TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
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 Tuesday, February 8, 1994, at the Tahoe Sands Inn Convention Center, 3600 U.S. 50, South Lake Tahoe, California, and at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 9, 1994, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach California. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

January 31, 1994

By: David S. Ziegler
Executive Director
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 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. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Adoption of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan and Related Actions - Tuesday, February 8

1. Certification of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan EIS/EIR

2. Adoption of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan

3. Amendment of Land Capability Overlays H-16, H-17, and G-17

4. Amendments of Chapters 24, 26, and 30 to Include Community Plan Standards

5. Amendments of PAS 089B, for Consistency With the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan

6. Amendments to PASs to Delete PASs 089B and 091
B. Amendment of Chapter 22, Height Standards, Subsection 22.4.C, Additional Height for Redevelopment Projects Within the City of South Lake Tahoe, to Create Special Height Districts Which Would Be Permitted Additional Building Height

C. Adoption of the Tahoe City Community Plan and Related Actions—Wednesday, February 9

1. Certification of the Tahoe City Community Plan EIS/EIR

2. Adoption of the Tahoe City Community Plan

3. Amendment of Land Capability Overlay C-7

4. Amendments of Chapters 24, 26, and 30 to Include Community Plan Standards

5. Amendments of Plan Area Statements (PASs) 002, 003, 171, and 174 for Consistency With the Tahoe City CP and Placer County General Plan

6. Amendment of PASs to Delete PAS 001A

D. Adoption of Chapter 97, Employer-Based Trip Reduction Ordinance

E. Amendment of Chapter 82, Adjustment of Water Quality Mitigation Fees to Account for Inflation

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Finding of Technical Adequacy and Recommendation on Certification of the Sierra Nevada College New College Campus, Final Environmental Impact Statement

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director


2. Other

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. PENDING MATTERS

IX. RESOLUTIONS

A. For Former APC Chairman Teri Jamin

X. ADJOURNMENT
February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan and Related Actions

Proposed Action: The APC is requested to review and make a recommendation on the following items related to the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan.

1. Certification of the revised Final EIR/EIS for Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan (mailed separately - 1/28/94)

2. Adoption of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan (mailed separately in white binder - 1/31/94)

3. Adoption of technical amendments to implement the CP as follows:
   a. Amendment of Land Capability Overlays H-16, H-17 and G-17 (Attachment A)
   b. Amendments of Chapters 24, 26, and 30 to Include CP Standards (Attachment B)
   c. Amendments of PAS 089B for Consistency with the Stateline/Ski Run CP (Attachment C)
   d. Amendments to delete PAS 089B California South Stateline Resort Area and PAS 091 Ski Run (Attachment D)

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends certification of the EIS/EIR, adoption of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan (with staff recommended changes noted in the draft CP and summarized in Attachment G), and adoption of the Plan Area Statement amendments and other technical amendments.

Background: In the Summer of 1992, a draft Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan was circulated with an Environmental Assessment. Three of the four commentors indicated that an EA was not adequate and an EIS/EIR should be prepared and recirculated. Staff agreed to prepare an EIS/EIR and circulate the revised document. The Community Plan was also modified.
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in hopes of reducing controversy. The controversy was focused on the proposed hotel site on the Park Cattle Company lands, the CP boundaries, and the drainage treatment provisions. The delay in the SLT Redevelopment improvements (e.g. the Loop Road, drainage basins, and linear park) further complicated the situation.

The revised Team-recommended Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan, (July, 1993), and the accompanying Draft Stateline/Ski Run EIS/EIR (July, 1993), was handed out in August of 1993. The July draft Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan was discussed at the January APC and Governing Board meetings.

Staff has now prepared a revised Final EIS/EIR for your consideration. Staff also reviewed the Community Plan for consistency with the EIS/EIR and TRPA regulations. A staff recommended draft of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan with underline/overstrike language was prepared. The recommendations are based on the TRPA staff review of the EIS/EIR and CP. As seen from the summary in Attachment G and the actual text changes, there are only minor changes recommended by staff. The Team reviewed the changes and concur with all but one boundary change noted below.

**Issues:** The staff presentation will focus on the issues of controversy that have been identified. This list may be changed as a result of the City's Community Plan Workshop which will be held February 1. It should be noted that there is a consensus on the majority of the content.

1. **Inadequate EIS/EIR** - The original environmental document for the CP was an environmental assessment that was circulated for 30 days. It was argued that an EIS/EIR was needed. The EA was converted to an EIS/EIR and recirculated. Current comments by the League to Save Lake Tahoe and Mike Remy, representing some Conklin Tract property owners, indicate that the document is still inadequate and should be revised and recirculated. (see EIS/EIR comment letters)

**Recommendation:** TRPA staff recommends the EIS/EIR be certified.

2. **Boundaries** - The citizen members of the Team feel strongly that the findings for CP boundary adjustments are being interpreted incorrectly, however, they are willing to agree on all but one change (see boundary discussion in Attachment G for Area #9). The League to Save Lake Tahoe and TRPA staff disagree with the Team's view on the findings for Area #9.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends the addition cannot be made based on the Governing Board actions regarding the Douglas County CPs.

3. **Area-Wide Drainage** - Lahonton supports the City's area-wide drainage system concept but indicates that the responsibility for all drainage remains with the individual properties if the systems fail to meet discharge standards. The League to Save Lake Tahoe desires to have better assurances that area-wide drainage systems are constructed with or before
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the commercial development. Both are concerned about any CP exemptions or substitutions.

Recommendation: Staff recommends using the wording approved by the Governing Board for the Douglas CPs for drainage.

4. Area-Wide Standards - There are provisions in the proposed area-wide standards that need modification to be equal or superior to TRPA standards. The sign ordinance was developed by a separate City citizen group and generally allows for more sign area than Chapter 26. The EIS recommends some additional safe guards.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the modifications listed above in the Background section.

5. Threshold Achievement - There is an argument by the League (that was also presented with the Douglas County CPs) that the CPs are not attaining thresholds or that the CP targets were inadequate in regards to attaining thresholds. The traffic/parking related targets, i.e., VMT, LOS, CNEL, and CO, are the most contentious. It is the assumption of staff that a community plan must contribute to threshold attainment, but is not responsible for threshold attainment for the entire Region.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the Community Plan.

Required Findings: Findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed community plans. Attachment E contains the findings related to the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan, the related PAS amendments, and technical amendments. The Governing Board will have to make the findings to adopt the Community Plan.

Environmental Documentation: The Community Plan and related actions were the subject of an Environmental Assessment. An EA was prepared pursuant to the requirements of TRPA. Because of controversy, changes in the CP, and delays in redevelopment improvements, an EIS/EIR was draft and circulated. The Final EIS/EIR for the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan, (January, 1994) is now before the TRPA for certification. Certification is defined as finding that the final EIS is in compliance, procedurally and substantively, with Article VII of the compact, Chapter 5 of the Code and the Rules of Procedure.

(Attachment F is an Executive Summary)

Also, the Compact and the TRPA Code require that prior to approving a plan for which an EIS was prepared, the TRPA Governing Board shall make findings for each significant adverse effect identified in the EIS. The required findings are found in Attachment E.

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.
MEMORANDUM

January 31, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Map Amendment for the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan Area

Proposed Action: Approval of the land capability map amendment as shown in Exhibit A.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission approve the amended land capability map.

Background: The verification of the land capability classes and the soil map units for the area included in the Stateline\Ski Run Community Plan Area was completed in the summer of 1989. This work was done using standard soil survey mapping procedures. The field work was done by Mr. Russell Almaraz and Mr. Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientists, and Mr. Robert Erlich and Mr. John Cobourn, hydrologists. Soils were examined at close intervals using soil pits dug with shovels and a hand auger. The soils at the pit sites were examined with enough detail to determine the soil classification and the appropriate soil series. Slope measurements were also taken at these sites using a clinometer, to determine the appropriate soil map unit of that series (which includes the slope range) in which the soil found at that pit should be placed. The field notes on soil characteristics and slope were recorded on the field maps which had a scale of 1 inch equal 400 feet.

To assist in the identification of soil series and map units from which the land capability classes were determined, and the boundaries between them, aerial photographs of several types were utilized. These included U-2 infrared photos developed by the U.S. Forest Service and enlarged to a scale of 1 inch equal 400 feet, and color photos with a scale of 1 inch equal 2000 feet.

Attachment A

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
The identification of areas classified as stream environment zone (SEZ) and land capability class 1b, was done jointly by the soil scientists and hydrologists. Working together, they determined the presence of any soil, vegetative, or hydrologic SEZ indicators and the boundaries between the SEZs and the other land capability classes.

The land capability class and soil map unit delineations were depicted on a copy of the TRPA 1 inch equal 400 foot base map series for the Stateline/Ski Run area. The mapping was determined by staff to be an accurate representation of soils and land capability within the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan Area.
February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendments to Chapters 24, 26, and 30 to Include CP Standards

Proposed Action: As part of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan approval, the APC is requested to approve substitute standards and guidelines for design, parking, and signage.

Recommendation: Staff recommends adoption of the standards and guidelines for the Community Plan. Staff also recommends the sign standards, as permitted by Chapter 26, and the guidelines, as permitted by Chapter 30, be adopted for the entire City.

Background: Chapter 14 of the Code allows the community plan substitution of equal or superior standards for design, signs, and parking. Section 4.8 of the EIS/EIR confirms that the proposed standards meet the equal or superior test.

As to the guidelines, Chapter 30 of the Code allows for local jurisdictions to have substitute equal or superior guidelines which could apply to CPs. The EIS/EIR confirms that the guidelines meet the equal or superior test.

As to the applicability outside the CP, the Code does not address parking or design standards substitution. It is the intent in the long term that TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe adopt a joint set of standards and guidelines for design, signs and parking. The APC endorsed this idea at its December, 1993, meeting.

Findings: The analysis is found in Section 4.8 of the EIS/EIR. An evaluation of signs was prepared in March of 1993 and contains a sign analysis for the entire City. The findings are included in Attachment E.

Environmental Documentation: This is covered by the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan EIS/EIR.
CHAPTER 24

DRIVEWAY AND PARKING STANDARDS

Chapter Contents

24.0 Purpose
24.1 Applicability
24.2 Driveways
24.3 Parking (Reserved)

24.0 Purpose: This chapter sets forth minimum standards for driveways and parking facilities to minimize interference with traffic flow on the street and highway system of the Tahoe Region.

24.1 Applicability: This chapter is applicable to all development that requires or uses vehicular access or parking, except:


24.2 Driveways: To ensure organized and well-designed ingress and egress of vehicles from driveways, TRPA shall review the design of driveways according to the following standards and procedures:

24.2.A Driveway Defined: A driveway is a clearly identifiable path of vehicular access from the parking area of a parcel to the public right-of-way or other access road. A driveway may be either one-way or two-way.

24.2.B Compliance Program: The standards set forth in Subsections 24.2.C through 24.2.F, inclusive, shall be conditions of approval for projects with driveways, and for projects for which TRPA finds that the driveways are not in compliance with the standards set forth in Subsections 24.2.C through 24.2.F, inclusive, and are causing significant adverse impacts on traffic, transportation, air quality, water quality, or safety. If TRPA finds that driveways associated with existing development are causing such impacts, TRPA may implement corrective measures pursuant to Chapter 9.

Exhibit C
CHAPTER 26

SIGNS

Chapter Contents

26.0 Purpose
26.1 Applicability
26.2 Sign Package Review
26.3 List of Exempt Activities
26.4 List of Qualified Exempt Activities
26.5 Substitution of Standards
26.6 General Sign Standards
26.7 Signs in Conservation Plan Areas
26.8 Signs in Recreation Plan Areas
26.9 Signs in Residential Plan Areas
26.10 Signs in Commercial/Public Service Plan Areas
26.11 Signs in Tourist Plan Areas
26.12 Gasoline Price Signs
26.13 Temporary Signs
26.14 Existing Signs

26.0 Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to promote and protect the public health, welfare, and safety of the general public by implementing regional outdoor advertising regulations pursuant to Article VI of the compact, to protect property values, create a more attractive economic and business climate, enhance the aesthetic appearance of the physical community, preserve the scenic and natural beauty and provide an enjoyable and pleasing community in accordance with Community Design Subelement of the Land Use Element and related elements of the Goals and Policies. It is further intended to reduce signs or advertising distractions and obstructions that may contribute to traffic accidents.

26.1 Applicability: All signs shall comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Chapter, except:


26.1.B City of South Lake Tahoe Substitutions: The City Standards and Guidelines for Design, Signage, Parking, Driveway, and Loading Spaces shall apply to the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan. The guidelines contained within this document shall apply to the entire City.

Except as exempted in Section 26.3, installation, modification or replacement of signs requires review and approval as a project in accordance with this Chapter and other applicable provisions of the Code. In addition, sign projects also may have imposed, as conditions of approval, appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program.

Exhibit B
Chapter Contents

30.0 Purpose
30.1 Applicability
30.2 Design Review Guidelines
30.3 Scenic Quality Improvement Program
30.4 Substitution Of Standards And Guidelines
30.5 Site Design Standards
30.6 Building Design Standards
30.7 Landscaping Standards
30.8 Exterior Lighting Standards
30.9 Water Conservation Standards
30.10 Standards For Combustion Appliances
30.11 Outdoor Advertising
30.13 Establishment of Scenic Highway Corridors

30.0 Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to ensure that projects are designed and constructed consistent with the Community Design Subelement of the Land Use Element and related elements of the Goals and Policies.

30.1 Applicability: All projects shall comply with the standards set forth in this chapter, except:


30.1.B City of South Lake Tahoe Substitutions: The City Standards and Guidelines for Design, Signage, Parking, Driveway, and Loading spaces shall apply to the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan. The guidelines contained within this document shall apply to the entire City.

In addition, exempt activities, as defined in Chapter 4, shall comply with sections 30.9 and 30.10. Appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and Scenic Quality Improvement Program may be considered as conditions of project approval.

30.2 Design Review Guidelines: Design and site planning methods and techniques shall be set forth in a handbook called Design Review Guidelines.

30.3 Scenic Quality Improvement Program: Additional design guidelines applicable to specific areas shall be set forth in a document called the Scenic Quality Improvement Program. Provisions of that program shall be required by TRPA, as appropriate, as conditions of project approval.
MEMORANDUM

February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of PAS 089 Lakeside Park Area

Proposed Action: The Advisory Planning Commission is requested to recommend the appropriate action in regard to the adoption of the PAS 089 Lakeside Park Area. The proposed PAS and map is Exhibit A.

Recommendation: TRPA staff recommends approval of the proposed plan area statement.

Background: When the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan was drafted, a major area was proposed to be deleted. This area located between the motel area at Stateline and the Lake, is known as the Lakeside Park area. This area was deleted because it is primarily residential with a lot of SEZ.

It was not appropriate to keep the area in the currently adopted PAS 089 because PAS 089B is a tourist/commercial plan area. Since there was no adjoining plan area to merge with Lakeside Park it required the creation of its own plan area. Exhibit A represents the modifications to PAS 089B (the current applicable PAS) needed to create a new PAS 089.

The proposed residential/recreation theme represents the existing land use pattern and is consistent with the Community Plan. Although this is a "down zoning" in the TRPA system, the City zoning only allowed low density residential uses. Also, it was at the request of Lakeside Park residents that this area be removed from the community plan.

Findings: The EIS/EIR in Section 4.1 briefly discusses the proposal in the context of the Community Plan adoption. The findings for this total package are included in Attachment E.

Environmental Documentation: This proposal is considered in the Final EIS/EIR for the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan. There are no identified unmitigated impacts associated with this PAS amendment. The Findings are included in Attachment E.
089B -- LAKESIDE PARK AREA

PLAN DESIGNATION:
- Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL TOURIST
- Management Strategy: MITIGATION REDIRECTION
- Special Designation: NONE PRELIMINARY COMMUNITY PLAN AREA
- Eligible for redevelopment plans. TDR receiving area for:
  1. Existing Development
  2. Residential Bonus Units (Policy 5 limitation)

SCENIC RESTORATION AREA:
PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING LOCATION
MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM
(Policy 5 limitation)

DESCRIPTION:
- Location: This is a residential/recreation hotel/motel area on the California side of South Stateline and is located on TRPA maps H-16 and H-17.
- Existing Uses: This area includes some numerous motels, the Crescent V shopping center, Lakeside Marina and beach, numerous commercial establishments, and some older residences. The area is 95 percent built out.
- Existing Environment: The land classification of this area is a mixture of high and low hazard. The shorezone tolerance district is 1. Land coverage and disturbance is high.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue as a residential/recreation area while improving lake access opportunities, major tourist center with an emphasis on redirection through redevelopment.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:
1. This area has traffic congestion problems at peak periods.
2. This area is the major traffic generator in the Basin.
3. There is a disturbed barrier beach with littoral drift problems.
4. This area contains Scenic Roadway Unit 32 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 31 and the roadway unit is targeted for restoration as required by the scenic threshold. This area has some drainage problems on Pine Boulevard.
5. There is a need for affordable housing in this Plan Area.
6. There are pedestrian access problems in the vicinity of the post office.
25. The USFS has identified bald eagle habitat in this Plan Area.

6. The South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Redevelopment Plan is in this plan area.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Redirection in PAR 090A, 090B, 091, 092 should be consistent with an adopted Redevelopment Plan and Community Plan. These plans may include consideration of additional building height consistent with that permitted by the Code of Ordinances.

2. The Lakeside Marina harbor and adjacent barrier should be reviewed to determine whether or not significant littoral drift problems exist. If a significant littoral drift problem does exist, then reasonable alternatives should be reviewed. Any alternative to mitigate a significant littoral drift problem should receive appropriate private and public financial assistance to accomplish this goal.

3. A special Plan Area transportation plan should be developed for this Plan Area to include consideration of alternative transportation modes, transit terminals, more efficient vehicular and pedestrian access, and movement and parking for tour and other buses outside the Stateline area.

14. Restoration of the barrier beach/SEZ area should be a high priority.

5. This area should be considered for affordable housing for casino employees, on a fair-share basis with the Nevada Plan Areas. Residential bonus units shall only be permitted for employees or affordable housing.

6. Additional pedestrian crossings should be considered in this area, especially near the Stateline post office.

7. The Crescent V Center and adjacent areas should have a high priority for initial redirection activities.

8. All activities within the South Lake Tahoe Demonstration Redevelopment Plan Area shall be subject to the special provisions of the adopted redevelopment plan.

9. Commercial, tourist accommodation or residential uses on parcels abutting the Montreal Extension right-of-way shall not be permitted access to the Montreal Road Extension, except for new single-family residences which have no alternative access. New commercial and tourist accommodation uses or signage, abutting the Montreal Road Extension, shall be restricted consistent with the limited access design of the Montreal Road Extension.

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

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

Residential
- Employee housing (S), multiple family dwelling (S), multi-person dwelling (S), nursing and personal care (S), residential care (S), and single family dwelling (S) (A).

Tourist Accommodation
- Bed and breakfast facilities (S) (A), hotels, motels, and other transient dwelling units (S) (A), timeshare (hotel/motel design) (S), and timeshare (residential design) (S).

PAS 089B -- LAKESIDE PARK AREA
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Commercial

Eating and drinking places (S), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (S), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (S), service stations (A), amusement and recreation services (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), outdoor amusement (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), financial services (A), health care services (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), schools, business and vocational (S), secondary storage (S), and vehicle storage and parking (S).

Public Service

Churches (A), collection stations (S), cultural facilities (A), day care centers/pre-schools (S), local assembly and entertainment (S), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organisations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), social service organizations (A), pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (S).

Recreation

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

Resource Management

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

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 1

Primary Uses

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

Accessory Structures

Buoys (A), piers (S), fences (S), boat ramps (S), floating docks and platforms (A), shoreline protective structures (S), and water intake lines (A).
**MAXIMUM DENSITIES:** Pursuant to Chapter 21 DENSITY, the following list establishes the maximum allowable densities that may be permitted for any parcel located within the Plan Area. The actual development permitted may be further limited by transfer of development rights limitations, residential density incentive program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-person-Dwelling</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>5 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Housing</td>
<td>As per the limitations above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel and other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with less than 10% of units with kitchens</td>
<td>40 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with 10% or more units with kitchens</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeshare</td>
<td>As per the limitations set forth in this table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Vehicle Parks</td>
<td>10 sites 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 0.445 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 55 dBA 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 List pursuant to Chapter 33 Allocation of Development. The following additional capacities are measure 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 Volume III of the Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 13 of Volume I of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

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

3. Stream zone restoration as indicated in Volume III of the Water Quality Management Plan, the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program. (To be completed).

4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway-50 corridor. (To be completed).
February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendments to Delete PAS 089B South Stateline Resort Area and 091 Ski Run

Proposed Action: In order to adopt the Stateline/ Ski Run Community Plan, the Plan Area Statements need to be amended to delete PAS 089B and 091 so that the Community Plan can replace them.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the attached technical amendments be approved.

Background: The Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan replaces the currently adopted PAS 089B and 091. It should be recognized that part of 089B was deleted from the Community Plan and new PAS 089 Lakeside Park will replace that area (see Attachment D). The Plan Area Statement document needs to be amended to reflect this change. These are technical amendments needed to adopt the Community Plan. The findings and environmental documentation related to the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan (Appendix E) address this action.

Attachment D
Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
REGIONAL PLAN FOR THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN
PLAN AREA STATEMENTS

PREFACE .................................................. i

I  INTRODUCTION ........................................ I - 1

A) Framework of Regional Plan ................................ I - 1
B) Plan Area Statement Relationship to Other Documents.. I - 4
C) Plan Area Maps ........................................ I - 5
D) Plan Area Amendments .................................... I - 5
E) Existing Uses .......................................... I - 5

II PLAN AREA FORMAT AND DESCRIPTION ................ II - 1

Example .................................................. II - 2

Legend to Plan Area Statement Sections .................. II - 8
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001A -- TAHOE CITY
001B -- TAHOE CITY INDUSTRIAL
002 -- FAIRWAY TRACT
003 -- LOWER TRUCKEE
004 -- BURTON CREEK
005 -- ROCKY RIDGE
006 -- FISH HATCHERY
007 -- LAKE FOREST GLEN
008 -- LAKE FOREST
009A-- LAKE FOREST COMMERCIAL
009B-- DOLLAR HILL
010 -- DOLLAR POINT
011 -- HIGHLANDS
012 -- NORTH TAHOE HIGH SCHOOL
013 -- WATSON CREEK
014 -- CEDAR FLAT
015 -- NORTH STAR
016A-- CARNELIAN WOODS
016B-- CARNELIAN BAY SUBDIVISION
017 -- CARNELIAN BAY
018 -- FLICK POINT/AGATE BAY
019 -- MARTIS PEAK

Exhibit A
III PLAN AREA STATEMENTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>KINGSWOOD WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>TAHOE ESTATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>TAHOE VISTA COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>TAHOE VISTA SUBDIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024A</td>
<td>NORTH TAHOE RECREATION AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024B</td>
<td>SNOW CREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>KINGSWOOD EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>KINGS BEACH INDUSTRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>WOODVISTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>KINGS BEACH RESIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>KINGS BEACH COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>MOUNT ROSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>BROCKWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>NORTH STATELINE CASINO CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>STATELINE POINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>CRYSTAL BAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>CRYSTAL BAY CONDOMINIUMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE #4/PONDEROSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>LAKEVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>WOOD CREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>CHATEAU/COUNTRY CLUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>FAIRWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>TUNNEL CREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE TOURIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>MILL CREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>MT. SHADOWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>TYROLIAN VILLAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>INCLINE SKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>INCLINE LAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>INCLINE VILLAGE INDUSTRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>EAST SHORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>MARLETTE LAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>SPOONER LAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>GLENBROOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>SHAKESPEARE POINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>GENOA PEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>LOGAN CREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>CAVE ROCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>LINCOLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>LAKE RIDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>SKYLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>ZEPHYR COVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>MARLA BAY/ZEPHYR HEIGHTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>ROUND MOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>BLKS POINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070A</td>
<td>EDGECOOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III PLAN AREA STATEMENTS (continued)

070B -- RABE
071 -- Replaced by the Round Hill Community Plan
072 -- ROUND HILL/TAHOE DEMPSEY
073 -- LAKE VILLAGE
074 -- ROUND HILL RESIDENTIAL
075 -- DOUGLAS COUNTY SEWER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
076 -- Replaced by the Kingsbury Community Plan
077 -- OLIVER PARK
078 -- MIDDLE KINGSBURY
079 -- CHIMNEY ROCK
080 -- KINGSBURY DRAINAGE
081 -- KINGSBURY VILLAGE
082 -- UPPER KINGSBURY
083 -- KINGSBURY HEIGHTS
084 -- PALISADES
085 -- LAKEVIEW HEIGHTS
086 -- HEAVENLY VALLEY NEVADA
087 -- HEAVENLY VALLEY CALIFORNIA
088 -- TAHOE VILLAGE
089A-- Replaced by the Stateline Community Plan
089B----CALIFORNIA-SOUTH-STATELINE-RESORT-AREA Replaced by the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan
089 -- LAKESIDE PARK
090 -- TAHOE MEADOWS
091 -- SKI-RUN Replaced by the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan
092 -- PIONEER/SKI RUN
093 -- BIJOU
094 -- GLENWOOD
095 -- TROUT/COLD CREEK
096 -- PIONEER VILLAGE
097 -- BIJOU PINES
098 -- BIJOU/AL TAHOE
099 -- AL TAHOE
100 -- TRUCKEE MARSH
101 -- BIJOU MEADOW
102 -- TAHOE KEYS
103 -- SIERRA TRACT-COMMERCIAL
104 -- HIGHLAND WOODS
105 -- SIERRA TRACT
106 -- MONTGOMERY ESTATES
107 -- BLACK BART
108 -- WINNEMUCCA
109 -- TAHOE VALLEY CAMPGROUND
110 -- SOUTH "Y"
111 -- TAHOE ISLAND
112 -- GARDNER MOUNTAIN
113 -- INDUSTRIAL TRACT
114 -- BONANZA
115 -- GOLDEN BEAR
116 -- AIRPORT
117 -- TAHOE PARADISE (T.P.) WASHOAN
118 -- TWIN PEAKS
119 -- COUNTRY CLUB MEADOW
120 -- TAHOE PARADISE (T.P.) MEADOWVALE
PLAN AREA STATEMENT 089B
SOUTH STATELINE RESORT AREA
HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE
STATELINE/SKI RUN COMMUNITY PLAN
PLAN AREA STATEMENT 091
Ski Run Commercial
Has been replaced by the
Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan
FINDINGS FOR STATELINE/SKI RUN COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Article VII(d) Findings for the EIS: These findings are made and based upon the administrative record of the EIS/EIR and the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan, including other documents prepared pursuant to the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan. A summary of impacts and mitigations is provided in the EIS/EIR Executive Summary (Attachment F). 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 soils impacts. In addition, area wide remedial water quality improvement projects and SEZ restoration projects are required as part of this plan.

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 CP, as mitigated by proposed transportation projects and BMP requirements. 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. Mitigation projects are proposed with this CP to attain VMT and LOS targets. Parking, VMT, and LOS mitigation is listed in Chapter III of the CP.

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:** The lake access proposals require further study. There are no impacts identified with vegetation, wildlife and fisheries for this CP assuming compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements.

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 CP 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 recreation impacts identified. Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to recreation projects 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 CP proposes scenic targets and strategies to attain the targets. The CP proposes Design Standards and Guidelines to address signs and other 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:** There were no safety impacts identified.

II. Chapter 6 Findings for Community Plan Adoption and Adoption of related
Code and PAS Amendments: The following findings must be made prior to
adopting the proposed plan and amendments:

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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

**Rationale:** Stateline/Ski Run is identified as an area appropriate
for community plans in the Goals and Policies, Land Use
Subelement, Goal #2, Policy 6. Community plans are an
important tool for redirection and rehabilitation of
development as discussed in the Land Use Subelement,
Goal #2. The Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan was pre-
pared in conformance with the substantive and procedural
requirements of the Goals and Policies, as implemented
through Chapter 14 of the Code.

Consistent with the Goals and Policies, the 1988 TRPA
108 Plan and 1991 RTP/Air Quality Plan also consider
community plans as an implementation tool. The
Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan contains the required
element of community plans, including environmental
targets to assist in the attainment and maintenance of
the thresholds. When implemented, the Stateline/Ski Run
Community Plan will have a beneficial impact on TRPA's
efforts to attain and maintain thresholds.

All development within community plans is subject to the
Code of Ordinances. As contemplated by Chapter 14, the
community plans, when adopted, will replace the existing
plan area statements. The community plan includes up-
dated land capability information.

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

**Rationale:** The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold
related targets with strategies to achieve those tar-
gets. The EIS for this plan did not find any threshold
to be exceeded.
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(id) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

**Rationale:** The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets (for air quality and water quality, the threshold targets are the applicable standards) and strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any standard would be exceeded.

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:** The Community Plan sets environmental targets, with implementation strategies, which are designed to make a contribution to achieving a regional threshold. By linking the allocation of commercial floor area to environmental targets and implementation programs, the Community Plan will work, in concert with other regional plan programs (e.g., 208 Plan, RTP/Air Quality Plan) to achieve and maintain thresholds. Community plan are an important tool in the achievement and maintenance of thresholds.

The concentration and rehabilitation of commercial and related development in the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan will reduce VMT and auto trips and provide a land use pattern that encourages transit and pedestrian modes of transportation. The rehabilitation is directly related to scenic improvements and indirectly to implementation of BMPs. The provision of environmental targets and capital improvements to achieve them within the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan will result in progress toward threshold attainment that ordinarily would not be required under EIS mitigation requirements.

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

**Rationale:** See 2 and 4 above.

IV. **Special Findings and Considerations Related to Community Plan Adoption**

A. **Chapter 14 Community Plans Findings and Considerations,**

1. **Section 14.3 Boundary Findings** - Six additions to this Community Plan are proposed. The rationale for making the findings is found in the Section 4.1.2 of the EIS/EIR and the TRPA Staff Summary for which the findings were prepared.
2. **Section 14.5.C Equal or Superior Standards for Density, Noise, Driveways, Parking, Outdoor Advertising, Historic and Design** - The Final EIS/EIR documents that the proposed substitute standards and guidelines are equal or superior to the existing TRPA standards and guidelines.

3. **Subsection 14.6.D Approval of the Community Plan**
   
a. The APC has obtained and considered the recommendations of local government and other responsible public agencies and has made a recommendation to the Governing Board.

b. The Governing Board has determined that the plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies, the Code, the attainment of the targets and the requirements of 14.6.B(1).

c. The Governing Board determined the effect on other plan areas and determined no PAS amendments are appropriate.

d. The Governing Board established the initial allocations set forth in Chapter II of the Community Plan.

B. Chapter 33 Commercial Allocation Required Considerations

1. **Subsection 33.3.C Initial Allocations** - TRPA has considered the demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining needed funds for implementation, and compatibility with other community plans.

2. **Subsection 33.3.C Allocation of Reserve** - TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed CPs (18) to determine which CPs best demonstrate the ability to maintain environmental thresholds, and have a clearly demonstrated need for the additional allocation.

C. Chapter 26 Substitute Standards

1. **Subsection 26.5.B Community Plan Standards** - Section 4.8.2 of the Final EIS/EIR gives TRPA the basis for finding the community plan scenic quality improvement program and sign provisions are equal or superior to TRPAs.

2. **Subsection 26.5.A Local Government Standards (City-wide Standards)** - The scenic evaluation prepared for these areas indicates that they are equal or superior (with recommended changes) and can achieve a scenic roadway unit score of 16 by 2007. TRPA can make the finding that these standards and improvements are equal or superior to TRPAs.
STATELINE / SKI RUN
COMMUNITY PLAN

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Prepared For:
The City of South Lake Tahoe
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Prepared By:
Editor
Jerry D. Budy, Ph.D.

Contributing Parties
Basin Systems
Zephyr Cove, Nevada
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Zephyr Cove, Nevada
City of South Lake Tahoe
South Lake Tahoe,
California

January, 1994
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PLAN ALTERNATIVE

Purpose

The Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan (CP) is a commercial area land use plan that implements key features of the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan. Adoption of the Community Plan will supersede the applicable Plan Area Statements and the City's General Plan (including zoning document and Redevelopment Plan) in this area. Upon adoption by the TRPA Governing Board and the City of South Lake Tahoe, the CP will help guide and direct future growth in the Stateline/Ski Run area.

Affected Environment

The CP area, which is located along US Highway 50 from the California-Nevada state line to Bijou Creek, extending up Ski Run Boulevard to Pioneer Trail, includes approximately 275 acres. The City of South Lake Tahoe has historically operated as a summer/winter vacation and tourist center, and a residential and commercial hub that today supports nearly 22,000 permanent residents.

The study area sits between Lake Tahoe and the mountainous terrain defining the Region's south-eastern boundary. Elevations range from 6,229' to over 6,300'. Of the total area, much is considered sensitive to development, lying in stream environment zones near the lake's shore. For the most part, this area is overlapped by inadequate drainage systems which contribute to existing water quality problems. Within the study area in particular, mapped SEZ amounts to approximately 84 acres with almost 58 acres covered. Other environmental features in need of improvement include scenic quality and traffic congestion.

Background Of Preferred Alternative

The Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan has been prepared as a joint effort between the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and the Stateline/Ski Run Community Planning Team. The adopted plan will be the end product of considerable effort made over several years which has included numerous public hearings with community input. The Planning Team consists of TRPA staff, City of South Lake Tahoe staff, and citizen and business representatives.

This community plan area is unique in the Region in that it sits predominately in an established Redevelopment Area. In other circumstances, the Community Plan would be adopted first, establishing the guiding land use, infrastructure, and remedial programs necessary, with the Redevelopment Plan following as an important implementation tool. In this case, many of the guiding principals have already been established; the CP incorporates those principals, updating some aspects as necessary.

Description Of Preferred Alternative

The Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan is an important component of the long-term, coordinated effort to improve the human and natural environments of the South Lake Tahoe community. Following the general land use direction established in 1987 through adoption of the Plan Area Statements, the Redevelopment Plan refined and updated specific planning objectives in 1989. Redevelopment Project Number One implemented features of the Redevelopment Plan beginning in 1990. The Redevelopment Plan established the framework to revitalize the stagnating economy of South Lake Tahoe through a creative mix of public improvements, financial incentives, and environmental restoration.
This CP refines and updates these previous efforts. It a simultaneous planning process in Stateline, Nevada. The Douglas County Community Plans and the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan developed during the same time frame and benefited from coordinated environmental review so that critical environmental issues could be addressed on a sub-regional level. This comprehensive, bi-state planning process also occurred during development and evaluation of the Loop Road Project, which addresses the problem of traffic congestion in the busy commercial area on both sides of the state line.

Specifically, the approved preliminary plan for the Stateline/Ski Run area proposes a strategy which includes the following objectives:

- Create unique districts within the CP boundaries which concentrate development. The CP will allow up to 30,000 additional square feet of commercial floor space in the Stateline area and 15,000 square feet in the Ski Run area. (An additional 35,000 sq. ft. of transferred floor area is included for evaluation purposes.)
- Establish major tourist accommodation areas adjacent to the casino core, within and north of the Loop Roads, and also along Ski Run Boulevard near the Ski Run Marina.
- Encourage retail areas that are attractive for pedestrian traffic and that are served by improved parking facilities.
- Create an array of transportation options which will reduce the dependence of tourists and residents on the private automobile.
- Construct detention basins and artificial wetlands to treat the runoff generated by development within the community plan area.
- Rehabilitate existing housing and encourage construction of new affordable housing within the CP area.

Major aspects of the Community Plan are summarized below.

**Land Use:** The land use classification proposed for the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan area is Tourist with its major themes as Major Tourist Accommodation and High Quality Retail Activities. Land use districts, or for TRPA purposes, Special Areas, incorporate development themes for portions of the community including Retail/Tourist, Retail, Recreation, Tourist/Residential, and Recreation/Public Service. Within these areas, the CP proposes permissible uses designed to implement each theme. This preferred alternative designs for 45,000 sq. ft. of allocated commercial floor area and considers 35,000 sq. ft. of transferred floor area. The alternative also allows additional tourist accommodation units (25 of these originate from the bonus pool, the remainder are transferred from other areas) and up to 145 residential bonus units. Of the commercial floor area (CFA) designated for Stateline, land use policies direct the majority to the Park Avenue project area with additional CFA reserved for the Laurel Avenue sub-area. In the Ski Run district, CFA is divided nearly equally between the SE Corner sub area (SE corner of Ski Run Blvd. and US 50) and the Ski Run pedestrian district around the intersection of Tamarack Ave. and Ski Run Blvd. Available tourist accommodation units (TAU) are reserved for the Ski Run area to encourage development of small scale bed and breakfast inns. The allocation system provides incentive for redevelopment of uses in conformance with CP policies by limiting the amount available to any one project (to encourage community-wide improvement), and linking use of CP incentives to environmental improvement.

**Transportation:** Several important plan proposals address traffic congestion. The Loop Road project will allow alternate travel through the congested Stateline area. Designated improvements to US Highway 50 include sidewalks, drainage improvements, street lights, and a coordinated landscaping theme. New community parking lots allow increases in the total number of parking spaces available to address
specific shortages. Two potential community parking lots (Laurel and Ski Run) are identified to serve this function.

Conservation: This alternative proposes the following environmental targets to be met by 1997 for six threshold issues. The targets established represent one third of the Regional Plan improvement goals, recognizing the reduced number of years until the 2007 threshold attainment date.

1) Reduce VMTs by the Stateline/Ski Run share of the community plan total of 1,543 VMTs by 1997 (or 11,920 VMTs by 2007) and obtain level of service D at selected monitoring points.

2) Restore approximately 9.5 acres of SEZ by 2007, which is in excess of the 208 Plan target, with approximately 3.2 scheduled by 1997.

3) Attain the SQIP 1997 targets for scenic thresholds.

4) Restore 11 acres of hard coverage to meet excess coverage reduction responsibilities.

5) Implement a retrofit program which requires developed parcels which are not part of an area wide drainage system to install on site BMPs to treat runoff. Until area wide drainage systems are be shown to meet water quality effluent limitations, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Lahontan Region) policy is to require on site treatment of stormwater runoff from individual parcels. Properties which meet the special circumstances identified in TRPA Code Chapter 25 may consider off site treatment.

6) Stay within the designated noise limits of 65 CNEL for US 50/Loop Road, 65 CNEL for Special Areas which are commercial, 55 for Special Areas which are residential, and 55 CNEL for the Shorezone area.

Recreation: The Community Plan proposes to provide new park facilities through property acquisition between Paradise and Osgood streets and within the Moss District. It will also provide a public recreation demonstration project geared to beach access. Public trail linkages will be provided above the South Loop Road to the 200 acre Van Sickle property, and a bike trail will be constructed within the Lakeside District to the beach and to Nevada.

Public Service: A fire station located at the intersection of Ski Run and Pioneer Trail will replace the current station on US 50 designated for removal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT/EFFECT</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>1) No CP status with severely limited commercial expansion potential.</td>
<td>1) No CP status with severely limited commercial expansion potential.</td>
<td>1) TRPA/City, 2) Prior to CP approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</td>
<td>1) The CP promotes the same general mix of uses throughout, emphasizing land use themes through use of targeted incentives. 2) Six parcels appear to meet the findings necessary for inclusion in the CP boundary, fourteen parcels do not.</td>
<td>1) Concentrate new development in the Staterline area.</td>
<td>1) TRPA/City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1) Distribution of more CFA to Staterline and more TAU to Ski Run does not support the concept adopted in the Redevelopment Plan, nor is it supported by the economic analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that TRPA Code of Ordinances provisions will insure that typical development-related impacts are mitigated. These are not listed separately here and would include, but not be limited to: application of temporary and permanent BMPs, compliance with coverage, scenic, and design standards, and adherence to environmental documentation requirements at the project review stage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT/EFFECT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils</strong></td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) No overall increase in coverage within the Redevelopment Area can occur. Outside, additional coverage can occur within Code limits. 2) Coverage reduction will occur accompanying Redevelopment Projects and site-by-site excess coverage mitigation. Less coverage reduction will occur on a regional basis with no CP mitigation ratios established. Site-by-site coverage reduction will be slower.</td>
<td>1) None needed. 2) None needed.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable. 2) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable. 2) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The proposed excess coverage mitigation program meets its target. With progress on the Redevelopment Project #1 (with mitigation package), CP bonus programs can proceed. Disturbed soil stabilization program may also meet the target, principally through enforcement of the TRPA BMP retrofit program (Code Section 25.3.A). 2) Coverage increases will occur through development of vacant property. The maximum envisioned increase (approximately 5 acres) does not result in a net increase in coverage in the Redevelopment Area and will result in approximately 2.6 acres of coverage reduction within the hydrologic area. 3) The Loop Road Project presents an overall decrease in coverage, although it can contribute more to coverage reduction in the area. 4) Without inclusion into the CP boundaries, CP allowed coverage increases cannot be allowed in District 6b. (Most of this district is recommended for exclusion from the CP boundary.)</td>
<td>1) Features of the excess coverage mitigation program: a- US 50 Improvements (1.5 acres) b- Redevelopment Project #1 (7.3 acres) c- Ski Run Blvd. Improvements (1 acre) d- Park Ave. Project (2.5 acres) e- Motel Area (0.5 acre) Features of the disturbed ground restoration program: f- Implementation of Redevelopment Projects g- Application of BMPs through project review h- Achievement of the land coverage reduction targets i- Implementation of TRPA's BMP Retrofit Program 2) As required by the Code. 3) Incorporate the mitigation measure from the Loop Road project which identifies roadway width reduction along the South Loop. 4) Amend the policy to exclude coverage increases, encourage consideration of additional coverage for affordable housing, or delete it.</td>
<td>1) Coverage/disturbed ground reduction. a- after 1997 b- by 1997 c- by 1997 d- by 1997 e- by 1997 f- by 1997 g- through 1997 h- through 1997 and beyond i- by 1997 2) At the time of project review. 3) Prior to CP adoption. 4) Prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td>1) Coverage/disturbed ground reduction. a- State b- Redevelopment, private c- City, assessment district d- private e- private f- Redevelopment, private g- private h- see above i- private 2) Project proponent. (TRPA during project review.) 3) TRPA / City 4) TRPA / City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Same effects as for Alt. 2. Greater overall coverage reduction possible with exclusion of Montreal Extension.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/FACT</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality/Stream Environment Zones</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) None needed.</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) None needed.</td>
<td>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 3 (Proposed Plan)</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) Not applicable.</td>
<td>Alternative 3 (Proposed Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) Not applicable.</td>
<td>Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative 1 (No Project)
- 1) All increases in SEZ coverage allowed in Alt. 2 could also occur in this alternative.
- 2) SEZ restoration following the 206 Plan program currently generates 5 acres. SEZ restoration within the CP area. The same projects envisioned in Alt. 2 are under current consideration for addition to the existing TRPA program, possibly creating an equal situation.

### Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)
- 1) Completion of previously studied drainage plans will improve water quality; monitoring will show standards compliance. Additional treatment may be necessary.
- 2) Previous review of project performance standards was done.
- 3) Storm water treatment shall occur in conjuction with project review for all properties which do not meet the special circumstances of Code section 25.7. The CP specifically identifies financial constraints as an acceptable circumstance.
- 4) The SEZ restoration program identifies up to 9.55 acres, exceeding the 3.2 acres required in the target. Progress on those projects required for Redevelopment Project #1 allows commencement of SEZ benefit programs.

### Alternative 3 (Proposed Plan)
- 1) This alternative presents similar SEZ effects as Alt. 2, drainage and water quality projects as Alt. 2.
- 2) Same as Alt. 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shorezone/Fish Habitat</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Projects with potential impacts on the shorezone could occur with or without CP development. See Alt. 2.</td>
<td>2) See Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) See Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) See Alt. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Increased public beach access and use of Ski Run Marina for water transit have negligible effects on shorezone/fisheries with adequate mitigation identified at the project stage.</td>
<td>1) None needed at this time.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation/Circulation</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) LOS: With no CP, Redevelopment and Loop Road projects will proceed and produce adequate LOS. 2) VMT: Regional VMT is expected to increase by 16% over 1981 baseline conditions.</td>
<td>1) See Alt. 2. 2) VMT reduction measures identified in the RTP will reduce this impact.</td>
<td>1) See Alt. 2. 2) Through 2007.</td>
<td>1) See Alt. 2. 2) TRPA / City / Caltrans / TMA / others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) LOS: Redevelopment and Loop Road projects will proceed and produce adequate LOS. 2) VMT: VMT reduction measures will produce 5,370 reduction, exceeding minimum target. 3) Implementation of new parking standards increases parking needs by 110-310 spaces in Stateline and 71-171 spaces in Ski Run. Implementation of the employer trip-reduction program and transit and pedestrian connections may reduce this number.</td>
<td>1) Intersection improvements identified in previous studies are necessary to maintain adequate LOS. a- Loop Road intersections b- US 50/Ski Run 2) VMT reduction strategies are: a- long distance bus service (520) b- transit terminal (2,300) c- gondola to Heavenly (2,300) d- sidewalks, bike trails (250) 3) No additional needed at this time.</td>
<td>1) a- after 1997 a- before 1997 c- after 1997 d- through 1997 3) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) a- State / City b- Redevelopment / private 2) a- State / City / Redevelopment / private c- State / City / private 3) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) LOS: Exclusion of Montreal Extension and allowing parallel parking along the US 50 pedestrian corridor results in less LOS improvement, more intersection congestion. Maintaining four lanes for Ski Run Blvd. along its length appears unnecessary relative to expected traffic.</td>
<td>1) None identified.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Circulation, cont.</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) VMT: Concentrating tourist units in Ski Run results in less VMT reduction. No proposals combine to produce 2007 VMT target attainment to be met by 1997. 3) Same parking numbers expected overall as for Alt. 2 (different distribution). Allowing parallel parking along US 50 increased the supply near small shops, yet may discourage some pedestrian activity.</td>
<td>2) VMT reduction strategies same as for Alt. 2. Additional implementation measures necessary to produce compliance by 1997. 3) None identified.</td>
<td>2) Same as for Alt. 2. 3) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable. 2) Same as for Alt. 2. 3) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The North Park alternative for the Loop Road was not the environmentally preferred alternative in the Loop Road Project EIR/EIS, even considering the proposed mitigation. 2) Increased transit to Heavenly is unlikely to attract the ridership of a tram, reducing VMT and traffic benefits.</td>
<td>1) Sec the Loop Road Project EIR/EIS. 2) Additional measures may be needed to attract the same patronage as an elevated tram.</td>
<td>1) Prior to adoption of this alternative. 2) Prior to project approval.</td>
<td>1) TRPA / City 2) TRPA / City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Construction of CP features will increase locally produced suspended particulates. 2) Completion of the Loop Road system, improved tailpipe emissions, and increased use of transit and other alternatives will create CO standards attainment by 2007.</td>
<td>1) Identify and institute appropriate dust control measures during project review. 2) No additional needed (see the transportation discussion).</td>
<td>1) During project review. 2) See transportation.</td>
<td>1) TRPA / City 2) See transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Noise levels associated with increased traffic from CP development along US 50 will increase slightly, yet remain within adopted standards. 2) Noise associated with the Loop Road project will exceed adopted standards in some areas. 3) Tailoring noise standards to land use districts provides superior protection for residential, hotel/motel areas (Alt. 2 and 3). 4) The CP incorrectly identifies the US 50 noise corridor.</td>
<td>1) None needed. 2) As determined by the Loop Road EIR/EIS. 3) None needed. 4) Amend the CP to correctly identify the US 50 noise corridor.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable. 2) Prior to project approval. 3) Not applicable. 4) Prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable. 2) TRPA / City 3) Not applicable. 4) TRPA / City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Resources/Community Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Without a CP, adopted programs and projects produce threshold attainment by 2007. Implementation may be difficult.</td>
<td>1) None needed.</td>
<td>Through 2007.</td>
<td>TRPA / Placer Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Modifications to the City-wide Design Manual (Chapters I and II) needed to meet equal or superior test. 2) A modification to Chapter III of the Design Manual needed to meet equal or superior test. 3) Amendments to the City-wide sign standards are needed to meet the equal or superior test.</td>
<td>1) a) TRPA must retain authority for allowing exceptions based on equal scenic effect. b) Manual must apply to all projects which require a permit. Retain TRPA standards for single family construction. Include language identifying TRPA permit authority. c) TRPA to retain approval of state and federal project. d) Identify the Rural transition districts and relevant guidelines. e) Make the guideline for landscaped islands in parking lots a standard. f) Other minor text modifications. 2) In the Stateline pedestrian district (Lakeside of US 50), allow only one story structures to extend to a 10' setback; structures may increase according the sun angle requirements of the Redevelopment Plan. 3) a) Text modifications to clarify assumptions made in the evaluation: i) window signs must conform to building sign height, as amended ii) no exceptions to freestanding sign criteria allowed if minimum of 10' landscaping width cannot be obtained. minimum width allowed only if offsetting improvements are made. iii) package presented to receive exception may not include other required features. iv) minimum landscaped planter width across a frontage establishes the maximum width of a freestanding sign. v) the master sign plan must include an approved location for all banners which must be grouped or coordinated if more than one.</td>
<td>1-3) Prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td>1-3) TRPA / City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic Resources/Community Design, continued</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan), continued</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2, cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2, cont.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) continued</td>
<td>b: Building signs located more than 50 feet from the property line shall not exceed 26 feet high.</td>
<td>4) Through 1997 and after 1997</td>
<td>4) TRPA / City / State / Redevelopment / private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) With Redevelopment and CP features (with mitigations), all units will meet or exceed the CP target improvements by 1997 as follows: Roadway Unit #32 increases by 1 point</td>
<td>c: Structure for roof signs may not extend above the main roof line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Unit #33 increases by 2 points</td>
<td>d: All banners must be in windows. Consider exceptions when BRB reservation is made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e: Amend the exceptions provisions as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) TRPA must approve all exceptions along scenic corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) no exceptions allowed for: maximum sign area, sign height (building above 26' or freestanding), planter width of less than 10' or less than 100% of frontage except for driveways to allow a freestanding sign, sign color if internally illuminated, and number and setback of freestanding signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f: Limit total sign area for tourist accommodation uses to: 120 sq. ft. if one major street entrance, for two, three, and four major entrances, allow 240 sq. ft., 360 sq. ft., and 480 sq. ft., respectively. No more than 80 sq. ft. per freestanding sign is allowed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g: Amend compliance section to recognize TRPA amortization schedule and authority outside of Redevelopment area. Allow Redevelopment schedule if public loan program is available within two years of bond release; if not, then TRPA schedule will apply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Progress on Redevelopment and CP projects needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 3 and Option</th>
<th>Alternative 3 and Option</th>
<th>Alternative 3, Option</th>
<th>Alternative 3, Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Use of Design Manual and Sign Ordinance same as for Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as for Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as for Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Same as for Alt. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Allowing parking along US 50 in the pedestrian core will produce less scenic benefits than Alt. 2. Increasing setback to 20', if additional landscaping is incorporated, can offset this effect somewhat.</td>
<td>2) Exclude parking or increase emphasis on other features.</td>
<td>2) Prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td>2) TRPA / City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Reduced building setback along Ski Run will adversely affect lake view from Pioneer Trail.</td>
<td>3) None identified.</td>
<td>3) Not applicable.</td>
<td>3) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) No tram to Heavenly (in the Option) will eliminate impacts.</td>
<td>4) None needed.</td>
<td>4) Not applicable.</td>
<td>4) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural/Historical/Architectural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The CP area is sensitive for cultural / historical / architectural resources.</td>
<td>1) Adherence to Code and CEQA provisions will insure no significant impacts result from development.</td>
<td>1) Through 1997.</td>
<td>1) TRPA / SHPO (during project review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Hazards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) No impacts identified.</td>
<td>1) None needed.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Components of the Redevelopment Plan and Project will increase recreational opportunities.</td>
<td>1) None needed.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The CP calls for trails along the Loop Road, improving that project's recreational aspects.</td>
<td>2) None needed.</td>
<td>2) Not applicable.</td>
<td>2) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Increased housing associated with Alt. 3 may create more demand than the CP recreation proposals can meet.</td>
<td>3) Housing projects should consider whether recreational opportunities exist in the vicinity. On site provision of some recreational opportunities could be considered.</td>
<td>3) During project review</td>
<td>3) Project proponent / City (project review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation / Wildlife Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) No sensitive species habitat exists within the CP area; thus no potential to adversely affect these species.</td>
<td>1) None needed.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Increases in landscaping will improve vegetation species diversity to an insignificant extent.</td>
<td>2) None needed.</td>
<td>2) Not applicable.</td>
<td>2) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing and Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts identified.</td>
<td>None needed.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services and Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts identified.</td>
<td>None needed.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDED CHANGES

1. **BOUNDARIES:** Exhibit Map A indicates the boundary adjustments proposed by the Team-recommended Community Plan. Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 18 were recommended for deletion by the Team and staff last summer. Areas 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, and 19 are recommended additions for which the findings can be made.

*Deletions* - The staff (and Team) recommends Area 5 (part of an erosion control project/cannot make the finding for commercial use), Areas 10 and 11 (added for residential purposes/cannot make the finding for commercial use), and Area 20 (proposed transportation corridor/cannot make the finding for commercial use) be deleted from the Team-recommended CP. Staff recommends Area 9 be deleted (Team disagrees) because the findings of commercial use and need cannot be made (i.e., the existing use is a residential duplex, it does not front Ski Run or relate to a commercial plan, and there is no allocation assigned to this area).

*Vision Map* - Draft a new staff (and Team) recommended Vision for 2007 Map.

*Chapter II - Amend Chapter II Land Use Matrix and District Map to match the boundary changes.*

**Rationale:** Based on the evidence in the EIS, the findings cannot be made for the additions. Adjustments in districts are required to make the findings.

2. **TRPA ADOPTION ONLY:** Line out references to City of South Lake Tahoe adopting the CPs and related standards and guidelines because TRPA cannot take action for the City. Upon adoption of the CPs by the City, the references may be reinserted in a joint plan document.

*TRPA References* - Add references to TRPA in City standards and guidelines. Create an Appendix B (with three sections) for signs, design, and parking for the City of South Lake Tahoe Community Plan.

*What Requires TRPA Review* - Define project (what requires permit), set TRPA review procedures, TRPA review of exceptions, and set the basis for an MOU.

**Rationale:** TRPA Legal Counsel indicates TRPA cannot take action for the City of South Lake Tahoe. The standards must be enforceable if the City does not adopt or assume the implementation responsibility.

3. **DESIGN, PARKING, AND SIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES:** Combine three appendices into a city Community Plan standards appendix. TRPA will make any Code amendments necessary to permit equal or superior standards.
Introduction - Make Design Manual introduction into an overall introduction section which relates to TRPA and the following chapters.
1. Make applicable to all projects and activities as defined by the TRPA Code (including State and Federal projects).
2. Add a provision for TRPA delegation for permitting authority for signage and for application of other standards for City reviewed projects.

Exceptions - Amend the exception section in Design Introduction as follows:
1. change to more than 10 percent of project cost, TRPA approved schedule.
2. add where assessments have been levied.
3. add TRPA approval required of exceptions, all findings must be made and add a finding that results must be equal or superior to standard excepted.

Scenic Corridors - Make amendments for TRPA scenic corridor standards - reference to rural transitional area on Pioneer Trail, scenic findings to setback reductions on scenic corridors, and define scenic corridor.

Setback - Add TRPA setback rules to TRPA scenic corridors except for redevelopment area.

Lighting - Change lighting standards for outdoor lighting to match wording for Douglas County CP, i.e., no special exception.

Rationale: EIS analysis of equal or superior standards require the above modifications.

SIGN PACKAGE: Add scenic mitigation measures to the Sign Ordinance and Chapter IV as follows:

TRPA Review Requirements - Establish TRPA review requirements:
1. Refer to Chapter 26 exemption list for what requires a permit.
2. Use TRPA amortization schedule (may be amended).
3. Equate TRPA PAS designations with City land use districts.

Window Signs - Sign Ordinance modifications to clarify assumptions made in the evaluation which requires that the placement of window signs must conform to building height requirements. Signage must be concentrated in one location and calculation of permissible area is based on window area for each facade.

Credits for Exceptions - The package presented for evaluation as an exception to sign standards may not include for credit other required features (i.e., the proposal must contain improvements not otherwise required by the Design Manual).

Freestanding Sign Width - Freestanding signs must occur wholly within the landscaped planter width.
Building Sign Height - Amend the ordinance for building sign height for signs located over 50 feet from property line as follows: signs up to 26 feet may be allowed, and from 0 to 50 feet a maximum of 15 feet allowed.

Roof Signs - Clarify the ordinance as follows: structure for roof signs may not extend above main roof line. Encourage structures with flat roofs to redesign roof with 5:12 pitch at least and allow sign dormers.

Temporary Signs and Banners - Amend ordinance to limit all temporary signs (banners, posters, etc.), placement to windows (within the 25% limit) of the business for which they are applicable.

Allow an exception for temporary signs (banners) outside the window area. This can only be allowed if the location is approved as part of an approved master sign plan. Reservation of some project area BRB for these banners will be necessary. The master sign plan must include an approved location for all banners; banners in multi-tenant buildings or MBCs must be grouped together unless they occur in a window.

Exceptions - Amend the ordinance as follows:
1. TRPA must approve all exceptions allowed along scenic corridors for relation to scenic thresholds, the City may approve all others.
2. No exceptions for a) sign height (building or freestanding), b) frontage landscaping width of less than 10’ and less than 100% of the frontage length not committed to minimum driveway widths, c) number of permissible freestanding signs, d) maximum permissible square footage, and e) sign color if internally illuminated.

Tourist Accommodations Limit - Amend the ordinance to limit total allowed sign area for tourist accommodations to 120 square feet per frontage.

Amortization - Amend the ordinance as follows:
1. Outside of the Redevelopment Area, amortization will occur on the schedule presented in the TRPA Code of Ordinance, Chapter 26. TRPA shall be responsible for amortization.
2. Within the Redevelopment Area, the provisions of the Redevelopment Plan are effective provided a publicly funded loan assistance program is established by 1995 or one year after the release of the bond funds. If no program is established by that date, TRPA amortization will occur based on the schedule presented in the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 26.

Rationale: The scenic analysis indicates that additional regulations are needed to reach the required score of 16.

5. WATER QUALITY: Amend CP Chapters IV and VII to:

Mitigation Fees - Add limitations to the Chapter VII water quality mitigation program that prevents crediting funds spent to meet on-site BMP requirements for off-site mitigation.
Water Quality Goal - Amend Water Quality Target Section of Chapter IV of the CPs to indicate that projects may substitute contributions to area wide solutions for payment of offsite mitigation. Also, projects may utilize proven area wide solutions to meet the discharge requirements pursuant to Chapter 25.

**Rationale:** The EIS pointed out that exempting projects from offsite mitigation requirements was a less requirement than the current TRPA standard.

6. **REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS:** The SLT Redevelopment Plan needs to be updated to match CP. References to plan area rules need to be changed to community plan rules, development standards modified, and program schedules updated.

**Rationale:** The SLT Redevelopment Plan has conflicting regulations and programs. The Community Plan supersedes the Redevelopment Plan.

7. **CP PURPOSE:** In Chapter I of the CPs add Compact quote "...to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities."

**Rationale:** TRPA Legal Counsel indicates that the quote is needed to clarify the role of the CP and TRPA.

8. **UPDATE CHAPTER VII CIP DATES:** Update the implementation schedules of the CIP to match most recent estimates.

9. **ADD PARKING PROGRAM POLICY:** Add parking program requirement to Chapter III.

**Parking Program** - Add a policy, like the policy found in the Douglas County Stateline CP, that future allocations beyond 1997 will be conditioned on the approval of a parking program that achieves the required VMT reduction.

**Rationale:** The EIS indicates that this program is needed to meet to 2007 VMT Target.
MEMORANDUM

February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 22, Height Standards, Subsection 22.4.C, Additional Height for Redevelopment Projects Within the City of South Lake Tahoe, to Create Special Height Districts Which Would be Permitted Additional Building Height

Due to this month's shortened packet preparation schedule, the staff report and attached Environmental Assessment on this matter will be mailed to the APC under separate cover. It is expected to be mailed to the APC no later than one day after the regular packet mailing.

Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038
(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

February 2, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 22, Height Standards, Subsection 22.4.C,
Additional Height for Redevelopment Projects Within the City of South Lake Tahoe, to Create Special Height Districts
Which would be Permitted Additional Building Height

Proposed Action: Amend Chapter 22, Height Standards, Subsection 22.4.C as indicated on Exhibit A (attached).

The City of South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency and the owners of private lands involved in the "Park Avenue Project," propose to amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 22 Height Standards, to add a new section (22.4.C) creating special height districts and permitting building heights in excess of that presently permitted under the Code. The proposed amendment language is included as Exhibit A in this staff report. Maximum heights proposed by the amendment range from 55 feet to 73 feet. The proposed heights would apply to uses including tourist accommodation, commercial, and parking structures. Presently, the Code permits building heights of 48 feet for tourist accommodation uses within community plan areas provided certain environmental improvements are made.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC conduct a public hearing on the matter and provide input to staff and the proponent. The proponent has prepared a focused Environmental Assessment (EA) of the proposed action and two alternatives. It is anticipated that the EA may be supplemented at or prior to the APC meeting. Therefore, staff has deferred a final recommendation until after the public hearing is conducted. Staff will summarize the conclusions of the EA at the APC meeting. The primary issues are discussed below.

Background: The Park Avenue Project is a proposed 34 acre redevelopment project within the City of South Lake Tahoe's Redevelopment Plan area. It extends along the east side of U.S. 50 from the Embassy Suites Hotel near the Nevada-California state line to the Crescent V Shopping Center near Park Avenue. Refer to Exhibit B, Existing Site Conditions. Existing land uses include commercial retail, tourist accommodation, surface parking, one private street (Van Sickle Avenue) and other related tourist-oriented uses. The site
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contains nearly 100% land coverage, and has several small clusters of mature Jeffrey pine trees ranging from fifty to ninety feet in height. It generally slopes toward U.S. 50 with a drop of approximately twenty-nine feet across the site. Existing building heights range from one to three stories with one four-story structure.

The site is a high priority area for redevelopment. It is within the City's adopted Redevelopment Plan area and the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan. Within the site are proposed locations for the south shore intermodal transit terminal facility and Heavenly Ski Resort's gondola terminal.

Based on the proposed locational criteria for the special height district, the amendment would make areas near the casino core on both sides of U.S. 50 in California eligible for the additional building heights. The eligible areas are generally shown in Exhibit B. At this time, no project proposal or developer has been identified to develop a project using the proposed regulations on the west side of U.S. 50.

Discussion: The proponents contend the existing height regulations in the Code are too limiting to the design program already developed for the project, and the amendment is needed to permit a viable project to occur. This is in part due to the slope across the site combined with the desire to connect many of the structures to the parking facilities. The Code treats the connected structures as one building for the purposes of height calculations.

The proposed amendment would designate a three-tiered, linear building envelope which runs parallel to U.S. 50 across the Park Avenue site. The area nearest U.S. 50 would be permitted building heights up to 55 feet for commercial and tourist accommodation uses. The middle tier of the envelope would permit building heights up to 73 feet for the same uses. The third tier, located furthest from U.S. 50 would permit building heights up to 56 feet for tourist accommodation uses and parking structures. Refer to Exhibit A, pages 4-5, and to Exhibit C, Proposed Site Plan and Site Section.

Projects located in special height districts may earn the additional building height by incorporating a series of public benefits into the project. The list of proposed benefits which may be provided include retiring land coverage, providing enhanced pedestrian areas, creating significant, new view corridors to nearby scenic resources, increasing building setbacks, and providing pedestrian/bicycle access to Lake Tahoe. Refer to Exhibit A, pages 5-7.

The EA focuses on disclosing potential adverse impacts in the following areas:

1. Land Use/Density
2. Scenic Resources Thresholds
3. Community Design Threshold
4. Transportation/Circulation
5. Soils/Land Coverage
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6. Vegetation (the ability to screen large structures)
7. Light/Glare
8. Consistency with Adopted Land Use Plans, Policies and Regulations

Staff believes that with appropriate mitigation, the amendment should not result in any significant adverse impacts. Potential significant adverse impacts were identified in the areas of vegetation preservation and light/glare. Based on mitigation proposed by staff, however, the impacts should be mitigated to less than significant levels.

Staff will begin this matter with a brief presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
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CHAPTER 22
HEIGHT STANDARDS

Chapter Contents
22.0 Purpose
22.1 Applicability
22.2 Definitions
22.3 Height Standards For Buildings
22.4 Additional Height For Buildings
22.5 Height Standards For Structures Other Than Buildings
22.6 Additional Height For Certain Structures
22.7 List of Findings
22.8 Existing Buildings And Structures

22.0 Purpose: This chapter establishes height standards to ensure attractive and compatible development as required under Goal #2, Policy 1.B. of the Community Design Subelement, Land Use Element of the Goals and Policies.

22.1 Applicability: Except for structures located lakeward of high water, which are regulated under Chapters 50 through 56, inclusive, and signs, which are regulated under Chapter 26, all buildings and other structures shall comply with the standards set forth in this chapter.

22.2 Definitions: The following terms are defined as set forth:

22.2.A Maximum Height: The maximum height of a building is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along an exterior wall of the building, and the elevation of the coping of the highest flat roof, the deck line of the highest mansard roof or the ridge of the highest hip, gable, gambrel, shed or other pitched roof, whichever is highest. The maximum height of a structure other than a building is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along the exterior foundation of the structure and the elevation of the highest point of the structure.

22.2.B Natural Ground Elevation: The natural ground elevation is the elevation of the existing ground surface prior to any disturbance of the site resulting from construction of the proposed improvements.

22.2.C Percent Cross Slope Retained Across Building Site: The percent cross slope shall be the gradient, in percent, of the terrain measured perpendicular to the contours through the middle of the building site. The building site shall include all that area counted as land coverage associated with each detached building. The cross slope shall be considered retained across the building site only if TRPA finds that the building complies with the limitations on excavation set forth in Section 64.7. Percentages of cross slope shall be rounded to the nearest even percentage.
22.3 Height

22.3 Standards For Buildings: Except as provided for in Section 22.4, no building shall have a maximum height greater than set forth in Table A. Chimneys, flues, vents, antennas, and similar appurtenances, may be erected to a height ten percent greater than the otherwise permissible maximum height of a building, or a height of six feet, whichever is less.

Example:

Percent slope retained across building site = 16%
Proposed roof pitch = 10:12
Maximum height = 40' 0"

22.3.A Required Findings: Building heights, up to the maximum set forth in Table A, may be approved in accordance with Table A if the project is in compliance with the standards in Section 30.12 and TRPA makes the following findings as required for additional height:

(1) Additional Height: Maximum building heights greater than 25 feet shall be considered additional height. Additional height, up to the maximum set forth in Table A for a roof pitch of 5:12, may be approved in accordance with Table A if TRPA makes findings (1) as set forth in Section 22.7. Maximum building heights greater than set forth in Table A for a roof pitch of 5:12 may be approved in accordance with Table A for residential buildings if TRPA makes findings (1), (2), and (8) as set forth in Section 22.7 and for other buildings if TRPA makes findings (1), (2), (3), and (8) as set forth in Section 22.7. If, in any case, the TRPA is unable to make the required findings, maximum building height shall be limited to that height for which the required findings can be made.

22.4 Additional Height For Certain Buildings: TRPA may approve building heights greater than those set forth in Section 22.3 in accordance with the following provisions and if TRPA makes the specified findings.

22.4.A Additional Height For Public Service, Tourist Accommodation, and Certain Recreation Buildings: TRPA may approve building heights greater than those set forth in Section 22.3 for buildings whose primary use is public service, tourist accommodation, or whose primary recreation use is participant sports facilities, recreation centers, or sport assembly as follows:

(1) Additional Height With Required Findings: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased by up to four feet, but not to exceed a maximum height of 38 feet, if TRPA makes the
following findings in Section 22.7: findings (1), (2), and (3) for tourist accommodation buildings; findings (1), (3), and (2) or (4) for public service buildings; and findings (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7) for the recreation uses identified in 22.4.A.

(2) Additional Height For Reduced Land Coverage: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased for reductions in the amount of land coverage otherwise permitted within a project area pursuant to Chapter 20. The maximum heights may be increased by one foot for each onsite reduction in land coverage equal to five percent of the base allowable coverage, or existing land coverage, whichever is greater, up to a limit of four additional feet, but not to exceed a maximum height of 42 feet, if TRPA makes findings (1), (2), (3) and (5) as set forth in Section 22.7.

(3) Additional Height For Public Service Buildings Which Are Not Visible From Lake Tahoe and Which Are Not Located Within Designated Scenic Highway Corridors: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased by up to eight feet, but not to exceed a maximum of 42 feet, if the building will not be visible from Lake Tahoe and the building is not located within a TRPA designated Scenic Highway Corridor pursuant to Chapter 30, provided TRPA makes findings (1), (2), (3), (4), (7), and (8) as set forth in Section 22.7.

22.4.B Additional Height For Tourist Accommodation Buildings Within Community Plan Areas: In addition to the provisions set forth in Subsection 22.4.A, TRPA may approve building heights greater than those set forth in Section 22.3 for buildings whose primary use is tourist accommodation, and which are located within an approved community plan as set forth in Chapter 14. The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased up to a maximum height of 48 feet in accordance with the following provisions, if TRPA makes the findings required in Subparagraph (4) of this subsection.

(1) Additional Height For View Corridor: Nine additional feet, up to a 12 foot increase in the maximum heights set forth in Table A, may be approved by TRPA for each 100 foot wide view corridor, or increments thereof in excess of 100 feet, provided as part of a tourist accommodation project. A view corridor, for purposes of this subsection, is defined as a view of Lake Tahoe from a major arterial which is unimpeded by
buildings or other structures.

(2) **Additional Height For Increased Setback:** Nine additional feet, up to a 12 foot increase in the maximum heights set forth in Table A, may be approved by TRPA for each 100 feet, or increments thereof in excess of 100 feet, of permanent set back from the high water line of Lake Tahoe, provided as part of a project in addition to the otherwise required setback.

(3) **Additional Height For Public Access:** Nine additional feet, up to a 12 foot increase in maximum heights set forth in Table A, may be approved by TRPA for each 50 foot wide by 200 foot long area, or increments thereof in excess of 50 feet by 200 feet, of public access provided along the shoreline of Lake Tahoe as part of a tourist accommodation project.

(4) **Required Findings:** Additional height may be approved under the provisions of Subparagraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, if TRPA makes findings (1), (2), (3), and (6) as set forth in Section 22.7.

22.4.C

**Additional Height For Redevelopment Projects Within The City Of South Lake Tahoe:** Additional height for redevelopment projects within the City of South Lake Tahoe is set forth in Chapter 15. Additional special height districts may be designated if the specific findings listed below can be made for redevelopment projects which are approved under state redevelopment laws, are within an adopted community plan, but are not considered to be redevelopment within TRPA definitions:

(1) **Special Height Districts:** Areas as identified above may be eligible for designation as special height districts within adopted redevelopment areas if they are also within an adopted community plan area which:

(a) Includes an area which is within 1400 feet of the nearest property line of a developed area which includes a cluster of at least three (3) high rise buildings with a high floor area ratio, (approximately 1.0) with a minimum height of 150 ft, and for which the project provides a transition in height from high rise to low rise;

(b) Includes an area which is within 1100 feet of any portion of a multimodal transportation building which includes direct access to bus, and other potential transit elements; and

(c) Includes a pedestrian connection along and/or through the special height district to provide enhanced public pedestrian access with enhanced access to a multi-modal transit center, and includes a widened pedestrian area along a state
or federal highway with storefronts, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities.

(2) Limitations on Additional Height Within Designated Special Height Districts.

(a) the maximum height of tourist accommodation, combined tourist accommodation and commercial structures shall not exceed 55 ft. within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a state or federal highway;
(b) the maximum height of tourist accommodation, combined tourist accommodation and commercial structures shall not exceed 73 feet between 101 feet and 420’ from the right-of-way of a state or federal highway;
(c) the maximum height of tourist accommodation and/or parking structures located between 421’ and 700’ from the right-of-way of a state or federal highway, shall be 56’, except as provided in subsection 22.6, when measured as provided in this subsection;
(d) the maximum height of any structure within a special height district recognized under this Section shall not exceed 73 feet;
(e) the maximum height of a multi-modal terminal as defined in Subsection 22.4.C.(1)(b) shall not exceed 48 feet;
(f) Qualifying special height districts which include additional height between Lake Tahoe and a state or federal highway may qualify for additional heights within the following limits:

Tourist accommodation and combined tourist accommodation and commercial structures, those portions of which are at least 50 feet from the state or federal highway right-of-way, and up to 1200 feet from any point on the boundary of the previously identified cluster of highrise buildings may be allowed a maximum height of up to 64 feet.

(3) Additional Height for Buildings in Designated Special Height Districts: In areas which qualify for designation as a special height district as set forth above, the additional height may be earned as follows:

(a) Additional Height with Required Findings: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased by up to 4 feet, but not to exceed a maximum height of 38 feet, if TRPA makes the following findings in Section 22.7: findings (1), (2), and (3) for tourist accommodation structures; findings (1), (3), and (2) or (4) for public service structures; and findings (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7) for the recreation structures identified in 22.4.A.

(b) Additional Height For Reduced Land
Coverage: The maximum heights specified in Table A may be increased for reductions in the amount of land coverage otherwise permitted within a project area pursuant to Chapter 20. The maximum heights may be increased by 2 feet for each onsite reduction in land coverage equal to 5 percent of the base allowable coverage, or existing land coverage, whichever is greater, up to a limit of 8 additional feet, but not to exceed a maximum height of 46 feet, if TRPA makes findings (1), (2), (3) and (5) as set forth in Section 22.7.

(c) Additional Height for View Corridor: 4 additional feet in the maximum heights set forth in Table A, may be approved by TRPA for creation of a view corridor. A view corridor, for purposes of this chapter, is defined as:

(i) at least 200 feet long provided as part of a tourist accommodation project, when viewed from the centerline of a major arterial to a prominent mountain ridge, hillside, or natural landscape feature including existing forest or trees. Views of such prominent feature or primary ridgeline may be over buildings and/or trees in the mid- or foreground which do not impede the view of the feature. Buildings in the fore or mid-or foreground may not be closer than 100' from the point at which a view corridor is measured for purposes of this section. View Corridors may, for purposes of this subsection, be a new view corridor or the expansion of an existing view, or

(ii) a view of Lake Tahoe at least 100 feet long, or increments thereof in excess of 100 feet, provided as part of a tourist accommodation project, when viewed from the centerline of a major arterial. Views of Lake Tahoe may be over buildings and/or trees in the mid- or foreground which do not impede the view of the Lake. Buildings in the fore or mid-or foreground may not be closer than 100' from the point at which a view corridor is measured for purposes of this section. View Corridors may, for purposes of this subsection, be a new view corridor or the expansion of an existing view.

(iii) view corridors shall be measured as the distance between the first point at which the viewed element is visible from the centerline of the major arterial when traveling in each direction along the arterial.
(d) **Additional Height for Increased Setback:**
12 additional feet in addition to the maximum heights set forth in Table A, may be approved by TRPA for a 50 foot deep by 200 foot long area of open setback, in excess of the legally required setback (South Tahoe Redevelopment Plan, 1988) from the edge of the right-of-way of a major arterial.

(e) **Additional Height For Public Access/Pedestrian Area:** An additional increase in maximum heights set forth in Table A, not to exceed a maximum of 10 additional feet, for each 30 foot wide by 1800 foot long public walkway/landscaped pedestrian area along and/or through the special height district.

(f) **Additional Height for Pedestrian/Bike path providing access from the special height district to Lake Tahoe:** An additional increase in maximum heights set forth in Table A, not to exceed a maximum of 10 additional feet, for an improved public pedestrian/bicycle path at least 10 feet in width, and connecting a special height district to the shore of Lake Tahoe.

**22.5 Height Standards for Structures Other Than Buildings:** Except as provided for in Section 22.6, no structure, other than a building, shall have a maximum height greater than 26 feet.

**22.6 Additional Height For Certain Structures:** The maximum height specified in Section 22.5 may be increased for communication towers, antennas, utility poles, special features of public safety facilities, ski lift towers, and other similar projects, excluding buildings and signs, up to the minimum height necessary to feasibly implement such projects. Additional height may be approved under the provisions of this section if TRPA makes findings (4) and (7) as set forth in Section 22.7.

**22.7 List Of Findings:** The findings required in this chapter are as follows:

(1) When viewed from major arterials, scenic turnouts, public recreation areas or the waters of Lake Tahoe, but not from a distance of less than 300 feet, the additional height will not cause a building to extend above the forest canopy, when present, or a ridgeline.

(2) When outside a community plan, the additional height is consistent with the surrounding uses.

(3) With respect to that portion of the building which is permitted the additional height, the building has been designed to minimize interference with existing views within the area to the extent practicable.

(4) The function of the structure requires a greater maximum height than otherwise provided for in this chapter.

(5) That portion of the building which is permitted the additional height, is adequately screened, as seen from major arterials, the waters of lakes, and other public areas from which the building is frequently viewed. In determining the adequacy of
screening, consideration shall be given to the degree to which a combination of the following features causes the building to blend or merge with the background.

(a) The horizontal distance from which the building is viewed;
(b) The extent of screening; and
(c) Proposed exterior colors and building materials.

(6) The building is located within an approved community plan, which identifies the project area as being suited for the additional height being proposed.

(7) The additional height is the minimum necessary to feasibly implement the project and there are no feasible alternatives requiring less additional height.

(8) The maximum height at any corner of two exterior walls of the building is not greater than 90 percent of the maximum building height. The maximum height at the corner of two exterior walls is the difference between the point of lowest natural ground elevation along an exterior wall of the building, and point at which the corner of the same exterior wall meets the roof. This standard shall not apply to an architectural feature described as a prow.

22.8 Existing Buildings And Structures: When a building or structure is being reconstructed or, whenever feasible when being modified, the building or structure shall comply with the height standards set forth in this chapter. Provisions of Chapter 4 regarding structures destroyed by calamity set forth exceptions to this section.
### TABLE A

**MAXIMUM HEIGHTS FOR BUILDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Slope Retained Across Building Site</th>
<th>0:12</th>
<th>1:12</th>
<th>2:12</th>
<th>3:12</th>
<th>4:12</th>
<th>5:12</th>
<th>6:12</th>
<th>7:12</th>
<th>8:12</th>
<th>9:12</th>
<th>10:12 or &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24'-0&quot;</td>
<td>25'-2&quot;</td>
<td>26'-5&quot;</td>
<td>27'-7&quot;</td>
<td>28'-9&quot;</td>
<td>30'-0&quot;</td>
<td>31'-2&quot;</td>
<td>32'-5&quot;</td>
<td>33'-7&quot;</td>
<td>34'-9&quot;</td>
<td>36'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24'-6&quot;</td>
<td>25'-8&quot;</td>
<td>26'-11&quot;</td>
<td>28'-1&quot;</td>
<td>29'-3&quot;</td>
<td>30'-6&quot;</td>
<td>31'-8&quot;</td>
<td>32'-11&quot;</td>
<td>34'-1&quot;</td>
<td>35'-3&quot;</td>
<td>36'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25'-0&quot;</td>
<td>26'-2&quot;</td>
<td>27'-5&quot;</td>
<td>28'-7&quot;</td>
<td>29'-9&quot;</td>
<td>31'-0&quot;</td>
<td>32'-2&quot;</td>
<td>33'-5&quot;</td>
<td>34'-7&quot;</td>
<td>35'-9&quot;</td>
<td>37'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25'-6&quot;</td>
<td>26'-8&quot;</td>
<td>27'-11&quot;</td>
<td>29'-1&quot;</td>
<td>30'-3&quot;</td>
<td>31'-6&quot;</td>
<td>32'-8&quot;</td>
<td>33'-11&quot;</td>
<td>35'-1&quot;</td>
<td>36'-3&quot;</td>
<td>37'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26'-0&quot;</td>
<td>27'-2&quot;</td>
<td>28'-5&quot;</td>
<td>29'-7&quot;</td>
<td>30'-9&quot;</td>
<td>32'-0&quot;</td>
<td>33'-2&quot;</td>
<td>34'-5&quot;</td>
<td>35'-7&quot;</td>
<td>36'-9&quot;</td>
<td>38'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26'-6&quot;</td>
<td>27'-8&quot;</td>
<td>28'-11&quot;</td>
<td>30'-1&quot;</td>
<td>31'-3&quot;</td>
<td>32'-6&quot;</td>
<td>33'-8&quot;</td>
<td>34'-11&quot;</td>
<td>36'-1&quot;</td>
<td>37'-3&quot;</td>
<td>38'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27'-0&quot;</td>
<td>28'-2&quot;</td>
<td>29'-5&quot;</td>
<td>30'-7&quot;</td>
<td>31'-9&quot;</td>
<td>33'-0&quot;</td>
<td>34'-2&quot;</td>
<td>35'-5&quot;</td>
<td>36'-7&quot;</td>
<td>37'-9&quot;</td>
<td>39'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27'-6&quot;</td>
<td>28'-8&quot;</td>
<td>29'-11&quot;</td>
<td>31'-1&quot;</td>
<td>32'-3&quot;</td>
<td>33'-6&quot;</td>
<td>34'-8&quot;</td>
<td>35'-11&quot;</td>
<td>37'-1&quot;</td>
<td>38'-3&quot;</td>
<td>39'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28'-0&quot;</td>
<td>29'-2&quot;</td>
<td>30'-5&quot;</td>
<td>31'-7&quot;</td>
<td>32'-9&quot;</td>
<td>34'-0&quot;</td>
<td>35'-2&quot;</td>
<td>36'-5&quot;</td>
<td>37'-7&quot;</td>
<td>38'-9&quot;</td>
<td>40'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>28'-6&quot;</td>
<td>29'-8&quot;</td>
<td>30'-11&quot;</td>
<td>32'-1&quot;</td>
<td>33'-3&quot;</td>
<td>34'-6&quot;</td>
<td>35'-8&quot;</td>
<td>36'-11&quot;</td>
<td>38'-1&quot;</td>
<td>39'-3&quot;</td>
<td>40'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29'-0&quot;</td>
<td>30'-2&quot;</td>
<td>31'-5&quot;</td>
<td>32'-7&quot;</td>
<td>33'-9&quot;</td>
<td>35'-0&quot;</td>
<td>36'-2&quot;</td>
<td>37'-5&quot;</td>
<td>38'-7&quot;</td>
<td>39'-9&quot;</td>
<td>41'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>29'-6&quot;</td>
<td>30'-8&quot;</td>
<td>31'-11&quot;</td>
<td>33'-1&quot;</td>
<td>34'-3&quot;</td>
<td>35'-6&quot;</td>
<td>36'-8&quot;</td>
<td>37'-11&quot;</td>
<td>39'-1&quot;</td>
<td>40'-3&quot;</td>
<td>41'-6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 or &gt;</td>
<td>30'-0&quot;</td>
<td>31'-2&quot;</td>
<td>32'-5&quot;</td>
<td>33'-7&quot;</td>
<td>34'-9&quot;</td>
<td>36'-0&quot;</td>
<td>37'-2&quot;</td>
<td>38'-5&quot;</td>
<td>39'-7&quot;</td>
<td>40'-9&quot;</td>
<td>42'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 5.1: Alternative 3 Site Plan
Section - West of Highway 50

Area eligible for Max. 60' building height (see pg. 3.1: site plan)

Setback:
Max. 1/4 story building height
Max. 42' building height

Section - East of Highway 50
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Figure 5.2 Alternative 3 Site Section 26
MEMORANDUM

February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of the Tahoe City Community Plan and Related Actions

Proposed Action: The APC is requested to review and make a recommendation on the following items related to the Tahoe City Community Plan:

1. Certification of the revised Final EIR/EIS for the Tahoe City Community Plan (mailed separately by Placer County - 2/1/94)

2. Adoption of the Tahoe City Community Plan
   (mailed separately in white binder - 1/31/94)

3. Adoption of technical amendments to implement the Tahoe City CP as follows (attachments in this packet):
   a. Amendment of Land Capability Overlay C-7
      (Attachment A)
   b. Amendments of Chapters 24, 26, and 30 to Include CP Standards
      (Attachment B)
   c. Amendments of PASs 002, 003, 171 and 174 for Consistency with the Tahoe City CP and the Placer County General Plan
      (Attachment C)
   d. Amendments to delete PAS 001A Tahoe City
      (Attachment D)

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends certification of the EIS/EIR, adoption of the Tahoe City Community Plan (with staff recommended changes noted in the draft CP), and adoption of the Plan Area Statement amendments and other technical amendments.

Background: In April, May, and June of 1991, the APC held hearings on this Community Plan. Because of the controversy (generally the Payless site and the connector road), APC continued its review of the Tahoe City Community Plan until Placer County adopted the Plan.

GWB/rd
2/1/94

AGENDA ITEM V.C.
Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission
Adoption of the Tahoe City Community Plan and
Related Actions -- Page 2

The Community Plan was delayed and modified to the point where it was agreed
to recirculate the Plan and the environmental document. The Governing Board,
frustrated by delays, directed staff to accelerate the Community Plan process
and approved a community plan adoption schedule. Under the schedule, TRPA
will proceed with the community plan adoption process even if it means acting
on the plan in advance of local government adoption.

The revised Team-recommended Tahoe City Community Plan, (August, 1993), and
the accompanying Draft Tahoe City EIS/EIR (August, 1993), was handed out in
August of 1993. The August draft Tahoe City Community Plan was discussed at
the January APC and Governing Board meetings.

Staff has now prepared a revised Final EIS/EIR for your consideration. Also,
staff reviewed the Community Plan for consistency with the EIS/EIR and TRPA
regulations. A staff recommended draft of the Tahoe City Community Plan with
an underline/overstrike format was prepared. As one can see, there are only
minor changes recommended by TRPA Staff.

Issues: The presentation will focus on the issues of controversy that have
been identified. It should be noted that there is a consensus on the majority
of the content of the Plan.

1. Inadequate EIS/EIR - The original environmental document for the CP was
an EIS/EIR. Both the APC and the Placer County Planning Commission
recommended the original EIS/EIR for certification. It was later argued
that the EIS/EIR needed to be recirculated because of time delays, CP
changes, and new studies. The EIS/EIR was redrafted and recirculated
last summer. Current comments by Larry Hoffman representing Payless and
the Downtown Merchants indicate that the document is still inadequate and
should be revised and recirculated because it lacks analysis and alterna-
tives for the downtown improvement project(s) (see comment letters in the
Final EIS/EIR).

Recommendation: TRPA staff and Placer County staff recommend the EIS/EIR
be certified. The Downtown Improvement Project has its own EIS/EIR and
that is where the project detail impacts should be addressed.

2. Downtown Improvement Project - The traffic and drainage improvements for
the central area of Tahoe City are controversial. The Community Plan, in
response to the Regional Transportation Plan calls for traffic flow im-
provements, parallel parking, bike trails, and sidewalks for the downtown
area (see Chapter III of the Community Plan). There is concern by the
League to Save Lake Tahoe that that there could be too much parking. The
businesses worry about not having enough parking, especially in the down-
town area.

There is confusion over the CP impacts and the impacts of the Downtown
Improvement Project. The draft EIS/EIR for the project was presented in
November. Controversy with the project design, most specifically the
loss of on-street parking on State Route 28, has spilled over to the
Community Plan.
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Recommendation: TRPA staff, the Team, and Placer County staff recommend the Plan as drafted.

3. Area-Wide Drainage - Lahonton supports the area-wide drainage system but indicates that the responsibility for all drainage remains with the individual properties if the system fails to meet discharge standards. The League desires to have better assurances that area-wide drainage systems will be constructed with the commercial development. Both are concerned about any CP exemptions or substitutions.

Payless is concerned that their property at the Wye is targeted as a possible wetland treatment area in the Community Plan. In the EIS/EIR for the downtown project, the County has designated this as the preferred alternative. The Golf Course is worried about the impact of the construction on its business. Many of the drainage issues are project specific (see comment letters in the Final EIS/EIR).

Recommendation: TRPA staff has added language in Chapter IV Water Quality similar to what was approved for the Douglas County Community Plans.

4. Connector Roads - There is confusion in regards to a connector service road and/or bypass in the back of the commercial area along the golf course. This original proposal is no longer a Plan requirement. Only a short segment connecting the Grove Street parking lot is left in the CP improvement program.

Recommendation: TRPA staff, Placer County staff, the Team, and others worked through a consensus group to create the recommended language in the CP.

5. PAS 003 Amendment - There is a recommendation from the Team and Placer County Planning Commission to TRPA to make the commercial uses located in the Truckee River corridor conforming uses and to allow for expansion in order to upgrade the area. For the environmental and planning reasons noted in the EIS/EIR, TRPA staff, the League, the USFS staff and others disagree and do not recommend the amendment to PAS 003 (see Attachment C for details).

Recommendation: The staff recommended draft of PAS 003 does not include the reclassification for commercial uses.

Required Findings: Findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed Community Plans. Attachment E contains the findings related to the Tahoe City Community Plan, related PAS amendments, and technical amendments. The Governing Board will have to make the findings to adopt the Community Plan.
Environmental Documentation: This Community Plan and related actions were the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement. An EIS was prepared pursuant to the requirements of TRPA and recommended for certification by the APC in June of 1991. Because of delays, changes in the CP, and additional studies, the EIS/EIR was revised and recirculated. The revised Final EIS/EIR for the Tahoe City Community Plan (January, 1994) is now before the TRPA for certification. The brackets indicate this portion of the EIS/EIR is for Placer County purposes and is not part of TRPA action. Certification is defined as finding that the final EIS is in compliance, procedurally and substantively, with Article VII of the compact, Chapter 5 of the Code and the Rules of Procedure. (Attachment F is an Executive Summary)

Also, the Compact and the TRPA Code require that prior to approving a plan for which EIS was prepared, the TRPA Governing Board shall make findings for each significant adverse effect identified in the EIS. The required findings are found in Attachment E.

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.
MEMORANDUM

February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay Map (C-7)
For The Tahoe City Community Plan Area

Proposed Action: Agency staff is proposing to amend the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Map (C-7) as a component of the Tahoe City Community Plan adoption process. If the Governing Board takes a separate action on the land capability of the Payless parcel, it will be automatically added to the overlay map.

Staff Recommendation: TRPA staff has inspected the area and supports the findings and conclusions of the land capability report prepared by the team of experts. The attached land capability map (C-7) identifies the boundaries of the proposed land capability districts as defined in the land capability report and staff summary. Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed Regional Plan amendment to change the Land Capability Overlay Map (C-7) for the Tahoe City Community Plan area.

Background: The current land capability overlay maps were adopted by TRPA in 1987 pursuant to Chapter 12 of the Code of Ordinances. A summary of the information relating to the land capability investigation report for the Tahoe City Community Plan area is described in the analysis section below. TRPA is proposing the amendments to the Land Capability Overlay Map (C-7) pursuant to the Community Plan process set forth in Chapter 14 of the Code of Ordinances, specifically Subsection 14.6.C(2) and (3) of that chapter. Additionally, the provisions of the 1988 Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region (208 Plan) call for TRPA to precisely identify and map Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) areas prior to the approval of any community Plan (Volume I, p. 132). This amendment will update and change the designated land capability in the Tahoe City Community Plan area as shown on the attached map.
In April, May, and June of 1991, the APC reviewed this item and received detailed testimony on the land capability status of the Payless site. In 1993 Placer County submitted an application to make a man-modified determination for the Payless site and the APC recommended approval in October, 1993. The Governing Board has yet to act on the application.

Other properties may pursue man-modified determinations as set forth in Chapter 20.2.F(3) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances under separate applications.

Analysis: The procedures used to amend the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps are set forth in Subsection 20.2.E of the Code of Ordinances. The process in this case was initiated by TRPA as a part of the Tahoe City Community Plan.

A land capability report was prepared for the Tahoe City Community Plan area by Davis Consulting Earth Scientists under contract to TRPA. The team of experts employed by Davis included Sid Davis, Grant Kennedy and Lawrence Welch, Soil Scientists, and C. M. Skau, Ph.D., Hydrologist. The attached report covers an area 282 acres in size and contains information concerning the soils, geomorphology, topography, surface and subsurface hydrology, vegetative characteristics and related environmental factors pertaining to the land capability of the area.

Field work for this land capability report was started in August, 1987 with the initial soils investigations. During the following two months additional soil testing, hydrologic evaluations and field inspections were conducted to prepare the proposed land capability amendments. The area was studied using soil mapping and classification techniques which utilize the Soil Survey of the Tahoe Basin area, aerial photography, U.S. Geological Survey topographic quadrangle maps, and on-site soil observations. Areas exhibiting soil characteristics or hydrologic conditions which were determined to be different than as mapped were intensively examined.

Since the fall of 1987, some additional field work relating to land capability and hydrology of this area has been completed and those reports available to TRPA staff have been reviewed and incorporated into these findings. There were seven representative soil profiles described in the land capability report which identify the soil characteristics of the major soil map units. Auger holes and vegetative species were used to assess the subsurface hydrologic conditions and identify stream environment zone (SEZ) areas.

The land capability report was broken into four areas of study divided by major roadways, streams or other land forms. The findings related to each of the areas are as follows:

Cathedral Drive North to the Truckee River

This area is mapped as land capability 5 associated with the Tallac and Jabu soil series with areas of class 1b associated with the gravelly alluvial lands and beaches. The upper areas, south of the Tahoe Tree Company, were verified
as mapped, land capability class 5 associated with the Tallac soil series. The lower areas displayed characteristics of SEZ areas with soils which were seeped in the transition zone to the flat alluvial soils which were poorly and very poorly drained. The flat alluvial soils which are well drained gravelly sandy loams are best classified as land capability class 5. These soils are similar to the Tallac (TcB, gravelly coarse sandy loam, seeped, 0 to 5 percent slopes) soil map unit except that these soils were formed as a result of alluvial deposition rather than glacial depositions.

Quarry Area

The quarry area was verified as mapped, pits and dumps, land capability class 1c. The area between Highway 89 and the Truckee River was verified as mapped, land capability class 5 and 1b. The SEZ lands verified as class 1b are associated with the gravelly alluvial lands (Gr) and within the Truckee River flood plain. A small area, west of the quarry, was verified as mapped land capability class 2. Although there are some minor boundary line adjustments, there are no changes in land capability in this area.

Fairway Drive Central Core Area

The majority of this large area is mapped as SEZ, land capability class 1b, associated with the gravelly alluvial land (Gr) soil map unit. The remaining upsloping lands in this area are mapped as land capability class 5 and 5. The soils found in the concave area of the golf course and to the west were moderately fine and fine textured soils associated with old lake beds. These soils have evidence of high water tables. The groundwater in the proposed land capability district varies in depth and seasonally from 40 inches to the surface. Some portions of this area have a surface horizon comprised of fill material which has been imported and compacted. The extent and depth of the fill material varies throughout the area and does not significantly alter the soil profile. These areas have been disturbed by grading and replacement of fill material. While these soils are not identified in the Soil Survey, they do have the texture and color of an inclusion described in the gravelly alluvial land (Gr) map unit. Based on these findings, the soil labelled in the land capability report as "Soil B" are best classified as land capability class 1b because of near surface wet soil conditions.

The terrace along Highway 28 which encompasses most of the commercial core area of Tahoe City has soils which are moderately well drained gravelly clay loams underlain by cemented lake sediments similar to the Jabu moderately fine subsoil variant soil series. This area is best classified as land capability class 5.

The areas along the lake frontage and below the terrace exhibit wet solid conditions and are complexes of beach and gravelly alluvial soils. These areas are classified as land capability class 1b.
Grove Street and East

This area is predominantly mapped as land capability class 5 associated with the Fugawee soil series. There are small areas of class 6 associated with the Jabu soil series and 1b associated with gravelly alluvial land (Gr). The areas mapped as the Fugawee soil series were verified based on physical inspection of the soils in several undisturbed locations. The Tahoe City Creek has been rerouted and straightened to a channel which flows due south to Lake Tahoe. The soils which were developed from the former drainage channel are shallow, seeped sandy loam soils most similar to the Jabu (JbD) soil map unit. These areas are classified as land capability class 3.

The soils found in the area east of Tahoe City Creek and the State Park campground were found to have physical properties similar to the mapped Jabu (JhC) soil map unit. This area remains as mapped, land capability class 5.

The area at the far eastern end of the community plan area was mapped as SEZ, land capability class 1b. This area exhibits the characteristics of a wet meadow with poorly drained soils which are consistent with the gravelly alluvial land (Gr) as mapped.

If you have any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Gordon Barrett at (702) 588-4547.
February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendments to Chapters 24, 25, and 30 to Include CP Standards

Proposed Action: As part of the Tahoe City Community Plan approval, the APC is requested to approve substitute standards and guidelines for design, parking, and signage. The APC has the option of recommending these substitute standards and guidelines for just the Community Plan area and/or for the surrounding Placer County Tahoe City General Plan area.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the standards and guidelines for the Community Plan.

Background: Chapter 14 of the Code allows the community plan substitution of equal or superior standards for design, signs, and parking. Section 5.8 of the EIS/EIR confirms that the proposed standards meet the "equal or superior test".

As to the guidelines, Chapter 30 of the Code allows for local jurisdictions to have substitute equal or superior guidelines which could apply to CPs. The EIS/EIR confirms that the guidelines meet the equal or superior test.

As to the applicability outside the CP, the Code does not address parking or design standards substitution. It is the intent in the long term that TRPA and Placer County adopt a joint set of standards and guidelines for design, signs and parking. The APC endorsed this idea at its December, 1993, meeting.

Findings: The analysis is found in Section 5.8 of the EIS/EIR. The findings are included in Attachment E.

Environmental Documentation: This is covered by the Tahoe City Community Plan and Placer County Tahoe City General Plan EIS/EIR.
CHAPTER 30

DESIGN STANDARDS

Chapter Contents

30.0 Purpose
30.1 Applicability
30.2 Design Review Guidelines
30.3 Scenic Quality Improvement Program
30.4 Substitution Of Standards And Guidelines
30.5 Site Design Standards
30.6 Building Design Standards
30.7 Landscaping Standards
30.8 Exterior Lighting Standards
30.9 Water Conservation Standards
30.10 Standards For Combustion Appliances
30.11 Outdoor Advertising
30.13 Establishment of Scenic Highway Corridors

30.0 Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to ensure that projects are designed and constructed consistent with the Community Design Subelement of the Land Use Element and related elements of the Goals and Policies.

30.1 Applicability: All projects shall comply with the standards set forth in this chapter, except:


30.1.B Placer County Substitutions: The Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking, and Design shall apply to the Tahoe City Community Plan.

In addition, exempt activities, as defined in Chapter 4, shall comply with sections 30.9 and 30.10. Appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and Scenic Quality Improvement Program may be considered as conditions of project approval.

30.2 Design Review Guidelines: Design and site planning methods and techniques shall be set forth in a handbook called Design Review Guidelines.

30.3 Scenic Quality Improvement Program: Additional design guidelines applicable to specific areas shall be set forth in a document called the Scenic Quality Improvement Program. Provisions of that program shall be required by TRPA, as appropriate, as conditions of project approval.
26.0 Purpose
The purpose of this chapter is to promote and protect the public health, welfare, and safety of the general public by implementing regional outdoor advertising regulations pursuant to Article VI of the Compact, to protect property values, create a more attractive economic and business climate, enhance the aesthetic appearance of the physical community, preserve the scenic and natural beauty and provide an enjoyable and pleasing community in accordance with Community Design Subelement of the Land Use Element and related elements of the Goals and Policies. It is further intended to reduce signs or advertising distractions and obstructions that may contribute to traffic accidents.

26.1 Applicability: All signs shall comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Chapter, except:


Except as exempted in Section 26.3, installation, modification or replacement of signs requires review and approval as a project in accordance with this Chapter and other applicable provisions of the Code. In addition, sign projects also may have imposed, as conditions of approval, appropriate provisions of the Design Review Guidelines and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program.
CHAPTER 24

DRIVEWAY AND PARKING STANDARDS

Chapter Contents

24.0 Purpose
24.1 Applicability
24.2 Driveways
24.3 Parking (Reserved)

24.0 Purpose: This chapter sets forth minimum standards for driveways and parking facilities to minimize interference with traffic flow on the street and highway system of the Tahoe Region.

24.1 Applicability: This chapter is applicable to all development that requires or uses vehicular access or parking, except:


24.1.B Placer County Substitutions: The Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking, and Design shall apply to the Tahoe City Community Plan.

24.2 Driveways: To ensure organized and well-designed ingress and egress of vehicles from driveways, TRPA shall review the design of driveways according to the following standards and procedures:

24.2.A Driveway Defined: A driveway is a clearly identifiable path of vehicular access from the parking area of a parcel to the public right-of-way or other access road. A driveway may be either one-way or two-way.

24.2.B Compliance Program: The standards set forth in Subsections 24.2.C through 24.2.F, inclusive, shall be conditions of approval for projects with driveways, and for projects for which TRPA finds that the driveways are not in compliance with the standards set forth in Subsections 24.2.C through 24.2.F, inclusive, and are causing significant adverse impacts on traffic, transportation, air quality, water quality, or safety. If TRPA finds that driveways associated with existing development are causing such impacts, TRPA may implement corrective measures pursuant to Chapter 9.
February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of Amendments To Plan Area Statements 002, 003, 171, and 174 And Related Plan Area Statement Map Overlays

Proposed Action: The Advisory Planning Commission is requested to recommend to the Governing Board the appropriate action in regard to the adoption of amendments to PAS 002, 003, 171, and 174. These amendments are related to the Placer County General Plan Update and the Tahoe City Community Plan. The text amendments and map amendments are attached as Exhibit A. The Planning Team and Placer County recommends amendment to PAS 003 as per Exhibit B.

Recommendation: TRPA staff recommends approval of the amended PASs contained in Exhibit A. TRPA staff does not recommend approval of the proposed Planning Team amendment to PAS 003 (Exhibit B).

Background: In May of 1991, the APC reviewed the proposed Placer County General Plan Update for the Tahoe City area. The APC directed staff to bring back the necessary PAS amendments needed to make the TRPA Plan and the Placer County Plan consistent. At the June APC meeting no action was taken on these Plan Area Statement amendments, however, the Tahoe City Community Plan was continued until Placer County took action. In July of 1991 the APC and Governing Board approved all of the PAS amendments except for the PASs directly relating to the Tahoe City Community Plan.

Analysis: The PAS amendments are required to (1) implement the recommendations of the Tahoe City Plan Team; (2) update the PASs in response to TRPA actions in regard to transportation, water quality and scenic plans; (3) make adjustments required by the adoption of the Tahoe City Community Plan; and (4) coordinate with Placer County the adoption of a new General Plan.

PAS 003 -- This amendment is required for a minor boundary adjustment to add a developed parcel next to the Pfeifer House to the Tahoe City Community Plan, to update the PAS to current TRPA plans, and implement the recommendations of the Plan Team.
The most notable and significant change in the creation of commercial districts is in the Truckee River corridor (see Exhibit B). At the request of the property owners in the summer of 1991, the Truckee and Placer County Planning Commission recommended approval of creating two commercial areas to recognize and allow the expansion of existing commercial uses.

This issue was not addressed in the EIR/EIS because the proposal was made after the APC review of the Final EIR/EIS. The County's finding of no environmental impact was based on the fact that the allocation of commercial floor area was tied to a yet to be developed list of environmental improvements.

In general, staff does not consider this a minor change and the proposal was not in the original proposal for the Community Plan. It requires further research and documentation which should be provided by the applicant under a separate application. Other reasons TRPA staff does not support the Exhibit B proposal are:

1. The proposal is not consistent with the Plan Area Statement's overall recreation direction or past zoning actions of the TRPA;

2. The area is not suitable for industrial use because of scenic impacts, lack of public services, drainage and water quality issues, and avalanche danger; and

3. Future planning studies such as the USFS recreation river designation for the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the State Route 89 Transportation Corridor Study would be preempted.

PAS 002 -- The golf course area remains in PAS 002 and is not added to the Tahoe Area Community Plan. It is still planned for by the Plan Team and is an "influence area of the Community Plan." The Grove Street parking lot area was added to the Community Plan. The residential bonus units are redistributed as called for in the Community Plan.

PAS 174 -- The USFS 64-Acre Tract area was not added to the Tahoe City Community Plan. It, like the golf course area, is an influence area of the Community Plan. The USFS staff has reviewed the changes and do not object.

PAS 171 -- A simple change to add 5 bonus units from PAS 002 was added to this area to implement the APC's original recommendation to create a multi-residential area.

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

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

1. Finding: The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.
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**Rationale:** The coordinated Placer County-TRPA land use regulation will help implement the Regional Plan and resolve land use issues. There is no major change of land use or development potential proposed.

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

**Rationale:** An EIS/EIR was prepared on the subject PAS amendments and it did not identify any significant adverse impacts including exceedances of thresholds.

3. **Finding:** Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable for 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:** An EIS/EIR was prepared for these PAS amendments and it did not identify any violations of standards.

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 maintaining the thresholds.

**Rationale:** The amendments generally coordinate local and regional planning. The EIS/EIR indicates the Community Plan and amended PASs will achieve thresholds.

**Environmental Documentation:** The plan amendments have been addressed in the Final EIR/EIS for the Tahoe City Community Plan and the Placer County General Plan Amendment for the Tahoe City Area. No significant unmitigated impacts were identified.

If you have any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.
002 -- FAIRWAY TRACT

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification
RESIDENTIAL

Management Strategy
MITIGATION

Special Designation
TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:
1. Multi-Residential Units
   (Special-Area-#1-only)

PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA
MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM AREA
   (Special-Area-#1-only)

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This Plan Area is located north of the Tahoe City commercial area and is found on TRPA map C-7.

Existing Uses: This low density residential area includes a golf course and an elementary school. Older, lower-cost homes are located in the flat area near the school. The area is 60 percent build out.

Existing Environment: The land capability classification of this area is 40 percent low hazard, 15 percent moderate hazard, 40 percent SEZ and 5 percent high hazard. The disturbance risk is high in the vicinity of the school and moderate in the hilly areas behind it. The land coverage is 10 percent with an additional 10 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT:

This area should continue to serve as a residential neighborhood, maintaining the existing character.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. The golf course uses a large amount of fertilizer within the SEZ.

2. Subdivision improvements within the planning area are not adequate with respect to drainage, infiltration and slope stabilization.

3. West Fairway Drive is of inadequate width.
SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The golf course area should be continued as a buffer/open space area to the commercial development of Tahoe City.

2. The 1975-TRPA/Placer-County-Urban-Design-Plan shall be used as a guideline for future planning considerations with appropriate revisions to bring the Design-Plan up-to-date. This policy applies to the surrounding Plan-Areas affected by the Urban-Design Plan. The new Tahoe City Community Plan will be developed to reflect the goals of the 1975 Tahoe City-Urban-Design-Plan as updated.

3. TRPA will assist with a study of the entire area within Plan-Area 091A-092 and adjacent Plan-Areas to identify areas that are man-modified in accordance with Chapter 29 of the Code of Ordinances. The target date for completion of the study will be August 17, 1987. Areas recognized by the Agency as man-modified shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 29 of the Code of Ordinances.

2. Special Area #1 is a multi-residential area that recognizes areas zoned for multiple residential use under pre-existing County and TRPA zoning. Development of housing for the workers of the Tahoe City area is encouraged for this area. May be considered for such residential area.

5. Placer-County-and-the-Tahoe-City-Advisory-Council, in cooperation with TRPA, have commenced a general plan review of the areas included in Plan-Areas 091A, 091B, 092, 093, 094, 095, 096, 097, 098, 099A, 099B, 010A, 010B, 022, 171, 172, 173, and 174. Until that general plan process has been completed, the Plan Areas designated 091A, 091B, and 099A have been designated preliminary Community Plan areas. However, it is the intent of TRPA that an in-depth examination of the entire area be undertaken during the general plan process to determine the final areas that shall be subject to Community Plan incentives, and establish the final boundaries of Community Plan areas as well as to develop other relevant planning considerations. Proposals for inclusion of any significant additional areas within Community Plan boundaries shall demonstrate compliance with the criteria for such inclusion set forth in the Code of Ordinances.

6. Man-modified SEBS should be evaluated and restored to the extent practical and consistent with the TRPA-SEBS program. Where lands are found to be man-modified, the new capability designation shall supersede the SEBS designation.

3. Special Area #2 is a recreation/public service area which is in the influence area of the Tahoe City Community Plan. All projects shall be subject to the policies and standards of this Plan Area and, where applicable, shall be consistent with the planning direction provided in Chapter I of the Tahoe City Community Plan.
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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, except as noted in Special Area #1:

Residential
- Single family dwelling (A).

Public Service
- Cemeteries (A), churches (A), cultural facilities (S), day care centers/pre-schools (S), local post offices (S), local public health and safety facilities (S), membership organizations (A), publicly owned assembly and entertainment (S), public utility centers (A), schools-kindergarten through secondary (A), pipelines and power transmissions (S), transit stations and terminals (S), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (A).

Recreation
- Day use areas (A), golf courses (A), participant sports facilities (S), cross country skiing courses (A), outdoor recreation concessions (A), and snowmobile courses (S).

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).

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

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

Residential
- Multiple family dwelling (A), nursing and personal care (A), employee housing (A), and residential care (A).

Special Area #2 (Recreation/Public Service Area): The following list of
PAS 002 -- FAIRWAY TRACT
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permissible uses is applicable throughout the Special Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Employee housing (S).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td>Bed and breakfast facilities (S); hotel, motel, and other transient dwelling units (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commercial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Retail</th>
<th>Eating and drinking places (A), nursery (S).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Entertainment</td>
<td>Amusements and recreation services (A); privately owned assembly and entertainment (S).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td>8 units per acre <em>SA-#1-only</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Housing</td>
<td>15 units per acre <em>SA-#1-only</em></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 45 20 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area 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-Volume IV of the Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-i through 18 of Volume I of the 288 Water Quality Plan and the Tahoe City Community Plan.

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

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification  RECREATION
Management Strategy  REDIRECTION
Special Designation  SCENIC RESTORATION AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area is located within the canyon area of the Truckee River between Tahoe city and River Ranch and is depicted on the following Agency maps B-7, B-8, C-7, C-8 and the Tahoe City Quadrangle.

Existing Uses: Except for a few commercial and residential uses, this planning area is mostly undeveloped and in public ownership. The existing uses mostly occur in areas of poor land capability and along the highway corridor. Access to the areas not directly fronted by the highway is limited to unimproved roads. Recreational activities include river rafting, fishing, hiking, and biking. This highway corridor serves as a major visitor approach to Lake Tahoe.

Existing Environment: Most of the land in this area is classified as high hazard. The plant composition is dominated by mature stands of mixed conifer stands. The river and forested backdrop of the canyon combine to create a scenic entrance to the Basin.

PLANNING STATEMENT:

This area should be managed for recreational uses that are compatible with the special scenic and resource values of the planning area. Existing developed facilities that contribute to scenic degradation in the area should be relocated to other suitable areas outside the planning area.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Most of the residential and commercial facilities are located within high hazard lands and detract from the scenic quality of the highway corridor which is a designated Scenic Corridor.

2. Inadequate parking facilities along the highway contribute to visual and water quality problems.

3. The roadway leading into Tahoe City (Scenic Roadway Unit 42, 43) is targeted for scenic restoration according to the adopted threshold standards.
4. The capacity of the highway is exceeded during peak use periods.

5. Drainage in this Plan Area flows to the Truckee River and away from Lake Tahoe.

6. The Truckee River has been determined to be eligible for Recreation River Status under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Redirect Existing commercial uses out-of in this Plan Area should be encouraged to relocate to more appropriate Plan Areas. Incentives through TDRs to any receivable Plan Area should be provided to encourage commercial uses to relocate. Commercial uses that are allowed to remain for safety reasons should be required to show that there is no safe feasible alternative site and should be required to do visual buffering or landscaping as conditions for any permits for additions, modifications, or alterations.

2. Provide suitable parking facilities for recreational users of the river.

3. Optimize recreation and travel use of the river corridor to that which maintains its attractiveness and environmental stability.


5. Public recreation opportunities on Lake Tahoe and the Truckee river should be encouraged. Prior to any expansion, the total number of rafts operating at one time on the Truckee River should be established by a comprehensive environmental analysis. This analysis should include, but not be limited to, determination of overall recreation needs, attractiveness of the facilities, environmental constraints and impacts, parking and traffic constraints, and various water flow limitations. Parking for commercial rafting should be provided by the businesses and in locations that do not further congest the "Wye" area.

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) and summer homes (S).

- **Commercial**
  - Fuel and ice dealers (S).

- **Public Service**
  - Pipelines and power transmissions (S), regional local public health and safety facilities (S), public utility centers (S), transportation routes (S), and transit stations and terminals (S).

- **Recreation**
  - Day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), undeveloped campgrounds (A), outdoor recreation concessions (S), rural sports (S), and visitor centers (S).

- **Resource Management**
  - Reforestation (A), regeneration harvest (S), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (S), special cut (S), thinning (A), tree farms (S), timber stand improvement (S), early successional stage vegetation management (A), non-structural fish habitat management (A), non-structural wildlife habitat management (S), farm/ranch accessory structures (S), grazing (S), range pasture management (S), range improvement (S), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (S), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and run-off control (A).

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

Single Family Dwelling  1 unit per parcel
Summer House  1 unit per parcel of lease site

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. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 89 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 USES 0 PAOT   OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

OTHER: Four 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. Improvements required by Volume IV of the Surface Water Quality Management Plan as shown on Figure-VIII-1 through VIII-18 of Volume I of the 28th Water Quality Plan.

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


4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway 89 corridor. (To-be-completed)
171 -- TAVERN HEIGHTS

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification: RESIDENTIAL
Management Strategy: MITIGATION
Special Designation: SCENIC RESTORATION AREA
TDR RECEIVING AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is the residential area along Highway 89 between Sunnyside Resort and Tahoe City and can be located on TRPA maps C-7 and C-8.

Existing Uses: Tavern Heights is a mixture of residential uses ranging from medium density condominiums to large estates. The shoreline is in private ownership. The area is 85 percent built out.

Existing Environment: This area is 90 percent low hazard. The shoreline is classified as tolerance district 7. Approximately 20 percent of the area has been covered with impervious surfaces and an additional 20 percent has been disturbed.

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

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Most of the piers in this area are extremely long due to shallow water.
2. The prime fish habitat in Lake Tahoe is tentatively identified for habitat restoration.
3. Scenic Roadway Unit 14 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 14 are within this Plan Area. The roadway unit is targeted for scenic restoration as required by the scenic threshold.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The two churches and their facilities, as they exist upon the adoption of this Plan Area, are considered allowed uses.
2. Special Area #1 is designated for multi-residential use.

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), multi-family dwellings (SA #1 only) (S).

Tourist Accommodation
Bed and breakfast facilities (S).

Public Service
Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), 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), 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 7

Primary Uses
Beach recreation (A), 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, 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 program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwelling</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast Facilities</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS: Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 5 units.

MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area, including the Highway 89 corridor, is 55 CNEQ.

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

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

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

1. Improvements required by Volume IV of the Water Quality Management Plan.
2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.
4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway 89 corridor.
174 -- 64-ACRE TRACT

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification  RECREATION
Management Strategy  REDIRECTION
Special Designation  SCENIC RESTORATION AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area is the federally-owned land south of the outlet to the Truckee River and is located on TRPA map C-7.

Existing Uses: This site contains a 100-unit mobile home park, which is being phased out, and miscellaneous commercial uses, is owned and managed by the USFS for public recreation and river rafting including trailhead parking for the Rim Trail.

Existing Environment: This area is mostly classified as SEZ. The area has river frontage and some lake frontage. The land coverage and disturbance is moderate to high. The shorezone tolerance district is 7.

PLANNING STATEMENT:

This area should be redeveloped into a public recreation area consistent with the overall design plan for Tahoe City.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. This is the logical site for development of a visitor information and education center, a west shore bypass, a community theater or amphitheater, bike trail, transit center, and trailhead for the Tahoe Rim Trail.

2. There are unauthorized private uses on federal land.

3. Scenic Roadway Unit 14 and Scenic Shoreline 14 are within this Plan Area.

4. The Truckee River has been determined to be eligible for Recreation River Status under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
SPECIAL POLICIES:


2. Public recreation opportunities on the lake and Truckee River should be generally encouraged. The total number of rafts operating at one time should be established by a comprehensive environmental analysis. This analysis should include but not be limited to, determination of the overall recreation needs, attractiveness of the facilities, environmental constraints and impacts, parking and traffic constraints, and various water flow impacts. Parking for commercial rafting should be provided by the businesses and in locations that do not further contest the "Wye" area.

3. A major visitor facility should be located near the Truckee River entrance to Tahoe City to provide visitors with information about Tahoe's historical past, natural history, environmental history, and current events.

4. The Tahoe City Area Community Plan, the U.S. Forest Service Plan, and the BIS-prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation should be used as guidelines for future planning considerations. This policy applies to the surrounding Plan Areas.

1. Use all appropriate opportunities to increase opportunities for public access to the Truckee River and Lake Tahoe.

2. Increase the total mileage of bicycle trails available for public use in the Placer County General Plan area, complete linkages in the system, and complete alignments as established in the Tahoe City P.U.D. Master Plan.

3. Coordinate with the U.S. Forest Service the overall development of the 64-Acre Tract property pursuant to requirements set forth in the Recreation Element. This development should include a Visitor Center/Interpretive facility and pier, as well as public parking for accessing the Truckee River and adjacent trail systems.
4. The Recreation Element shall consider the "Parks and Recreation Master Plan" of the Tahoe City Public Utility District along with the planning programs of the California State Parks Department, and U.S. Forest Service. Capital improvements in the Plan Area should be responsive to the needs assessment that was included in the Tahoe City P.U.D. Master Plan.

5. This Plan Area is a recreation area which is in the influence area of the Tahoe City Community Plan. All projects shall be subject to the policies and standards of this Plan Area and, where applicable, shall be consistent with the planning direction provided in Chapter I of the Tahoe City Community Plan.

PERMISSIBLE USES:

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

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

Residential

Employee housing (S).

Public Service

Cultural facilities (A), pipelines and power transmission (S), power-generating facilities (S), public assembly and entertainment facilities (S), public safety facilities (S), transmission routes (S), government offices (S), public utility center (S), membership-organizations (S), and transit stations and terminals (S).

Recreation

Marinas (S), beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (S), cross country skiing courses (A), day use areas (A), group facilities (S), riding and hiking trails (A), developed campgrounds (A), outdoor recreation concessions (A), rural sports (S), participant sport facilities (S), snow mobile courses (S), and visitor center (A).

Resource Management

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

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 7

Primary Uses

Beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (A), marinas (S), safety and navigational facilities (A), salvage operations (A), tour boat operations (A), waterborne transit (S), and water oriented outdoor recreation concessions (A).

Accessory Structures

Boat ramps (A), breakwaters or jetties (S), buoys (A), fences (S), floating docks and platforms (S), piers (S), shorezone 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 program, special use determinations, allocation limitations and general site development standards.

**USE**

**MAXIMUM DENSITY**

- Residential
  - 15 units per parcel

- Employee Housing
  - 8-sites-per-acre

- Recreation
  - 25 persons per acre

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 0 units.
MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 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

Other: Two miles of trails.

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 Volume IV of the Water Quality Management Plan and the Tahoe City Community Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through Figures VIII-18 of Volume I of the 298-Water-Quality-Plan.

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

3. Stream zone restoration as indicated in Volume III of the Water Quality Management Plan, the Stream Environment-Bone-Restoration-Program—(To-be-completed)

4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Tahoe City Community Plan and the Scenic quality Implementation Program for the Highway State Route 89 corridor. (To-be-completed)
PLAN DESIGNATION:

- Land Use Classification: RECREATION
- Management Strategy: REDIRECTION
- Special Designation: SCENIC RESTORATION AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area is located within the canyon area of the Truckee River between Tahoe City and River Ranch and is depicted on the following Agency maps B-7, B-8, C-7, C-8 and the Tahoe City Quadrangle.

Existing Uses: Except for a few commercial and residential uses, this planning area is mostly undeveloped and in public ownership. The existing uses mostly occur in areas of poor land capability and along the highway corridor. Access to the areas not directly fronted by the highway is limited to unimproved roads. Recreational activities include river rafting, fishing, hiking, and biking. This highway corridor serves as a major visitor approach to Lake Tahoe.

Existing Environment: Most of the land in this area is classified as high hazard. The plant composition is dominated by mature stands of mixed conifer stands. The river and forested backdrop of the canyon combine to create a scenic entrance to the Basin.

PLANNING STATEMENT:

This area should be managed for recreational uses that are compatible with the special scenic and resource values of the planning area. Existing-developed facilities that contribute to scenic degradation in the area should be re-located to other suitable areas outside the planning area.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Most of the residential and commercial facilities are located within high hazard lands and detract from the scenic quality of the highway corridor which is a designated Scenic Corridor.

2. Inadequate parking facilities along the highway contribute to visual and water quality problems.

3. The roadway leading into Tahoe City (Scenic Roadway Unit 42, 43) is targeted for scenic restoration according to the adopted threshold standards.
4. The capacity of the highway is exceeded during peak use periods.

5. Drainage in this Plan Area flows to the Truckee River and away from Lake Tahoe.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Redirect Existing commercial uses out-of in this Plan Area should be encouraged to relocate to more appropriate Plan Areas. Incentives through TDRs to any receivable Plan Area should be provided to encourage commercial uses to relocate. Commercial uses that are allowed to remain for-safety-reasons-should-be-required-to show-that-there-is-no-safe-feasible-alternative-site-and should be required to do visual buffering or landscaping as conditions for any permits for additions, modifications, or alterations.

2. Provide suitable parking facilities for recreational users of the river.

3. Optimize recreation and travel use of the river corridor to that which maintains its attractiveness and environmental stability.

4. Provide opportunities for low-to-moderate resource management in the plateau area.

5. Public recreation opportunities on Lake Tahoe and the Truckee river should be encouraged. Prior to any expansion, the total number of rafts operating at one time on the Truckee River should be established by a comprehensive environmental analysis. This analysis should include, but not be limited to, determination of overall recreation needs, attractiveness of the facilities, environmental constraints and impacts, parking and traffic constraints, and various water flow limitations. Parking for commercial rafting should be provided by the businesses and in locations that do not further congest the "Wye" area.

5. A maximum of 2,000 square feet of commercial floor space allocation shall be assigned to Special Area 1, linked to a program of improvements including fencing and landscaping for visual improvement.

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) and summer homes (S).

Commercial

- Fuel and ice dealers (S), building materials and hardware (S), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), auto repair and service (S), secondary storage (S), industrial services (S), small scale manufacturing (S), collection stations (S), vehicle storage and parking (S), and warehousing (S).

Public Service

- Pipelines and power transmissions (S), regional local public health and safety facilities (S), public utility centers (S), transportation routes (S), and transit stations and terminals (S).

Recreation

- Day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), undeveloped campgrounds (A), outdoor recreation concessions (S), rural sports (S), and visitor centers (S).

Resource Management

- Reforestation (A), regeneration harvest (S), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (S), special cut (S), thinning (A), tree farms (S), timber stand improvement (S), early successional stage vegetation management (A), non-structural fish habitat management (A), non-structural wildlife habitat management (S), farm/ranch accessory structures (S), grazing (S), range pasture management (S), range
improvement (S), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (S), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and run-off control (A).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer House</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel of lease site</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. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 89 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 USES 0 PAOT  OVERNIGHT USES 0 PAOT

OTHER: Four 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. Improvements required by Volume IV of the Surface Water Quality Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through VIII-10 of Volume I of the 2008 Water Quality Plan.

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

4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway 89 corridor. (To-be-completed)
MEMORANDUM

February 1, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendments to Delete PAS 001A Tahoe City

Proposed Action: In order to adopt the Tahoe City Community Plan, the Plan Area Statements need to be amended to delete the Tahoe City PAS 001A so that the Community Plan can replace it.

Recommendation: Staff recommends the attached technical amendments (Exhibit A) be approved.

Background: The Tahoe City Community Plan replaces the currently adopted PAS 001A. The Plan Area Statement document needs to be amended to reflect this change. These are technical amendments needed to adopt the Community Plan. The findings and environmental documentation related to the Tahoe City Community Plan (Appendix E) address this action.
Tahoe City Community Plan Amendment

REGIONAL PLAN FOR THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN
PLAN AREA STATEMENTS

PREFACE

I

INTRODUCTION

A) Framework of Regional Plan

B) Plan Area Statement Relationship to Other Documents

C) Plan Area Maps

D) Plan Area Amendments

E) Existing Uses

II PLAN AREA FORMAT AND DESCRIPTION

Example
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Exhibit A
PLAN AREA STATEMENT 001A
TAHOE CITY
HAS BEEN REPLACED BY THE
TAHOE CITY COMMUNITY PLAN

(SEE PLACER COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN)
FINDINGS FOR TAHOE CITY COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Article VII(d) Findings for the EIS: These findings are made and based upon the administrative record of the EIS/EIR and the Tahoe City Community Plan, including other documents prepared pursuant to the Tahoe City Community Plan. A summary of impacts and mitigations is provided in the EIS/EIR Executive Summary (Attachment F). 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 soils impacts. In addition an area wide remedial water quality improvement project and SEZ restoration projects are required as part of this plan.

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 CP, as mitigated by proposed transportation projects and BMP practices. 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.

Attachment E
Rationale: Compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements relating to transportation will provide mitigation for transportation impacts. Mitigation projects are proposed with this CP to attain VMT and LOS targets. Parking, VMT, and LOS mitigation measures are listed in the CP.

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: The 89 Bypass option and the lake development require further study. There are no impacts identified with vegetation, wildlife and fisheries for the required CP improvements assuming compliance with the TRPA Regional Plan and Code requirements.

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 CP 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. There is mitigation required as a result of recreation projects. 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 CP proposes scenic targets and strategies to attain the targets. The CP proposes Design Standards and Guidelines to address signs and other 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:** There were no safety impacts identified.

II. **Chapter 6 Findings for Community Plan Adoption and adoption of related Code and PAS Amendments:** The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed plan and amendments:

A. **Chapter 6 Findings:**

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

   **Rationale:** Tahoe City is identified as an area appropriate for community plans in the Goals and Policies, Land Use Subelement, Goal #2, Policy 6. Community plans are an important tool for redirection and rehabilitation of development as discussed in the Land Use Subelement, Goal #2. The Tahoe City Community Plan was prepared in conformance with the substantive and procedural requirements of the Goals and Policies, as implemented through Chapter 14 of the Code.

   Consistent with the Goals and Policies, the 1988 TRPA 108 Plan and 1991 RTP/Air Quality Plan also consider community plans as an implementation tool. The Tahoe City Community Plan contains the required element of community plans, including environmental targets to assist in the attainment and maintenance of the thresholds. When implemented, the Tahoe City Community Plan will have a beneficial impact on TRPA's efforts to attain and maintain thresholds.

   All development within community plans is subject to the Code of Ordinances. As contemplated by Chapter 14, the community plans, when adopted, will replace the existing plan area statements. The community plan includes updated land capability information.

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

   **Rationale:** The Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets with strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any threshold to be exceeded.
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 Community Plan sets forth environmental threshold related targets (for air quality and water quality, the threshold targets are the applicable standards) and strategies to achieve those targets. The EIS for this plan did not find any standard would be exceeded.

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:** The Community Plan sets environmental targets, with implementation strategies, which are designed to make a contribution to achieving a regional threshold. By linking the allocation of commercial floor area to environmental targets and implementation programs, the Community Plan will work, in concert with other regional plan programs (e.g., 208 Plan, RTP/Air Quality Plan) to achieve and maintain thresholds. Community plan are an important tool in the achievement and maintenance of thresholds.

The concentration and rehabilitation of commercial and related development in the Tahoe City Community Plan will reduce VMT and auto trips and provide a land use pattern that encourages transit and pedestrian modes of transportation. The rehabilitation is directly related to scenic improvements and indirectly to implementation of BMFs. The provision of environmental targets and capital improvements to achieve them within the Tahoe City Community Plan will result in progress toward threshold attainment that ordinarily would not be required under EIS mitigation requirements.

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

**Rationale:** See 2 and 4 above.

IV. **Special Findings and Considerations Related to Community Plan Adoption**

A. Chapter 14 Community Plans Findings and Considerations,

1. **Section 14.3 Boundary Findings** - Two additions to this Community Plan are proposed. The first addition is for the proposed Grove Street parking lot a commercial facility. The second addition is for existing commercial facilities next to Fanny Bridge. Section 5.1.7 of the EIS/EIR indicates the findings can be made.
2. **Section 14.5.C Equal or Superior Standards for Density, Noise, Driveways, Parking, Outdoor Advertising, Historic and Design** - The Final EIS/EIR documents that the proposed substitute standards and guidelines are equal or superior to the existing TRPA standards and guidelines.

3. **Subsection 14.6.D Approval of the Community Plan**

   a. The APC has obtained and considered the recommendations of local government and other responsible public agencies and has made a recommendation to the Governing Board.

   b. The Governing Board has determined that the plan is consistent with the Goals and Policies, the Code, the attainment of the targets and the requirements of 14.6.B(1).

   c. The Governing Board determined the effect on other plan areas and determined no PAS amendments are appropriate.

   d. The Governing Board established the initial allocations set forth in Chapter II of the Community Plan.

B. **Chapter 33 Commercial Allocation Required Considerations**

1. **Subsection 33.3.C Initial Allocations** - TRPA has considered the demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining needed funds for implementation, and compatibility with other community plans.

C. **Chapter 26 Substitute Standards**

1. **Subsection 26.5.B Community Plan Standards** - Section 5.8 of the Final EIS gives TRPA the basis for finding the community plan scenic quality improvement program and sign provisions are equal or superior to TRPA's pursuant to Subsection 26.5.C of the Code.
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I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PLAN AND ITS ALTERNATIVES

The Tahoe City Community Plan is a commercial area land use plan that works to implement features of the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan. The plan area is located on Lake Tahoe’s North Shore, in Placer County, California. Adoption of the Community Plan will supersede the applicable Plan Area Statements. The Placer County Tahoe City Area Plan will update the County’s General Plan in this area by adopting the appropriate TRPA Plan Area Statements. This summary does not include information concerning the General Plan update. Upon adoption by the TRPA Governing Board and the Placer County Board of Supervisors, these plans will help form the parameters for future growth in the greater Tahoe City area.

A. BACKGROUND OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The Community Plan establishes goals and policies for a host of activities including land use, recreation, transportation and parking, urban design, public facilities, and environmental improvement. The CP has been prepared as a joint effort between the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Placer County, and the Tahoe City Community Planning Team. The Planning Team consists of TRPA staff, Placer County staff, and the local members of the Tahoe Area Regional Municipal Advisory Committee.

The proposed CP has experienced many changes since its inception. Earlier plan versions included different CP boundaries, different land use recommendations, and different implementation approaches. Some of the original ideas for community improvement are included in the alternatives to the proposed plan. The alternatives also incorporate some actions proposed by property owners. This document evaluates all the alternatives and identifies the ways in which they differ from the proposed CP.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The following matrix describes the three primary alternatives studied, as well as additional options to Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan) which could be implemented. Section C of this summary provides more detail concerning Alternative 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>State Route 28</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>State Route 89</th>
<th>Bike Trails</th>
<th>Parking Layout</th>
<th>Parking Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td>Hwy by-pass behind commercial core without pedestrian mall along store-fronts.</td>
<td>HOV lane (+4 persons) on SR 89, eliminate turn pockets. Develop park and ride system w/no core parking.</td>
<td>Intersection improvements (could include widening, more lanes, and new bridge).</td>
<td>SR 28: In ROW only.</td>
<td>Individual parking on-site.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Options</strong></td>
<td>(Option to Alt. 3) Hwy by-pass with pedestrian mall.</td>
<td>1. Light rail to Truckee. 2. Water-borne. 3. Tram to ski area.</td>
<td>(Option to Alt. 3 w/no by-pass) Redesign existing &quot;Y&quot; to include: 1. Rotary 2. Overpass</td>
<td>SR 28: Behind commercial development.</td>
<td>Develop community parking lot in conjunction with large retail store (may be parking garage).</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Other Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Commercial Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tourist Development / Business Core Theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service / Industrial Use</td>
<td>Existing: lumber yard remains in river corridor. Relocate Caltrans when &quot;Y&quot; by-pass is built.</td>
<td>Existing: no CP status. Future 10,000 SF for use outside CPs, leave transfer CFA where it is now.</td>
<td>Existing: offices and facilities spread out.</td>
<td>Existing: marina for 162 boats with buoys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
<td>Use SA 2 for industrial with screening and allow consolidation of TCPUD offices; relocate fire and power stations when possible; Burton Creek/Dollar Hill as County and State P.S. Relocate Caltrans when &quot;Y&quot; by-pass is built. Rely on other plan areas for additional need.</td>
<td>Design for total 100,000 SF over existing. Assign 50,000 SF allocation, design for additional 50,000 SF transfer.</td>
<td>Emphasize tourist accommodations. Design for total up to 167 units over existing: 25 new, 142 transfer. Allow redevelopment of Lighthouse / Boatworks to accommodate a hotel of up to 200 rooms.</td>
<td>Allow TCPUD offices to consolidate in SA 2. Develop Burton Creek parcel as County government center for jail and offices. Expand marina: allow up to 400 additional slips, replace storage building with parking garage and other uses, remove all buoys in area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td>Relocate Caltrans out of river area. Rely on other plan areas for additional need.</td>
<td>Design for total 60,000 SF over existing. Assign 30,000 SF allocation, design for additional 30,000 SF transfer.</td>
<td>Retail center. Additional 50 tourist units over existing: 25 new, 25 transfer.</td>
<td>Develop Dollar Hill as government center. Expand marina: allow 200 slips with other proposals as above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Options</strong></td>
<td>1. Design for allocation only: 50,000 SF. 2. Develop large retail store in &quot;Y&quot; area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Chimney site as government center or locate out of plan area.</td>
<td>Expand marina 400 slips: 1. Parallel to shore, south. 2. Parallel to shore, north. 3. Perpendicular to shore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, cont.</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Multi-Purpose Facility</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Drainage System</td>
<td>1997 Targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 1 (No Project)</strong></td>
<td>existing: no developed facility with some assembly functions available in scattered sites.</td>
<td>existing: retain existing rafters. Future TCPUD, USFS, and CSP plan.</td>
<td>existing: poor drainage system w/little or no pre-treatment. Future on-site BMPs stimulated by projects, downtown drainage system.</td>
<td>existing: TRPA programs on case-by-case basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td>develop in dollar hill. maintain fairway center and community center for small-scale assembly.</td>
<td>add 45 units (20 new with bonus units, 25 transfer) in special area #5.</td>
<td>on-site treatment where possible. three area-wide systems where coverage and groundwater is high.</td>
<td>VMT: -3,903 SEZ: 4 A restored. Coverage: 2.8 A hard coverage, 11.6 A disturbed restored. Scenic: 27% improvement roadway units, 33% shoreline units.</td>
<td>revised placer county design review standards (incorporated as CP design review guidelines). includes revised sign standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>elimanate golf course to provide room for hwy by-pass.</td>
<td>on-site compliance w/ BMPs.</td>
<td>same as above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Options</strong></td>
<td>develop in tahoe city: 1. commons. 2. golf course. 3. chimney site. 4. behind pepper tree. 5. fairway site.</td>
<td>behind trading post.</td>
<td>1. add 100 RAOTs. 2. remove 100 RAOTs. 3. relocate golf course to highlands park. use open space for community recreation.</td>
<td>VMT: no reduction. SEZ: no restoration. Coverage: allow 10% increase. Scenic: improve 50%.</td>
<td>TRPA scenic improvement program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. ALTERNATIVE #2 - PREFERRED (THE COMMUNITY PLAN)

Land Use: The overall business theme proposed for Tahoe City is Major Tourist Accommodation, Retail, and Services. Six Special Areas incorporate development themes for portions of the community including Retail / Tourist, Public Service/Industrial, Recreation, Tourist / Residential, and Recreation/Public Service. Within these areas, the plan proposes permissible uses designed to implement each theme. This alternative designs for 100,000 square feet (SF) of additional commercial floor area while assigning 50,000 SF from the pool available to community plans. The alternative also allows up to 167 additional tourist accommodation units (25 of these originate from the designated pool, the remainder are transferred from other areas) and up to 50 affordable housing units (25 bonus units and 25 transferred units).

Transportation: Plan proposals address improved traffic flow, improved parking, and increased transit usage. Replacing diagonal parking with parallel parking along SR 28 will allow room for pedestrian improvements, street lights and landscaping and reduce friction between through travel and parking cars that contributes to traffic congestion. A parking / access program to be implemented by Placer County will improve parking by building new parking lots in key areas of town and using a shuttle to link them with businesses. Improved access may occur through use of shared or reduced driveways or linkages between parking lots. The CP requires two limited parking lot connectors and considers other connections. A large community parking lot on the 64 Acres (USFS parcel) will incorporate a transit and visitor facility to encourage regional transit ridership. The bike trail proposed will utilize the highway right-of-way and possibly a route along the lake shore.

Conservation: This alternative proposes environmental targets for threshold issues. The targets are:

- reduce VMTs by the target amount (3,903 VMTs) and obtain level of service D at selected monitoring points;
- restore 4 acres of SEZ (one third of the amount needed for the threshold requirement for regional compliance by 2007);
- attain at minimum a 27 percent improvement in scenic roadway units and 33 percent improvement in scenic shoreline units by 1997;
- restore approximately 2.8 acres of hard coverage to meet excess land coverage mitigation responsibilities;
- implement the downtown portion of the area-wide drainage system including a collection system, retention pond, and SEZ treatment; implement area-wide drainage systems in concert with redevelopment proposals in the marina area and in the Wye area; implement on-site systems in all areas where possible; stabilize approximately 11.6 acres of disturbed land and soft coverage, and obtain increased BMP application;
- summer day use recreational opportunities should increase by 1,100 PAOTs (design capacity);
• noise limits of 55 CNEL for the transportation corridors (State Routes 28 and 89) and for residential and urban recreation areas (Special Areas 4 and 5) are allowed. Commercial areas must not exceed 65 CNEL.

Recreation: This CP encourages increased access to Lake Tahoe and the Truckee River. This can occur through improved beach access at publicly owned beaches, increased trail access and park-like development of the River corridor, and increased boating / marina access in the Lighthouse-Tahoe City Boat Company area. The CP endorses USFS plans for the 64 Acres that include an interpretive center and parking lot / trailhead, with the addition of a visitor information center and transit facility (connected to the community parking lot). California State Parks' preliminary plans to renovate the Tahoe State Recreation Area and move the campground to Burton Creek are also included, although this will occur after the CP target dates.

Public Service: In this alternative, Burton Creek or Dollar Hill would serve as a center for County facilities including administrative offices and criminal justice facilities. The TCPUD administrative offices could also relocate to Dollar Hill or to the TCPUD maintenance facility in Special Area 2 (the Chimney parcel). The upper Dollar Hill property (the former "Firestone" properties), or upper Burton Creek would receive the Caltrans and Placer County maintenance yards. Dollar Hill could also support a community multi-purpose facility in this proposal. The plan encourages development of a new fire station located off the bluff above Commons Beach, possibly within the Chimney parcel.

Implementation: The implementation package for this alternative uses a combined public / private approach to providing remedial programs. The CP benefits will become effective after an irrevocable commitment to the downtown drainage and streetscape project occurs. Subsequent improvements will develop in concert with increased commercial floor area or tourist accommodation units. Each project will receive an allocation directly related to the amount of improvements provided. In addition, environmental improvements will occur as a result of compliance with the existing requirements for BMPs, sign compliance, traffic mitigation, etc.

II. SUMMARY OF ANTICIPATED IMPACTS AND NECESSARY MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE TAHOE CITY COMMUNITY PLAN

The following table identifies the effects / impacts and necessary mitigation measures identified throughout the environmental review process for the Tahoe City Community Plan. After the table, an environmental benefit comparison matrix is included which identifies the environmentally superior alternative.
## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS/EFFECTS, MITIGATION MEASURES

### TAHOE CITY COMMUNITY PLAN

The following section is a summary of impacts and mitigation information found in other sections of this document. Refer to appropriate sections for complete discussion of each item mentioned. A summary of monitoring needs can be found at the end of this chapter.

It is important to note that TRPA Code of Ordinances provisions will insure that typical development-related impacts are mitigated. These are not listed separately here and would include, but not be limited to: application of temporary and permanent BMPs, compliance with coverage, scenic, and design standards, and adherence to environmental documentation requirements at the master plan or project review stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>IMPACT/EFFECT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>1) No CP status with severely limited commercial expansion potential. 2) No new CFA eliminates incentive for private sector participation in environmental remedial programs. Limited transfer will continue to make off-site improvements.</td>
<td>1) Rely on transfer of commercial floor area with the correspondingly higher costs. 2) Must rely more heavily on publicly financed projects or private initiatives to make improvements commensurate with those for Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</td>
<td>1) Allowed uses for Tahoe City SA 1, 2, and 3 create non-conforming uses. They are: 3 single family dwellings, a welding shop, a warehouse use, and a lumber yard. 2) Up 167 additional tourist units evaluated for construction in lakeside area. To provide necessary parking, etc., this action may require removal of existing businesses. 3) Allow marina expansion of up to 400 slips (see other sections for specific anticipated impacts). 4) County document continues commercial zoning for uses in PAS 003 (non-conforming under TRPA regulations). This allows expansion (limited) of uses in sensitive lands and reduces likelihood of relocation. 5) Incorporate approx. 3.75 acres into CP boundary for existing commercial property in redevelopment area and commercial parking area. These properties appear to meet required findings for additions.</td>
<td>1) Pursuant to Code (Section 18.5), these uses can continue, providing no cessation or substantial change in use occurs. The CP limits change or expansion in current use, while providing incentives to change use in conformance with the Plan. No additional mitigation is required. 2) Require full environmental review of all issues prior to approval. 3) Require master plan development and full environmental review of all issues prior to approval. 4) No compelling reason exists to amend this PAS which overrids the potential benefits of the current condition. No amendments should be made. 5) None needed.</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 1) Through 1997. 2) Through 1997. 1) No schedule. 2) Prior to project approval. 3) Pursuant to Chapter 15, require marina master plan and full environmental review. 4) No schedule. 5) No schedule.

2. 1) Not applicable. 2) Not applicable. 4) TRPA (during project review). 2) TRPA / Placer Co. 3) TRPA / Placer Co. 4) Not applicable. 5) Not applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT/EFFECT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use, cont.</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>1) No schedule.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Designation of Tahoe City Industrial as a CP area creates immediate opportunity for relocation of industrial uses which lie in undesirable areas (see Section 7.2).</td>
<td>2) More reliance on public sector financing may be necessary to realize the same environmental improvements as for Alt. 2.</td>
<td>2) By 1997.</td>
<td>2) TRPA / Placer Co. / other public and private.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Less CFA available in Tahoe City produces less incentive for remedial environmental projects.</td>
<td>3) None needed.</td>
<td>3) No schedule.</td>
<td>3) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Fewer tourist units concentrated in Tahoe City allows existing units to remain in other areas.</td>
<td>4) During marina master plan process.</td>
<td>4) TRPA / Placer Co.</td>
<td>4) TRPA / Placer Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Allow marina expansion of up to 200 slips (see other sections for specific anticipated impacts).</td>
<td>5) Prior to project approval.</td>
<td>5) Caltrans / other public agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Removal of the golf course to provide room for a highway by-pass reduces the variety of recreational opportunities in Tahoe City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Creating a highway by-pass with a pedestrian mall in the commercial core substantially alters the circulation and land use patterns of the area. Reduced auto access to some businesses will likely force change in business type.</td>
<td>1) Large scale redevelopment of parking and entrance to businesses is necessary. Change to primarily pedestrian business access will force some businesses to change. Golf course purchase is required.</td>
<td>1) Prior to project approval.</td>
<td>1) Caltrans / other public agencies and private businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Developing a Payless store at the Wye increases commercial concentration at a Tahoe City entrance point. (This requires a successful man-modified determination to accomplish.)</td>
<td>2) If this project proposes to exceed the 10,000 SF cap on CFA in first three years, it must prove contribution to improvements equal to that otherwise obtained from smaller scaled projects throughout the community to avoid significant impact.</td>
<td>2) Prior to project approval.</td>
<td>2) Project proponent. (TRPA &amp; Placer Co. during project review.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Allowed additional development in Tahoe City can increase coverage for public facility projects.</td>
<td>1) Coverage reduction for mitigation as required by the TRPA Code.</td>
<td>1) Prior to project approval.</td>
<td>1) Project proponent (TRPA during project review.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Limited in-town coverage reduction will occur accompanying case-by-case development mitigation and public service projects.</td>
<td>2) None needed.</td>
<td>2) No schedule.</td>
<td>2) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils, cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The proposed excess coverage and disturbed lands mitigation programs meet their targets. With irrevocable commitment of the starred project, CP bonus programs can proceed. CFA is linked to the following projects, increasing target attainment through redevelopment: landscape policy, upper river, pave parking. Lower river project remains an option for future consideration. 2) Coverage increases will occur through public service and recreation projects. The coverage increases could range widely, depending on project design. Those which could increase coverage include full connector development, lake shore bike trail, and some parking lots. 3) Wye by-pass development after 1997 will increase coverage. 4) Full connector does not appear to be needed, at least within the time frame of the CP, and would increase coverage over Bailey limits.</td>
<td>1) Features of the excess coverage mitigation program: a- Calif. parks (1 acre) b- Upper River (1 acre) c- Landscaping in ROW (0.5 acres) d- Landscape policy (2.5 acres) Features of the disturbed ground restoration program: e- *Wye pond (3 acres) f- 64 Acres (5 acres) g- Calif. parks (1 acre) h- Upper River (3 acres) i- Landscaping in ROW (1 acre) j- Landscape policy (1 acre) k- Borrow Pit (5 acres) l- Pave parking (4 acres) m- Lower river (8 acres)</td>
<td>1) Coverage/disturbed ground reduction. a- by 1997 b- by 1997 c- by 1997 d- through 1997 e- 1994 f- by 1997 g- by 1997 h- by 1997 i- by 1997 j- through 1997 k- 1994 l- 1994-1997 m- by 2007</td>
<td>1) Coverage/disturbed ground reduction. a- State b- private / Lands of Sierra (aided by Redevelopment Agency) c- private (TRPA &amp; Placer Co. during project review.) d- same as &quot;e&quot; e- Placer Co. f- USFS g- State h- private i- same as &quot;e&quot; j- same as &quot;e&quot; k- TRPA (enforcement action) l- Placer Co. / assessment districts m- Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The coverage reduction program is the same as for Alt. 2 with the exception of landscaping in the ROW. Fewer incentives for private sector participation may increase the burden on public sector contributions. 2) Coverage increases for the SR 28 by-pass route and Wye intersection improvements exceed that of Alt. 2. Coverage increases for the bike trail element is less than that of Alt. 2</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) All coverage mitigation as required by the Code.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) At the time of project approval.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) Project proponent. (TRPA during project review.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soils, cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The coverage target program makes the reduction target smaller by 10% compared to Alt. 2. To remain consistent with the Regional Plan, other portions of the hydrologic area must reduce coverage in an equal amount. No TRPA or County program currently requires this. 2) Coverage increases for the SR 28 by-pass route and Wye intersection improvements exceed that of Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Develop an implementation program which ties reduced coverage reduction in Tahoe City to increased coverage reduction in other portions of the hydrologic area. 2) All coverage mitigation as required by the Code.</td>
<td>1) Prior to adoption of this alternative. 2) During project review.</td>
<td>1) TRPA / Placer Co. / CP team. 2) Project proponent. (TRPA during project review.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream Environment Zones / Water Quality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 1 (No Project)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 1 (No Project)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) All increases in SEZ coverage allowed in Alt. 2 could also occur in this alternative. 2) SEZ restoration following the 208 Plan program currently generates no SEZ restoration within the CP area. The same projects envisioned in Alt. 2 are under current consideration for addition to the existing TRPA program, possibly creating an equal situation.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) None needed.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) No schedule.</td>
<td>1) Same as Alt. 2. 2) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Impacts include increase coverage associated with several projects. These projects could conceivably make required findings for the increase. (Shoreline bike trail may need to consider alternative alignments.) 2) SEZ restoration program will exceed established target. With irrevocable commitment to the starred project, CP bonus programs can proceed. TRPA will track a CP account to determine if sufficient progress has been made on the other projects. A successful man-modified challenge on the Payless site will drive the need for additional SEZ restoration. 3) Marina expansion by up to 400 slips will impact water quality without mitigation. This includes degradation of existing open water areas.</td>
<td>1) SEZ coverage reduction as required by Chapter 20 Code provisions, to be determined at the time of project review. 2) Features of the SEZ restoration program: a- Calif. parks (1 acre) b- *Wye pond (3 acres) c- Miscellaneous (1 acre) Additional projects possible: d- 64 Acres (4 acres) e- Lower River (7 acres) f- Upper River (5 acres) 3) The proponent should assume an expanded treatment system to assure maintenance of water quality standards.</td>
<td>1) At the time of project review. 2) SEZ restoration: a- by 1997 b- 1994 c- by 1997 d- by 1997 e- by 2007 f- by 1997 3) During marina master plan process.</td>
<td>1) TRPA 2) SEZ restoration: a- State b-Placer Co. / private c- private / TRPA / Placer Co. 3) Project proponent / TRPA / marina master plan team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Stream Environment Zones</td>
<td>Water Quality, cont.**</td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan), cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2, cont.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan), cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan), cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2, cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2, cont.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Downtown area wide system, with progress on additional treatment, expected to treat urban runoff to meet standards. Irrevocable commitment to this project is needed to allow assignment of allocations.</td>
<td>4) Development of downtown area wide system with monitoring to record standards attainment. CP text revisions necessary to clarify each contributor's responsibility to standards attainment and increase emphasis on use of infiltration where possible (based on Chapter 25.7 criteria).</td>
<td>4) 1994.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other areas to rely on BMPs if possible or other area-wide systems.</td>
<td>5) Other systems must be evaluated and monitored prior to acceptance.</td>
<td>5) By 1997.</td>
<td>5) Placer Co. / Caltrans / private. (TRPA for project review.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Exemption from water quality mitigation fees will apply to few projects as most properties do not qualify for new coverage. CP allowance for contribution to off-site projects as substitution for this fee requires modification to avoid impacts.</td>
<td>6) The substitute program should clarify only those funds in excess of the anticipated costs for meeting on-site responsibilities can be credited toward payment of the mitigation fee.</td>
<td>6) Prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td>6) Placer Co. / private.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Use of mitigation funds for on-site treatment required by area-wide systems requires clarification to avoid impacts.</td>
<td>7) Text revisions shall clarify use of mitigation funds must follow provisions established in Code Section 82.5.</td>
<td>7) Prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td>7) TRPA / Placer Co. / CP team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This alternative presents fewer SEZ impacts related to bike trails and greater SEZ impacts related to the SR 28 by-pass route and the Wye intersection (dependent upon project designs) as compared to Alt. 2.</td>
<td>1) Off-setting mitigation as required by Code.</td>
<td>1) At the time of project review.</td>
<td>1) Project proponent. (TRPA during project review.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The same SEZ restoration target and programs are included in this alternative. Lower private business incentives may inhibit SEZ coverage reduction otherwise anticipated.</td>
<td>2) Same as Alt. 2. Increased restoration incentives should be developed.</td>
<td>2) Same as Alt. 2. Prior to adoption of this alternative.</td>
<td>2) Same as Alt. 2. TRPA / Placer Co. / CP team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Marina expansion by up to 200 slips will impact water quality without mitigation. This includes degradation of existing open water areas.</td>
<td>3) The mitigation package proposed during the marina master plan and project review stages may be less extensive compared to Alt. 2. Ability to meet exemptions for degradation policy is required.</td>
<td>3) During marina master plan process.</td>
<td>3) Project proponent / TRPA / marina master plan team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Reliance principally on on-site water treatment to meet standards will be difficult in some areas of Tahoe City. Simple BMPs in these areas are not sufficient and storm water treatment may require more expensive techniques. Multiple on-site systems are more difficult to monitor for effectiveness.</td>
<td>4) Storm water treatment on-site in areas of high water table and excess coverage must be able to meet discharge standards; this may involve more expensive treatment options.</td>
<td>4) On-going monitoring.</td>
<td>4) Private. (LaFontant &amp; TRPA during project review.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Lower incentives for project development will result in fewer properties implementing BMPs compared to Alt. 2.</td>
<td>5) Increased incentives for BMP retrofit are necessary.</td>
<td>5) Prior to adoption of this alternative.</td>
<td>5) TRPA / Placer Co. / CP team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream Environment Zones / Water Quality, cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Options                                                                                     | 1) Mitigation according to Code requirements if findings for SEZ disturbance can be met.  
2) Increased storm water treatment potential necessary to identify in Tahoe City to offset reduced SEZ treatment. | 1) During project review.  
2) Prior to adoption of this alternative. | 1) Project proponent.  
(TRPA during project review.)  
2) TRPA / Placer Co. / CP team. |
| 1) This alternative presents greater SEZ impacts related to the SR 28 by-pass route when compared to both Alt. 2 and 3 and the Wye intersection as compared to Alt. 3.  
2) This alternative assumes no SEZ restoration program proposed in CP; reliance on project-driven restoration and TRPA program. If considered projects are incorporated into TRPA program, results in same amount of SEZ restoration though less benefit as no area-wide system. |                                                                                      |                            |                                |
| **Shorezone/Fish Habitat**                                                                     | **Alternative 1 (No Project)**                                                       | **Alternative 1**           | **Alternative 1**              |
| Alternative 1 (No Project)                                                                    | 1) None needed.  
2) Same as Alt. 2.                                                                 | 1) No schedule.  
2) Same as Alt. 2.                                                        | 1) Not applicable.  
2) Same as Alt. 2.                                                        |
| 1) Shorezone stabilization and fish habitat improvement rely on standard TRPA requirements.  
2) Marina expansion may proceed without adoption of a CP; although on-shore limits make it less likely. | Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)                                                       | Alternative 2               | Alternative 2                  |
| Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)                                                                 | 1) Mitigation measures will be necessary to implement this proposal. Specific measures cannot be determined at this time, but may include a reduction in size, area-wide water quality treatment, and use of permeable enclosures.  
2) The system ultimately approved must: meet discharge standards for sediment and toxins, discharge at a steady rate, discharge at a similar temperature as river water, and prevent migration into pipes of the system.  
3) When a bike trail project is proposed, alternative alignments must be studied to produce a project which can meet required findings. | 1) During marina master plan process.  
2) Prior to project approval.  
3) Prior to project approval. | 1) Project proponent / TRPA / Placer Co. / marina master plan team.  
2) Placer Co. / Caltrans.  
3) Project proponent.  
(TRPA during project review.) |
| 1) Marina expansion will produce changes with potential for significant impacts associated with littoral processes, shorezone vegetation, and fish habitat. Specific impacts must be identified during the marina master plan and project review stages.  
2) Diversion of surface flow to the Truckee River for drainage system may create impacts to fisheries related to water quality, velocity, temperature, and migration.  
3) Proposed bike trail along the shoreline does not appear to meet required findings for shorezone disturbance. | Alternative 3                                                                        | Alternative 3               | Alternative 3                  |
| Alternative 3                                                                                 | 1) Similar to Alt. 2. The mitigation package may be less extensive as the expansion is smaller.  
2) Develop increased BMP application incentives. | 1) Same as Alt. 2.  
2) Prior to adoption of this alternative. | 1) Same as for Alt. 2.  
2) TRPA / Placer Co. / CP team. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT/EFFECT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3, cont.</td>
<td>3) Retaining the bike trail within the highway ROW produces no shorezone impacts (as compared to Alt. 2).</td>
<td>3) None needed.</td>
<td>3) No schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding the marina enclosure parallel to shore (either direction) appears to produce more impacts than perpendicular to shore. This should be further studied.</td>
<td>Mitigation for enclosure design and location must be proposed during the marina master plan and project plan stages.</td>
<td>During marina master plan process.</td>
<td>Project proponent / TRPA / Placer Co. / marina master plan team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation/Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 (No Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) LOS: With no CP, Tahoe City will experience limited growth, yet exceed capacity on portions of SR 28 and at the SR 28/Grove St. intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) VMT: Regional VMT is expected to increase by 16% over 1981 baseline conditions. This alternative produces a net reduction in VMT of 4,490 miles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan) |
| 1) LOS: The "Do Nothing", "Auto", and "Transit" oriented transportation packages evaluated cannot meet minimum LOS for the S.R. 28/Grove and S.R. 28/Jack Pine intersections, as well as most SR 28 roadway segments. The "Minimum Transportation Alternative", which constitutes the CP requirements, includes the minimum necessary items from the menu to produce adequate LOS in 2007 for all intersections and roadway segments. (Omitting levels or distribution of development than that assumed by the analysis may alter the minimum required. Project level detail will assign responsibility.) |

| Alternative 1 (No Project) |
| 1) Minimum improvements necessary include: |
| a. Conversion of angle parking to parallel between Cobblestone and the Lighthouse Center; bike lanes along both sides of highway. |
| b. Parking connector between Grove St. and Porter's. |
| c. Signaling or Traffic Control Officer at SR 28/Grove. |
| 2) VMT reduction measures identified in the RTP will reduce this impact. |

| Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan) |
| 1) The minimum improvements needed include: |
| a. Conversion of angle parking to parallel the length of SR 28 in the core; bike lanes and sidewalks along both sides of highway. |
| b. Strong intercept parking program with frequent shuttles. |
| c. Parking connector between Grove St. and Porter's. |
| d. Parking connector between Grove St. and Lighthouse Center. |
| e. Signaling or Traffic Control Officer at SR 28/Grove St. and SR 28/Jack Pine. Additional left-turn and right-turn pockets at the SR 28/Jack Pine intersection are also required. |

| Alternative 1 |
| 1) |
| a. 1994-1997 |
| b. by 1997 |
| c. 1994 |

| Alternative 2 |
| 1) |
| a. 1994 |
| b. 1994-1997 |
| c. 1994-1997 |
| d. As conditions warrant |
| e. As conditions warrant (Grove St. by 1994) |

<p>| Alternative 2 |
| 1) |
| a. Placer Co. / Caltrans |
| b. Placer Co. / TRPA |
| c. Placer Co. |
| d. Placer Co. |
| e. Placer Co. / Caltrans |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT/EFFECT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Circulation, cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan), cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2, cont.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2, cont.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan), cont.</strong></td>
<td>2) VMT reduction strategies are:</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. transferred CFA (8,900)</td>
<td>a. by 1997</td>
<td>a. private / TRPA (to track)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. shuttle program (1,360)</td>
<td>b. 1994-1997</td>
<td>b. private / Placer Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. increased bicycle and pedestrian activity (830)</td>
<td>c. 1994-1997</td>
<td>c. TCPUD / Placer Co. / Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. transferred tourist units (2,130)</td>
<td>d. by 1997</td>
<td>d. private / TRPA (to track)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. transferred housing (200)</td>
<td>e. by 1997</td>
<td>e. private / TRPA (to track)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. home mail (200)</td>
<td>f. by 1997</td>
<td>f. US Postal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. TART expansions (3,350)</td>
<td>g. by 1997</td>
<td>g. TART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. water-borne transit (1,140)</td>
<td>h. by 1997</td>
<td>h. private / TMA / TRPA / Placer Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. private shuttles - ski area and tour boats (400)</td>
<td>i. by 1997</td>
<td>i. private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) No schedule.</td>
<td>(Parking lots begin in 1994)</td>
<td>3) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) LOS: Tahoe City will experience less growth than in Alt. 2, yet still exceed capacity on SR 28 through the core and at the SR 28/Grove St. and SR 28/Jack Pine intersections.</td>
<td>1) The minimum improvements needed include:</td>
<td>1) a. 1994</td>
<td>1) a. Placer Co. / Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) VMT: New development adds 6,450 miles while other plan features act as mitigation to produce net reduction of 4,930 miles.</td>
<td>a. Conversion of angle parking to parallel the length of SR 28 in the core; bike lanes, sidewalks along highway.</td>
<td>b. 1994-1997</td>
<td>b. Placer Co. / TRPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Parking connector between Grove St. and Porter's.</td>
<td>d. As conditions warrant (Grove St. by 1994)</td>
<td>d. Placer Co. / Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Signalization or Traffic Control Officer at SR 28/Grove St. and SR 28/Jack Pine.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2) a. by 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. transferred CFA (5,340)</td>
<td>c. 1994-1997</td>
<td>c. TCPUD / Placer Co. / Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. shuttle program (1,360)</td>
<td>d. by 1997</td>
<td>d. private / TMA / TRPA / Placer Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. increased bicycle and pedestrian activity (830)</td>
<td>e. by 1997</td>
<td>e. US Postal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. transferred tourist units (380)</td>
<td>f. by 1997</td>
<td>f. TART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. home mail (200)</td>
<td>g. by 1997</td>
<td>g. private / TMA / TRPA / Placer Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. TART expansions (2,010)</td>
<td>h. by 1997</td>
<td>h. private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. water-borne transit (1,140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation/Circulation, cont.

#### Alternative 3

3) Use of the 1988 TRPA proposed parking standard and mandate for on-site parking effectively eliminates many businesses from participation in CP commercial programs. This reduces the effectiveness of all environmental remedial programs which rely on CFA incentives.

4) The SR 28 by-pass with adequate intersections at either end would replace the need for other LOS improvement features. This feature increases VMT due to a slightly longer alignment and providing excess capacity.

**Options**

1) LOS: The SR 28 by-pass with mall, assuming adequate intersections at either end, produces adequate LOS in all areas. Substantial redevelopment of existing properties results.

2) VMT: The SR 28 by-pass with mall increases VMT due to a slightly longer alignment and providing excess capacity.

3) Transit features improve LOS and reduce VMT through aggressive implementation.

#### Alternative 1 (No Project)

Tailpipe emission improvements and Regional VMT reduction measures produce CO and visibility standards attainment.

**Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)**

Air quality improvements will be minimal under any scenario. CO standards will be attained by 2005 under any scenario. With VMT reduction in Alt. 2, visibility standards will be attained. No significant impacts result from CP proposals. Short-term impacts from fugitive dust during construction will occur.

#### Air Quality

**Alternative 1 (No Project)**

None needed.

**Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)**

VMT reduction strategies for Alt. 2 must be implemented to attain visibility standards. Anti-dust measures such as early paving and soil stabilization should be made conditions of project approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT/EFFECT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar effects as Alt. 2. Less traffic results in slightly better air quality.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SR 28 by-pass results in acceptable air quality. The transit features produce improved air quality.</td>
<td>None needed.</td>
<td>Through 1997 and beyond.</td>
<td>All public/private transportation organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 1 (No Project)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 1 (No Project)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Roadway noise levels exceed the transportation corridor levels along SR 89 and SR 28. 2) Existing marina exceeds standards lakeward of high water for undeveloped recreation.</td>
<td>1) Implement TRPA policies which reduce noise levels where possible. Rely on project specific measures. 2) Develop noise abatement techniques which may include operations techniques and boat type limits.</td>
<td>1) On-going. 2) During marina master plan process.</td>
<td>1) TRPA. 2) Project proponent/TRPA/marina master plan team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Land use-related noise should not exceed CNEL limits. 2) Roadway noise levels will increase above ambient levels where new roads are considered (e.g. Wye by-pass). Maximum standards may not be exceeded. 3) Roadway noise levels will exceed the transportation corridor levels along SR 89 and 28. Noise due to traffic will exceed the maximum levels of adjacent land uses where the CP reduces the standard to 55 dB (SA 3 and 4). Change in noise over existing condition is not perceptible. 4) Marina expansion by 400 slips will likely exceed noise standards in the shorezone and lakeward of high water.</td>
<td>1) None needed. 2) Designate a noise corridor if needed. Incorporate use of noise abatement techniques during project design such as building design, use of setbacks, site design, and sound absorbing devices. 3) Change the transportation corridor override in this area. No significant increase in existing noise, yet sensitive receptors (recreation and residential) require noise abatement to attain proposed standards. Target mitigation measures to those areas to retain minimum 60 CNEL standard throughout CP area. 4) Develop mitigations during the marina master plan which may include reduction in size of expansion, different operations techniques, and boat type limits.</td>
<td>1) No schedule. 2) During project review. 3) During project review and prior to CP adoption. 4) During the marina master plan process.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable. 2) Placer Co./Caltrans/TRPA (during project review). 3) TRPA (during project review and prior to CP adoption). 4) Project proponent/marina master plan team/TRPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts same as for Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts same as for Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
<td>Same as Alt. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic Resources/Community Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>O STAT A E 1 (No Project)</strong></td>
<td><strong>O STAT A E 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>O STAT A E 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without a CP, the SQIP produces threshold attainment in all units. The proposed Downtown project could occur without a CP and implements a portion of the SQIP program.</td>
<td>None needed, although implementation is slow.</td>
<td>Through 2007</td>
<td>TRPA / Placer Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>O STAT A E 2 (Proposed Plan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>O STAT A E 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>O STAT A E 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Amendments to PAS 003 decrease opportunity for substantial scenic restoration through relocation in Unit #42. No compelling reason for amendment exists sufficient to override the opportunity for improvement through the existing situation.</td>
<td>1) Do not amend PAS 003 to reduce current opportunity for relocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The possibility of large projects receiving more than 10,000 SF CFA endangers the assumptions of small-scale community-wide projects contributing to scenic improvements.</td>
<td>2) Amendment to the Allocation Guidelines is necessary to assure projects which receive more than 10,000 SF make commensurate community-wide improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) With plan features, all units will meet or exceed the CP target improvements by 1997 as follows: Roadway Unit #14 from 14 to 15.5</td>
<td>3) Assumptions of the evaluation listed in the Technical Appendix are necessary to implement in order to produce the ratings listed. Additionally, the scenic features of the Downtown Improvement Project must be completed by 1997. No other mitigations are necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Unit #15 from 13 to 16.5</td>
<td>4) See #5, below and the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Unit #42 from 12 to 14</td>
<td>5) As noted above for specific areas. No exceptions to standards can be allowed without TRPA approval based on evaluation of equal effect. Need additional evaluation for use throughout Placer Co. For adoption of substitute sign standards, the following actions must occur: a. Complete all portions of the downtown improvement project evaluated by Omni-Means by 1997.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Unit #15 from 5 to 6</td>
<td>b. Improve visual access to the River through redevelopment in the Wye area by 2007.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) With plan features and mitigations (as noted below for #5 and in the Technical Appendix), all units will reach threshold attainment by 2007 as follows: Roadway Unit #14 from 14 to 16</td>
<td>c. Improve visual access to the Lake through relocation of the fire station by 2007.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Unit #15 from 13 to 17.5</td>
<td>d. Reduce visual access to the following developments by 2007: power substation (through relocation or substantial screening), lumber yard (through relocation or sign area reduction and substantial screening), rafter parking (through substantial screening).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Unit #42 from 12 to 16</td>
<td>e. Assure net scenic improvement results from projects which redevelop existing structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Unit #15 from 5 to 8</td>
<td>1) At PAS amendment consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Through implementation of mitigation measures, the substitute sign and design standards are equal to the TRPA sign standards and meet the requirements for adoption for use in Tahoe City only.</td>
<td>2) Prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) TRPA / Placer Co. / CP team.</td>
<td>3) As listed in the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) As listed in the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td>4) See #5, below and the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) See #5, below and the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td>5) As noted above and prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. by 1997</td>
<td>b. by 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. by 2007</td>
<td>c. by 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. by 2007</td>
<td>d. by 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. by 2007</td>
<td>1) TRPA / Placer Co. / private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) TRPA / Placer Co. / private (assisted by Redevelopment Agency)</td>
<td>3) As listed in the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) As listed in the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td>4) See #5, below and the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) See #5, below and the Technical Appendix.</td>
<td>5) As noted above and prior to CP adoption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Placer Co. / private</td>
<td>b. Placer Co. / private (assisted by Redevelopment Agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Fire District / Placer Co.</td>
<td>d. same as &quot;a&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. TRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic Resources/Community Design, cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ratings for Recreation Areas will see slight improvement for most bikeway units. Project mitigations on-site and in adjacent properties are necessary to avoid degradation in the Tahoe City Recreation Area and Commons Beach.</td>
<td>6) None needed at this time.</td>
<td>6) During project review</td>
<td>6) TRPA (during project review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on the TRPA scenic program produces threshold attainment, although lower incentives make implementation slower and less certain. This alternative produces less improvement compared to Alt. 2 for parking (on-site vs. community parking), a SR 28 by-pass, and on-site BMPs (eliminating possibility of Wye pond). It produces superior benefits for elimination of a Wye by-pass and smaller marina expansion.</td>
<td>None needed for use of TRPA scenic program. Projects which develop under this alternative must propose sufficient mitigations to offset anticipated impacts.</td>
<td>Incremental improvement by 2007 and during project review.</td>
<td>Project proponents / TRPA (project review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less benefit compared to Alt. 2. results from intersection redesign at the Wye (rotary or overpass), and development of a Payless store (altering possibility of SEZ increase and Wye pond). More benefit compared to Alt. 2. results from the SR 28 by-pass with pedestrian mall.</td>
<td>Projects which develop under this alternative must propose sufficient mitigations to offset anticipated impacts.</td>
<td>During project review.</td>
<td>Project proponents / TRPA (project review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural/Historical/Architectural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City is sensitive for cultural/historical/architectural resources.</td>
<td>Adherence to Code and CEQA provisions will insure no significant impacts result from development.</td>
<td>By 1997.</td>
<td>TRPA / SHPO (during project review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Hazards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts identified.</td>
<td>None needed.</td>
<td>No schedule.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/EFFECT</td>
<td>MITIGATION MEASURES</td>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>1) None needed at this time.</td>
<td>1) No schedule.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Potential impact on river system results from an increase in RAOTs; more study needed.</td>
<td>2) Alternative alignments for the lake shore route should be considered during project review to provide a high quality recreation experience while not endangering shorezone stability.</td>
<td>2) During project development and review.</td>
<td>2) Project proponent / TRPA (project review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Bike trail system as proposed in Alt. 2 (alignments along SR 28 and along the lake shore) meets all bicyclists needs.</td>
<td>3) None needed for recreation (others identified in other sections).</td>
<td>3) No schedule.</td>
<td>3) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Marina expansion desirable to increase lake access if other environmental impacts can be mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>1) None needed at this time.</td>
<td>1) No schedule.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Potential impact on <em>Rorippa subumbellata</em> exists through development of buoy field off Lake Forest Beach in General Plan area. More study needed before project approval.</td>
<td>2) No additional shorezone vegetation removal should be allowed.</td>
<td>2) During marina master plan and project plan development.</td>
<td>2) TRPA (during marina master plan and project plan review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Marina expansion may remove shorezone vegetation, with little opportunity to mitigate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy and Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>1) None needed at this time.</td>
<td>1) No schedule.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts identified.</td>
<td>2) No additional shorezone vegetation removal should be allowed.</td>
<td>2) During marina master plan and project plan development.</td>
<td>2) TRPA (during marina master plan and project plan review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services and Facilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Alternatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Alternatives</td>
<td>1) None needed.</td>
<td>1) No schedule.</td>
<td>1) Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts identified.</td>
<td>None needed.</td>
<td>No schedule.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT COMPARISON

The following table provides a comparison of environmental benefit for major issues derived from the various alternatives. This comparison uses the following terms: not desirable (produces impacts or impractical); acceptable (meets minimum requirements); good (produces benefits while adequately mitigating possible impacts); and superior (produces important benefits while adequately mitigating or avoiding significant impact). This comparison assumes implementation of mitigation measures described in the previous table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>superior²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water/SEZ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>superior²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>superior³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air/Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA⁵</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>superior³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of Environment</td>
<td>Tourist Units:</td>
<td>Government:</td>
<td>Marina:</td>
<td>Community Facility:</td>
<td>Affordable Housing:</td>
<td>Recreation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water/SEZ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>need more info.</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>need more info.</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>need more info.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>need more info.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air/Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 1</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 2</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. 3</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>no proposal</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>not desirable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Wye by-pass allows a better urban design around Fanny Bridge (i.e. more pedestrian-oriented with an emphasis on the area's natural resources), yet creates impacts to coverage, SEZ, scenic resources, and noise which are difficult to mitigate. 2 The lake shore bike route produces a superior recreational experience, yet requires new disturbance in low capability lands. This may be mitigated, but cannot be avoided. 3 This conclusion is based on the assertion that a higher allowed level of commercial development will better fund remedial projects and that transferred development will result in environmental improvements at the transfer source location. 4 Although this alternative requires Caltrans to relocate without the offsetting measure of a Wye by-pass, no implementing proposal exists. 5 The location of parking lots and parking connectors in Alternative 2 can produce increases in noise considered significant for some land uses. Project level design must minimize noise sources and include adequate mitigation. 6 No
additional coverage can occur under any alternative. Reuse of existing coverage to generate the maximum cost increases fees generated for coverage reduction elsewhere. 7

The ability to move government functions (Placer County and Caltrans) to the high capability land of the Dollar Hill area allows substantial low capability land restoration. Land ownership and funding are major constraints to this alternative. 8 The high capability Dollar Hill parcel is superior to any Tahoe City location. 9 The cultural sensitivity of the Bittencourt Tract neighborhood is not reflected in this matrix. Increased housing density in this area may remove significant historical residences. More study is needed before proceeding with this plan element. 10 Adding RAOTs will impact soil and water quality issues; reducing RAOTs will not meet demonstrated recreation need. Relocating golf course to Highlands Park will prevent other recreation uses in that location. 11 Any increase in marina capacity will exacerbate the existing lakeward noise standard exceedance and create a shorezone standard exceedance. Mitigation may be possible to reduce this to less than significant levels. 12 These proposals must create an overall improvement in scenic quality as seen from the shoreline to be considered acceptable.

Conclusion

The preferred alternative for the Tahoe City Community Plan presents the most comprehensive approach to implementing the Regional Plan concept for community plans. It includes a vision for Tahoe City which is more dense and more tourist-activity oriented. This analysis concludes that the new development can reasonably be expected to provide adequate mitigation to offset its impacts while funding necessary environmental remedial programs. The CP relies heavily on the commercial and tourist incentives to produce community-wide improvements. Through adoption of the mitigation measures, this reliance, along with public funding in key areas, can meet identified targets for environmental restoration. The other alternatives, while they may propose superior features for some elements, all lack the basic package of incentives geared to tying new development to mitigating actions.
MEMORANDUM

January 27, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of Code of Ordinances Chapter 97, Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program

Proposed Action: The proposed action is to recommend to the Governing Board adoption of a new chapter of the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 97, Employer Based Trip Reduction Program, attached as Exhibit A, and an amendment to Chapter 2, Definitions, attached as Exhibit B. The new chapter will implement an element of the 1992 Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP). It is intended to assist in the achievement and maintenance of environmental thresholds for transportation and air and water quality.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC hold a public hearing on the proposed ordinance and recommend adoption to the Governing Board.

Background: The 1992 RTP-AQP includes a transportation control measure that requires employers of commercial and retail development to implement trip reduction programs. Employer-based trip reduction is a program of measures designed to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from employment sites. This will assist in attainment and maintenance of the regional VMT threshold. Volume III, pp. 13-14 of the RTP-AQP says:

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

In June, July, and August TRPA staff received APC member comments and recommendations concerning the initial draft of the Employer-Based Trip Reduction Ordinance. During these same months TRPA staff presented the draft ordinance to the South Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce Environmental Affairs Committee, the South Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce, the Tahoe Douglas Chamber of Commerce, and the Incline Village/Crystal Bay Chamber of Commerce.
TRPA staff has also worked with staff from the Placer County Transportation Commission (PCTC), the Truckee/North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (TNT/TMA), the TRPA Transportation - Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee, and the Tahoe Transportation Coalition to develop the draft ordinance.

A committee has been formed within TRPA to expedite transportation issues. The Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program has been the main focus of the committee thus far. Staff has created a packet (attached) that will go out to the major employers. Within this packet is a "fill-in-the-blanks" form that has been developed to fulfill the Employer Transportation Plan Requirements of this program. This was done in an attempt to simplify implementation of this ordinance as much as possible.

The Employer-Based Trip Reduction Ordinance was taken to the Advisory Planning Commission on January 12, 1994 for final action. After a presentation was made to the Commission and public input was received, a motion was made to delay the adoption of the ordinance for one month so that a few of the large employers could give the Employer Transportation Plan form a trial run. As part of the motion, it was also recommended that TRPA staff look into a few other issues. These issues included the definition of a common work location and uses that it would apply to; the issue of paid parking as a Transportation Control Measure; and the possibility of utilizing region-wide rideshare matching, once such a service is available. This motion carried unanimously. Staff also agreed to look into the Clean Air Fuel Vehicles as a TCM.

Level 2 of this ordinance would apply to all Common Work Locations that fit the characteristics defined in Attachment B, with 100+ employees cumulatively. This definition will not apply to temporary uses which last shorter than three months. We will also include in the ordinance the possibility for appeal. The following paragraph will be inserted:

A Common Work Location, with a central contact point and 100+ cumulative employees, may be exempted from performing the Level 2 requirements if implementation is deemed impractical by TRPA. An applicant can appeal a denied exemption to the TRPA Governing Board.

The issue of paid parking as a TCM raised concern as well. The criteria for receiving credit has been changed. The points will be allocated the same; however, an Employer Parking Management Plan will be required by each employer who chooses this TCM as part of the Employer Transportation Plan. Included in this plan shall be provisions for paid parking.

In comments received by the Placer County Transportation Commission, it was suggested that TRPA utilize a rideshare system. The Caltrans Rideshare system matches interested commuters by origin and destinations. This service is currently available for destinations in California only. The TNT/TMA is currently working with the PCTC to develop a system that can be utilized for destinations in Nevada as well. As soon as such a system is available, the distribution of applications to interested employees will be a required TCM, as outlined in Section 97.3.A of this ordinance.
There was also some concern raised about the TCM for Clean Air Fuel Vehicles, and what is required as part of the 1992 Regional Transportation Plan – Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP) for the Lake Tahoe Region. The RTP-AQP discusses several alternative fuels, including methanol, ethanol, compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) and electricity, which can produce significant reductions in motor vehicle emissions. In Volume III of the RTP-AQP, page 33, pros and cons of each are discussed. While use of alternative fuels that have substantial positive effects is encouraged, the use of such fuels is not a requirement set forth in the RTP-AQP.

The committee formed within the agency has also completed additional work on the Employer Transportation Plan packet that was handed out at the January APC meeting. It was suggested to staff at APC that some baseline data would be required in order to measure the benefits. Staff agreed that this would be valuable information. Included in the packet now is a page requesting information regarding existing employee commute habits. This should be filled out at the initial implementation of the plan, and periodically thereafter to evaluate the effectiveness of the Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program.

Pursuant to the motion made at the January 12, 1994 APC meeting, TRPA staff has been in contact with several large employers in an attempt to facilitate the trial run of the Employer Transportation Plan form. At this time, no results have been received. Any information that is received from the trial run will be presented at the February 9, 1994 APC meeting.

FINDINGS: Prior to adoption of the ordinance, Chapter 6 requires certain findings to be made. Ordinance 87-8 findings are not required since the ordinance is adopting a new program. The Chapter 6 findings and brief rationales on which the findings can be made are set forth below.

A. Chapter 6 Findings:

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

   Rationale: A policy and objective of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency’s Regional Transportation Plan – Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP) is to implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce the number of vehicle trips on the Region’s highways. The 1991 Regional Plan and Threshold Evaluation states that TRPA should adopt ordinances to expand employer programs.

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

   Rationale: The Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program is a program of measures designed to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from employment sites, and will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.
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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 ordinance is a program to reduce trips, to attain air and water quality standards.

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:** The Employer Based Trip Reduction Program is designed to reduce the number of vehicle trips made to and from employment sites. Its implementation will assist in the achievement and maintenance of the thresholds and implement the planning documents listed in Finding 1.

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

**Rationale:** See 4 above.

**Environmental Documentation:** Based on the completion of an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), TRPA staff proposes a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) because the Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program is designed to attain and maintain Environmental Thresholds for transportation, air and water quality. Implementation of this program will also be implementing an element of the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan and the 1991 Regional Plan and Threshold Evaluation.

If there are any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Bridget Mahern at (702) 588-4547.
EXHIBIT A - DRAFT

CHAPTER 97

EMPLOYER BASED TRIP REDUCTION PROGRAM

Chapter Contents

97.0 Purpose
97.1 Applicability
97.2 Program Requirements
97.3 Transportation Control Measure (TCM) List
97.4 Plan Review
97.5 Annual Reporting Requirements
97.6 Implementation Schedule
97.7 Compliance Monitoring

97.0 Purpose: This Chapter implements the 1992 Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan, and Goal #4, Policy 2 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Implementation Element of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies Plan. The Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program set forth in this chapter is intended to assist in the achievement and maintenance of environmental thresholds for transportation and air and water quality.

97.1 Applicability: The provisions of this chapter shall apply to all employers in the Tahoe Region.

97.1.A Local Government Standards: Local governments may adopt equal or superior trip reduction programs. TRPA, upon finding the local program is equal or superior to the TRPA Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program as it may affect attainment and maintenance of TRPA’s environmental thresholds, may exempt employers under such programs from the provisions of TRPA’s Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program.

97.2 Program Requirements:

97.2.A All Employers (Level 1): Every employer shall encourage use of alternative commute modes by providing the following:

(1) Posting in a conspicuous place or places informational material to encourage ridesharing, such as:

(a) Current schedules, rates (including procedures for obtaining transit passes), and routes of mass transit service to the common work location or employment site;
(b) The location of all bicycle routes within at least a five-mile radius of the facility;
(c) Posters or flyers encouraging the use of ridesharing and referrals to sources of information concerning ridesharing.

(2) Distributing Rideshare applications to interested employees when a Region-wide service is available.

97.2.B

All Employers or Common Work Locations with 100 or More Employers at a Single Project Area (Level 2): In addition to the requirements of Subsection 97.2.A, all employers or Common Work Locations, with 100 or more employees working at a single project area, shall provide additional encouragement for the use of alternative transportation modes through the provision of the following incentives and resources:

For the purposes of clarity any reference to an employer also includes, as appropriate, reference to Common Work Locations. In addition, any reference to an Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC) for employers also includes, as appropriate, reference to the employer performing the ETC duties, and the Property Transportation Coordinators (PTC) for Common Work Locations.

A common Work Location, with a central contact point and 100+ cumulative employees, may be exempted from performing the Level 2 requirements if implementation is deemed impractical by TRPA. An applicant can appeal a denied exemption to the TRPA Governing Board.

(1) Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC): Every Employer shall facilitate the employees use of an area-wide ridesharing program and other auto trip reduction programs by performing the responsibilities of, or by designating an employee as, an Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC).

(a) Responsibilities: The ETC’s responsibilities shall include:

(i) Implementing all requirements of subsection 97.2.A.

(ii) Communicating employee or tenant transportation needs to the TRPA, Transportation Management Association (TMA) representative, property manager, property owner, and/or city and county staff as appropriate.

(iii) Assisting employees or tenants in forming car pools or vanpools.

(iv) Develop, coordinate, and implement the Employer Transportation Plan, as required under subsection 97.2.B.1.
(v) Perform an annual survey of employees and tenants showing the distribution of employees and tenants by transportation mode (See 97.4).

(vi) Coordinate Employer Transportation Plans with property owner/manager and other tenants as applicable.

(vii) Participate in the development of a ridesharing program through a TMA, if available.

(2) Employer Transportation Plan: An Employer Transportation Plan is required for each Level II employer.

(a) Employer Transportation Plan Elements: The Transportation Plan shall include:

(i) Description. A description of the activity and operating characteristics of the proposed or existing project (e.g., business hours and peak hours of travel), including a parking area map or diagram.

(ii) Existing Conditions. A description of the available alternative transportation facilities and programs currently in place, such as bike lockers, preferential carpool parking, rideshare information posting, vanpool subsidies.

(iii) Estimate. A description and estimation of the commuting characteristics of the labor force (e.g., travel distance and mode).

(iv) Transportation Control Measures (TCMs). Measures designed to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips. At a minimum, all required TCMs, as set forth in Section 97.3.A, shall be included in the Employer Transportation Plan. Each Employer Transportation Plan shall show a minimum of 20 points worth of TCMs.

(v) Implementation Schedule. A timeline showing the approximate schedule of implementation of each of the selected TCMs.

(3) Trip Reduction Credit for Transportation Control Measures (TCMs): Every Employer Transportation Plan shall include and implement all of the mandatory TCMs set forth in Section 97.3.A, Required TCMs. The employer may then select from optional TCMs from the Transportation Control
Measure List that will best serve to reduce commute trips of the employees and/or tenants.

(4) Seasonal Employment Distinguished: In the case of seasonal work locations, the Transportation Plan shall be in effect only at such times that the employment level reaches 100 or more employees.

97.3 Transportation Control Measure (TCM) Menu: Each of the following Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) are assigned a Trip Reduction Credit. Each Employer Transportation Plan must include measures that have a cumulative total of 20 trip reduction points. The required TCMs do not have trip reduction credit assigned to them, since each plan will include them.

97.3.A Required Transportation Control Measures (TCMs): The following TCMs will be required in every Employer Transportation Plan (Trip Reduction Credit):

(1) Designation of an Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC): The Employer shall serve as ETC or designate an employee to perform the duties of the ETC.

(2) Posting of Ridesharing Information: Posting of ridesharing information, including:

(a) Posters or flyers encouraging the use of ridesharing and referrals to sources of information concerning ridesharing; and

(b) The names and phone numbers of the Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC), and Transportation Management Association, where applicable.

(3) Posting Alternative Transportation Mode Information: Posting alternative transportation mode information, including:

(a) Current schedules, rates (including procedures for obtaining transit passes), and routes of mass transit service to the common work location or employment site; and

(b) The location of all bicycle routes within at least a five mile radius.

(4) Bicycle Parking Facilities: To receive credit, the employer must provide bicycle parking for all bicycle commuters, as determined by the Employee Transportation Coordinator. The bicycle parking facilities shall be, at minimum, Class II stationary bike racks.

(5) Preferential Carpool/Vanpool Parking: Unless there are overriding considerations specific to the employment site, parking spaces for 4% of employees must be designated as carpool parking...
or vanpool parking and must be, with the exception of handicapped and customer parking, the spaces with most convenient access to the employee entrances. The ETC may issue Carpool and Vanpool stickers to the vehicle owners and shall be responsible for monitoring the spaces.

97.3.B **Optional Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) (Trip Reduction Credit):** Each employer, in preparing an Employer Transportation Plan, shall choose from the following list of TCMs to achieve the required number of trip reduction credits. It is at the discretion of the individual employer to choose which are best suited to his/her location, business, and employees.

1. **ETC Education Program** (3 points per session): To receive the designated points, the ETC must attend at least one educational seminar, workshop, or other approved training program on an annual basis. Sessions are subject to TRPA approval to receive points.

2. **In-House Carpool Matching Service** (3 points): The ETC conducts a survey of all employees in order to identify persons interested in being matched into carpools. Potential carpoolers are then matched by work address and shift. Credit is given if this service is performed on an annual basis and for all employees interested in ridesharing.

3. **Additional Preferential Carpool/Vanpool Parking** (1 - 3 points): Up to 3 additional points will be given for additional preferential carpool/vanpool parking provided beyond that required under Subsection 97.3.A.(5). An additional point is provided for each additional 2% of total number of employees designated parking for which preferential carpool/vanpool parking is provided, up to a maximum of 3 additional points.

4. **Transportation Management Association (TMA) Membership** (4 points): The ETC or other designated employee shall actively participate in a regional TMA. The ETC shall attend membership meetings or send a designated representative, pay all required dues, and/or be involved in any other programs which the TMA Board administers.

5. **Guaranteed Ride Home Program** (2 points): Employers provide or contract to provide a guaranteed ride home for employees who rideshare two days a week or more. The guaranteed ride home would be provided to the ridesharer in the event that an emergency or illness requires that they or their carpool or vanpool driver must leave work early.

6. **Clean Air Fuel Vehicles** (1 - 5 points): The employer obtains and maintains fleet vehicles
that use clean air fuels, such as compressed natural gas, electricity, methanol, and propane. 1 point is given for each dedicated alternative fuel vehicle, or flexible fuel (able to use either gasoline or alternative fuel) vehicle to a maximum of 5 points.

(7) Shuttle Bus/Buspool Program (5 points): The employer provides shuttle service to transport workers to and from their residences, a park-and-ride lot, or other staging area to the workplace. The employer may choose to lease a bus and may work with nearby employers or employment complexes to maximize ridership. 5 point will be given for every 5% of employees provided for by this TCM.

(8) Carpool Program (4 points): The employer is required to obtain a vehicle, to obtain insurance, and to make available to any group of two or more employees a vehicle for commute purposes. The employer may recover full or partial operating costs from the vanpool participants. 4 points will be given for every 5% of employees provided for by this TCM.

(9) Vanpool Program (5 points): The employer is required to obtain a van or vans, to obtain insurance, and to make available to any group of at least seven employees a van for commute purposes. The employer may recover full or partial operating costs from the vanpool participants. 5 points will be given for every 7% of employees provided for by this TCM.

(10) Transit Pass Subsidy (5 points): The employer provides a monthly transit or rail pass subsidy of 50% or the maximum taxable benefit limit, whichever is higher.

(11) Price Parking (3 - 9 points): The employer develops an Employee Parking Management Plan, addressing price parking. Parking Management Plan will be approved by TRPA. 3 points will be given for paid parking provided for each 10% of employees, not to exceed 9 points.

(12) Transit Shelter (3 points): The employer provides a shelter on the designated bus route or will post a bond for future construction once the transit route is extended to the site. Credit is given when the transit shelter is constructed in conformance with City/County regulations and when the employment site is on or adjacent to existing or planned bus route.

(13) Secure Bicycle Parking Facilities (2 points): The employer provides parking for at least 5% of employment. The bicycle parking facilities shall be of the following types:

(a) A Class I bicycle parking facility with a locking door, typically called a bicycle
lockers, where a single bicyclist has access to a bicycle storage compartment; or
(b) A fenced or covered area with Class II stationary bike racks and a locked gate.

(14) Showers (2 points): One shower facility shall be provided for employers of less than 200 persons. For employers of more than 200 persons, there shall be four showers with the number increasing by two for every 500 employees.

(15) Lockers (2 points): Ten lockers shall be provided for employers of less than 200 persons. For employers of more than 200 persons, there shall be 20 lockers, with the number increasing by 10 for each 500 employees.

(16) Flexible Work Location/Telecommuting (2 points): The employer allows for employee flexibility in workplace outside of the employer's established location. This may include, but is not limited to, telecommuting from the employee's home, or the creation of neighborhood office satellites. Credit is given when employees in appropriate positions, which may not include the entire work force, are permitted to telecommute at least one day per week.

(17) Flexible Work Hours (1 point): The employer provides a work hour management strategy allowing the employee to adjust work hours outside of the employer's established start and stop time and outside peak hours. Variable work hours may include, but are not limited to: 1) staggered work hours involving a shift in the set work hours of all employees at the workplace to those outside of peak hours; and 2) flexible work hours involving individually determined work hours within guidelines established by the employer. Credit is given when employees in appropriate positions, which may not include the entire work force, are permitted to take advantage of flexible work hours. This should be done in such a way so as not to jeopardize any carpools.

(18) Compressed Work Weeks (3 points): A management strategy allowing the employee to compress the total number of hours required in a week to fewer days. For example, a typical 40-hour work week could be compressed into 4 10-hour days. Credit is given when employees in appropriate positions, which may not include the entire work force, are permitted to reduce their number of work days by at least one in two weeks (9-80 schedule). This should be done in such a way so as not to jeopardize any carpools.

(19) On-Site Services (1 - 5 points): Necessary services would be provided on site that eliminates the need for a vehicular trip before, during, or after the work day. Necessary services would
include, but are not limited to, child care, cafeteria/restaurant, lunch room, automated teller machine, dry cleaners, or post office. These services may be provided by the employer, through cooperative efforts of employers and service providers, or by other means. Actual credits awarded will depend on which service or combination of services are provided and proximity to employment site. Points given will be evaluated by TRPA Staff.

(20) **Transit System Subsidy/Grant** (1 - 15 points):
The employer provides support to local transit system, which could be for system operations, marketing or for capital needs such as new buses. Subsidies or grants could be financial or through donation of capital needs. Actual credits awarded will depend on the amount and type of subsidy or grant. Points given will be decided by TRPA Staff, depending on amount.

(21) **Other** (points to be determined by TRPA): Trip reduction measures that are not included in this menu or do not specifically fit the descriptions contained herein may also be considered. Innovative methods are strongly encouraged. An example would be a high school setting up a ridesharing educational program for their students.

97.4 **Plan Review:** The Employer Transportation Plan shall be referred to the TRPA TCM Coordinator for review and evaluation of the proposed mitigation measures. Recommendation will be made to the Executive Director of the TRPA. The Executive Director may approve, deny or modify the Plan. Appeals can be made to the TRPA Governing Board.

97.5 **Annual Reporting Requirements:** All employers or designated Employee Transportation Coordinators shall meet with the TRPA TCM Coordinator at least once every two years to review progress of ETCs transportation plans and to submit the annual transportation surveys regarding employees' use of alternative transportation modes.

97.6 **Implementation Schedule:** Employers and Common Work Locations with 100 or more employees working at a single site must comply with this ordinance within 6 months of adoption, or upon reaching 100 employees, whichever time is greater. Employers and employment complexes with less than 100 employees must comply with this ordinance within thirty days of receipt of posting information.

97.7 **Compliance Monitoring:** Employers shall encourage employees to use alternative transportation. TRPA shall conduct random audits to evaluate the effectiveness of the Employer Transportation Plans.
**Definitions:**

**Alternative Commute Mode:** Method of traveling to and from the worksite other than by single occupant vehicle (i.e., transit, carpool, vanpool, bicycle, walking, telecommuting).

**Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR):** The average number of persons occupying each vehicle. AVR is calculated by multiplying the number of employees by the standard number of trips in a work week (generally 10), then divided by actual number of vehicular trips per work week. For example, if all employees drive alone to work each day, the AVR = 1.0. If only 67 vehicular trips are taken, then the AVR is 1.5, which means that, on average, each vehicle is transporting 1.5 people to their destination. The higher the AVR, the more people are using alternative transportation methods.

**Carpool:** A motor vehicle occupied by two or more persons traveling to and from work.

**Common Work Location:** Single building, building complex, campus or work sites at common location. A common work location is typified by a common private parking lot or area to be used by employees, tenants, customers, and/or other visitors to the complex, notwithstanding parking slot designations, such as specific spaces designated for specific tenants. For Trip Reduction Ordinance purposes, to be considered a common work location, the site must have a central contact point such as a property manager, property owner or lessor.

**Commuter:** An employee who travels regularly to and from an employment facility three or more days a week.

**Commuter Matching Service:** Any system for mapping and matching home and work locations of interested commuters to identify prospects for ridesharing.

**Employer:** A person or business firm, with a business license, that hires one or more persons to work for wages or salary.

**Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC):** Employee or other individual designated by the employer or project controller to coordinate and implement TCM activities as required by the Transportation Plan.

**Employer Transportation Plan:** The plan developed by the employer or project controller to reduce single occupant vehicle trips.

**Peak Period Commuter:** Any employee who travels regularly to and from a work facility three or more days a week and arrives or departs from the facility during the peak period specified by the jurisdiction. This peak period should be linked to the hours that commuter congestion actually occurs.

**Project Controller:** Owner, lessor and/or manager of a common work location.
Property Transportation Coordinator (PTC): Owner, lessor and/or property manager of a common work location, or designee thereof, designated to coordinate and implement TCM activities as required by the Transportation Plan.

Ridesharer: Any employee who commutes to and from his or her work location by any mode other than single occupancy light or medium duty vehicle, motorcycle, or moped.

Shift of Employment: Any group of employees who work at a common work location and who arrive and depart from work in a common time interval not greater than one hour.

Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV): A motor vehicle occupied by one employee for commute purposes.

Transportation Control Measures (TCMs): Measures used to maintain or improve the efficient movement of persons and goods while reducing the congestion and air quality impacts associated with motorized vehicles.

Transportation Control Measure (TCM) Coordinator: TRPA employee or other individual designated to manage and enforce employer compliance with TRO requirements.

Transportation Management Association (TMA): An association, usually of employers, developers, property managers, and public agencies, organized to facilitate, support, and encourage the use of alternative transportation methods for commuters.

Trip Reduction Credit: The number of points credited to an employer’s Transportation Plan for implementing a specific Transportation Control Measure (TCM) program.

Vanpool: A motor vehicle, other than a motor truck or truck tractor, suited for occupancy by more than six (6) but less than 16 persons including the driver, traveling to and from work.
EMPLOYER-BASED TRIP REDUCTION PROGRAM

This packet is intended to facilitate implementation of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) employer-based trip reduction program. Reduction of Employer-Based Trips (employee trips to and from employment sites) will help improve and maintain air and water quality and relieve traffic congestion.

The requirements of the Employer Transportation Plan for Level II employers (employers of 100 employees or more) are outlined in this packet. As part of the plan, the employer must implement five required Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) as well as selected optional TCMs which generate points. As outlined in Chapter 97 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (see attached), the total points earned by implementing optional TCMs must be 20 points or greater. The worksheet in this packet describes the information TRPA requires for each optional TCM.

The worksheet is broken into two sections which should be completed and returned to TRPA. The first section is for the employer to define their characteristics and existing employee commute habits. The second section covers the optional TCMs. For each optional TCM the employer should "fill in the blanks" or attach additional information as requested under each measure. Please examine Sections 97.3.A and 97.3.B of the Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program (attached) for a greater understanding of the TCM requirements. If there are any questions regarding this Program, please call TRPA at (702) 588-4547.
Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program

Employer Transportation Plan/Worksheet

EMPLOYER CHARACTERISTICS

Employer ____________________________________________

Contact Person (ETC) and Title ____________________________________________

Phone Number ____________________________________________

Address (Physical) ____________________________________________

Address (Mailing) ____________________________________________

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES (fill in which applies to your business)

Year Round ____________________________________________

Seasonal ____________________________________________

If seasonal applies, what are the months you experience peak season employment?

__________________________________________________________

I hereby declare that the information submitted as part of this worksheet is true and
accurate to the best of my knowledge. I am an authorized representative or
employee of the employer. I also understand that TRPA may require additional
information regarding compliance with the selected optional transportation control
measures. My employer understands that they are responsible for implementing the
selected transportation control measures. I understand that should any information
or representation submitted in connection with this worksheet be incorrect or untrue
TRPA may take appropriate action.

_________________________ Date __________________________

Signature of Contact Person (ETC) or employee completing worksheet
BASELINE TABLE FOR EMPLOYEE COMMUTE HABITS

Please complete the table below to establish the baseline conditions for your employees' commuting habits. Many businesses and establishments in Tahoe experience peak and off-peak seasons. If you do experience seasonal fluctuations in the total number of employees, complete both sections of the table. For employers that maintain constant numbers of employees, fill in information in the peak season category.

The table below should be completed using information for an average work day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute Mode</th>
<th># of employees Peak Season</th>
<th># of employees Off Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpooling/Vanpooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you entered employees in the "other" commute mode, please describe that commute mode.

____________________________________________________________________________________

If you completed the peak and off season sections, what months do you experience your peak season and off season?

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Signature of Contact Person (ETC) or employee completing table information

Date
Optional Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)
(see Section 97.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances attached)

☐ Check Selected TCMs

When completing the optional transportation control measures, be sure to indicate if the employer is currently carrying out the transportation control measure. If so, TRPA may acknowledge those existing measures and credit them toward the cumulative point total.

☐ TCM #1 ETC Education Program (3 points per session)

Title of Program(s) ____________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Date(s) ______________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Attach a description of the program(s) along with any certifications received with the program.

☐ TCM #2 In-House Carpool Matching Service (3 points)

Attach a copy of the employee survey and matching information

☐ TCM #3 Additional Preferential Carpool/Vanpool Parking (1 to 3 points)

Carpool Spaces provided for an additional _____% of employees beyond that required in Section 97.3.A (5) (1 point each additional 2% of employees).

☐ TCM #4 Transportation Management Association (TMA) Membership (4 points)

Truckee-North Tahoe TMA: Member as of __________________________

South Shore TMA: Member as of __________________________
☐ TCM #5 Guaranteed Ride Home Program (2 points)
Attach description of policy.

☐ TCM #6 Clean Air Fuel Vehicles (1 to 5 points: 1 point for each vehicle)
Type(s) of Alternative/Flexible Fuel Vehicles (and number) ________________

☐ TCM #7 Shuttle Bus/Buspool Program (5 points for every 5% employees)
Attach complete description of service provided, including number of employees utilizing service.

☐ TCM #8 Carpool Program (4 points for every 5% employees)
Attach description of carpool vehicle program.

☐ TCM #9 Vanpool Program (5 points for every 7% employees)
Attach description of vanpool vehicle program.

☐ TCM #10 Transit Pass Subsidy (5 points)
Attach description of this policy

☐ TCM #11 Paid Parking (3 to 9 points: 3 points for each 10% of employees)
Attach a description of an employee paid parking management plan. Awarding points will be subject to TRPA review and approval.

☐ TCM #12 Transit Shelter (3 points)
Shelter constructed (location) ________________________________
or date bond posted ________________________________
- TCM #13 Secure Bicycle Parking Facilities (2 points)
  Attach a description of facilities provided.

- TCM #14 Showers (2 points)
  Number of showers provided __________________________

- TCM #15 Lockers (2 points)
  Number of lockers provided __________________________

- TCM #16 Flexible Work Location/Telecommuting (2 points)
  Attach description of policy.

- TCM #17 Flexible Work Hours (1 point)
  Attach description of policy.

- TCM #18 Compressed Work Weeks (3 points)
  Attach description of policy.

- TCM #19 On-Site Services (1 to 5 points; determined by TRPA)
  Attach description of on-site services and proximity to work location.

- TCM #20 Transit System Subsidy/Grant (1-15 points; determined by TRPA)
  Attach description of subsidy/grant with amount provided.
  Date provided __________________________
TCM #21 Other (points determined by TRPA)

Attach description of proposal for TRPA review and approval of points awarded.

Total Number of Points Generated
TRPA Approval of Plan:

Signature
MEMORANDUM

January 31, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Status Report on Amendment of Chapter 82, Goals and Policies and 208 Plan Relative to Update of Water Quality Mitigation Fee

Proposed Action: No action is requested at this time. This item is being presented as a status report only. Staff has calculated the water quality mitigation fee using the formula below, including an adjustment for inflation, and concludes that the fee would increase by less than one cent per square foot of impervious land coverage.

Recommendation: Staff feels an increase is not warranted at this time, and will continue to examine the fee on an annual basis.

Background: Mitigation of development impacts is often financed through impact fees imposed at the time of project approval and permit issuance. On April 23, 1992, the Governing Board adopted Ordinance 92-7 amending Chapter 82, Subsection 82.3. This ordinance allowed the water quality mitigation fee to be increased from $0.29 per square foot of impervious land coverage to the current rate of $1.25 per square foot. The formula used to calculate this fee was derived at that time.

Discussion:

Calculation of Water Quality Fee

\[
\text{Mitigation Fee} = \frac{\text{Acquisition Factor} \times (\text{Cost} + \text{SEZ Cost} + \text{O&M Costs})}{\text{Total Coverage in Acres} \times \text{square feet per acre}}
\]

The variables in this formula are the CIP and SEZ program costs, which change annually due to the amount spent on projects in the Basin. Staff has included money spent on erosion control and stream restoration projects since 1991 in this formula and has applied a five percent inflation rate over a two year period to the values to arrive at the per square foot value. Generally, CIP and SEZ spending has kept up with the rate of inflation which offsets any increase at this time.

/kjh

AGENDA ITEM V.E

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
MEMORANDUM

January 26, 1994

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Final Environmental Impact Statement, Sierra Nevada College, Proposed New College Campus

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission make a finding of technical adequacy, and recommend to the Governing Board that they certify the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Sierra Nevada College’s proposed new college campus.

Background: In December 1993, the Advisory Planning Commission reviewed the Draft EIS at a public hearing and took public testimony. No recommendation was made to the Governing Board. The Governing Board also reviewed the Draft EIS and took public testimony at their December 1993 meeting. The public comment period for the Draft EIS closed on December 31, 1993.

The Final EIS addresses all the comments received during the circulation period for the Draft EIS. Staff has reviewed the Final EIS and found it to be satisfactory. This document is enclosed for your review. The final EIS and Phase One of the project are scheduled for Governing Board action at their February 1994 meeting.

Kaufman Planning and Consulting Services, who prepared the EIS, will be present at the APC meeting and will give a brief summary of the final document. If you have any questions concerning this item, please contact Lyn Barnett in the TRPA Project Review Division at (702) 588-4547.