contact Paul Pettersen, Senior Planner of the Project Review Division at (702) 588-4547.

/pp
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AGENDA ITEM V.A

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
ATTACHMENT A
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project

Application Type: Public Service

Applicant: Placer County Department of Public Works

Applicant's Representative: Jim Rinser, K.B. Foster Civil Engineering

Location: Tahoe City Downtown Area (See Exhibit A for project plans)

Assessor's Parcel Number/Project Number: 530-102-93 / 930691

Agency Staff: Paul Pettersen, Senior Planner

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the project. The required actions and recommended conditions of approval are outlined in Section E of this staff summary.

Project Background: The Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project was proposed in 1988 as a Tahoe City Community Plan demonstration project. This public works project is a water quality, traffic, and scenic improvement project for the core of Tahoe City. A draft EIR/EIS was prepared for the project in 1989. Also, at the same time another EIR/EIS was being circulated for the Tahoe City Community Plan. The Plan and the project became intertwined with controversy. Lawsuits were threatened. Without consensus on the Plan or the project, and after three meetings in 1991, the Advisory Planning Commission recommended TRPA action be deferred on the Community Plan until Placer County resolved the issues.

Although Placer County certified the project EIR in 1990, TRPA never took action on the EIS portion of the document. Further studies for drainage and traffic were conducted and numerous hearings were held. The County selected a preferred project (Alt. 13) for the drainage component based on the hearings and, prepared the Draft Subsequent EIR/EIS in 1993.

In the meantime, the TRPA Governing Board, dissatisfied with the lack of progress in community planning, directed staff to complete the Tahoe City Community Plan and bring it to the Board as soon as possible. In February 1994, the Governing Board (with the Advisory Planning Commission's recommendation) certified the Community Plan EIS/EIR and adopted the Community Plan. The Community Plan EIS/EIR (which was also circulated twice) addressed many of the larger planning/impact issues.

The concept of the urban improvement project is fundamental to the Community Plan. The broader planning issues were resolved with the adoption of the Community Plan. The urban improvement project is required and described in
Chapters IV and VII of the Community Plan. At this point, the project focuses on the details of the required improvements. This required urban improvement project is important to achieving environmental targets and is required to be approved and funded prior to TRPA releasing the Community Plan incentives, i.e., commercial floor area allocations.

In November 1993, the Advisory Planning Commission held a hearing to review the Draft Subsequent Project EIR/EIS. The Governing Board also reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS and took public testimony at their November, 1993 meeting. The public comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS began on September 24, 1993, and concluded on November 23, 1993.

The Placer County Board of Supervisors unanimously certified the Environmental Impact Report (Draft and Final) at their June 7, 1994 meeting. The TRPA Governing Board unanimously certified the EIR/EIS (Draft and Final) at their August 24, 1994 meeting.

Project Description: The proposed project involves three basic components of implementation. The three components (highway improvements, parking improvements, and drainage improvements) are discussed as follows:

PROPOSED PROJECT COMPONENT 1 - HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENT

Alternative 1: This component of the proposed project includes curb and gutter construction on both sides of Highway 28 from the intersection with Highway 89 to the Tahoe State Recreation Area. This component includes an overlay of this portion of Highway 28 and restriping to provide parallel parking, bike lanes on each side, one travel lane in each direction and a two-way center left turn lane. Also included is construction of interim asphalt sidewalks to facilitate drainage and the placement of existing overhead utility lines underground.

Due to the selection of Component 3 Alternative 11 (phased Storm Water Quality Improvements), Component 1 improvements will be phased with Highway 28 improvements from the intersection with Highway 89 to Grove Street as Phase A. The Highway 28 improvements from Grove Street to the Tahoe State Recreation Area will be Phase D. There are no Highway 28 improvements included in Phase B and Phase C has been eliminated.

PROPOSED PROJECT COMPONENT 2 - PARKING FACILITIES

Alternative 1 and 6: In the Draft Subsequent EIR/EIS Component 2 Alternative 1 was identified as the proponent preferred alternative. The proposed project now also includes Alternative 6 which involves the Tahoe Marina ("West End") public parking facility. Due to a change in funding, the public parking facilities are no longer being referred to as "Park and Ride" parking.
facilities. The proposed project now includes the 35 space Grove Street public parking facility, the 46 space Jack Pine Street public parking facility and the 12 space Tahoe Marina public parking facility.

PROPOSED PROJECT COMPONENT 3 - STORM WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

Alternative 11: In the Draft Subsequent EIR/EIS Alternative 13 was identified as the proponent preferred alternative. The proponent preferred alternative has now been changed to Alternative 11. Alternative 11 is a phased project consisting originally of four phases and currently consisting of three phases. Phase A includes Highway 28 and the commercial area from Grove Street to the "Y" along with Grove Street and the Tahoe Lake School. Phase A stormwater runoff will be collected by a system of curb, gutter and drainage inlets. The runoff will be conveyed to the "Payless" site via a "shallow" storm drain pipe behind the businesses. Treatment will be by a proposed 2-stage detention pond and wetland treatment area located on the "Payless" site. The drainage component also includes Highway 28 and the commercial properties on the north side of the Highway from Grove Street to the Tahoe State Recreation Area. The runoff from these areas will also be collected by a system of curb, gutter and drainage inlets. The runoff will then be conveyed to either the Tahoe State Recreation Area site or the "Texaco" site for treatment, once additional funding is secured. In the interim, the proposed drop inlets with sediment vaults will provide stormwater treatment. Due to the amount of area utilized for storm water treatment, Alternative 11 provides a level of treatment as high or higher than all alternatives studied.

Issues: The proposed project involves a project for which an EIS was prepared, a special use determination, additional coverage in excess of 1,000 square feet in land capability district 1b, and a public service facility involving over 3,000 square feet of land coverage, and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:

1. Environmental Impact Statement:

In August 1994, the Governing Board certified a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for this project. (The FEIS evaluated 8 alternatives for the highway improvements, 7 alternatives for the parking improvements and 15 alternatives for the drainage improvements.) The document has been certified as "technically adequate" by the Placer County Board of Supervisors in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Environmental mitigation measures were identified in the FEIS/FEIR and have been incorporated into the proposed TRPA permit. In general, the mitigation measures are designed to mitigate impacts to the following vegetation, wildlife, fisheries, cultural
resources, land use, timber management, fire management, traffic, air quality, noise, and socio-economic. In addition, several mitigation measures were also included to mitigate various concerns expressed by the public during the EIS/EIR comment period.

2. Identification of Impacts/Mitigation and Findings:

On the issue of findings required by the Compact prior to project approval, it appears that all impacts can be mitigated by the preferred project alternative. Therefore, the findings can be made without the need for an overriding socio/economic/technical finding.

3. Proven Test for Drainage System:

On the issue of meeting the community plan requirement for a proven area-wide drainage system, the data indicates that the preferred project alternative, as proposed with the permit conditions, has the ability to meet the proven test.

4. Consistency with the Community Plan:

The project, as proposed with the permit conditions, is consistent with the Community Plan. Approval and funding of this project shall qualify for the release of the incentives under Policy 1A of Chapter IV within the Tahoe City Community Plan.

5. Community Implementation and Responsibility:

The project conditions require, as project mitigation, that programs for sanding and salt, for monitoring, and for maintenance be included as part of the project approval. Also, the project conditions set forth the roles and responsibilities for BMPs for both private and public landowners.

Staff Analysis:

A. Environmental Documentation: The Governing Board certified an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this project in August, 1994. The proposed project is consistent with the preferred alternatives (Component 1, Alternative 1; Component 2, Alternatives 1 and 6; Component 3, Alternative 11) identified in the Revised Final EIS.
A copy of the Revised Final EIS was made available at the August, 1994 Governing Board hearing. Please refer to Exhibit B for a summary of the environmental mitigation measures listed in the document. These mitigation measures have been incorporated into the proposed project and the TRPA permit conditions.

B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within the Tahoe City Community Plan (Special Area 1 and Special Area 5). The Land Use Classification is Commercial/Public Service and the Management Strategy is Redirection. Agency staff has reviewed the subject Plan Areas and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed activities (Transportation Route, Runoff/Erosion Control, and Vehicle Parking) are listed as allowed uses for Special Areas 1 and 5, with Vehicle Parking listed as a special use within Special Area 1.

C. Land Coverage:

1. Land Capability District:

   The land capability district(s) of the project area are classes 1b, 3, and 5. The total project area is approximately 598,653 square feet.

2. Existing, Allowed and Proposed Land Coverage: Please refer to the land coverage matrix attached as Exhibit C.

3. Coverage Mitigation:

   The applicant will be required to mitigate new land coverage and existing excess land coverage within the project area by fee, restoration of existing disturbed low land capability lands, and/or through land coverage transfer consistent with Chapter 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

D. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 5, 6, 18, 20 and 64 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which each finding can be made.

1. Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the significant adverse environmental effects to a less than significant level.

   The proposed project and permit incorporates mitigation measures identified in the Revised Final EIS which avoid or reduce identified environmental effects to landforms, visual quality,
geology, water quality, vegetation, wildlife, fisheries, cultural resources, land use, timber management, fire management, traffic, air quality, noise and socio-economic resources to a less than significant level. In addition, several design related conditions have been added to the proposed permit to bring the project into conformance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

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

a. Land Use: The project is a permissible use in the subject plan area. Transferred land coverage associated with the project is to be created pursuant to Chapter 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

b. Transportation: The project will not generate any additional daily vehicle trip ends (dvte) within the project area. The preferred alternative for Components 1, 2 and 3 are consistent with the Tahoe City Community Plan for highway improvements, traffic and parking. Policy 2D indicates that improvements to State Route 28 are to include a minimum of three lanes and two bikeways. Where diagonal parking results in conflict with bicycles or through traffic, it will be converted to parallel parking, or eliminated. The project is consistent with Policy 2E. A parking management program is proposed to help mitigate current problems.

c. Conservation: The project is located along Scenic Roadway Unit 15 (Tahoe City) which is not in attainment. Areas of concern identified by the Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) include parking on roadway shoulders, parking access off the main roadway, little or no landscaping between buildings and the roadway, unpredictable traffic patterns due to parking on both sides of the roadway with a continuous center turn lane and overhead utility lines. The proposed project addresses these concerns by providing highway, parking, landscaping and utility improvements. There are no known special interest species, sensitive or uncommon plants or historic or cultural resources within the project area.

d. Recreation: The project proposes a Class II bike lane which is consistent with the recreation element.
e. Public Services and Facilities: The proposed project is included on the TRPA List of Additional Public Service Facilities. The project will capture and treat the 20 year, 1 hour volume of the urban runoff within the project area which currently reaches Lake Tahoe with little or no treatment.

f. Implementation: This project does not require any allocations of development. All transfers of land coverage shall be in accordance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

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

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled "Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings" in accordance with Chapter 5, Subsection 5.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the APC/GB hearing and at TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

5. The project to which the use pertains, is of such a nature, scale, density, intensity and type to be an appropriate use for the parcel on which, and surrounding area in which, it will be located.

The proposed parking lot improvements will be located within an area already used for parking. The improvements include paving, curbs, striping of parking spaces, storm water treatment and perimeter landscaping.

6. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners.
The applicant will provide a paved parking surface to replace the uncontrolled dirt parking area. The paved designated parking lots will provide more efficient access for the parking of motor vehicles. Temporary and permanent BMPs will be applied to the site providing water quality treatment, and the proposed pavement will reduce dust and provide storm water treatment.

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

The proposed parking area is located within the Tahoe City Community Plan, Special Area 1, which has identified vehicle parking lots as a special use. The area has previously been used as an uncontrolled dirt parking area for the commercial businesses to the west. The proposed use is consistent with the Community Plan permissible uses.

8. **The project is on the list of additional public service facilities.**

The Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project was added to the TRPA List of Additional Public Service Facilities.

9. **There is no feasible alternative that would reduce land coverage.**

The project EIR/EIS identified all feasible alternatives. The proposed project alternative has the least impact of all alternatives considered in the EIS.

10. **The project, because of its unusual configuration or service requirement, requires special consideration.**

The project, as proposed, provides the necessary traffic, parking and water quality improvements as specified in the Tahoe City Community Plan.

11. **The facility primarily serves the needs of persons other than those who are, or will be, residents of the lands in question, or the owners of the land in question.**

The proposed parking lots, highway improvements, and water quality improvements will be public and maintained by Placer County and Caltrans.
12. The project, program, or facility is necessary for environmental protection.

The project, as proposed, provides the required water quality and traffic circulation improvements as identified in the 208 Plan and the Tahoe City Community Plan.

13. There is no reasonable alternative, including relocation, which avoids or reduces the extent of encroachment in the stream environment zone.

The project EIR/EIS discussed all feasible alternatives to locating the detention pond/wetlands treatment area within the project area. The water quality treatment basins are the minimum size necessary to provide the required storm water treatment for the project area.

14. Impacts are fully mitigated and, if applicable, transferred land coverage requirements pursuant to 20.3.C(2)(e) are met.

All new land coverage will be transferred in accordance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All new disturbance, relocated land coverage and new land coverage will be mitigated by restoring 1.5:1 of stream environment zone land.

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

All land coverage to be relocated will remain within the same land capability class.

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

All areas of removed land coverage shall be revegetated with TRPA approved vegetation species.

17. The relocation is not to Land Capability Districts 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, or 3, from any higher numbered land capability district.

All land coverage to be relocated will remain within the same land capability district.

18. If the relocation is from one portion of a stream environment zone to another portion, there is a net environmental benefit to the stream environment zone.
The project EIR/EIS discussed the water quality benefits to stream environment zone and Lake Tahoe. The coverage relocation for the detention pond is the minimum size and area necessary to provide water quality treatment for the project area.

19. It is a necessary measure for the protection or improvement of water quality.

The detention pond basin excavation is the minimum necessary to provide adequate volume for the required storm water treatment.

20. Article VII(d) Findings for the Project: These findings are made and based upon the administrative record of the EIS/EIR and the Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project, including other documents prepared pursuant to the Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project. A summary of impacts and mitigations is provided in the EIS/EIR Executive Summary (Exhibit B). These findings are also based on the Regional Plan Package and supporting environmental documents, including but not limited to the Goals and Policies, the 1988 TRPA 208 Plan, the 1991 RTP, and the EISs for said documents.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on EARTH AND SOILS identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to land coverage and soils disturbance will provide mitigation for soils impacts. In addition, the CP sets forth coverage and disturbance reduction targets and a related CIP to further mitigate impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to water quality will provide mitigation for soil impacts. In addition the area wide water quality improvement project and SEZ restoration projects are required as part of this project.
With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on AIR QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: There are no identified air quality impacts associated with this project. Compliance with the Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to air quality will provide assurances that no adverse impacts will occur.

With respect to the significant and possibly significant effects on TRANSPORTATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to transportation will provide mitigation for transportation impacts. The project proposes to attain VMT and LOS targets. Parking, VMT, and LOS mitigation measures are listed in the EIS.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on VEGETATION, WILDLIFE, AND FISHERIES identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

Rationale: There are no impacts identified with vegetation, wildlife and fisheries for the project improvements.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on NOISE identified in the EIS changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effect to a less than significant level.

Rationale: The additional noise levels identified will be mitigated through compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements. The project does list noise targets and strategies to attain the targets.
With respect to the possibly significant effects on RECREATION identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** There are no direct impacts to recreation identified. Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to recreation will provide mitigation for unidentified impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SCENIC QUALITY identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** The project proposes scenic targets and strategies to attain the targets. The project proposes Design Standards and Guidelines to address scenic improvement measures.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on LIGHT AND GLARE identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements and the new Design Standards and Guidelines relating to light and glare will provide mitigation for those impacts.

With respect to the possibly significant effects on SAFETY AND RISK OF UPSET identified in the EIS, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project which avoid or reduce the potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

**Rationale:** All safety impacts will be fully mitigated through design implementation and project conditions.

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

1. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section D above, and a mitigated finding of no significant environmental effect.
II. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, and the certified Final Environmental Impact Statement subject to the following conditions:

(1) The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment Q.

(2) All conditions of approval and environmental mitigation measures identified for the preferred alternative in the Revised Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) are hereby incorporated into this permit. Any modification to the FEIS shall also require modification to the conditions contained in this permit, if applicable. The permittee shall agree, by acknowledging this permit, that responses to comments contained in the FEIS are enforceable as permit conditions of approval.

(3) Prior to commencement of construction the following special conditions of approval must be satisfied:

(a) The site plan shall be revised to include:

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

(ii) Temporary erosion control structures located downslope of the proposed construction area.

(iii) Vegetation protective fencing around the entire construction site.

(b) The applicant shall mitigate excess land coverage on this property by submitting an excess coverage mitigation fee, or by removing coverage within Hydrologic Transfer Area Number 8.

The excess coverage mitigation fee shall be calculated as follows:

(i) Estimated Project Construction Cost of the parking facilities x .0275.
Excess land coverage may be removed in lieu of an excess coverage mitigation fee. To calculate the amount of excess coverage to be removed use the following formula:

(ii) Excess coverage mitigation fee (per formula (1), above) divided by $5.00 per square foot.

If you choose this option, please revise your final site plan and land calculations to account for the coverage removal.

(c) Applicant shall transfer 12,730 square feet of coverage to the project area for the construction of the parking facilities. (Note all coverage transfers must be in compliance with Chapter 20 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the TRPA Rules of Procedure.)

(d) The final construction drawings shall have notes indicating conformance to the following design standards for color, and fences:

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

(ii) Fences: Wooden fences shall be used whenever possible. If cyclone fence must be used, it shall be coated with dark brown or black vinyl, including fence poles.

(e) The permittee shall provide a landscape plan and fertilizer management plan for the Tahoe Marina Parking Facility and the Detention Pond/Wetlands Treatment Area in accordance with the standards required in Sections 30.7 and 81.7 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances for TRPA review and approval.
(i) The landscape plan for the detention pond/wetlands area shall be designed by a licensed landscape architect with wetlands restoration specialization. The plan shall include, but not be limited to: relocation of the maintenance access from Highway 28 to the Lucky's parking area; diversified species selection; clustered tree planting throughout the site to blend the site with the existing background vegetation, to provide a filtered view of the wetland from the southerly edge of the site, and to provide screening of adjacent development on the easterly and westerly edges of the wetland as viewed from Highway 28 and Highway 89; and irregular grade variation of the wetlands treatment area.

(ii) The landscape plan for the Tahoe Marina Parking Facility shall include, but not be limited to: clustered tree and shrub planting to screen the parking area from Highway 28 and the lake; incorporation of the sidewalk and the bus stop shelter within the landscape area.

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

(g) The applicant shall obtain all required approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Review Board, California Department of Fish and Game, California Department of Transportation, and the California State Lands Commission for this project.

(h) The applicant shall submit 3 sets of final construction drawings and site plans to TRPA.

(4) Fertilizer use on this property shall be managed to include the appropriate type of fertilizer, rate, and frequency of application to avoid release of excess nutrients and minimize use of fertilizer.
Excavation equipment shall be limited to the construction easements to minimize site disturbance.

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

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

Any normal construction activities creating noise in excess of the TRPA noise standards shall be considered exempt from said standards provided all such work in conducted between the hours of 8:00 A.M. and 6:30 P.M.

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

The applicant shall submit post-construction photos of the detention pond and wetlands area within 30 days of the project completion date, demonstrating any resultant impacts to scenic quality as viewed from Highway 28.

The permittee is responsible for insuring that the project, as built, does not exceed the approved land coverage figures shown on the site plan. The approved land coverage figures shall supersede scaled drawings when discrepancies occur.

The permittee shall submit a salting and sanding program for the entire project area for TRPA review and approval prior to acknowledgement of this permit.

The permittee shall submit to TRPA for review and approval a maintenance program for the proposed facilities to ensure proper functioning of the proposed improvements. Said maintenance program shall include funding responsibilities.
(14) The permittee shall submit to TRPA for review and approval a water quality monitoring program which includes; pre-construction monitoring, post-construction monitoring, and monitoring locations and criteria. If water quality monitoring demonstrates non-compliance with the TRPA water quality standards, additional mitigation programs may be required.

(15) The permittee shall submit to TRPA for review and approval a traffic management plan for all traffic circulation impacts during construction.

(16) The permittee shall submit to TRPA for review and approval construction access locations and necessary construction easements for all construction activities. Said construction plan shall include all construction staging areas and type of construction equipment to be utilized.

(17) Parallel parking within the Highway 28 project area shall be implemented no later than May 1, 1998. Two hour parking limit signs shall be located along the Highway 28 parallel parking spaces.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>Construction Impacts</td>
<td>All contractors shall adhere to standard engineering and construction methods. All contractors shall follow all applicable criteria of the Uniform Building Code (UBC). All construction equipment shall be equipped with proper muffling devices and spark arresters. The construction areas shall be periodically dampened to control fugitive dust. During any construction activity, all vehicles shall drive at speeds below 15 mph when traveling on exposed surfaces. During any construction activity, the period of time in which any particular area remains exposed shall be limited, the extent feasible. All construction equipment shall receive periodic maintenance as required for efficient operation to reduce engine emissions. Use of any explosives for excavation purposes shall be in accordance with federal, state and local laws to ensure the highest degree of safety for protection from injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality and Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td>The project shall be conditioned to include the following: 1) A Site and sanitary program for the project area. 2) A maintenance program for the project including maintenance and funding responsibilities. 3) A monitoring program that includes pre-construction monitoring, post-construction monitoring, monitoring locations and monitoring criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 1</strong> (&lt;br&gt;Proposed Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two travel lanes (center left turn lane)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Elimination of diagonal parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Addition of parallel parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporary A.C. sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minor soil disturbance during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Noise during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased air pollution and fugitive dust during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased traffic congestion and reduced access to properties facing the Highway during construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adherence to temporary erosion control plan including dust control prepared in accordance with TRPA and Placer County standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All construction equipment shall be equipped with proper muffling devices and spark arresters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Between the hours of 9:00pm and 6:00am, noise levels from construction activities shall not exceed 65 DBA at a distance of 50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All construction equipment shall receive periodic maintenance as required for efficient operation to reduce engine emissions. Dust control through regular watering and good housekeeping procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic congestion occurring during the construction phase will be mitigated with the implementation of a traffic control plan including proper signing and trained flag personnel. The traffic control plan will be updated weekly and traffic signing and flag personnel will be submitted to Caltrans and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for approval. The traffic control plan will include the following elements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) All Highway 28 construction activities will be halted between Thursday at 5:00pm and Tuesday at 8:00am for the Memorial Day, Independence Day and Labor Day holiday weekends. All construction equipment shall be moved off the highway and all trenches shall be covered sufficiently for safe vehicle usage during these periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Advisory signs, including any anticipated delay periods, shall be posted at the following locations during construction activity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Highway 89 near the interstate 80/89 interchange/exit ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Highway 267 near the highway 267/280 intersection and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Highway 89 at least 1 mile south of the Highway 280 &quot;T&quot; junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Flyers will be distributed to every business operator in Tahoe City on a weekly basis with information on the anticipated construction activities for the following week. A construction superintendent name and phone number will also be provided so that business operators can call for information on alternative access points to their businesses during the construction week. Other unannounced access will not always be possible every effort will be made to provide access from at least one travel lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storm water runoff from impervious surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduced parking in the State right-of-way to 75 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduced number of nearby parking spaces for customers of some &quot;west end&quot; businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water Quality and Drainage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed project component number 1 (Storm Water Quality Improvements)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Since no increase in coverage is proposed, no increase in storm water volume is expected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposed project component number 2 (Public Parking Facilities): adding 98 spaces with the Grove Street and Jack Pine Street parking facilities and the Alternative 2 Tahoe Martinez parking. These parking facilities shall be completed prior to removing the diagonal parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Posting two hour time limit on parallel parking space in the highway right-of-way of an equivalent mitigation program that will help ensure that these spaces are available for customer parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide storm water treatment facilities for runoff from the 20 year 1 hour design storm runoff from Components 1 and 2 of the proposed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS (cont)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proposed Preferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water Quality and Drainage impacts:**

- On and off-street traffic will be installed in the drainage system collectors and a routine maintenance program will be implemented to ensure that these structures function as designed.
- The County Service Area of the Department of Public Works will replant vegetation in the wetland area, detention basin, and parking area landscape planters when warranted.
- Temporary water quality measures listed in the TRPA's "Handbook of Best Management Practices - Chapter VII: Temporary Runoff Management" will be installed during construction.
- Typical measures include placement of straw bales and inlet fences, and temporary sediment basins in construction zones. If construction activities are suspended for an extended period, vegetation of bare soil areas will be provided.
- Any water removed from utility trenches will be filtered prior to being released into drainage courses so that sediments do not reach Lake Tahoe.
- Sand applied to road surfaces must either be removed by sweeping operations or it will be transported by runoff to deposition areas, stream courses, the Truckee River of Lake Tahoe. Salts, depending on their chemical composition, will eventually dissolve or suspend in solution and be transported by runoff. Some vegetation species have high tolerances to elevated salinity concentrations with the ability to assimilate salt into the plant cells and thereby translocate the salt into the local water bodies. By minimizing the use of road salts, placing snow pile areas where runoff can be collected and properly selecting plant species for their salt tolerant characteristics, the numerical discharge limits of Lahontan and TRPA can be satisfied.
- Snow plowing and removal operations in the Tahoe City area are conducted by a number of public and private contractors, including Caltrans, Placer County, and private contractors. Current Caltrans is responsible for plowing State Route 28 and 28A. Operational procedures vary depending on the amount of snowfall, but Caltrans generally plows snow to the edge of the travel lane on Highway 28. During clear weather, Caltrans will remove the snow from the travel lane to either undeveloped portions of the right-of-way, to Common Beach, to Tahoe State Recreation Area or to the Caltrans maintenance yard.
- The proposed Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project will include designation for snow storage areas in accordance with TRPA's Code of Ordinance Sections 31.5.C. and Section 31.6. For the Highway 28 improvement projects, snow storage will continue to occur on the edge of the right-of-way and the center turn lane. Portions of the old 12 mile lane will also provide snow storage areas, leaving two travel lanes in each direction free for vehicle traffic.
- The combined snow storage capacity on Highway 28 and at the parking facilities is sufficient to accommodate all the plowed snow from the project facilities. The location of the snow storage areas will allow for water quality treatment of the melting snow since the storage areas are above or adjacent to the drainage collection point. The melting snow will therefore be directed to the drainage collection points where sediment removal and biological treatment can occur, then into the constructed wetland where further biological treatment can occur.
- All mitigation measures associated with Component 1, Alternative 1 plus the following:
  - Additional impacts:
    - Possibly more traffic congestion due to bottlenecks at either end of town where highway changes from four lanes to two lanes.
  - This impact would be difficult or impossible to mitigate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS (cont.)</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2 cont.</td>
<td>Possible more runoff from impervious surfaces; Possibly greater reduction of parking in the State right-of-way</td>
<td>Additional storm water quality treatment facility; Additional public parking spaces outside the State right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Elimination of the turning lane</td>
<td>All impacts associated with Component 1 Alternative 1 plus the following impacts: Increased traffic congestion due to cars having to wait behind a car making a left turn off the highway; Possibly less runoff from impervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>Elimination of the proposed bike lanes</td>
<td>All impacts associated with Component 1 Alternative 1 plus the following impacts: Increased traffic congestion due to &quot;sloped&quot; from overpass sharing the travel lane with autos and possible safety hazard; Possibly less runoff from impervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td>Elimination of all on-street parking</td>
<td>All impacts associated with Component 1 Alternative 1 plus the following impacts: Possibly less traffic congestion due to reduced &quot;sloped&quot; from overpass sharing the travel lane with autos and possible safety hazard; Possibly less runoff from impervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 6</td>
<td>Providing Portland Cement Concrete (P.C.C.) or paving stone sidewalks with street furniture, landscaping and lighting instead of the proposed temporary asphalt sidewalk to facilitate drainage</td>
<td>Greater reduction of parking in the State right-of-way; Possibly less traffic congestion due to reduced &quot;sloped&quot; from overpass sharing the travel lane with autos and possible safety hazard; Possibly less runoff from impervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 7</td>
<td>Leaving additional existing diagonal parking in place with an interim striping plan</td>
<td>Minor soil disturbance during construction; Noise during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3: cont.</td>
<td>Noise during construction cont.</td>
<td>Between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., noise levels from construction activities shall not exceed 80 DBA at a distance of 50 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased air pollution during construction</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall receive periodic maintenance as required to protect the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased traffic congestion and reduced access to properties fronting the Highway during construction</td>
<td>Traffic congestion occurring during the construction phase will be mitigated with the implementation of a traffic control plan including proper signing and trained flag personnel. The traffic control plan will be submitted to California and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for approval. The traffic control plan will include the following elements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. All Highway 28 construction activities will be halted between Thursday at 5 p.m. and Tuesday at 8 a.m. for the Memorial Day, Independence Day and Labor Day holiday weekends. All construction equipment shall be moved out of the highway and all trenches shall be covered sufficiently for safe vehicle usage during these periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Advisory signs included any anticipated delay periods shall be posted at the following locations during construction activity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Highway 28 near the interstate 80 / S. 89 southbound off-ramp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Highway 28 near the Highway 267 / 28 intersection, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Highway 28 at least 3 miles north of the Highway 28 / 89 &quot;Y&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storm water runoff from impervious surfaces</td>
<td>Proposed project component number 1 (Storm Water Quality Improvement) (Since no increase in coverage is proposed no increase in storm water volume is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water quality and drainage</td>
<td>Provide storm water treatment facilities for runoff from the 20 year 1 hour design storm runoff from Components 1 and 2 of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oils and grease trap will be installed in the drainage system collector and a routine maintenance program will be implemented to ensure that these structures function as designed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The County Service Area or Department of Public Works will plant vegetation in the wetland area, detention basin, and parking area landscape planters when warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary water quality measures listed in the TRPA &quot;Handbook of Best Management Practices - Chapter VII: Temporary Runoff Management&quot; will be installed during construction. Typical measures include placement of straw bales and filter fences, and temporary sediment basins in construction zone. If construction activities are suspended for an extended period, revegetation of bare soil areas will be provided. Any water removed from utility trenches will be filtered prior to being released into drainage courses so that sediments do not reach Lake Tahoe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 1: HIGHWAY 28 IMPROVEMENTS (cont)</td>
<td>Water quality and drainage concerns: Sand applied to road surfaces must either be removed by sweeping operations or it will be transported by runoff to downstream areas, stream courses, the Truckee River or Lake Tahoe. Salt, depending on its chemical composition, will eventually dissolve and be transported by runoff. Some vegetation species have high tolerances to elevated salt concentrations; with the ability to assimilate salt ions into the plant cells and thereby reduce the salt entering the local water bodies. By minimizing the use of road salts, placing snow in areas where runoff can be collected and properly treating plant species for their salt tolerance characteristics, the numerous discharge limits of Lahontan and TRPA can be satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 8: “no project, leaving the existing Highway 28 as is”</td>
<td>Compared to the proposed project (Alternative 1), the no project alternative would have the following impacts: Increased traffic congestion Continued traffic hazard created by cars backing into the travel lane when un-parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 2: PUBLIC PARKING FACILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proponent: Preferred)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered aesthetics and environmental issues during construction.</td>
<td>Noise during construction.</td>
<td>Same as component 1, Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor traffic disruption during construction.</td>
<td>Increased air pollution, as well as traffic congestion during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor removal of existing vegetation and creation of construction debris.</td>
<td>Visual impacts.</td>
<td>Dispose of waste in accordance with all local, State and Federal regulations and re-vegetate all areas disturbed by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic on Grove Street and Jack Pine Street.</td>
<td>Storm water runoff from impervious surfaces.</td>
<td>Install proposed landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased STP and pavement failure at the Jack Pine Street and Tanque Verde parking facilities.</td>
<td>Parking availability for Highway U.S. 70 businesses.</td>
<td>The provision of all-street parking facilities accessible via Grove Street and Jack Pine Street will increase traffic volumes approaching State Route 28 on these roadways, leading to a step increase in emissions. The provision of a traffic signal and a traffic control officer in peak periods at either or both of these intersections would yield an adequate level of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic volumes approaching State Route 28 on Grove Street and Jack Pine Street.</td>
<td>TCPUD Parks and Recreation liability associated with softball/baseball damage to cars.</td>
<td>A stop sign will be required at the exit driveway from the Grove Street and Jack Pine Street &quot;Park and Ride&quot; Parking Facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed project component number 3 (Storm Water Quality Improvement) on an as needed basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District usage of Grove Street parking lot site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Grove Street, Jack Pine Street and the Tanque Verde parking facilities allow for more parking than currently available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 2: PUBLIC PARKING FACILITIES (CONT.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District of existing underground surface coverage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality &amp; Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place County will pay fair market value for the Grove Street parking facility site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronthis storm water treatment facilities for runoff from the 20-year 1-hour storm design storm runoff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract either a rock-lined, natural appearing channel or provide an underground pipe system to convey runoff from the proposed parking area to the proposed interceptor pipe. The exact method of conveyance will be chosen by the engineer and the method will be in compliance with Place County Drainage, Grading and Erosion Control ordinances and the Florida Handbook of Best Management Practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary water quality measures listed in the Florida Handbook of Best Management Practices. Chapter VII, &quot;Temporary Erosion Management,&quot; will be installed during construction. Typical measures include placement of straw bales and filter fabric. The temporary structure is to be removed when the construction activities have ended. Any water removed from the site will be filtered to prevent it from being released into drainage courses so that sediment does not reach the Lagoon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow storage for the Grove Street parking facility will occur in the landscaped area and adjacent stream environment zone area on the northwest edge of the parking area. The landscaping for the parking facility will be selected for its ability to have excessive weeds planted upon it and for soil tolerances characteristics. The snow placed in the storage area will be moved by front end loaders only, which will operate from the parking lot pavement area. No vehicles will be allowed to enter the landscaped area or the adjacent stream environment zone. Lagoon staff generates water from stream environment areas and other areas of storage locations, as long as vehicle access is limited since wetland vegetation can prevent water from the parking area. Snow will be placed during the winter months to provide parking on a year-round basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow storage at the park Site parking facilities will occur in the areas which will remain open or undeveloped area. The available snow storage area would be approximately 16,000 square feet. Front end loaders will be employed to move excessive snow and operation will be restricted to avoid driving onto the open area. If possible, the Park Site parking facility will not be plowed on a regular basis, depending upon the available parking in other areas of the City. Snow will be placed during the winter months to provide parking on a year-round basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The combined snow storage capacity on Highway 28 and at the parking facilities is sufficient to accommodate all the plowed snow from the project facilities. The location of the snow storage areas will allow for water quality treatment of the melting snow since the storage area is adjacent to the drainage interceptor collection points. Melting snow will be directed to the drainage detention pond where sediment removal and water quality treatment can occur, then into the constructed wetland where further biological treatment can occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 2: PUBLIC PARKING FACILITIES (cont.)</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>increasing the number of parking spaces at the Grove Street parking facility</td>
<td>Creation of new impervious coverage on low capability S/L. Possible surface and public safety impact caused by pedestrians crossing Highway to get to and from the Tahoe Marina public parking facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>incorporating a Full Connector Road into the Grove Street parking facility</td>
<td>All the impacts associated with Component 2 Alternative 1 plus the following additional impacts: Creation of new impervious coverage on low capability S/L. Additional runoff from impervious surfaces. More traffic on Grove Street. Land use impact on Tahoe City Golf Course. Increased noise at the back of commercial area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>incorporating a Limited Connector Road into the Grove Street parking facilities</td>
<td>Same as Component 2: Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td>decreasing the number of parking spaces at the Jack Pine or Grove Street parking facility</td>
<td>All the impacts associated with Component 2: Alternative 1 with the following reduced impact: Storm water runoff from impervious surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 7</td>
<td>no project (do not provide any public parking outside the Highway right-of-way)</td>
<td>Erosion from cars continuing to park on compacted dirt surface. Possible increase in VMT if more time is spent driving around looking for parking space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPONENT 3: STORM WATER COLLECTION AND DRAINAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 11</td>
<td>Non disturbance during construction</td>
<td>Adherence to a temporary erosion control plan prepared in accordance with TRPA and Placer County standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>Noise during construction</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall be equipped with proper muffling devices and spark arresters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Increased air pollution during construction</td>
<td>Between the hours of 9:00 AM and 6:00 AM, noise levels from construction activities shall not exceed 80 dBA at a distance of 50 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased traffic congestion and reduced access to properties along the highway during construction</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall receive periodic maintenance as required for efficient operation to reduce engine emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic congestion occurring during the construction phase will be mitigated with the implementation of a traffic control plan including signs, signs, and trained flag personnel: The traffic control plan will be submitted to Caltrans and the Placer Regional Planning Agency for approval. The traffic control plan will include the following elements:**

1) **All Highway 29 construction activities will be halted between Thursday at 3:00 PM and Tuesday at 6:00 AM on the Memorial Day, Independence Day and Labor Day holiday weekends. All construction equipment shall be removed from the highway and all traffic shall be covered sufficiently for safe vehicle usage during these periods.**

2) **Advance signs, including any anticipated delays, shall be posted at the following locations during construction activities:**
   a) Highway 29 near the Interstate 80 NE-89 Southbound off ramp,
   b) Highway 29 near the highway 267/29 intersection; and
   c) Highway 29 at least 5 miles south of the Highway 29/80 interchange.

3) **Flyers will be distributed to every business operation in town.** Caltrans will provide a weekly flyer with information on the anticipated construction activity. The following were construction superintendent’s name and phone number will also be provided to the business operators. A call-in number for information on alternative access points to their businesses during the construction work. While unrestricted access will not always be possible, every effort will be made to provide vehicle access from at least one travel lane.

**Land use impact:**

**Visual quality for Texas and State Park:**

**Water quality and drainage:**

**Land used for storm water treatment facilities would not be available for other uses. Other use would be located on other sites.**

**These sites will require less grading and berms than the "Pavics" site and will have much less impact.** All impacts will be mitigated with landscaping:

The detention pond outlet works will be at an elevation to provide both sufficient storage capability and detention times. Sizing for this facility will include the ability to determine the post development 20 year 1 hour storm runoff, pass the 100 year 24 hour storm, and retain an increased sediment.

The detention pond will be designed to allow some of the pollutants contained in storm water runoff to settle out prior to release of runoff water to the wetland treatment area. The detention pond should be cleaned out and debris disposed of properly on an annual, or more frequent, basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 3: Storm Water Collection and Drainage Treatment System (cont.)</td>
<td>Water quality and drainage control</td>
<td>Construct a wetland treatment area to provide additional water quality treatment of infiltrated runoff prior to discharge into the Truckee River. All grading, terracing, and vegetation planting shall be approved by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. A water quality monitoring program will be established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The wetland treatment area will be designed for a minimum 24-hour residence time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>All topsoil and excavated during construction activities will be stockpiled and stabilized for replacement and revegetation in the wetland treatment areas. All debris, trash, excavation spoils, oil and grease, and moved vegetation generated during construction activities or during project maintenance activities will be transported to the Placer County sanitary landfill or other approved location in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations for the disposal of wastes. The County Service Area of Department of Public Works will re-plant vegetation in the wetland area, detention basin, and parking area landscape planters when warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The County Service Area of Department of Public Works maintenance operations will be conducted to avoid any heavy equipment operations in the wetland treatment areas or functioning stream environment zones. Sediment removal from the detention pond will be conducted with small, lightweight front-end loaders similar to the &quot;Hobart&quot; type of equipment. An eight-foot wide maintenance access will be constructed into the detention pond area. Maintenance vehicles will travel on front-end loaders, which are utilized for snow removal operations; equipment operation will be restricted in writing to avoid disturbing the stream environment zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary water quality measures listed in the TRPA &quot;Handbook of Best Management Practices - Chapter VII, Temporary Runoff Management&quot; will be installed during construction. Typical measures include placement of straw bales and filter bales, and temporary sediment basins in construction zones. Road construction activities are suspended for an extended period. Revegetation of bare soil areas will be provided. Erosion control measures will be installed prior to being released into drainageways so that sediments do not reach the Tahoe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project will be phased so that the permanent water quality treatment facilities, interceptors, detention basins, and wetland treatment area are in place to serve the other project components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road surfaces must either be removed by sweeping operations or will be transported by runoff to deposition areas, stream courses the Truckee River or Lake Tahoe. Sediments, depending on their chemical composition, will eventually dissolve or suspend in solution and be transported by runoff. Some vegetation species have high tolerances to elevated salt concentrations, with the ability to assimilate salts into the plant cells and thereby reduce the salt entering the local water bodies. By minimizing the use of road salts, placing snow piles in areas where runoff can be collected and properly selecting plant species for their salt tolerance characteristics, the numerical discharge limits of Lahontan and TRPA can be satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 3: STORM WATER COLLECTION AND DRAINAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM (CONT.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>MITIGATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proponent: Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td>Public safety impact caused by depth of &quot;Pavies&quot; detention pond</td>
<td>Snow removal or storage operations are not proposed or required for the constructed wetland and detention pond on the &quot;Pavies&quot; site. Some limited quantities of snow may be pushed or blown into the area by Caltrans operations, but active relocation of snow to the wetland treatment area is discouraged since early melting of onsite snow is essential for water quality treatment processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual impact caused by fencing around &quot;Pavies&quot; detention pond</td>
<td>Fencing around detention pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible groundwater contamination from stormwater in &quot;Pavies&quot; detention pond</td>
<td>Landscape screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impervious surface coverage created by &quot;Pavies&quot; detention pond impermeable liner</td>
<td>Provide detention pond with an impermeable liner or remove coverage and restore offsite SEL area equal to 1.3 times area of new coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible Failure of &quot;Pavies&quot; detention pond impermeable liner due to hydrostatic pressure caused by groundwater uplift</td>
<td>Remove coverage and restore offsite SEL area equal to 1.3 times area of new SEL coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interception and discharge of groundwater caused if a subsurface drainage system under &quot;Pavies&quot; detention pond is required</td>
<td>Provide a subsurface drainage system or provide a liner design that will not fail because of groundwater uplift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor soil disturbance during construction</td>
<td>It necessary monitor the quality of the intercepted groundwater to verify it meets standards for discharge as surface water to the Truckee River. If the intercepted groundwater does not meet standards, pump it into the detention pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise during construction</td>
<td>Adherence to a temporary erosion control plan including dust control prepared in accordance with TRPA and Placer County standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased air pollution and fugitive dust during construction</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall be equipped with proper muffling devices and spark arresters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil disturbances during construction</td>
<td>Between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM, noise levels from construction activities shall not exceed 65 DBA at a distance of 50 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise during construction</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall receive periodic maintenance as required for efficient operation to reduce engine emissions. Dust control through regular watering and good housekeeping procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased air pollution during construction</td>
<td>Adherence to a temporary erosion control plan prepared in accordance with TRPA and Placer County standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Deep&quot; interceptor pipe in Highway 28</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall be equipped with proper muffling devices and spark arresters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detention pond and wetland treatment area on &quot;Pavies&quot; site</td>
<td>Between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM, noise levels from construction activities shall not exceed 65 DBA at a distance of 50 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil disturbances during construction</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall receive periodic maintenance as required for efficient operation to reduce engine emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise during construction</td>
<td>Adherence to a temporary erosion control plan prepared in accordance with TRPA and Placer County standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased air pollution during construction</td>
<td>All construction equipment shall be equipped with proper muffling devices and spark arresters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table entries are assumed to be placeholders as the actual content is not clearly visible.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPONENT 3: STORM WATER COLLECTION AND DRAINAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM (cont.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 3: STORM WATER COLLECTION AND DRAINAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM (CONT.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPONENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative b: Deep interceptor pipe to Highway 28, &quot;Lakeside&quot; storm drain pump station. Detention pond and wetland treatment area on Tahoe City Golf Course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 3: STORM WATER COLLECTION AND DRAINAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM (CONT.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPONENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 3: STORM WATER COLLECTION AND DRAINAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPONENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 13 (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 2, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendments of Chapters 2, 4, 13, 43, and Other Related Amendments to Limit Subdivisions and Urban Uses to Existing Urban Areas, to set criteria for Subdivisions in Preferred Affordable Housing Areas, and to Set Criteria for Adding Multi-Family Residential Uses to Plan Areas.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is to amend the subdivision provisions of the Code and other related provisions to direct the location of new and transferred development to areas within urban boundaries. The amendments are summarized below and provided in detail in the adopting ordinance (Attachment A).

1. Clarify Definition of Urban Boundary: The first amendment would move the definition of “urban area” from Subsection 41.2.K to Chapter 2 (Definitions).

2. Clarify Use of Existing Urban Areas in Regards to Post-1987 Project Subdivision: The second amendment would amend Subsection 43.4.A (Subdivision of Post-1987 Projects) to permit subdivisions only within urban areas existing on December 31, 1994 or as amended pursuant to Section 13.7 (PAS Amendments).

3. Limit Subdivisions in Preferred Affordable Housing Areas: The third amendment would amend Subsection 43.4.F to prohibit approval of residential subdivisions after December 31, 1995 if the local government has not demonstrated to the TRPA Governing Board its commitment to assume its fair share responsibility to provide affordable housing.

4. Add Findings for the Expansion of Urban Boundaries and Uses: The fourth amendment would add findings to Section 13.7 (Plan Area Statements and Plan Area Maps) regulating the changes of urban boundaries. Also, the addition of multifamily uses to any PAS would require a finding that the area is suitable for transit oriented development.
Staff Recommendation: TRPA staff recommends that the APC recommend approval of the proposed amendments.

Background: At the October Advisory Planning Commission meeting, staff presented a process to form a working group of local planners, local housing experts, and concerned citizens to help advise TRPA on the resolution of three issues resulting from the recent settlement of litigation regarding the Douglas County Community Plans. The issues are related to the following three objectives of the TRPA Regional Plan.

Objective #1: To preserve parcels for multifamily development (primarily affordable and moderate cost housing) which have good access (roads, transit, and walking) to jobs and services.

Objective #2: To assist in the direction of new and transferred development to the areas within urban boundaries by limiting the approval of new subdivisions to such areas.

Objective #3: To direct new and transferred development into land use patterns that concentrate such development in existing urbanized areas, that promote transit/pedestrian modes of transportation, that make efficient use of existing infrastructure, that promote conservation of the Basin's limited resources, and generally help achieve the thresholds.

The schedule that was presented to the APC indicated that TRPA was first to deal with how "to direct the location of new and transferred development to areas within urban boundaries." The results of the meeting were presented to the Advisory Planning Commission in November. The other issues regarding affordable/multifamily housing/subdivisions were to be considered in December.

A workshop was held on October 24, 1994 with a number of interested persons on both sides of the issues. The APC reviewed the draft amendments and suggested changes to the boundary findings which are now included in the attached ordinance.

A second workshop was scheduled for November 17, but was cancelled because of snow. Staff held an informal meeting on December 1. The attached ordinance reflects the suggestions made at that meeting. The following is a summary of the concerns expressed.

The League to Save Lake Tahoe expressed concerns about development expanding beyond the existing urban boundary and for affordable housing being used for other subdivisions which may result in pressure to expand urban boundaries to meet affordable housing needs.

A representative from the California Attorney General's office noted issues concerning implementation of the subdivision policies in the 208 Plan. It was their position that the amendments will require a 208 Plan amendment.
Property owner representatives indicated a need to be flexible and questioned the need for additional regulation. There is a major concern for the ability of property owners to develop subdivisions, especially in the Incline area.

Local planners were also concerned about the flexibility for approving PAS amendments, and the affordable housing issue. The Washoe County representative did not see the need to link subdivisions with affordable housing because the County was working on affordable housing plans and programs currently. The planners felt that the housing issue is primarily a local issue but the California planners felt that TRPA has a role in establishing a fair share allocation for each jurisdiction.

There was general agreement with the intent of the Regional Plan and the objectives. With some reservations, the group agreed that new subdivisions and new permissible urban uses could be limited to urban areas as defined by the Plan Area Statements. The majority of disagreements focused on the flexibility of making future amendments and the need for additional controls in regards to affordable housing.

**Discussion:** The staff recommended amendments are designed to balance the need to concentrate development within urban areas with the need to deal with unforeseen situations. Staff has attempted to balance the concerns of all within the limitations of the Regional Plan Package noted below, and the stated objectives.

The limitation of certain subdivisions to existing urban areas is stated in Goal #2 of the Land Use Element of the Regional Goals and Policies. This limitation is also consistent with the 208 Plan (Volume 1, p. 218) which states "This alternative will maintain the existing boundaries of the urban area within the Region, and will generally result in the in-fill of property in land capability districts 4 through 7 with urban land uses, consistent with the TRPA Plan Area Statements." The 208 Plan also speaks to the avoidance of new road networks as a reason for limiting the opportunities for subdivision. TRPA legal counsel has researched the 208 Plan and has concluded that the proposed amendments are consistent with the historical interpretation of the 208 Plan and do not require 208 Plan amendments.

For informational purposes staff has attached a copy of the 1983 TRPA Regional Plan EIS "fair share" analysis (Attachment B) and a copy of the San Diego Transit-Oriented Development Design Guidelines (Attachment C).
Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission
Amendment of Chapters 2, 4, 13 and 43, and Other Related
Amendments, to Limit Subdivisions and Urban Uses to
Existing Urban Areas -- Page 4

Required Findings:  The required findings and rationales are set forth below:

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.

Rationale:  The amendments implement Goal #2, Policies #2 and #7 of the Land Use Subelement of the 1986 Goals and Policies by restricting post-1987 subdivisions in existing urban areas and encouraging new urban development to be located within those areas. The amendments will further implement the 208 Plan and its policies of limiting subdivisions to infilling of existing urban areas. The amendments are also consistent with the Housing Subelement Goal #1 Policies 1-4. The amendments will assist, indirectly, in the implementation of the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan by encouraging new urban development to be located within designated urban areas.

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

Rationale:  The amendments will assist in the attainment of the thresholds by encouraging the infill of existing urban areas, and by directing new/transferred development to already subdivided and urbanized areas.

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:  The amendments positively affect attainment of air and water quality standards for the reasons set forth in 2, above.

4. Finding:  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.

Rationale:  See findings 1, 2 and 3, above.
Ordinance 87-8 Findings:

1. **The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.**

   **Rationale:** The Compact directs TRPA to adopt regional ordinances relating to subdivisions and, for the reasons set forth above, the amendments will assist in the achievement and maintenance of the thresholds.

2. **One or more of the following:**

   a) **There is demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan Package and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds;**

   b) **That legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code;**

   c) **That technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code;**

   d) **That 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;**

   e) **That 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.**

   f) **That 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 Package and complying with the Compact.**
Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission
Amendment of Chapters 2, 4, 13 and 43, and Other Related
Amendments, to Limit Subdivisions and Urban Uses to
Existing Urban Areas -- Page 6

Rationale: Staff recommends finding (f) because the ordinances, as
currently adopted for post-1987 projects and plan area amendments,
do not adequately address the policy of encouraging development to
be located within existing urban areas and the amendments are
designed to remedy that lack.

Environmental Documentation: Because of the more restrictive nature of the
amendments, staff recommends a finding of no significant effect.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please
contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 94-

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY; AMENDING CHAPTERS 2, 4, 13,
41 AND 43 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATING TO SUBDIVISIONS;
PLAN AREAS, DEVELOPMENT IN NON-URBAN PLAN AREAS, AND PROVID-
ING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

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

Section 1.00 Findings

1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance No. 87-9, as
amended, by amending Chapters 2, 4, 13, 41 and 43 of the Code of
Ordinances relating to subdivisions and plan areas, in order to further
implement the Regional Plan and Article VI(a) and other applicable
provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.20 The Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") conducted a public hearing and
voted to make a recommendation of approval on the amendments. The
Governing Board has conducted a noticed public hearing on the amend-
ments. Oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and con-
sidered.

1.30 The provisions of this ordinance have been found not to have a signifi-
cant environmental effect on the environment, and thus are exempt from
the requirement of an environmental impact statement pursuant to Article
VII of the Compact.

1.40 The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this
ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Section 6.5 of the
Code of Ordinances and Article V(g) of the Compact and the findings
required by Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8. As to the Ordinance 87-8
findings, the Board finds that those findings were supported by a pre-
ponderance of the evidence in the record.

1.50 The Board further finds that the amendments adopted hereby continue to
implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and
maintains the adopted environmental thresholds as required by Article
V(c) of the Compact.

1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in
the record.
Section 2.00  Amendment of Chapter 2 of the Code

2.10  Delete Subsection 41.2.K from Chapter 41 and move to Chapter 2.

41.2.K  Urban Area: Urban areas are those areas designated as residential, tourist, or commercial/public service by the plan area statements.

Section 3.00  Amendment of Chapter 43 of the Code

3.10  Subsection 43.4.A is hereby amended as follows with added language underlined:

43.4.A  Existing Urban Areas: Subdivisions may only be permitted in urban areas existing on December 31, 1994 or as amended pursuant to Subsection 13.7.D.

3.20  Subsection 43.4.F is hereby amended as follows with added language underlined:

43.4.F  Affordable Housing: Subdivisions of post-1987 residential projects in plan areas designated preferred affordable housing areas or subdivisions of affordable housing projects shall be subject to the following standards:

(1) Subdivision of Affordable Housing Projects: Subdivisions 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.

(2) Residential Subdivisions in Preferred Affordable Housing Areas: Approval of subdivisions after December 31, 1995 of post-1987 residential projects which do not qualify as affordable housing are prohibited until TRPA finds the city or county of jurisdiction has demonstrated its commitment to assume its "fair share" responsibility to provide lower and very low income housing within existing urban areas pursuant to Goal 1 of the TRPA Housing Subelement.

Section 4.00  Amendment of Chapter 13 of the Code

4.10  Amend Section 13.7 to add Subsection 13.7.D Findings for Plan Area Statement amendments.

13.7.D  Findings for Plan Area Amendments: Prior to adopting any plan area amendment, TRPA must find:

(1) The amendment is consistent with the plan area designation criteria in Subsections 13.5.B and 13.5.C.; and
(2) If the amendment is to expand an existing urban plan area boundary into a non-urban plan area or to add residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, or public service permissible uses to a non-urban area, it must be found that the amendment:

(a) Is to correct an error which occurred at the time of adoption, such as mapping errors, editing errors, or errors based on erroneous information; or

(b) Is to enable or allow TRPA to better progress toward or maintain one or more environmental thresholds without degradation to other thresholds as measured by the Chapter 32 indicators; or

(c) Is needed to protect public health and safety and there is no reasonable alternative to locate the use in an urban area; and,

(d) Will make the plan area statement consistent with an adopted policy or standard of the Regional Plan; and,

(3) If the amendment is to add multifamily as a permissible use to a plan area, the plan area must be found suitable for transit oriented development.

Section 5.00 Amendment of Chapter 4 of the Code

5.10 Amend Appendix A of Chapter 4 to add item I. General, 24.

24. Approval of the demonstration of commitment for affordable housing pursuant to Section 43.4.F

Section 6.00 Interpretation and Severability

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

Section 7.00 Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective 60 days after the date of its adoption.
PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held December ____, 1994, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

Wayne S. Chimarusti, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
GOAL #1: TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL BE PROVIDED IN
SUITABLE LOCATIONS FOR THE RESIDENTS OF THE REGION.

POLICIES

1. SPECIAL INCENTIVES, SUCH AS BONUS DEVELOPMENT UNITS WILL BE GIVEN TO
PROMOTE AFFORDABLE OR GOVERNMENT- ASSISTED HOUSING FOR LOWER INCOME HOUSE-
HOLDS (90 PERCENT OF REGION'S MEDIAN INCOME) AND FOR VERY LOW INCOME HOUSE-
HOLDS (50 PERCENT OF THE REGION'S MEDIAN INCOME).

The 1980 census data indicate that approximately 95 percent of the region's
lower income households were paying more than the recommended costs for
rental housing. There is a need to reverse the current trend of higher
cost housing and to provide needed affordable housing.

2. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WILL BE ENCOURAGED TO ASSUME THEIR "FAIR SHARE" OF THE
RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE LOWER AND VERY LOW INCOME HOUSING.

Current data indicate the City of South Lake Tahoe and Placer County are
assuming more than their share of the responsibility as detailed in the
Regional Plan EIS.

3. FACILITIES SHALL BE DESIGNED AND OCCUPIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH LOCAL, REGION-
AL, STATE, AND FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR THE ASSISTANCE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH LOW
AND VERY LOW INCOMES. SUCH HOUSING UNITS SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR
RENTAL OR SALE AT A COST TO SUCH PERSONS THAT WOULD NOT EXCEED THE
RECOMMENDED STATE AND FEDERAL STANDARDS.

4. AFFORDABLE OR GOVERNMENT ASSISTED HOUSING FOR LOWER INCOME HOUSEHOLDS
SHOULD BE LOCATED IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, GOVERNMENT
SERVICES, AND TRANSIT FACILITIES. SUCH HOUSING MUST BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE
SCALE AND DENSITY OF THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOOD.
City of San Diego
Land Guidance System

Transit-Oriented Development
Design Guidelines

Prepared by
Calthorpe Associates

for the
City of San Diego

Approved by the City Council August 4, 1992

This report is in the public domain.
October, 1992

A Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is a compact land use pattern with housing, public parks and plazas, jobs, and services located along key points on the transit system. The strategic application of the TOD principles will greatly help us in our efforts as a community to reduce automobile dependence, improve air quality, and create pedestrian-oriented, interactive neighborhoods.

The guidelines are the result of an eighteen month long effort under the City’s Land Guidance Program. In addition to the work of Calthorpe Associates, key players included the Land Guidance Subcommittee (a broad-based Citizens Advisory Committee), City staff, and other public agency staff. The TOD Guidelines and a companion City Council Policy (600-39) were approved by the City Council on August 4, 1992.

Now that the guidelines are approved, they are being incorporated into basic City policies and regulations. The TOD perspective is being brought to the Street Design Manual update, the Zoning Code update, the Progress Guide and General Plan, community plan updates, demonstration projects, and the Regional Growth Management Strategy.

The TOD concept provides the community with an approach to create a desirable and more efficient urban form while addressing the issues of traffic congestion, air quality, neighborhood character, and growth management. The guidelines support the substantial public investment in transit systems and result in regional, environmental, and fiscal benefits over the long term.

I hope that you find these guidelines to be interesting and useful.

Michael J. Stepner, FAIA, AICP
City Architect
Introduction

Land Guidance System

The Land Guidance Section was established in September 1989 as a part of the City of San Diego's Mobility Program. The aim of the Land Guidance Section is to reduce transportation demand through new and revised land development policies. Since its inception, the Section has undertaken a number of studies characterizing the status of traffic congestion and land development patterns in the city. The group has also assessed the effectiveness of adopted policies and standards as to whether they support or hinder transportation demand management goals.

In May 1991, the Planning Department and the Engineering and Development Department contracted with Calthorpe Associates to prepare Design Guidelines, Incentives and Implementation Strategies aimed at redirecting urban growth to patterns which encourage non-automobile travel, yet protect the city's quality of life. This package, along with a number of accompanying policies and programs, constitutes the Land Guidance System for the City of San Diego.

Transit-Oriented Development Concept

Guiding Principles

San Diego, along with a number of other growing metropolitan regions throughout the country, is increasingly faced with a crisis of many dimensions: mounting traffic congestion, diminishing affordable housing, receding open space, threatened wildlife, urban sprawl, air pollution and socially isolated communities. Reliance upon typical patterns of low density urban development will perpetuate these problems. The goal of the Land Guidance System is to establish policies and standards which seek to address these problems by redirecting urban growth to patterns which reduce automobile dependence and support alternative modes of transportation, while minimizing impacts on existing community character. The Design Guidelines for Transit Oriented Development (TODs) represent strategies to accommodate projected growth within San Diego, maintain the city's present quality of life, and allow for continued economic vitality. Consistent with these concerns, these Design Guidelines are based on the following guiding principles:

- Maximize the use of existing urbanized areas accessible to transit through infrastructure-sensitive infill and redevelopment.
- Reduce consumption of non-urban areas by designing the urban area efficiently.
- Employ land use strategies to reinforce transit.
- Reduce the number of auto trips and regional vehicle miles traveled by creating opportunities to walk and bike.
- Protect the natural environment and community character by reducing the need for roadway expansions.
- Reduce air pollutant emissions and conserve limited energy resources.
- Provide a diversity of housing types.
- Foster a more vital, interactive and secure community.
TODs link transit and land use

The Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) concept is simple: moderate and high density housing, along with complementing public uses, jobs, retail and services, are concentrated in mixed-use developments located at strategic points along the regional transit system. Low density housing and other auto-oriented uses surround these TODs in "Secondary Areas." The location, design, configuration, and mix of uses in a TOD provides an alternative to traditional development by emphasizing a pedestrian-oriented environment and reinforcing the use of public transportation.

This linkage between land use and transit is designed to result in an efficient pattern of development that supports the transit system and makes significant progress in reducing sprawl, traffic congestion, and air pollution. The TOD's mixed-use clustering of land uses within a pedestrian-friendly area connected to transit, provides for growth with minimum environmental and social costs.

TODs aren't just a transit strategy; a walkable environment is key to reducing congestion

TODs represent a land use strategy which seeks to strike a balance between resolving today's critical transportation issues and allowing freedom of movement and choice of travel mode. Although focused on reinforcing transit, the mixed-use and walkable neighborhoods developed under these guidelines would equally support carpools, bus, trolley, biking, walking, and more efficient auto use. Given historic development trends and projections for the future, each of these travel modes will play an important role in solving the city's increasing traffic congestion problems.

A "walkable" environment is perhaps the key aspect of TODs. The alternatives to drive-alone auto use depend on creating comfortable pedestrian environments at the origin and destination of each trip as an incentive to walking, biking, carpooling, or riding transit. No one likes to arrive at work without a car if they cannot walk comfortably from transit to their destination or run a mid-day errand. TODs seek to bring many destinations within walking distance and allow trips to be combined. Placing local retail, parks, day care, civic services, and the transit stop at the center of a TOD reinforces the opportunity to walk or bike for many errands, as well as combine a trip to transit with other stops. Streets lined by trees and building entries that connect transit stops with local destinations also help to make the TOD environment "pedestrian-friendly."

Similarly, it has been shown that a higher percent of people are likely to use transit if they can walk to the station, rather than get in their cars to drive to a "park and ride" lot. Initial sampling in San Diego and experiences in other communities have found that people living or working within 3 to 5 blocks of high frequency bus or trolley service utilize the transit system more than any other group. The TOD design guidelines provide strategies for locating high density employment-oriented development adjacent to trolley stops and moderate density residential-oriented neighborhoods along local bus lines. Park-and-ride lots will continue to be a part of the San Diego transit system, but will not be located within TODs. Transit utilization in TODs will increase over time as the mix of uses reaches build-out, as a transit corridor develops, and as residents and employees see the convenience of transit service. Simultaneously, the type of transit service coming to TODs can mature. It may start with local bus service, add express bus service as ridership grows, and finally provide rideshare connections.

From a traffic engineering standpoint, walkable places can affect the average household "mode split," or the percentage of trips taken on foot, bike, bus, trolley, carpool, or by auto. For example, in European communities, auto use is generally between 35% and 48% of all trips; transit trips comprise only 5% to 20% of trips; and pedestrian trips are between 30% to 50% of total trips. Clearly, transit is supported in areas with healthy pedestrian environments. In comparison, the U.S. mode split is 82% via auto, 11% walking, and 3% by public transit. If we increased walking trips to a modest 20% (only half of Europe’s mode split), we could potentially double transit ridership. In order to achieve these goals, we must provide amenities for pedestrians in a manner that works with American lifestyles. The TOD design guidelines provide a flexible approach to making these changes, without eliminating the car.

TODs can reduce auto trip generation and congestion on major roads

The TOD concept recognizes that the majority of trips will continue to be in cars, and thus focuses on reducing congestion on arterials and thoroughfares. Standard suburban development patterns presently force all local shopping, recreation and school trips, as well as work trips, onto the arterial street system. This pattern leads to the congestion neighborhood groups are typically most concerned about. Even without transit, the TOD street system reduces traffic congestion on major streets. The TOD street system still allows convenient access to major roads, but provides an alternative street network for local trips. An interconnected system of local streets, internal to the TOD, reduces congestion on main roads by providing local streets to local destinations. Streets are lined by trees and buildings in which cars are moving at a slower pace than on arterials and collectors. These streets need to be designed to minimize the potential for drivers to use neighborhood streets as through traffic short cuts. Arterials are seen as edges, providing for through traffic and access. On a regional scale, development focused around transit and providing local street networks that avoid arterial streets, should lead to a reduced need for costly road construction in the future.

TODs help solve affordability issues

TODs not only promote alternates to auto use, but are also a formula to provide affordable communities. Communities that are affordable to the environment because they require efficient use of land, help to preserve open space, and reduce air pollution; affordable for the diverse households moving to San Diego because a variety of housing types, at various costs and densities are encouraged in convenient locations; affordable to limited income households because the mix and configuration of uses allow reduced auto dependence and therefore lower auto-related expenses; affordable to businesses seeking to relocate because their workforce can be freed of the gridlock and high housing costs typical in other California metropolitan regions; and affordable to the public taxpayer because TOD infrastructure is efficient, streets are safe, and public amenities are well-used.

TODs work in Redevelopable, Urbanizing and New Growth Areas

TODs are an opportunity to promote efficient development patterns, both in the existing urbanized fabric of the city and in growth areas. Efficient development patterns provide a number of benefits, including minimizing urban sprawl, reducing vehicle miles traveled, improving air quality, and enhancing the social aspect of neighborhoods. TOD concepts can be applied in existing developed areas that have the potential to be "revitalized" with a mix of transit-supportable uses (Redevelopable Sites); small to moderate sized undeveloped parcels within the urbanizing portions of the city that could be "infilled" with new TOD uses (Urbanizing Sites); and areas that are scheduled for urban expansion (New Growth Areas). In each of these

settings, TOD plans can respond carefully to sensitive environmental resources and to the context and character of existing adjacent neighborhoods.

Transit-Oriented Developments Defined

Transit-Oriented Developments are mixed-use neighborhoods, up to 160 acres in size, which are developed around a transit stop and core commercial area. The entire TOD site must be within an average 2,000 foot walking distance of a transit stop. Secondary Areas of lower density housing, schools, parks, and commercial and employment uses surround TODs for up to one mile.

Retail and office uses in the commercial core of the TOD will vary depending on its location, purpose, and market demand. For example, some TODs may focus on shopping centers with both employment centers and supporting retail and services; commercial core areas in other TODs will be made up of existing commercial shopping streets or a typical neighborhood shopping center with a standard grocery/drug store anchor; and finally, the smallest TODs will focus on a convenience center. Additional TOD uses will also vary based on their location. TODs with high frequency transit service are most appropriate for intensive employment and housing uses; TODs with less frequent transit service will have lower density residential and neighborhood uses. The residential densities and building intensities specified by these guidelines are designed to allow a service-oriented transit system that runs at frequent headways to important destinations in the region.

Proximity to Transit

Proximity to transit is a key factor in determining the suitability of a site for higher density, mixed-use developments. Convenient transit service is necessary to reduce traffic congestion during commute hours; added benefit can be gained by capturing local trips on-site before they reach arterial streets. A fundamental purpose of the TOD concept is to create a land use pattern which will ultimately support transit. In order for TODs to successfully reduce auto travel throughout San Diego, they must be located within easy walking distance of, or within convenient feeder bus connections to dedicated transit lines. Studies by regional transit agencies throughout the country have shown that the greatest pedestrian capture rate for public transit occurs when transit stops are within a 10 minute walking distance from home or office, have frequent headways, and are close to a dedicated transit right-of-way. On-board surveys by SANDAG are finding that 80 percent of trolley riders live or work within a 10 minute walking distance. It is also important that destinations on either end of the trip are pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use. TODs should be designed to be easily accessed by individuals with disabilities.

The City of San Diego is fortunate to have an established transit system that is well-used with opportunities for growth. The transit system has three broad levels of service: the "Trunk Line Network" consisting of trolley or high speed limited stop bus service, the "High Frequency Bus Corridors" which connect neighborhoods with major destinations in San Diego, and the "Feeder Bus Network" made up of local bus lines that connect with the trunk line network or bus corridors that run through residential neighborhoods. TODs must be located on a segment of the Trunk Line Network, along High Frequency Bus Corridors, or on a segment of the Feeder Bus Line Network within 10 minutes transit travel time from the Trunk Line Network or Bus Corridors. These locations offer the greatest opportunity for creating mixed-use destinations that reflect the significant investment necessary to construct the transit system and generate the greatest number of transit-bound trips. Immediate transit service is not essential to successfully

SANDAG 1991 On Board Surveys
implementing these ideas, because a system of interconnected streets will be effective at reducing traffic congestion on surrounding arterials and highways.

Urban and Neighborhood TODs

Two types of TOD’s may be developed: “Urban TODs” and “Neighborhood TODs.” Urban TODs are located on the Trunk Line Network at light rail stops or at express bus stops. Because they are adjacent to the major spine of the regional transit system, these TODs may have a higher percentage of job-generating uses and may be developed at higher commercial intensities and residential densities. Neighborhood TODs are located on high frequency bus routes or along feeder bus lines within 10 minutes travel time from light rail stops or bus transfer stations. These TODs should place a greater emphasis on residential uses and local-serving shopping.

Secondary Areas

TODs may be surrounded by more auto-oriented, low density areas called “Secondary Areas.” These Secondary Areas can take advantage of the services within a TOD through an interconnected street system with easy access to the transit stop by foot, bike or car. Secondary Areas will be primarily comprised of standard single-family neighborhoods. These areas may also provide uses that serve TOD residents, such as public schools and community parks. Along major arterials, commercial and employment uses may be located in Secondary Areas to provide additional transit ridership and support TOD core commercial area businesses. Because they are entirely within one mile of the transit stop, Secondary Areas are ideal for bicycle travel to the TODs.

Non-TOD Areas

Some of the urban design concepts addressed in these guidelines would be suitable for projects throughout the city that are striving for greater pedestrian orientation and a reduction in automobile dependence. Please refer to the Implementation Chapter and the associated Council Policy for the long range strategy for incorporating TOD design elements into city-wide policies and regulations.

Functional Settings

Three types of settings have been identified which broadly characterize the physical pattern of development throughout the city: Redevelopable Sites, Urbanizing Sites, and New Growth Areas. These three functional settings represent the range of conditions where TODs could be located. The characteristics of these settings are summarized below:

Redevelopable Sites: A majority of San Diego is urbanized and fully built-out. As land values increase over time, older neighborhoods may gradually transition to new uses and economically underutilized areas may redevelop to more intensive uses. TODs may be able to take advantage of this change to reinforce the transit system with land uses that provide riders and provide incentives to creating pedestrian-oriented environments. Existing on-site uses that are economically viable can serve as the starting point for TODs and in some cases will represent the nucleus for future economic revitalization. Intensification and redevelopment must, however, be balanced with a strong sensitivity to protecting existing neighborhoods and a recognition that additional development is not appropriate in every setting.
Urbanizing Sites: This category represents undeveloped parcels of land that have been "skipped over" in the process of growth and are surrounded by existing development. In many cases these parcels do not have an established street system on-site, but are connected to surrounding neighborhoods or adjacent to existing commercial developments. These sites are often large enough to develop all or a major portion of a TOD; the existing surrounding neighborhoods will then function as its Secondary Area. Many of these sites are still vacant because they have on-site canyons, floodplains and steep slopes. The extent and character of future TOD development will be largely shaped by these features.

New Growth Areas: There are a number of large undeveloped sites within the Planned Urbanizing and Future Urbanizing Areas with planned or potentially viable transit service. These sites should be developed as one or more TODs, with associated Secondary Areas, under the guidance of these Design Guidelines. While New Growth Areas are the easiest to develop with transit- and pedestrian-oriented patterns, they are generally located at the edge of urban development and may ultimately spread the size of the city. Future planning processes will determine how and where TOD designations will be applied. Furthermore, in many cases, transit service to these sites is only at preliminary planning stages and TODs may be required to function for some time without full transit service. Corridor plans, which identify long-term opportunities for TODs along future transit corridors, should be prepared where transit lines pass through New Growth Areas to ensure that the TOD concept is applied in a manner that respects environmental constraints, works with topography, and functions in the interim without strong transit service.

How To Use These Guidelines

The Design Guidelines address a broad range of issues related to site selection, land use patterns, street configuration and design details. The following "decision tree" illustrates how these guidelines should be used, depending on the type of site under consideration:

Transit-Oriented Development Design Guidelines Decision Tree

- Site or Study Area
  - Existing or Planned Trunk Transit Line
    - Urban TOD
      - Redevelopable Site
        - Design Guidelines Sections 1, 2, 4 - 11
      - Urbanizing Site
        - Design Guidelines Sections 1, 3, 4 - 11
  - Existing or Planned Feeder Bus Line/High Frequency Bus Corridor
    - Neighborhood TOD
      - Redevelopable Site
        - Design Guidelines Sections 1, 2, 4 - 11
      - Urbanizing Site
        - Design Guidelines Sections 1, 3, 4 - 11
  - Not Transit Served
    - Secondary Area
    - Non-TOD Use
    - New Growth Area
      - Design Guidelines Sections 1, 6 - 8
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Design Guidelines

1. TOD Definitions and Guiding Principles

Guideline 1A:

TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD)

A Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is a mixed-use community within a typical 2,000 feet walking distance of a transit stop and core commercial area. The design, configuration, and mix of uses emphasize a pedestrian-oriented environment and reinforce the use of public transportation, without ignoring the role of the automobile. TODs mix residential, retail, office, open space, and public uses within comfortable walking distance, making it convenient for residents and employees to travel by transit, bicycle or foot, as well as by car.

Discussion:

TODs can be developed throughout San Diego on undeveloped sites in urbanizing areas, sites with the potential for redevelopment or reuse, and in new urban growth areas. Their uses and configuration must relate to existing surrounding neighborhoods.

TOD sites must be located on or near existing or planned segments of the trunk transit line network or feeder bus line network, yet adequate auto accessibility is also important. The TOD design guidelines establish standards for site selection and development to ensure that TODs succeed in providing a mix of uses, a variety of housing types, and a physical environment that is conducive to pedestrian and transit travel.

The size of a TOD and its average 2,000 feet walking distance from the transit stop must be determined on a case-by-case basis. 2,000 feet is intended to represent a "comfortable walking distance" (±10 minutes) for a majority of people. In some locations, comfortable walking distance is affected by topography, climate, intervening arterials or freeways, and other physical features. Therefore, the size of a TOD will be greater or lesser depending on surrounding features.

Justification:

TODs offer an alternative to traditional development patterns by providing housing and employment opportunities for the increasingly diverse population of San Diego, and physical environments that facilitate pedestrian and transit access. Developing a network of TODs throughout the City will also serve to strengthen the overall performance of the regional transit system.
Guideline 1B:

RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSIT AND CIRCULATION

The TOD site must be located on: 1) an existing or designated trunk transit line network; 2) on a high-frequency bus corridor; or 3) on a feeder bus line network within 10 minutes transit travel time from a stop on the trunk line network. Where transit may not occur for a period of time, the land use and street patterns within a TOD must function effectively in the interim and guide the timing and location of future transit lines.

Discussion:

The trunk line network represents the San Diego region's express transit system. It consists of either light rail "trolley" lines or high speed limited stop bus service, with at least a 15 minute frequency of service. TODs on the trunk line network will be located either at light rail or express bus stops.

High frequency bus corridors consist of routes that pass through residential neighborhoods to connect with major destinations (such as existing routes along Park Boulevard and University Avenue). These corridors typically provide 6 to 10 minute headways with bus stops located every 2 to 4 blocks.

The feeder bus line network is a system of timed transfer local bus routes which link to the trunk line network. Transit stops on the feeder bus line network that serve as links to the trunk line, should be within 10 minutes transit travel time (approximately 2 to 3 miles), from a trunk line network stop, with buses running at least a 15 minute frequency of service. In some circumstances, a feeder bus line can be provided by a private transit system that meets the level of service criteria of the feeder bus line network.

The TOD program recognizes than even with an ambitious 40% non-auto mode split, 60% of all trips will continue to be via autos. The land use patterns in TODs, as well as their internal street systems, must plan for on-going auto use. Adequate auto access from arterials and freeways, as well as frequent transit service, will also be an important locational consideration for the more intensive, employment-oriented TODs. Similarly, not all transit stops will be TODs; some stops will be developed as park-and-ride lots or will be located at low-intensity industrial uses.

In many locations transit service is planned, but will not be implemented until well after development occurs. San Diego has the opportunity to guide transit planning by providing the densities necessary to support transit initially. In early years, express bus service can serve planned trolley lines and establish ridership clientele. Land use patterns
should guide transit service planning, rather than expecting transit to come to an area that must be retrofit to meet transit-supportable densities.

**Justification:**

A fundamental purpose of TODs is to create a land use pattern which will support transit. Studies by SANDAG and other transit agencies have shown that the greatest pedestrian “capture rate” for public transit occurs when transit stops are within a 10 minute walking distance from home or office, have frequent headways, and are close to a dedicated transit right-of-way. It is also important that the destinations are pedestrian-oriented and offer a mix of land uses.
Guideline 1C: URBAN TOD

Urban TODs are located on the trunk line network, at light rail or at bus stops, and may be developed at high commercial intensities and residential densities.

Discussion:

Special site development guidelines are recommended for TODs that are highly accessible by transit to permit higher density residential development and to encourage a higher percentage of job-generating uses. Where Urban TODs are located in existing developed neighborhoods, it may be appropriate to apply the densities and mix of uses recommended for Neighborhood TODs. Urban TODs are typically sited approximately 1 mile apart to meet trolley station spacing guidelines, although they could be sited closer together in certain circumstances. Examples of potential Urban TOD include sites within the Mission Valley and University communities.

Justification:

Each TOD may assume a different character and mix of uses depending on its location within the region and the surrounding land uses. Urban TODs are suitable for job-generating and high intensity uses, such as offices, large-scale shopping centers, and high density housing, because they allow direct access from any location within the transit system without requiring passengers to transfer between modes. Similarly, the intensity of development along the trunk line network should reflect the significant investment necessary to construct the transit system and should generate the greatest number of transit-bound trips.
Guideline 1D:

NEIGHBORHOOD TOD

Neighborhood TODs are located on the feeder bus line network within 10 minutes transit travel time (no more than 3 miles) from a light rail stop or express bus stop, or along high frequency bus lines that pass through residential neighborhoods. They should place an emphasis on residential uses and local-serving shopping.

Discussion:

Land use proportions and density standards for Neighborhood TODs encourage sites which are served by local feeder buses or along high frequency bus lines, but are not located along the trunk transit line network. Neighborhood TODs should have a residential and local-serving shopping focus. Neighborhood TODs will typically cluster around a bus stop. Where bus stops are frequent, TODs can be situated close together and form a "corridor" of higher density, mixed-use nodes. Potential Neighborhood TOD sites include parts of Clairemont, Pacific Beach and Mid-City.

Justification:

Neighborhood TODs can help provide affordable communities because they include a variety of housing types to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population of the city in a land use pattern that minimizes the need for multiple car households. If properly designed, Neighborhood TODs can meet local needs for public facilities and parks, respect the character and quality of existing neighborhoods, and limit inter-community traffic through residential areas.
Guideline 1E:

REDEVELOPABLE, URBANIZING AND NEW GROWTH AREAS

TODs may be developed on Redevelopable and Urbanizing Sites and in New Growth Areas. Redevelopable sites are developed areas of the city that could be revitalized with new uses and transit service. Urbanizing sites are vacant sites surrounded by existing urban development. New Growth Areas are larger, undeveloped properties on the periphery of the city. Community plans, specific plans, and plans for transit corridors should identify appropriate sites in each of these settings for TODs and transit service.

Discussion:

Three types of settings have been identified which broadly characterize the physical pattern of development throughout the city: Redevelopable Sites, Urbanizing Sites, and New Growth Areas. These three functional settings represent the range of conditions where TODs could be located. The characteristics of these settings are summarized below:

Redevelopable Sites: A majority of San Diego is urbanized and fully built-out. As land values increase over time, older neighborhoods may gradually transition to new uses and economically underutilized areas may redevelop to more intensive uses. TODs may be able to take advantage of this change to reinforce the transit system with land uses that provide riders and provide incentives to creating pedestrian-oriented environments. Existing on-site uses that are economically viable can serve as the starting point for TODs and in some cases will represent the nucleus for future economic revitalization. Intensification and redevelopment must, however, be balanced with a strong sensitivity to protecting existing neighborhoods and a recognition that additional development is not appropriate in every setting.

Urbanizing Sites: This category represents undeveloped parcels of land that have been "skipped over" in the process of growth and are surrounded by existing development. In many cases these parcels do not have an established street system on-site, but are connected to surrounding neighborhoods or adjacent to existing commercial developments. These sites are often large enough to develop all or a major portion of a TOD; the existing surrounding neighborhoods will then function as its Secondary Area.

New Growth Areas: There are still a few undeveloped sites within the Planned Urbanizing and Future Urbanizing Areas with planned or potentially viable transit service. These sites should be developed as one or more TODs, with associated Secondary Areas. While New Growth Areas are the easiest to develop with transit- and pedestrian-
oriented patterns, they are generally located at the edge of urban development and may ultimately spread the size of the city. Furthermore, in many cases, transit service to these sites is only at preliminary planning stages and TODs may be required to function for some time without full transit service. Corridor plans should be prepared along transit lines that pass through New Growth Areas to ensure that the TOD concept is applied in a manner that respects environmental constraints, works with topography, and functions in the interim without strong transit service.

Justification:

TODs are an opportunity to promote efficient development patterns, both in the existing urbanized fabric of the city and in growth areas. Efficient development patterns provide a number of benefits, including minimizing urban sprawl, reducing vehicle miles traveled, improving air quality, and enhancing the social aspect of neighborhoods.
Guideline 1F:

CORE COMMERCIAL AREAS

Each TOD must have a mixed-use core commercial area located adjacent to the transit stop and surrounded by TOD residential neighborhoods. At a minimum, the core area should provide convenience retail and civic sites. Larger core areas may also include major supermarkets, professional offices, restaurants, service commercial, entertainment uses, comparison retail, and employment-intensive office and light industrial uses.

Discussion:

The size and location of core commercial areas reflect the anticipated market demand, proximity to transit and phasing considerations. Optional upper floor office and residential uses in the core commercial area increase the mixed-use, round-the-clock nature of the core area. Employment-generating uses, such as stand-alone office uses and employee-intensive light industrial uses may be located adjacent to or amongst the retail component of the core commercial area. The transit stop and core commercial area should be complemented with a “village green” or public plaza which can serve as a focal point for community activities. Secure and convenient bicycle parking facilities should be provided to encourage bicycle access.

Justification:

A commercial core at the center of each TOD is essential because it permits most residents and employees to walk or ride bicycles to obtain basic goods and services. This is particularly advantageous for those without cars and individuals with mobility limitations. Those who still choose to drive to shop will have to go fewer miles and can avoid using arterial streets for local trips. Core commercial areas also provide a mixed-use destination that makes transit use attractive. People are more prone to use transit to get to work if the transit stop is combined with retail and service opportunities.
Guideline 3G:

TOD RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Housing Mix Alternatives (18 Dwelling Units/Acre Minimum Average Net Density)

TOD residential areas include housing that is within a convenient walking distance (average 2,000 feet) from core commercial areas and transit stops. Average minimum densities should vary between 18 and 25 du/acre, depending on proximity to transit, relationship to surrounding existing neighborhoods, and location within the urban area. TOD residential density requirements should be met with a mix of small lot single-family, townhomes and apartments.

Discussion:

TOD residential areas should extend from the core commercial area and transit stop over an area that is an average 2,000 feet in radius, representing a 10 minute walking distance. Net densities are roughly 20% higher than gross densities, once streets and other infrastructure improvements are accounted for. The minimum average density requirements are intended to set a baseline density standard for all TODs; higher average density standards may be adopted by individual community plans to respond to locational differences within the city. Community plans, TOD development plans, specific plans and/or zoning studies will clarify how the minimum average density standards are applied to individual sites.

TOD residential areas should contain a variety of housing types and ownership patterns, ranging from small lot single-family homes with carriage units to apartment buildings. For example, a Neighborhood TOD residential area may be a mix of small lot single-family lots with carriage homes (13 du/ac), townhouses (25 du/acre) and apartments (45 du/acre) combined to meet the density requirements. The same strategy of mixing residential product types can be used in Urban TODs.

Justification:

TOD residential areas provide a higher concentration of households in close proximity to transit service and core commercial areas than typical suburban land use patterns. Minimum densities of at least 12 du/acre are necessary to support local bus service; higher densities are necessary for adequate light rail and express bus service. To this end, the TOD Concept encourages walking and biking, reduces reliance on the automobile, supports transit service, and creates distinct, identifiable neighborhoods.

4"Public Transportation and Land Use Policy." Pushkarev and Zupan. 1977
Guideline 1H:

PUBLIC USES

Public uses are required in each TOD to serve residents and workers in the TODs and neighboring areas. Parks, plazas, and public services may be used in any combination to fulfill this requirement. Small public parks and plazas must be provided at a minimum within TODs to meet local population needs. Roadways and park-and-ride facilities are not applicable towards fulfilling the public use requirement.

Discussion:

Each TOD must contain open space areas available to the public and facilities which serve the needs of the surrounding community. Varying sizes and types of TODs will require or justify inclusion of civic buildings and public facilities. Appropriate public facilities include daycare, libraries, community buildings, police and fire stations, post offices, and governmental services. Public buildings should be placed in central locations, as highly visible focal points, or adjacent to public parks and plazas. Civic uses such as an urban plaza, community center, post office, and library, are best located in the core area in conjunction with retail businesses and offices. Recreation-oriented uses, such as parks, recreation facilities, and community buildings, as well as large parks and schools, should be centrally located with easy access from TOD and Secondary Area residences and the core area. Schools should be placed at the perimeter of TODs and their Secondary Area.

Justification:

The structure of a TOD is built around accessible and convenient public facilities and spaces. A strong sense of community, participation, identity, and conviviality is important to support the sense of safety and comfort within a TOD. Public uses in TODs serve this role by providing meeting places, recreation opportunities and lunchtime picnic spots essential to the vitality of TODs. Kensington Park is a good example of a well-used park that is centrally located in a neighborhood, has good visibility from the street, and benefits by being next to a public library.
Guideline 11:

MIXED-USE

All TODs must have a mix of uses arranged horizontally within their boundaries. Vertical mixed-use buildings are also permitted, but are considered a bonus in addition to the basic horizontal mixed-use requirement.

Discussion:

Horizontal mixed-use refers to the "plan view" arrangement of land uses within the TODs. Rather than requiring each building to have two or more uses, the area within the TOD must have residential, retail, public, and possibly office uses.

Vertical mixed-use refers to a building type that provides two or more uses, such as ground floor retail, with residential or office above. This is strongly encouraged in TODs, but is not required.

Justification:

If a neighborhood or employment area has local destinations within convenient walking distance, residents and employees are more likely to walk or bicycle. Furthermore, if local destinations are accessible to drivers without requiring use of the arterial street system, congestion can be reduced.

Vertical mixed-use buildings do contribute to a healthy pedestrian environment, but are much more difficult to implement due to common real estate practices that encourage single-use buildings. For this reason, the TOD concept does not rely on vertical mixed-use to create pedestrian-oriented places.
Guideline 1):

**STREET AND CIRCULATION SYSTEM**

The TOD street system should be clear, formalized, and inter-connected, converging to transit stops, core commercial areas, schools and parks. Cul-de-sac and "dead end" streets should be avoided or connected by pedestrian passages and/or bicycle paths. Multiple and parallel routes between the core commercial area, the TOD, and surrounding Secondary Areas must be provided so that local trips are not forced onto arterial streets.

**Discussion:**

The street pattern should be simple, memorable and direct, and avoid circuitous routes. Streets should converge near common destinations, such as transit stops, core commercial areas, schools and parks. They should allow autos, bikes, and pedestrians to travel on small local streets to any location in the TOD and to the Secondary Area. Street connections should be designed to keep through community trips on arterial streets and local trips within TODs. The TOD street system should focus streets into the core commercial area, yet minimize the number of light rail at-grade crossings. At no time should an arterial street be the only route to and from an area of the TOD.

Where there is steep topography or other sensitive resources, it may be necessary to curve streets and create some cul-de-sacs. Pedestrian and bicycle paths should be provided to allow residents within the TOD to walk to destinations within the TOD and overall, the principles of multiple and interconnected streets should be adhered to.

**Justification:**

Clear, formalized, and inter-connected street systems make common destinations visible, and provide the shortest and most direct path for pedestrians and bicyclists. With an inter-connected street system, any single street will be less likely to be overburdened by excessive traffic, thus reducing the need for cul-de-sacs. A street pattern which is circuitous and complex will discourage pedestrians; a street system with landmarks and a simple form will be memorable and familiar.
Guideline 1K:

GENERAL DESIGN CRITERIA

TODs should create pedestrian-oriented environments. In general, buildings should address the street and sidewalk with entries, features and activities, to enliven streets and to create safe, pleasant walking environments. Building intensities and densities should exceed minimum requirements to promote more active commercial centers, to support transit, and to encourage development that addresses the street. Variation is encouraged.

Discussion:

With the possible exception of anchor retail stores, primary building entrances should be physically and visually oriented toward streets, parks and plazas, and not to the interior of blocks or to parking lots or garages. Secondary building entrances oriented toward parking lots are permitted. Where existing viable uses are separated from the street by large parking lots, infill is encouraged at the street. In addition, new internal streets may be constructed closer to existing entries, thus creating a "main street" pedestrian setting.

Highest commercial intensities and residential densities should occur in the TODs. Core commercial areas should be intensive enough to provide a "main street" shopping spine. Furthermore, multi-storied buildings and structured parking are strongly encouraged near transit stops to better utilize the lands adjacent to the transit line and to provide additional transit ridership. As San Diego continues to grow, land economics may make future intensification desirable. Commercial area development plans should include long-term strategies for additional stories and buildings, as well as structured parking. Residential infill should also be possible by permitting some ancillary dwellings in single family residential areas.

Justification:

Buildings must be of a sufficient intensity and density to create safe and active streets enhanced by a sense of enclosure and visual interest, and to support transit. Orienting buildings to public streets will encourage walking by providing easy pedestrian connections, by bringing activities and visually interesting features closer to the street, and by providing safety through watchful eyes and activity day and night. Moderate-to-high intensities and densities also support frequent and convenient transit service; and retail centers can provide a greater variety of goods and services if more residents and employees are within close proximity.
Guideline 1L: SECONDARY AREAS

Each TOD will have a Secondary Area adjacent to it which includes lands no further than one mile from the proposed transit stop. The Secondary Area street network must provide multiple direct street and bicycle connections to the transit stop and core area without use of an arterial. Secondary Areas may have lower density single family housing, public schools, community parks, less intensive employment-generating uses, and park and ride lots. Competing retail uses are not allowed in the Secondary Area.

Discussion:

The Secondary Area provides for uses which are not appropriate in TODs because they are more auto-oriented. These areas will, however, provide market support for TOD businesses because Secondary Area residents and workers will shop in the TOD core commercial area and generate riders for the transit system. Employment-generating uses should be located across the street from the TOD transit stop.

Commercial uses which are very similar in nature and market appeal to those located in the TOD’s neighborhood-serving core commercial area are not allowed in Secondary Area because they diminish the ability of the TOD to establish a viable retail center. Similarly, very low intensity industrial and warehousing uses which are highly auto-dependent and do not have a sufficient number of employees to contribute to the pedestrian activity of the TOD are not appropriate for Secondary Areas.

Justification:

Single-family residential development is and will continue to be an important land use within the city. These areas typically have too low a density to be adequately serviced by transit. By maximizing street connections to TODs and making it convenient for residents to bike to the transit stop, transit utilization in single-family areas may increase. This is important both in new growth areas and in existing neighborhoods where streets may need to be retrofit. Providing multiple interior street connections between TODs and Secondary Areas will keep many auto trips off arterials. Locating public schools in Secondary Areas will provide a service for the TOD without using valuable transit-accessible land.
Guideline 1M:

RETROFIT OF EXISTING STREETS FOR PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE AND AUTO CONNECTIONS

Uses which rely extensively upon autos or trucks for their business are not appropriate uses for TODs or Secondary Areas. Rural residential, industrial uses, and travel commercial complexes should be located outside of TODs or Secondary Areas.

Discussion:

Many uses typically allowed in commercial areas rely predominantly upon auto travel to generate business patrons. These uses, such as auto dealers, freestanding car washes, mini-storage facilities, highway commercial uses, and motels (not including destination resorts), should not be permitted in TODs or Secondary Areas.

Similarly, low employment-generating industrial uses should not be permitted in TODs or Secondary Areas. They are not compatible with nearby residential uses and generate few employees to support core commercial areas. Low employment-generating industrial uses are appropriate where existing industrial activities occur and where major freeway noise impacts are anticipated.

Justification:

In order for more frequent transit to be economically viable, uses near transit stops must have a minimum residential densities and commercial uses must create a high level of pedestrian activity. Land near the transit stop should reinforce transit use by supporting higher density, pedestrian-oriented uses and development patterns. Uses which are primarily auto-oriented are not appropriate for TODs and are better located near major highways.
Guideline 1N:

COORDINATED PLANNING

Regardless of the number of property owners, the application for development of a TOD, or a portion of a TOD, must include a coordinated plan for the entire TOD site. This plan should be consistent with the design guidelines, coordinate development across property lines, and provide strategies for financing construction of public improvements.

Discussion:

While TOD sites in New Growth Areas will often be owned by a single entity, many other sites will consist of numerous parcels under multiple ownerships. To ensure that the TOD area is planned in a coordinated manner, a single TOD plan should be submitted. Property owners may jointly prepare a single TOD development plan or work cooperatively with the City to prepare a TOD specific plan.

Financing plans prepared as part of TOD development plans should distribute the costs of public infrastructure and improvements, as well as compensate landowners whose properties help satisfy the TOD public use requirement, through the use of assessment districts, landscape maintenance districts, and/or homeowners associations.

Justification:

TODs represent a departure from traditional single parcel development and require coordinated planning and implementation of public improvements such as streets, pedestrian paths, bikeways, and plazas.
Guideline 10:

PHASING

TODs must be developed in a balanced phasing pattern. Public areas must be dedicated concurrent with commercial and residential uses.

Discussion:

TODs represent relatively large projects which will be executed over several years. The phasing of the project is critical to its success, both as a financial undertaking and as a mechanism to encourage transit use. Smaller increments of development are not only easier to finance, they allow for variety and design excellence, rather than the appearance of mega projects.

To the degree reasonable, infrastructure improvements should be phased consistent with the increment of development. In order to ensure that public uses and amenities are provided in an integrated manner, developers should dedicate sites designated for public uses concurrent with development of commercial and residential uses.

Justification:

The retail uses of TODs are often dependent on the market area developed in the residential and office components of the project. While this core commercial center must often follow the residential development, the land for public facilities and parks can be set aside and developed concurrently to aid in the project’s marketing and to supply amenities and services to new residents.
THE FOUR URBAN VILLAGE TYPES

1. URBAN CENTER VILLAGES
   Locations: Within an Urban Center; well-recognized as a neighborhood or
   subarea of an Urban Center. Examples include Denny Regrade, Pike/Pine
   Corridor, University Village, and Southeast Lake Union.
   Sizes: From a quarter-mile radius (walking distance) up to about 240 acres.
   Function/Mix of Use: Characterized by a primary activity, either residen-
   tial or employment, or a mix.
   Density: 15-20 units per acre for residential; 25-50 units per acre for
   employment.
   Transportation: Access to a regional high-capacity transit system is
   required. Excellent pedestrian and local transit.

2. HUB URBAN VILLAGES
   Locations: Aurora/130th, Lake City, Ballard, Fremont, Rainier/190, and
   West Seattle Junction.
   Locational Criteria: Will consist of at least one high-density, mixed-use core
   area, surrounding by residential areas at strategic locations in the local and
   regional transportation networks, with direct transit connections to at least one
   Urban Center. It will be served by arterials, pedestrian and bike circulation.
   The Village will serve as a transit hub for surrounding neighborhoods.
   Sizes: Hub Village cores will be within a half-mile of the center of activity;
   peripheral areas will vary, allowing for residential density as well as travel
   by foot to the core.
   Function/Mix of Use: Mixed-used development preferred in the core;
   peripheral areas largely residential.
   Density: In core areas, 15-20 housing units per acre and from 25-50 jobs
   per acre. Outside the core, 8-12 housing units per acre.
   Transportation: A transit station will be located within the core to provide a
   transfer place between the transit system or for transfers to other transit
   modes.

3. RESIDENTIAL URBAN VILLAGES
   Locations: Aurora/97th, 85th/Greenwood, Holman Road/85th,
   Greenwood/Rosevald, Walkabout, Eastlake, Upper Queen Anne,
   23rd/Union, 23rd/Jackson, Beacon Hill, Columbia City, MUK
   Way/Young, MUK Way/Olivia, Rainer Beach, Alki, Admiral/California,
   California/Morgan, Barton/25th, Youngstown.
   Locational Criteria: Areas with a concentrated mix of residential develop-
   ment, located on a principal transit route with direct service to at least one
   Urban Center or Hub Village, ready access from arterials, with a full range of retail
   services. Areas will be conducive to pedestrian use and connected by bike
   and pedestrian facilities.
   Sizes: Comfortable for walking, encompassing at least 125 acres.
   Function/Mix of Use: Predominantly residential, with a mix of uses to
   support residents.
   Density: 10-15 housing units per acre.
   Transportation: Transit and non-Single Occupancy Vehicle facilities will be
   developed.

4. NEIGHBORHOOD VILLAGES
   Locations: About 23 are identified, ranging from NE 125th/15th NE, to W
   W., Draw/14th W., to 42nd E/E Madison, to Sylvan Way SW/Delridge Way
   SW, to S Graham/Rainier S.
   Locational Criteria: Neighborhood Villages will have transit service to the
   nearest Hub or Urban Center Village, good pedestrian and bike connections,
   opportunities for residential infill, adequate public facilities and a "neighbor-
   hood anchor" or focus of commercial services.
   Sizes: 2-3 blocks of commercial and/or multifamily zoning allowing for mod-
   est development in the "neighborhood anchor.
   Function/Mix of Use: Primarily residential, with some commercial to
   serve neighborhood needs.
   Density: Within the core area, 8-10 housing units per acre; outside, 6-8
   units per acre.
   Transportation: The core area will be the focal point for transit. Pedestrian
   oriented improvements to benefit residents and transiders will be preferred.
December 2, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary Between Plan Area 013, Watson Creek (Conservation), and Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat (Residential), to Add Placer County APN 092-010-18 to Plan Area 014

Proposed Action: The owner of a 26.5 acre parcel in Placer County, presently located in Plan Area 013, Watson Creek (Conservation), proposes to relocate the parcel into Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat Residential, for the purposes of developing additional residential uses. The proposed action would expand the TRPA Urban Boundary. Refer to Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries, and Exhibit B, Applicant’s Proposed Plan Area Boundary.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend denial of the proposed amendment to the Governing Board for the reasons set forth below in the Discussion section.

Background: The subject parcel is shown in Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries. It is vacant. It is approximately twenty six and one-half acres in size and contains Dollar Creek, a perennial stream. The Dollar Creek riparian corridor is stable and well-vegetated, and not in need of restoration. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has mapped a 100-year floodplain along the creek which varies from 50 to 100 feet wide through the site.

The existing Plan Area designation for the subject parcel is Plan Area 013, Watson Creek Conservation. Refer to Exhibit C, Plan Area Statement 013, Watson Creek. Permissible uses include residential summer homes and several developed recreation uses. It is located outside the TRPA Urban Boundary which is coincident with the existing boundary of Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat Residential. Plan Area Statement 014 is shown in Exhibit D.
Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary
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The applicant also owns two vacant, residential parcels in the existing sub-
division located adjacent to the subject parcel in Plan Area 014. The
applicant has stated his desired intentions are to create three large lot
parcels through a series of boundary line adjustments involving the subject
parcel and the two parcels in Plan Area 014. It is uncertain at this time
whether TRPA could approve the ultimate parcel configuration proposed by
the applicant.

Land Capability: TRPA mapped land capability includes class 1b (SEZ), class 5
(Umpa very stony sandy loam, UmD), and class 6 (Tahoma stony sandy loam, ThD)
found on site. The two soil types have slope ranges up to a maximum of
fifteen (15) percent. A more refined slope analysis submitted by the
applicant, however, estimates that approximately 15 acres have slopes in
excess of fifteen (15) percent. Slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent in
the Umpa soil series (UmE and UmF) are designated as land capability classes 3
and 1a, respectively. Tahoma series soils with slopes greater than fifteen
(15) percent are Jorge/Tahoma soils (JwE and JwF) rather than Tahoma soils and
are designated as land capability classes 4 and 2, respectively. The correct
land capability will have to be ascertained prior to any project development.

Discussion: In evaluating proposed plan area amendments, staff uses a three-
step procedure. A proposal to formalize this staff procedure will be con-
sidered by the APC (Agenda item V.A.) at the December meeting.

The first step is to determine whether a mistake was made in mapping the
original plan area boundaries in this area. Based on the existing land use
pattern, including the Urban Boundary located at the edge of the platted,
residential subdivision, and the presence of Dollar Creek and its related
flood plain on the subject parcel, there is no evidence that a mistake was
made in the original mapping on the subject parcel.

The second step is to determine whether some other factor has changed in terms
of the land use pattern or character of the site. Based on staff's review,
nothing appears to have changed which would warrant relocating the parcel into
the residential plan area and, at the same time, expand the urban boundary.
Further, the recent Douglas County Community Plan litigation settlement agree-
ment temporarily prohibits TRPA from taking action on subdivision applications
filed after July 1, 1994, on lands which are located outside the TRPA Urban
Boundary existing on August 1, 1994. This temporary prohibition applies to
the subject parcel and may affect the owner's ultimate plans for the site.
This temporary prohibition will be in effect until the Governing board con-
siders staff recommendations for Code amendments to clarify the appropriate-
ness of subdivisions outside the urban boundary existing on August 1, 1994
(estimated date for such consideration is December 1994). Refer to the TRPA
Urban Boundary section below for additional discussion.

The third step is to determine whether amending the Plan Area would change the
land use patterns such that attainment and maintenance of the environmental
thresholds is improved or enhanced. The subject parcel contains Dollar Creek
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and its associated riparian corridor and flood plain, and appears to have large areas of slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent. As discussed earlier, the stretch of Dollar Creek and its associated SEZ on the subject parcel are in stable condition and not in need of restoration. Dollar Creek is not included in the SEZ restoration program of the adopted Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (208 Plan). It contains several intrinsic values in the areas of soil conservation, water quality, wildlife habitat and in-stream fish habitat. Similarly, the 208 Plan states that "This alternative will maintain the existing boundaries of the urban area within the Region, and will generally result in the in-fill of property in land capability districts 4 through 7 with urban land uses, consistent with the TRPA Plan Area Statements (Volume I, p. 218). There are no regional benefits to be gained by approving the proposed amendment.

TRPA Urban Boundary: In 1986, as part of the Regional Plan package, TRPA established an Urban Boundary. All residential, commercial/public service and tourist accommodation plan areas are included within the Urban Boundary. The subject parcel is in a Conservation Plan Area which is not included within the Urban Boundary. Adding it to the Residential Plan Area (014) would expand the Urban Boundary.

TRPA established Urban Area Boundaries to clearly direct the location of all future residential, commercial/public service and tourist accommodation development. The Urban Boundary represents TRPA policy (shown below) that additional development occur within already developed areas. These areas contain the necessary public utilities, road system, and other supporting infrastructure to accommodate the additional development permitted under the Regional Plan.

The following sections of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Land Use Element, Land Use Subelement contains the Urban Boundaries policies.

"GOAL #2 DIRECT THE AMOUNT AND LOCATION OF NEW LAND USES IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES AND THE OTHER GOALS OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT.

Based on the findings of the Compact, evidence included in the environmental impact statement prepared for this Plan, and public testimony, the Tahoe Region is experiencing resource use problems and deficient environmental controls.

POLICIES

1. THE TOTAL POPULATION PERMITTED IN THE REGION AT ONE TIME SHALL BE A FUNCTION OF THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES.

Population growth in the Region will be guided by the limitations on land use set forth in the Plan. This Plan identifies land use, densities, traffic volumes, urban boundaries, and other factors that indirectly determine the population at any given time. All of these factors have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds.
2. SPECIFIC LAND USE POLICIES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE USE OF PLANNING AREA STATEMENTS FOR EACH OF THE PLANNING AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE MAP INCLUDED IN THIS PLAN (LOCATED INSIDE BACK COVER). AREAS OF SIMILAR USE AND CHARACTER HAVE BEEN MAPPED AND CATEGORIZED WITHIN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS: CONSERVATION, RECREATION, RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE, AND TOURIST. THESE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS SHALL DICTATE ALLOWABLE LAND USES. MORE DETAILED PLANS, CALLED COMMUNITY PLANS, MAY BE DEVELOPED FOR DESIGNATED COMMERCIAL AREAS. OTHER DETAILED PLANS, SUCH AS THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, SKI AREA MASTER PLANS, AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANS, MAY ALSO BE DEVELOPED. THESE DETAILED PLANS MAY COMBINE TWO OR MORE OF THE FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS.

Since the development permitted under this Plan is generally limited to the existing urban boundaries in which uses have already been established, the concept of this land use plan is directed toward regulating infill and redirection. The intent of this system is to provide flexibility when dealing with existing uses, continuation of acceptable land use patterns, and redirection of unacceptable land use patterns. Implementation ordinances set forth the detailed management criteria and allowed uses for each land use classification.

For example, as of March 1, 1993, there were approximately 1,244 vacant single-family parcels in Placer County which were above the IPES line and eligible for development. At the same time, there were 935 parcels in Placer County which are below the IPES line.

From a land use planning standard and in terms of attaining and maintaining the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities, the existing lands within the Urban Boundary should first be built out prior to expanding into those areas outside of it. A fundamental concept of the Regional Plan is to infill additional development into existing developed areas. Cumulatively, the incremental expansions of the Urban Boundary would be inconsistent with the Goals and Policies stated above.

In summary, staff believes that the parcel in question is appropriately mapped in Plan Area 013 and should not be relocated.

Findings: Prior to amending the plan area boundary, TRPA must make the following findings.

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.

Rationale: This Finding cannot be made. Adding Conservation Plan Area lands to a residential plan area and consequently expanding the Urban Boundary is inconsistent with the
Regional Plan Goals and Policies which direct new residential development into existing developed areas to infill rather than expanding into areas outside the Urban Boundary.

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

Rationale: This Finding cannot be made. As stated in page II-2 of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, establishing the Urban Boundary infilling additional development in existing developed areas rather than expanding into undeveloped areas was one of the key factors which have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds. Expanding the Urban Boundary at this time combined with the slower than anticipated progress toward threshold compliance will adversely effect the Region's ability to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.

4. Finding: The Regional Plan and all its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules, and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.

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 item.
013 -- WATSON CREEK

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: CONSERVATION
33 Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is a large Plan Area that covers the backdrop country between Dollar Point and Flick Point and is located on Agency maps D-4, D-5, D-6, E-3, E-4 and the Martis Peak Quadrangle.

Existing Uses: The Plan Area is mostly undeveloped and in public ownership. Existing uses are mostly limited to dispersed-types of recreation and to timber management.

Existing Environment: This area has a good mixture and distribution of plant communities, but mature fir trees still dominate the overall plant composition. Much of the area has good land capability.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This planning area should be managed with an emphasis on providing improved opportunities for dispersed recreation and timber harvest.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. There is an over abundance of unimproved roads.

2. There is good capability land for long range relocation of recreational development. However, the potential for developed recreational sites is constrained due to lack of the necessary infrastructure such as sewer, water, and improved roads.

3. The lack of significant natural features such as large streams or lakes limit the attractiveness of the area for campsite development.

4. The legal status of the North Rim Subdivision is uncertain.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The development or relocation of recreational facilities should be limited to good capability lands within close proximity to urban services.

2. Some bank stabilization and fish passage barrier removal work should be performed on Watson Creek.

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

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

- **Residential:** Summer homes (S).
- **Public Service:** Transmission and receiving facilities (S) and pipelines and power transmission (S).
- **Recreation:** Day use areas (S), developed campgrounds (S), off-road vehicle courses (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S), riding and hiking trails (A), rural sports (S), group facilities (S), undeveloped campgrounds (S), and snowmobile courses (S).
- **Resource Management:** Reforestation (A), regeneration harvest (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (S), early successional stage vegetation management (A), nonstructural fish habitat management (A), non-structural wildlife habitat management (A), structural fish habitat management (A), structural wildlife habitat management (A), farm/ranch accessory structures (S), grazing (S), range pasture management (A), range improvement (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (A), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Homes</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Campgrounds</td>
<td>8 sites per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Facilities</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

SUMMER DAY USES 0 PAOT  WINTER DAY USE 0 PAOT  OVERNIGHT USES 400 PAOT

OTHER: Seven miles of trail.

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

1. Stream zone restoration as indicated in the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program.
   (To be completed.)
014 -- CEDAR FLAT

PLAN DESIGNATION:

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

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area is located in the Cedar Flat area north of Dollar Point and can be found on TRPA maps D-6 and D-5.

Existing Uses: The area consists of older low density residential subdivisions. The entire length of the shoreline below the highway is single family residential with minor access to a county-owned strip of shoreline. The area is 75 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The lands are classified 60 percent low hazard, 15 percent high hazard and 15 percent moderate hazard. The high hazard and steeper lands are located along the shoreline which is a tolerance district 2 and 4 and is designated as prime fish habitat. The land coverage is 15 percent plus an additional 25 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue as a residential area of the same type and character now existing.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Erosion is evident on over steepened lands adjacent to the lake.
2. Subdivision and highway improvements are not up to minimal BMP standards.
3. Private use of the county-owned shorezone strip has created conflicts between public and private uses.
4. The prime fish habitat in Lake Tahoe is tentatively identified for habitat restoration.
5. Severe flooding and erosion problems associated with development within SEZs and channelization of natural drainages.
6. Scenic Roadway Unit 17 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 18 are within this Plan Area.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. A specific plan shall be developed by Placer County for the county littoral strip of land known as Lake Forest #2 prior to any further shorezone development. The plan should balance private pier and buoy uses with public recreation and fishery management.
2. Attention should be given to an overall hydrologic study of the area and appropriate remedial actions to correct the problems.
PERMISSIBLE USES: Pursuant to Chapter 18 PERMISSIBLE USES and if applicable, Chapter 51 PERMISSIBLE USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, the following primary uses may be permitted within all or a portion of the Plan Area. The list indicates if the use is allowed (A) or must be considered under the provisions for a special use (S). Existing uses not listed shall be considered nonconforming uses within this Plan Area. The establishment of new uses not listed shall be prohibited within this Plan Area.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Tolerance District 2**
- **Primary Uses**
  - Safety and navigational devices (A) and salvage operations (A).
- **Accessory Structures**
  - Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (S).

**Tolerance District 4**
- **Primary Uses**
  - Beach recreation (A), safety and navigational devices (A), and salvage operations (A).
- **Accessory Structures**
  - Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (C), breakwaters or jetties (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (S).

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

**USE**

Residential

Single Family Dwelling 1 unit per parcel

**MAXIMUM DENSITY**

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

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area, including the Highway 28 corridor, is 55 CNEL.

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

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

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

1. Improvements required by the Surface Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 of Volume I of the 2018 Water Quality Plan.

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

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

December 1, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Reaffirmation of TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP)

Propered Action: To hold a public hearing on reaffirming TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP), and make a recommendation for approval to the TRPA Governing Board.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the APC hold a public hearing and recommend the reaffirmation of TRPA's Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP) to the Governing Board.

Discussion: The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has been designated by the State of California as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the California portion of the Tahoe Region. As the RTPA, TRPA is responsible for completing a Regional Transportation Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region.

On May 27, 1992, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Governing Board adopted the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP). This plan is a comprehensive document addressing both transportation and air quality in the Lake Tahoe Region. It was completed as a comprehensive document to ensure consistency in meeting all federal and state transportation planning requirements.

According to Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines set forth by the California Transportation Commission, the governing Body of the RTPA is responsible for determining portions of the transportation plan that need updating. In the event that an RTPA determines that the previously adopted regional transportation plan is adequate and continues to represent the desires of the region, it shall certify in writing to Caltrans and the Commission that no updating is necessary and reaffirm the prior RTP.

TRPA has determined that the RTP-AQP adopted in 1992 is adequate and continues to represent the desires of the Region. When the 1992 Plan was being developed, considerable public participation was involved. Because of this level of public involvement, the Plan was well supported Region-wide. The assumptions used in the completion of the Plan are still valid.
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TRPA will be preparing the 1996 Threshold Evaluation Report, beginning in the upcoming fiscal year. The Evaluation will entail gathering data related to thresholds, monitoring for levels of attainment/nonattainment, and modelling forecasted situations. Since it would be more efficient to use the information gathered for the threshold evaluation in updating the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan, TRPA will update the RTP-AQP concurrently with the 1996 Threshold Evaluation Report.

In the reaffirmation of the RTP-AQP, public participation is very important. Staff would like to hold a public hearing at the APC meeting, and again at the Governing Board meeting to gain as much public input as possible. The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Advisory Committee and the Tahoe Transportation Coalition will be discussing this item at their December meetings as well.

If there are any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Bridget Mahern at (702) 588-4547.
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AGENDA ITEM VI C. 102
December 2, 1994

To:       TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From:     TRPA Staff
Subject:  Amendment of Kingsbury Community Plan, Chapter 4 Matrix to Clarify and Modify the Irrevocable Commitment

Proposed Action: Douglas County has requested that TRPA review and take action on the following items related to the Chapter IV Requirement List matrix located in the Kingsbury County Community Plan:

1. Technical corrections to the Kingsbury Community Plan Requirement List for Achievement of Targets (see Attachment A).

2. Modification of the Requirement List to change the irrevocable commitment from the construction of a sidewalk on Kingsbury Grade to construction of a sidewalk on US Highway 50 (see Attachment A).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the amendments.

Discussion: Douglas County staff has submitted a request that TRPA amend the Kingsbury Community Plan Chapter IV Requirement List matrix. These amendments are needed in order for Douglas County to satisfy the Chapter 4, Policy A (the irrevocable commitment policy) requirements. Upon satisfaction of the requirements the County may issue the commercial allocations.

During meetings with TRPA staff to arrange for the release of the commercial allocations, it was discovered that the matrix had inconsistencies that needed to be corrected. The mandatory designations in the CP Target column did not match the X’s in the Start Plan column. Also, a footnote was deleted in the printing of the document.

The second issue was that the original commitment to build frontage improvements on the NDOT parcel on Kingsbury Grade could not be met. The County did not acquire the parcel as was originally planned. The County has constructed an equal set of frontage improvements on US Highway 50 by the Nugget. The County desires to substitute the Nugget improvements for the required improvements.
Required Findings: The following Chapter 6 findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed community plan amendments:

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.

Rationale: The changes to the matrix are either technical changes to correct inconsistencies or project substitutions. They are consistent with the Community Plan and all the other applicable plans.

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

Rationale: The list of projects was evaluated in an EIS and the proposed amendments present no substantive change to that analysis which indicated all impacts were mitigated.

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: See 2 above.

Environmental Documentation: Based on the Douglas County Community Plan EIS analysis, staff has completed the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) and has recommended a determination of no significant effect on the environment for the proposed amendments.

There will be a brief presentation on this item at the meeting. Please contact Gordon Barrett at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
KINGSBURY CP REQUIREMENT LIST
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbols are explained in the text following the matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CP MEASURES

A. TRAFFIC/AIR QUALITY

1. LOS Policy
   - N X X RTP

2. Highway Improv.
   - Hwy 50/Kng Inter. Imp.
     - N X X X RTP X X
   - Hwy 50 Flow Improv.
     - E X X X X X X
   - Kingsby Flow Improv.
     - E X X X X X X
   - Kingsbury Connector
     - O X

3. Parking Program
   - Parking Ord.
     - N X X X PLN
   - Facil. & Manage. Plan
     - E

4. Transit Improv.
   - STAGE Extension
     - N X X X RTP X X
     - N X X X X X X
   - Casino Shuttles
     - N X X X RTP X X
   - Ski/Tour Shuttles
     - N X X X X X
   - Airporter(s)
     - N X X X RTP X X
   - Transit Facilities
     - N X X RTP

5. Pedestrian Improv.
   - Loop/Kingsbury
     - X X RTP X X X X
   - Hwy 50 Area
     - M X X X X X X X X X
   - Upper Kingsbury
     - N X X RTP X X X X

   - Kingsbury/Lake Trail
     - N X X X X X
   - Kingsbury/R.H. Trail
     - N X X X RTP X X
   - Casino/Kingsbury Trail
     - N X X X X

7. Mitigation Fee
   - N X X X CDE

8. TSM Policy
   - Membership
     - O
   - Ridership Incentives
     - N X X RTP X X
   - Van Pools
     - N X X RTP X X
KINGSBURY CP REQUIREMENT LIST
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbols are explained in the text following the matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury CP</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/93</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP MEASURES</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Land Use
   - Rec. Facilities  N  X
   - Comm/Tourist    E  X

B. SEZ RESTORATION

1. SEZ Target (3 ac.)
   - Burke Ck Nugget (.25 ac.) N  X  X  X  208  X  X  X
   - Edgewood Ck. (1.5 ac.)  N  X  X  X
   - Burke Creek Out (2 ac.)  O  X  X
   - Burke Ck Meadow (15 ac.) O  X  X  X  208

C. SCENIC IMPROVEMENT

1. Design Stds.& Guide.  N  X  X  X  PLN  X
2. Sign Standards      N  X  X  X  PLN  X
3. Sign Program        N  X  X  X
4. S Q I P Policy       N  X  X  X  CDE
5. View Policy         N  X  X  X
6. Underground Policy  N  X  X  X
7. Hwy 50 Improvements N  X  X  X  SQP  X  X
8. Kingsbury Improvements N  X  X  X  SQP  X  X

D. LAND COVERAGE REDUCTIONS

1. L.C. Target (2.3 ac.)
   - Hwy 50 Imp. (.1 ac.)  N  X  X  X
   - Upper Knq Imp. (.6 ac.) O  X  X  X
   - M D O T Site (.5 ac.)  N  X  X
   - Private (1.5 ac.)     N  X  X
FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

(Symbols are explained in the text following the matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsbury CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/93</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP MEASURES</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**E. WATER QUALITY**

1. BMP Req.
   - 80% Rest. Tar. [2.55 ac.]
     - Hwy 50 Shiders (.1 ac.)
     - Hwy Shoulder (.5 ac.)
     - NDOT Site (.5 ac.)
     - DC Park (1 ac.)
     - Private (2.7 ac.)

2. Area-wide Drainage Sys.
   - Lower System
   - Upper System
   - Edgewood Sys.

3. Noise Limits

**F. NOISE**

1. Noise Limits

**G. FISHERIES**

1. Burke Creek

**H. RECREATION TARGET**

1. Beach Access Policy

2. Rec. Targets [650 DCP]
   - Stn. Area Beach (500)
   - Rec. Trails (50)
   - DC Park (100)

*This applies to the Douglas County Park and the NDOT properties fronting Kingsbury Grade and US Highway 50.*
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December 6, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 33, Allocation for Development, Relating to Distribution of Residential Allocations to Parcels Below the IPES Line

PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is to amend Chapter 33 to provide for a 1995 (and beyond) program for distribution of residential allocations to parcels below the IPES line for transfer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends adopting an ongoing program identical to the 1993 and 1994 programs with the provision that counties which implement random distribution of allocations (such as Douglas County) be exempted from the set-aside.

BACKGROUND: In 1992 and 1993, Chapter 33 was amended to set-aside ten percent of each jurisdiction's annual allocations for distribution to parcels below the IPES line for transfer. TRPA distributed the set-aside allocations through random selection drawings of interested parcels below the line. Use of the allocations was limited to transfer only; no point buy-ups were permitted. At the end of each year, the program was to be evaluated prior to implementation of the next year's program.

The 1993 program resulted in eight applications for allocation transfers. The remaining 22 allocations were returned to the counties in July for reissuance. All the transfers were in the City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County.

The 1994 program resulted in twelve applications for allocation transfers. The remaining 18 allocations were returned to the counties for reissuance. One transfer occurred in Washoe County and the rest were in the City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County.

DISCUSSION: The 1993 and 1994 programs worked well in the City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County. The program has not worked as well in the other counties because the supply exceeds or meets the demand. Douglas County has recently adopted an allocation distribution system which permits parcels below the IPES line to receive and transfer allocations so no set-aside is needed in Douglas.

Due to a current lack of calculated sewer capacity, the 1995 allocations in the STPUD service area (City of South Lake Tahoe and southern El Dorado
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County) will not be released in January. STPUD is preparing a Facilities Plan and BIS to address this situation.

The allocation set-aside program should be continued and monitored. The rate of transfers in Placer and Washoe Counties may improve over time as market conditions improve. Further, it is important to provide the transfer option.

In order to avoid further annual amendments, staff is proposing to make the 10 percent set-aside an ongoing program with a provision for exemption of a county if the Governing Board finds that parcels below the line are permitted to compete for and obtain allocations for transfer.

The proposed ordinance amendments are set forth in Attachment A.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: Because the program is primarily administrative and promotes the retirement of sensitive lands, TRPA staff recommends a finding of no significant effect.

ACTION REQUESTED: TRPA staff requests that the APC hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the Governing Board.

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

Attachment
ATTACHMENT A
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 33
DISTRIBUTION OF ALLOCATIONS TO PARCELS BELOW IPES LINE

33.2.B Distribution and Administration of Residential Allocations:
Residential allocations shall be distributed and administered in accordance with the Goal and Policies, this Code and the Rules of Procedure.

(1) Distribution Systems Requirement: Distribution of allocations for 1993 and beyond shall be by a method or system which permits the participation of parcels with scores below the numerical level defining the top rank in the applicable jurisdiction.

(a) TRPA shall reserve 10 percent of each jurisdiction's 1994 annual allocations for distribution to parcels below the IPES line. The reserved allocations shall be distributed by a method of random selection by TRPA. A county or city may elect to distribute the reserved allocations, or may be exempt from the set-aside requirement, provided TRPA finds the substitute system or the city/county distribution system, as the case may be, provides an equal or superior opportunity for participation of parcels below the IPES line.

(b) Allocations distributed by TRPA under this subsection may either be transferred or returned to TRPA for reissuance to the jurisdiction of origin.

(c) A complete application for transfer of a reserved allocation shall be filed no later than June 17, 1994 of the year it was distributed. Transfers of allocations shall be deemed complete when the applicant has received a TRPA notice of eligibility for the transfer and the original allocation form has been signed by the owners of the transferer and transferee-parcels, and TRPA, the signatures of the receiving and sending county or city shall be required for inter-jurisdictional transfers.

(d) Upon transfer of a reserved allocation, a complete application for an additional residential unit shall be filed no later than December 31, 1994 of the year the allocation was distributed. Failure to submit a complete application for a transfer by June 1, 1994 or to file a complete application for a new residential unit by December 31, 1994 shall result in the forfeiture of the allocation to the jurisdiction of origin.