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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 13, 1994, at the Tahoe Sands Inn, Convention Center, 3600 U.S. 50, South Lake Tahoe, California. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

July 1, 1994

By: [Signature]
Deputy Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Tahoe Valley and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office, and the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

July 13, 1994
9:30 a.m.

Tahoe Sands Inn Convention Center
3600 U.S. 50, South Lake Tahoe, California

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 comments 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 TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. Recommendation on Certification and Finding of Technical Adequacy for Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project Final EIS 1-3

B. Update of the Short-Range Transit Plan 4-6

C. Amendment of Plan Area 111, Tahoe Island (Residential), to Add the Special Designation of TDR Receiving Area of Multi-Residential Units 7-14

D. Amendment of Plan Area 067, Marla Bay/Zephyr Heights (Residential) to Add Douglas County APN 05-182-01 to Commercial Special Area #1 15-20

E. Amendment of Plan Area 119, Country Club Meadow (Recreation), to Add Recreational Vehicle Parks as a Special Use 21-

F. Amendment to Chapters 2, 3, 4, 8, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 38, 52, 54, 73, 78, and 91 Pertaining to Clarification and Simplification of the Code 22-27

G. Amendment of Rule 2.10 of the Rules of Procedure Pertaining to Elimination of Tentative Agendas 28
VI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
A. The Role of the Advisory Planning Commission
B. 3-Year Strategic Plan 29-49

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
June 29, 1994

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
FROM: TRPA Staff
SUBJECT: Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Placer County, Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project

---

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 (EIR/EIS) for Placer County's Tahoe City Urban Improvement Project.

Background: In November 1993, the Advisory Planning Commission reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS during the APC meeting. The Governing Board also reviewed the Draft EIR/EIS and took public testimony at the November, 1993 Governing Board meeting. The APC comments are listed and addressed in "Section O" of the Final EIR/EIS dated May 1994; no comments were received at the November 1993 Governing Board meeting. The public comment period for the Draft EIR/EIS began on September 24, 1993 and concluded on November 23, 1993.

The Final EIR/EIS addresses all the comments received during the circulation period for the Draft EIR/EIS. The Placer County Board of Supervisors unanimously approved Placer County staff recommendations and certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) at the June 7, 1994 Board of Supervisors meeting. A brief executive summary (attached Exhibit A) explaining the project components and preferred alternatives has been prepared by the consultant who prepared the document. The Final EIR/EIS was mailed to the APC members and parties who commented on the document on June 28, 1994. The Final EIR/EIS is scheduled for Governing Board action at their July 1994 meeting.

The consultant who prepared the document will be present at the APC meeting and will give a brief summary of the Final EIR/EIS and the identified environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the proposed project. If you have any questions concerning this item, please contact Paul Pettersen of the TRPA staff at (702)588-4547.
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EXHIBIT A

TAHOE CITY URBAN IMPROVE PROJECT
FINAL EIR/EIS
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Placer County Board of Supervisors certified the Final EIR/EIS for the project June 7, 1994. The Draft Subsequent EIR/EIS for the project was circulated in September 1993 for public comment. In addition to receiving written comments on that document, Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency held public hearings to receive verbal comments. The Final Subsequent EIR/EIS was published in May 1994.

The Placer County Board of Supervisors (the project proponents) have now selected the following components and alternatives as the preferred project: Component 1, Alternative 1; Component 2, Alternative 1 and Alternative 6; and Component 3, Alternative 11.

Component 1 Alternative 1 - Highway 28 Improvements: This component includes curb and gutter construction on both sides of Highway 28 from the intersection with Highway 89 to the Tahoe State Recreation Area. Overlay of this portion of Highway 28 and restriping to provide parallel parking, bike lanes on each side, one travel lane in each direction and a two-way center left turn lane is also a part of this component. Also included is construction of interm asphalt sidewalks to facilitate drainage. Placing existing overhead utility lines underground would also be coordinated and made a part of this project.

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

Component 2 Alternative 1 and 6 - Public Parking Facilities: In the Draft Subsequent EIR/EIS Component 2 Alternative 1 was identified as the proponent preferred alternative. The preferred alternative has been amended, and now also includes Alternative 6 which is the Tahoe Marina ("West End") public parking facility. Due to a change in funding the public parking facilities are no longer being referred to as "Park and Ride" lots. The preferred alternative for Component 2 now includes the 36 space Grove Street public parking facility, the 50 space Jack Pine public parking facility and the 12 space Tahoe Marina public parking facility.

Component 3 Alternative 11 - Storm Water Quality Improvements: In the Draft Subsequent EIR/EIS Alternative 13 was identified as the proponent preferred alternative. The proponent preferred alternative has now been changed to Alternative 11. Alternative 11 is a phased project consisting originally of four phases and currently consisting of three phases. Phase A includes Highway 28 and the commercial area from Grove Street to the "Y" along with Grove Street and the Tahoe Lake School. Phase A stormwater runoff will be collected by a system of curb, gutter and drainage inlets. The runoff will be conveyed to the "Payless" site via a storm drain pipe behind the businesses. Treatment will be by a proposed 2-stage detention pond, constructed wetland treatment area located on the "Payless" site. Phase B is the residential area surrounding Jack Pine Street. Phase B stormwater runoff will be collected by a system of rock lined ditches and/or curb, gutter and drainage inlets. The runoff will be conveyed to the "Hooper" pond site. Treatment will be by a detention/infiltration pond on the "Hooper" pond site. Phase C was a plan to collect stormwater runoff from the Highway 28/89 "wye" area, and store it underground. Phase C has been completely eliminated from the proposed project. Phase D
EXHIBIT A

includes Highway 28 and the commercial properties on the north side of the highway from Grove Street to the Tahoe State Recreation Area. Phase D runoff will be collected by a system of curb, gutter and drainage inlets. The runoff will then be conveyed to either the Tahoe State Recreation Area site or the "Texaco" site for treatment. Treatment will be by a detention basin or a constructed wetland treatment area.
June 27, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Approval of Tahoe Basin Short Range Transit Program (SRTP)

Proposed Action: To review the Short Range Transit Program for the Lake Tahoe Region, and make a recommendation for approval to the TRPA Governing Board.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the APC review the Draft Final Report for the Tahoe Basin Short Range Transit Program, hold a public hearing and recommend approval of the Program to the TRPA Governing Board.

Discussion: In 1980, California and Nevada amended the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 91-148; 83 Stat. 360). The Compact includes two goals which relate to transportation: "To reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes and of public transit to move people and goods within the Region; and to reduce to the extent feasible air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles".

Implementation of the Short Range Transit Program will help to achieve these goals.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has been designated by the State of California as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). As the RTPA, TRPA is eligible to apply for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 26(a)(2) Technical Planning Assistance (TPA) Program. These funds are available for the purpose of conducting public transportation planning projects primarily in the nonurbanized areas of California (50,000 population and under). It is this grant program that has funded the Short Range Transit Program.

The proposed Program focuses on the coordination and implementation of transit expansion within the Lake Tahoe Region. The Program consists of a description of existing transit services; models, analyzes and recommends a transit service operations plan; and includes a financial plan strategy for the implementation of the Program over a five year period. The project study area is located within the Lake Tahoe Basin and a portion of the Truckee River corridor between Tahoe City and Alpine Meadows.

TRPA followed the Request for Qualifications process to select a consultant. It was during this process that TRPA combined the Technical Advisory Committee with the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). TRPA will continue to utilize
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the combined committee for upcoming transportation projects as well. For the SRTP, additional members were invited to include the private sector and interested individuals. This was done in an attempt to have broad support of the Program upon completion.

Currently in the Tahoe Region, there are three public transit systems. The South Tahoe Area Ground Express (STAGE) operates 9 transit coaches. Fixed route service for this system is operated by the City of South Lake Tahoe. Bus Plus, a 4 van system operated by El Dorado County, provides route deviation and coordinated transfers with STAGE. In the North Shore Region, Placer County operates the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART). TART provides fixed route service on the west and north shore areas of the Region. There is also additional service between Tahoe City and Truckee.

The draft Program contains a compilation of the existing conditions of the transit systems in the Region. Both financial and performance evaluations were completed for the three systems. The transit demand analysis is broken down into four categories: visitors, general public non-work trips, general public commuters, and elderly/disabled residents. This evaluation allows for an analysis of the mobility needs of the various segments of the population. Comparing the transit demand with the existing services enables us to determine what the needs are and what services should be provided. The service alternatives outlined in Chapter 4 are broken down into Region-wide, North Shore, Tahoe-Truckee and South Shore alternatives. These alternatives include ways that the systems can be improved, by providing additional services. The Capital Alternatives presented include improved maintenance facilities, fleet replacement, passenger amenities, transfer and park-and-ride facilities. The upgrade and completion of maintenance facilities will be essential in expanding service in the Region.

Most of the improvements identified in the SRTP will not be possible without the establishment of a new, stable and reliable funding source. Several existing funding sources, such as the Federal, State and TDA funds, are currently utilized. In order to increase services and implement the Program, new sources of funding must be created. In evaluating the feasibility of new funding sources, the Technical Advisory Committee agreed upon the implementation of a Basin-wide sales tax increase to support the proposed new services. The TTD has the authority, under Article IX of the Compact, to collect an incremental increase in sales tax, Region-wide, to support operation of the transit systems if it is passed by voters of the Region. A sales tax increase was chosen as the most feasible alternative because it is possible within the time frame of the SRTP. The proposed tax increase will be collected from both residents and visitors, who are a large part of the impact on the transportation system in the Region.

A 1/2% increase in sales tax Region-wide could generate up to $2.0 - 2.5 million annually. This would provide an on-going funding source that would be available for transit operations and capital costs, as well as capital improvements in each of the local jurisdictions. The need for additional on-going funding sources that can be utilized for operations has been well documented. STAGE, as an example, has had to utilize "emergency", one-time funds to get through times of economic uncertainty. The establishment of this source would help to eliminate these crises.

/bm
The SRTP is an important document in the Region because it focuses on coordination of services, and addresses both resident and visitor transit services. The recommended alternatives identified in the SRTP are consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the TRPA 1992 Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan.

A copy of the Draft SRTP will be directed to the APC under separate cover. A copy will be available at the TRPA offices for those interested in reviewing the document. If there are any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Bridget Mahern at (702) 588-4547.

/bm
June 27, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Amendment of Plan Area 111, Tahoe Island (Residential), to Add Special Designation of TDR Receiving Area For Multi-Residential Units

Proposed Action: The proposed applicant-initiated amendment is a modification to Plan Area Statement 111, Tahoe Island Residential, to add the special designation of "TDR Receiving Area" for Multi-Residential Units for Special Area #2 (see Attachment A). The proposed amendment will allow Special Area #2 to be eligible for transfer of multi-residential development rights.

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

Background: The applicant proposes to amend Plan Area Statement 111 (Residential) to make Special Area #2 a TDR receiving area for multi-residential units. Multi-family dwellings are an allowed use in Special Area #2.

PAS 111 is located near the "Y" intersection in South Lake Tahoe. It is bounded by U.S. 50 on the south, Emerald Bay Road on the west, Tahoe Keys on the north, and the Truckee Meadow to the east (see Attachment B). Predominant uses in Plan Area Statement 111 are residential, although non-residential development includes motels, restaurants, and heavy equipment and storage area. The area is approximately 70 percent built out. Residential densities are primarily one single family dwelling per parcel although some high densities are associated with duplexes, apartment buildings, and a planned unit development. A majority of multi-residential uses are located in Special Area #2 in the Eloise area. The portion of Special Area #2 located at Tahoe Keys Boulevard and Eloise and just north of U.S. 50 is predominantly multi-residential development. The other portions of Special Area #2 which is located on Eloise and parallel to Emerald Bay Road has a mixture of multi-residential development, tourist accommodation uses, single-family, and vacant parcels.

Special Policy #7 of the Plan Area Statement states that this area should be primarily a multi-residential area.
Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission
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Special Area #2 is currently a receiving area for existing development. This means that Special Area #2 is an eligible receiving area for transfer of existing uses which are permissible uses in the special area. Certain elements of existing development may be transferred or relocated to Special Area #2 provided the use is permissible in Special Area #2.

Discussion: The proposed amendment would make Special Area #2 a receiving area for multi-residential units. This would make Special Area #2 an eligible receiving area for transfer of residential development rights. A residential development would be able to be transferred to a parcel in Special Area #2, provided that the sending parcel is vacant and has a residential development right, the sending parcel is retired, and residential uses are permissible in Special Area #2. All transfers into Special Area #2 would be subject to the maximum density provisions of PAS II.

Also, Plan Area Statement III is currently designated as a Multi-residential Incentive Program Area and as a Preferred Affordable Housing Area. Plan Area Statement III is assigned a maximum of 80 bonus units pursuant to the Multi-residential Incentive Program.

Given the existing Plan Area descriptions relative to multi-residential uses, the TDR receiving area designation should be added to facilitate development of multi-residential uses.

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.

Rationale: The proposed Plan Area Statement amendment will allow for transfer of development rights for multi-residential units into Special Area #2. The amendment is consistent with Special Policy #7 of the existing Plan Area Statement III, which encourages development of multi-residential uses in Special Area #2. The amendment will enhance implementation of the Regional Plan by facilitating development of multi-residential uses. No additional development in excess of that established in the Regional Plan is permitted by the amendments.

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

Rationale: Development of multi-residential units must comply with applicable provisions of the Regional Plan. No additional development in excess of that established in the Regional Plan is permitted by the amendment.
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:** Project applicants will continue to be subject to the Regional Plan package, including maintenance of applicable air and water quality standards.

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

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

**Rationale:** For the reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

**Environmental Documentation:** Based on the above analysis and completion of an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), staff recommends a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE). As discussed above, Special Policy #7 of PAS 111 targets Special Area #2 as an area for multi-residential development. Further, PAS 111 has been designated as an area for affordable housing and has a multi-residential incentive program. The amendment is consistent with the policies of the Plan Area Statement and will help facilitate the development of multi-residential uses.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact John Hitchcock at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item.
111 -- TAHOE ISLAND

PLAN DESIGNATION:

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

1. Existing Development (Special Area #2 Only)
2. Multi-Residential Units (Special Area #2 Only)

SCENIC RESTORATION
PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA
MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This Plan Area is located north of the South Tahoe "Y" and south of the Tahoe Keys and is depicted on TRPA maps G18 and F-18.

Existing Uses: The predominant use of this area is residential although non-residential development includes motels, restaurants, and heavy equipment and storage area. The area is approximately 70 percent built out. Residential density is primarily one single family dwelling per parcel although some high densities are associated with duplexes, apartment buildings, and a planned unit development. Three Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association (TKPOA) single family dwelling subdivisions and TKPOA's water treatment facility are located within this area.

Existing Environment: Nearly half of this area (250 acres) is classified as SEZ. Substantial portions of the area classified as SEZ have been disturbed by existing development. Undeveloped lots within the SEZ total 322. The balance of the area is low hazard land with 238 undeveloped lots remaining. Over half of the planning area is disturbed with hard and soft coverage. Vegetation consists of fir, lodgepole pine, willow, and marsh grasses. Two TKPOA subdivisions in this area have been reclassified as man-modified.

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

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. There is an excess of land coverage and disturbance within the SEZ.
2. Portions of the area are subject to flooding.
3. This area contains a site reserved for possible affordable housing.
4. Additional fire hydrants and water system improvements are needed in this area.
5. This area is the location of Tahoe Valley ball field and Tallac Park (20 acres).

6. Thresholds require the scenic restoration of the Highway 89 corridor.

**SPECIAL POLICIES:**

1. Drainage problems on developed parcels should be remedied.

2. Restoration of disturbed SEZ and reduction of soft coverage have high priority.

3. Redevelopment is encouraged along Highway 89 consistent with a City of South Lake Tahoe re-development plan. Noncommercial and tourist accommodation uses permitted in this area should be located on Highway 89.

4. Expansion of the Tahoe Valley ball field and Tallac Park may be permitted, consistent with a TRPA-approved master plan, which specifies the PAOT capacity of the improvements.

5. A senior citizen affordable housing project of up to 80 units may be permitted to be developed on a six-acre parcel optioned to the City in this area. The option must be exercised by the City prior to 1987 or the land reverts to Dillingham for any use authorized by law.

6. Extensions of commercial development should be limited to Special Area #1 along Highway 89 to help facilitate concentration of commercial development, except for parcels within Special Area #2 adjacent to Highway 89, which had previously legally existing commercial uses and have existing commercial floor area as verified by TRPA. Any project proposed on parcels fronting Highway 89 within Special Area #2 must comply with the Recommendation for Improving the Scenic Quality as listed in the Scenic Quality Improvement Program Appendix B pages B-6 through B-7 (b.(1)) through (5)). If the improvements are not completed within two years from the date this policy becomes effective, PAS 111 Permissible Uses, General Merchandise Stores and Nursery, will be eliminated from the Permissible Uses list.

7. Special Area #2 in the Eloise area should be primarily a multi-residential area and professional offices and health care services shall be limited to parcels fronting the east side of Tahoe Keys Blvd.

**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 Areas #1 and #2):

**Residential**

- Single family dwelling (A).

**Public Service**

- Local public health and safety facilities (S), transit stations and terminals (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), public utility centers (S), churches (S), schools-kindergarten through secondary (A), and day care centers/pre-schools (S).

**Recreation**

- Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), and riding and hiking trails (A).
Resource Management

Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), Management 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).

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 dwellings (A).

Tourist Accommodation

Hotel, motel and other transient dwelling units accommodations ($) and bed and breakfast facilities ($).

Commercial

Eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales ($), nursery ($), and outdoor retail sales ($).

Recreation

Outdoor recreation concessions ($).

Special Area #2: The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #2.

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

Residential

Multiple family dwellings (A), nursing and personal care (S), and residential care (S).

Commercial

Professional offices (S), health care services (S), nursery (S), and general merchandise stores (S).

Tourist Accommodation

Bed and breakfast facilities ($).

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 Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td>8 units per acre</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>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourist Accommodation

Hotel, Motel and Other Transient Units
- with less than 10% of units with kitchens 40 units per acre
- with 10% or more units with kitchens 15 units per acre
Bed and Breakfast Facilities 10 units 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 80 units.

MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area, including 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

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 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 50 and 89 corridors.
SUBJECT AREA (SPECIAL AREA #2)
Proposed amendment will designate these areas as a TDR receiving area for Multi-residential Units.
MEMORANDUM

June 27, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area 067, Marla Bay/Zephyr Heights (Residential), to Add Douglas County APN 05-182-01 to Commercial Special Area #1

Proposed Action: The proposed amendment is a staff-initiated modification to the Plan Area Statement 067 (Marla Bay/Zephyr Heights) map. The proposed amendment will modify the existing Commercial Special Area #1 boundary to include Douglas County APN 05-182-01.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC recommend to the Governing Board approval of the amendment to add APN 05-182-01 to commercial Special Area #1.

Background: The parcel in question is presently developed and contains the Lakeside Wedding Chapel. Following an inquiry by the parcel owners regarding a potential commercial project, TRPA determined that APN 05-182-01 was excluded from commercial Special Area #1. The subject parcel lies adjacent to existing commercial development fronting on U.S. 50. Special Area #1 was intended to include the existing cluster of commercial uses, including the subject parcel. Special Area #1 contains commercial retail uses, restaurants, and professional office buildings. All of the existing commercial development is located within Special Area #1 except for the subject parcel (see Attachment A). In 1987, the subject parcel was inadvertently left out by TRPA when the original Special Area #1 boundary was drawn. The parcel owners have requested TRPA to revise the map to add the parcel to commercial Special Area #1 (see Attachment B). As mapped, the parcel currently lies outside the Special Area #1 boundary and the existing commercial use (wedding chapel) is considered non-conforming.
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.

Rationale: The proposed Plan Area Statement amendment will change the commercial Special Area #1 boundary to include an existing commercial use. The parcel was inadvertently left out of Special Area #1 when the map was drawn. Further, this amendment is consistent with the special policies of PAS 067 which provides for and limits commercial use in Special Area #1. The map amendment will bring the subject parcel into conformance with the Plan Area Statement.

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

Rationale: Based on the completion of the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) and the fact that this amendment does not modify or expand existing commercial uses, the amendment will not cause the environmental thresholds 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: This plan area map amendment is administrative in nature and does not represent a project approval and, therefore, does not effect water quality or air quality. However, any future projects proposed as a consequence of this amendment must meet all requirements of the TRPA Code of Ordinances which include 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: For reasons stated in Findings 1 and 2 above, the Regional Plan will continue to achieve and maintain the threshold.
Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission
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5. **Finding:** The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

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

**Environmental Documentation:** Based on the above analysis and completion of an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), staff recommends a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE). Further, the subject parcel was inadvertently excluded from Special Area #1 and is consistent with adjacent land uses. The map amendment is administrative in nature and is not expected to adversely affect the neighborhood.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact John Hitchcock at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item.
ATTACHMENT B
PROPOSED MAP AMENDMENT
6/28/94

067-Marla Bay/Zephyr Heights
Residential

SUBJECT PARCEL
APN 05-182-01

SPECIAL AREA #1

LAKE TAHOE

060-
Genoa Peak
Conservation
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038
(702) 588-4347
Fax (702) 588-4527

NOTICE OF PROPOSED REGIONAL PLAN AMENDMENT
AND PUBLIC HEARING

Date of Notice: June 29, 1994

Description of Proposed Plan Amendments: To amend the Commercial Special Area #1 boundary of Plan Area Statement 067, Marla Bay/Zephyr Heights Residential. The amendment would move Douglas County Assessor's Parcel 05-182-01, Lakeside Wedding Chapel, located at 635 Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Nevada into Commercial Special Area #1. See vicinity map below.

Public Hearing: On July 13, 1994 the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission is scheduled to consider the proposed amendment, hold a public hearing, and make a recommendation to the TRPA Governing Board. The TRPA Governing Board is scheduled to consider the proposed amendment and hold a public hearing at their July 27, 1994 meeting. The staff summary for the proposed amendment will be available for review at TRPA's offices five (5) working days prior to the meeting. This matter may be continued without further notice.

Interested persons may submit comments by mail to TRPA, Attention: John Hitchcock, P.O. Box 1038, Zephyr Cove, NV 89448. Written comments which are not received prior to the date of the meeting will not be considered by TRPA. In addition to, or in lieu of written comments, interested persons may appear at the meeting to present oral comments.
July 5, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area 119, Country Club Meadow (Recreation), to Add Recreational Vehicle Parks as a Special Use

Following discussions with the applicant of the proposed amendment of Plan Area Statement 119, Country Club Meadow (Recreation), to consider the addition of recreational vehicle parks as a permissible use within the plan area, staff has concluded that no amendments are necessary.

Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
July 5, 1994

To:    TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From:  TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment to Chapters 2, 3, 4, 8, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 38, 52, 54, 73, 78, and 91 Pertaining to Clarification and Simplification of the Code

PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is to delete unnecessary Code provisions, make technical corrections, and add clarifying language to implement existing policies. In addition, there is a proposed amendment to Chapter 8 to permit the use of abandoned securities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: TRPA staff recommends that the APC conduct a public hearing and recommend adoption of the proposed Code amendments.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS: The proposed amendments are set forth in Attachment A.

DISCUSSION: The amendments are the culmination of several years work compiling a list of mistakes and obsolete sections of the Code. Further, the amendments are intended to implement, in part, TRPA’s goal of simplifying and clarifying the Code. The proposed amendments are the second of several phases of Code amendments designed to make the Code more consistent, to fill in the holes, to simplify language and procedures, and to delete unnecessary or obsolete sections. In addition, based on the Governing Board’s request, staff has proposed an amendment to Chapter 8 which deals with the use of project securities which have been abandoned.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: Because of the nature of the amendments, staff recommends a finding of no significant effect.

ACTION REQUESTED: The APC should conduct a public hearing and make a recommendation on the proposed amendments.

Attachment
ATTACHMENT A
July 5, 1994
Technical and Clarifying Amendments to Code

1. Amend Chapter 3 (Section 3.1), Chapter 18 (Subsections 18.1.C and 18.5.A), Chapter 52 (Section 52.1), and Chapter 73 (Section 73.3), to insert July 1, 1987 as the effective date of the Regional Plan. Explanation: This amendment makes the Code more readable.

2. Amend Chapter 4 (Appendix A) to exempt voluntary remedial action plans and residential projects using 4 or less bonus units from Governing Board review. Explanation: These amendments delete minor projects from the necessity of Board review thus saving the applicant and TRPA time and money.

3. Amend Chapter 8 to add a new Subsection 8.8.D as follows:

8.8.D Forfeiture of Security: Securities may be forfeited in either of the following ways:

(1) Non-compliance - TRPA shall monitor compliance with secured conditions of approval pursuant to Section 8.2. A security, or portion thereof, shall be forfeited if TRPA finds that a secured condition of approval has not been timely complied with, and that the security, or a portion thereof, is necessary to achieve compliance. After notice and an opportunity to be heard is given to the permittee pursuant to the Rules of Procedure, TRPA may use the security to accomplish the condition of approval which was found to be not in compliance. Any portion of the security not used by TRPA shall remain posted until release pursuant to Subsection 8.8.E.

(2) Abandonment - Securities posted in cash may be forfeited after TRPA has mailed a check for the security amount, or sent the appropriate IRS form to allow the release of a check, to the person who posted the security (of a completed project), and received one of the following responses: a) the check or IRS form was returned with no forwarding address; b) the person who posted the security did not respond to the request to complete and return the IRS form necessary to release the check; c) the person who posted the security did not cash the check within one year of receipt, or; d) the person who posted the security refused to claim the security. Prior to forfeiting any security, TRPA shall publish a notice of intent to forfeit the security, which notice names the person who posted the security. The notice shall be published one time in a newspaper of general circulation in the Tahoe Region. If the person who posted the security does not claim the security within one year after the publication of the notice, the security shall be deemed abandoned and forfeited to a fund designated by the Governing Board.

Explanation: This amendment provides an administrative procedure to
deal with the abandonment of project securities which are posted to insure installation of BMPs or other conditions of approval. Currently, abandoned cash securities are held indefinitely and not useable for any purpose.

4. Amend Chapter 18, Section 18.0, to add "backshore" to the list of allowable uses set forth in Chapter 51.

18.0 Purpose: This chapter sets forth the allowable uses for the land areas within the Region. Allowable uses for the nearshore, foreshore, backshore and lakezone are set forth in Chapter 51.

Explanation: This amendment corrects an oversight and makes Chapter 18 consistent with Chapter 51.

5. Amend Chapter 20, Subparagraph 20.3.C(6) to delete the requirement for a "mandatory annual review" of the cost of land coverage as follows:

(6) Inadequate Supply of Land Coverage: If TRPA, after conducting a mandatory/annual review of the cost of land coverage available at the land bank, finds there is an inadequate supply of hard land coverage for commercial or tourist accommodation uses at a reasonable cost within a given hydrologically related area, TRPA may authorize an increase in the supply of land coverage for transfer in the order of priority set forth below.

Explanation: TRPA should only conduct a review at such time as the need arises. The requirement for an annual review is being disregarded and should be deleted.

6. Amend Chapter 20, Subparagraph 20.3.C(7)(b) to substitute the term "removal" for "retirement" as follows:

(b) Removal/Removal of Land Coverage For Credit: In the event land coverage is removed on one parcel, but is not proposed for immediate transfer to another parcel, the applicant shall comply with Subparagraph 20.3.C(7)(a)(i) and (ii), to assure credit for the removed coverage in accordance with Chapter 38.

Explanation: This amendment is a more accurate description of the action since the land coverage is being credited for future use (transfer or otherwise), not retired.

7. Amend Chapter 20, Subparagraph 20.3.D(1)(a)(ii) and (iii) to delete the reference to "merged pursuant to Chapter 45." and replace with "permanently consolidated". Also, change the term "merged" in the subparagraph immediately following, with the term "consolidated".

(ii) For a project on or comprising two or more contiguous parcels, the project area is the total combined square footage of the parcels, provided the parcels are permanently consolidated. If the parcels are not permanently consolidated, the owner shall record against the parcels a deed restriction, or other covenant running with the land, permanently assuring that the land coverage calculations for the parcels shall always be made as if the parcels had been
legally consolidated.

(iii) Where the proposed activity or project, for which land coverage is to be calculated, is a use accessory to an existing primary use located on or comprising one or more adjacent parcels, the project area for the accessory use is the total combined square footage of all of said parcels, owned or controlled by the same person, provided the parcels are permanently consolidated. If the parcels are not permanently consolidated, the owner shall record against the parcels a deed restriction, or other covenant running with the land, permanently assuring that the coverage calculations for the parcels shall always be made as if the parcels had been legally consolidated.

Explanation: Chapter 45 was never adopted, and the term "consolidated" is used in Chapter 4, so the amendments make the provision consistent with other Code provisions.

8. Amend Chapter 20 to delete Subsection 20.3.C (attached) and rewrite as follows:

Manner of Transferring Land Coverage: Land coverage may be transferred to eligible parcels for eligible uses, in accordance with the percentage limitations, as set forth in Subsection 20.3.B, and the requirements of this subsection. A transfer of land coverage shall be from one parcel or project area to another and shall only be transferred in conjunction with a project approved by TRPA. Land coverage banks may be designated by TRPA pursuant to Section 38.8, to provide land coverage for transfer purposes.

Explanation: This section was ambiguous and out-dated. The section also made unnecessary and incomplete references to the subparagraphs which followed and was therefore redundant.

9. Amend Chapter 20, Subparagraphs 20.3.C (3) and (4) as follows:

(3) Sending Parcels Classified as Sensitive Lands (Land-Capability Districts 1-3): If land coverage is transferred from a sending parcel, or a portion thereof, that is located, in whole or in part, in Land Capability Districts 1 through 3, inclusive, or is at or below the initial level defining the top rank under IPES (i.e., 725), the coverage transferred shall be permanently retired as set forth in Subparagraph 20.3.C(7) below, and may not be returned to the sending parcel.

(4) Sending Parcels Classified as Non-Sensitive Lands (Land Capability Districts 4-7): If land coverage is transferred from a sending parcel, or a portion thereof, that is located entirely within Land Capability Districts 4 through 7, inclusive, or is above the initial level defining the top rank under IPES (i.e., 725), the coverage transferred shall be retired as set forth in Subparagraph 20.3.C(7) below, but the land coverage may be returned to the sending parcel subject to the limitations of Subsections 20.3.A and 20.3.B.
Explanation: The deleted phrases "in whole or in part" and "entirely" were confusing and, in practice, were unworkable or overly-restrictive. The amendments also make the two sections more parallel.

10. Amend Chapter 22, Subparagraph 22.7(1) 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.

Explanation: This amendment is an unambiguous statement of the rule.

11. Amend Chapter 52, Subsection 52.3.C, to parallel its sister Section 4.3. Also, in Subparagraphs (4) and (6), update the references to Chapter 4. Lastly, amend Subparagraph (5) to require payment of the air quality fee, consistent with the parallel 1992 amendments to Chapter 4.

Explanation: Chapter 52 generally parallels Chapter 4 but recent amendments to Chapter 4 have not been reflected in Chapter 52, making it out of date.
(8) **Water quality Control Facilities:** Transfer of land coverage for water quality control facilities, such as erosion control projects, habitat restoration projects, wetland rehabilitation projects, stream environment zone restoration projects and similar projects, programs and facilities, may be permitted the minimum amount of land coverage needed to achieve their purpose provided there is not reasonable alternative, including relocation, which avoids or reduces the land coverage.

20.3.C **Manner Of Transferring Land Coverage:** Land coverage transferred to eligible parcels for eligible uses prescribed by Subsection 20.3.B, shall be transferred in the manner set forth in this Subsection. A transfer of land coverage may be from one parcel to another and may occur in connection with TRPA's approval of: a project; a community plan; redevelopment plan; a specific or master plan; or a transfer of coverage program for a subdivision. Transfers shall be recorded in accordance with Chapter 38, shall not result in land coverage on eligible parcels in excess of the maximum amounts prescribed by Subsection 20.3.B, and shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. Transfers may be undertaken in connection with Chapter 34. Removal of existing land coverage without transfer in connection with a project, in the manner and as otherwise required by this chapter, may be accomplished, by crediting the coverage account of the pertinent parcel pursuant to Chapter 38. Land coverage banks may be designated by TRPA pursuant to Chapter 38, which banks may provide a supply of land coverage to accommodate individuals needing coverage for transfer purposes.

(1) **Land Coverage Transfer Ratios:** Land coverage transferred from one parcel ("sending parcel") to another parcel ("receiving parcel") shall be in accordance with the following ratios:

(a) **General:** Except for transfers relating to commercial uses within approved community plans, the transfer of one square foot of land coverage to a receiving parcel requires the retirement of one square foot of land coverage on the sending parcel (1:1 transfer ratio).

(b) **Commercial Uses Within Approved Community Plans:** Receiving parcels within approved community plans, upon which there exist commercial facilities, shall be eligible to
MEMORANDUM

July 5, 1994

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Proposed Amendments to Rule 2.10 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure to Eliminate Tentative Agendas

This item was incorrectly placed on the APC agenda.

AGENDA ITEM V. G.

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
MEMORANDUM

July 5, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Three-Year Strategic Plan Update

The Management Team held a retreat in April to update the Agency’s Three-Year Strategic Plan and commence preparation of the Program of Work for FY 94-95. TRPA staff will present the Strategic Plan update to the APC for review and comment at the July meeting. The Governing Board will consider approval of the updated Strategic Plan along with the 94-95 Work Program at their July meeting.

A copy of the updated Strategic Plan is attached. If you should have any questions on this matter, please contact Jerry Wells, Deputy Director, at (702) 588-4547.

JW: 7/5/94

AGENDA ITEM VI. B.

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
THREE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

July 1, 1994 to June 30, 1997

and

PRIORITY OBJECTIVES FOR FY 94-95/95-96/96-97

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Revised -- June 30, 1994
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of this strategic plan is to identify the key goals and objectives of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for the next three years. The strategic plan is the cornerstone of work planning and budgeting and a vehicle for discussion of strategic issues.

TRPA updates this plan annually and invites comments at any time. Address your comments to: Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, P.O. Box 1038, Zephyr Cove, NV 89448.

B. RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL PLAN

The strategic plan is a planning and budgeting document, which TRPA uses to implement the Regional Plan efficiently and effectively. The strategic plan helps maintain a systematic approach to carrying out TRPA's mission, but it is not a part of the Regional Plan package itself.
II. MISSION AND VALUE STATEMENTS

TRPA's mission is set forth in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551, December 19, 1980). TRPA has also accepted responsibility for certain activities under other state and federal laws, in the areas of water quality, air quality, and transportation.

In December 1993, the TRPA Governing Board approved the following mission statement, which was developed at a strategic planning retreat held on November 12, 1993:

THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY LEADS THE COOPERATIVE EFFORT TO PRESERVE, RESTORE, AND ENHANCE THE UNIQUE NATURAL AND HUMAN ENVIRONMENT OF THE LAKE TAHOE REGION.

As TRPA carries out its mission, TRPA adheres to the following beliefs and values:

--- TRPA is primarily an environmental agency, but recognizes the interdependence of environmental, economic, and social well-being in the Tahoe Region.

--- TRPA exists to serve the public. Given the unique values of the Tahoe Region, TRPA's constituency extends beyond our geographic boundaries. TRPA can't please every applicant or satisfy every individual, but can make every effort to be reasonable and responsive.

--- TRPA believes in streamlining the Regional Plan, focusing on the highest priority tasks, concentrating on results, and improving effectiveness and efficiency.

--- TRPA should be the leader for plans and actions to preserve the environment of the Tahoe Region. TRPA will advocate action; act as a regional resource center; use innovative planning techniques and approaches; and network with local, regional, state, and national groups.

--- TRPA believes the Tahoe Region is capitalizing on a growing relationship of trust and cooperation among the many entities responsible for stewardship of Tahoe's unique resources.

--- TRPA believes in the highest standards of ethical conduct, honesty, fairness, and equity.

--- TRPA believes that an educated and informed public is essential to accomplishing environmental goals, and that the success of the Regional Plan relies on communication, cooperation, and participation from a vast number of people.
III. ORGANIZATION

To carry out its mission, TRPA is organized into three line divisions (Long Range Planning, Project Review, and Environmental Compliance), a Management Support Division, and three staff departments (Finance, Environmental Education, and Legal). The Executive Director and Deputy Director supervise the staff and are responsible for all decision-making delegated to the staff by the Governing Board. Agency Counsel advises both the staff and the Governing Board. The Advisory Planning Commission reviews planning matters and makes recommendations to the Governing Board.

See the TRPA organization chart, Figure 1.

TRPA calls upon the expertise of eight advisory committees and working groups to carry out its mission. They are:

Transportation/Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee  
Water Quality Monitoring Committee  
Visibility Monitoring Committee  
Streamlining Committee  
Forest Health Consensus Group  
Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) working group  
Stream Environment Zone Restoration Committee  
IPES/Land Capability Technical Advisory Committee

TRPA also participates in numerous inter-agency committees, task forces, steering groups, and similar organizations, to further the cause of environmental protection in the Tahoe Region. A partial list of these partnerships includes:

Bi-State Fisheries Task Force  
California Stormwater Management Task Force  
Erosion Control Task Force  
Highway Deicing Steering Group  
Lake Tahoe Unified Steering Group for Forest Assessment and Protection  
Nevada Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee  
Nevada Statewide Transit Advisory Committee  
Shorezone Project Review Committee (PRC)  
Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee  
South Tahoe Arts Council  
South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce  
Tahoe Coalition of Recreation Providers (TCORP)  
Tahoe-Douglas Chamber of Commerce  
Tahoe East Area Management Team (TEAM Tahoe)  
Tahoe Landscape  
Tahoe Transportation District Technical Advisory Committee  
Tahoe-Truckee Regional Economic Coalition (TTREC)  
Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Assn (TNT-TMA)  
Waste Not (Incline Village)
IV. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. SETTING

The Tahoe Region is a special place. It was once a place of unspoiled beauty. Yet, like other natural places, its beauty has been compromised. The progress of modern life has diminished the unique values that make the Tahoe Region so extraordinary. With ever-increasing pressure on the Region as a recreational resource and urban center, preservation of the values of the Tahoe Region is vitally important and immensely difficult.

Located between the Carson Range on the east and the Sierra Nevada on the west, the Tahoe Region straddles the California-Nevada state line. About two-thirds of the Region is in California. The total land area is over 207,000 acres, with about 75 percent in public ownership.

Lake Tahoe is the dominant feature of the Region and is world renowned for its clear waters, size, and beautiful setting.

The Tahoe Region was once home to the Washoe tribe. The Washoe people lived around the shores of Lake Tahoe during the summers, fishing the Lake and gathering food in the surrounding forests. Today, Washoe cultural sites are protected by the Regional Plan to preserve what remains of this important part of our heritage, and a Washoe Cultural Center is on the drawing boards.

During the gold rush and the western migration of European settlers in the 1800s, almost the entire Region was logged to obtain timber and fuel for the Comstock mines. Today, the forests of the Region are extremely unhealthy, partly because of the clear-cutting of that era and the fir-dominated forest that came back after the logging.

For many years after the turn of the century, the Tahoe Region served a small number of residents and tourists; access was difficult. Most development and urbanization of the Region occurred after the Squaw Valley winter Olympics in 1960. Since that time, the population of the Region has increased over five times, with about 80 percent of the population residing in California.

Today, the year-round resident population is about 52,000. Peak summer day population, including day-use visitors, is about 250,000 to 300,000. There are about 20 developed towns and communities. The City of South Lake Tahoe is the only incorporated city. The Region is home to approximately 24,500 single-family homes; 14,100 multi-family units; 12,000 tourist accommodation units; 2,115 campground units; and about six million square feet of commercial floor area. Casino gaming areas are located at the north and south stateline areas, and in Incline Village. The undeveloped areas of the Region are predominantly publicly owned. Outdoor recreation use of the Region is extensive.
B. ENVIRONMENTAL TRENDS

Long-term environmental trend data provide insight into both the challenges facing the Tahoe Region and the effectiveness of environmental control programs. The following paragraphs discuss some of the most critical trend information:

Water Quality. Since 1968, algal productivity has increased over 200 percent. During the same period, the clarity of the deep pelagic waters of Lake Tahoe has decreased, on the average, more than one foot per year. Waters of the shallower littoral zone of Lake Tahoe also show evidence of increasing algal productivity.

Lake Tahoe is undergoing cultural eutrophication, which occurs when the influences of civilization result in imbalances in a lake's nutrient budget, accelerating natural increases in algal productivity. It is important to note that, despite large public and private investments in water quality in the last 25 years, the water quality trends in Lake Tahoe will continue until the nutrient budgets can be brought back into balance. This will take many years, under any management and control strategy. Given undisturbed conditions, Lake Tahoe would be expected to change so slowly that the changes would be imperceptible over a human lifetime.

Air Quality. From 1978 to the present, federal, state, and TRPA standards for carbon monoxide have been exceeded at the Stateline-California monitoring station. Steady reductions have been seen in the concentrations of carbon monoxide and the number of days the standards were exceeded, despite increases in traffic volumes. (See Figure 4.) The main causative factor in the improvement in carbon monoxide pollution is the cleaner vehicle fleet throughout California, Nevada, and the entire U.S.

The Region does not attain state and TRPA ozone standards. There has been no apparent trend in ozone concentrations at the three monitoring sites in the Region since 1980. Peak ozone concentrations have hovered at or just above TRPA's 1-hour standard. Scientific evidence indicates long-range transport of ozone into the Region may be occurring.

Visual range (or "visibility") in the Region meets applicable standards and appears to have improved slightly since 1981. TRPA's fine particulate samplers reveal that the main causative factors in degradation of visual range are wood smoke and airborne dust.

Transportation. In 1982, TRPA adopted a threshold standard calling for a reduction in vehicle-miles-of-travel (VMT) of 10 percent from the 1981 peak summer day value. TRPA estimates that VMT has increased 14 percent in the Region, from 1.65 million miles in 1981 to 1.88 million miles in 1993. Surveys reveal that a large proportion of visitors and residents considers traffic volumes to be Tahoe's biggest problem, yet the data show that reliance on the private automobile is increasing. Population growth outside the Tahoe Region, with attendant increases in day-use traffic...
Economic Indicators. As stated elsewhere in this Strategic Plan, TRPA recognizes a relationship between environmental conditions and economic conditions. As the drafters of the bi-state compact recognized, the quality of the environment is the Region's biggest economic asset. In addition, unstable or declining economic conditions make environmental protection and enhancement more difficult than they already are. Two important economic indicators are sales tax revenues and transient occupancy tax (TOT) revenues. Data published by the South Lake Tahoe and Tahoe-Douglas Chambers of Commerce in 1993 indicated that sales tax revenues peaked in the South Shore in 1990 (and again in 1992 in Douglas County), and that South Lake Tahoe TOT revenues peaked in 1989 and 1992. Thus, these economic indicators show fluctuating economic conditions from year to year.

C. TRPA HISTORY

In 1969, California and Nevada created the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, which named TRPA the regional land use and environmental resource planning and regulatory agency for the Tahoe Region. TRPA adopted its first regional plan in 1971 and adopted its first land use ordinance in 1972.

During the 1970s, the Compact limited TRPA's review of projects to only those with a regional impact. Partly because of the voting procedures the Compact established, TRPA was ineffective at bringing about orderly growth and development in the Region, and additional development occurred at an accelerated rate. In response, the state of California activated the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (CTRPA) and, in the California portion of the Region, there were two regional agencies with jurisdiction over environmental matters from 1969 to 1984.

Extensive amendments to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact in 1980 (P.L. 96-551) rectified the problem created by the voting procedures and directed TRPA to adopt environmental threshold carrying capacities ("environmental thresholds" or "thresholds") to protect the values of the Region, and to amend the Regional Plan to attain and maintain the thresholds. TRPA adopted a comprehensive set of thresholds on August 26, 1982. (See Table 1.)

In 1984, TRPA amended the Regional Plan, but was immediately sued by the people of the state of California and the League to Save Lake Tahoe, on the grounds that the plan was incomplete, the EIS was flawed, and the plan did not comply with the Compact. After a two-day hearing, a federal district judge enjoined TRPA from implementing the 1984 plan, and TRPA initiated efforts to settle the litigation.

When initial settlement negotiations failed in 1985, TRPA convened the Consensus Building Workshop to attempt to find a consensus set of policies which would have broad support throughout the Region. The Consensus Building Workshop was a success--resulting in settlement of the litigation—and TRPA adopted amended Regional Plan Goals and Policies, a land use plan, and a code of ordinances in 1986 and 1987. This Regional Plan package, with amendments, is in place today.
In 1991 and 1992, TRPA completed its first comprehensive five-year evaluation of the thresholds and the Regional Plan and made amendments to the Plan in response to the evaluation. For a summary of the results of that evaluation, see Table 1.

The following chronology displays the major events in TRPA's history since the settlement of litigation in 1987:

1988
Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) adopted
Water Quality Management ("208") plan amended

1989
Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) implemented
South Tahoe Redevelopment plan approved, permit issued

1990
Defense of Regional Plan package in Kelly v. TRPA

1991
Five-Year Evaluation Report issued

1992
Regional Plan amended in response to Five-Year Evaluation
Integrated Transportation-Air Quality Plan adopted
Revised financing plan for erosion control approved
Nevada legislature conducts interim study of TRPA
Airport litigation resolved
First Economic Round Table conference held

1993
Meyers and Douglas County Community Plans adopted
Lowering of IPES line in Douglas and Washoe counties

1994
Tahoe City and Stateline-Ski Run Community Plans adopted
Nevada legislature conducts interim study of TRPA
Kelly v. TRPA litigation resolved

From the point of view of administration and management, TRPA has changed significantly in recent years. After the settlement of litigation in 1987, TRPA experienced a period of high project backlogs, heavy overall workload, large commitments of overtime, and complex policies and procedures. Today, after significant streamlining, clarification of procedures, and office automation, the backlog of applications is much smaller, and overtime balances are dramatically lower. TRPA has an internal system of strategic planning, work programming, and control, which contributes to improved focus and accountability. Nevertheless, hiring freezes, furloughs and staff vacancies have constrained production.

TRPA has stressed the development of Memoranda of Understanding with other units of government and entities such as utility districts to identify exempt activities and delegate project approvals to willing units of local government. TRPA has now entered into three delegation MOUs and 23 exempt activity MOUs. Because of these agreements, the work load in the project review area has peaked, in terms of numbers of activities reviewed, and TRPA now reviews a smaller number of more complex projects, spending more time on each project, and moving out of residential project review. From FY 89-90 to FY 92-93, the volume of applications received changed from 1,625 to 1,050, a decrease of 35 percent. The need to monitor activities carried out under MOUs for compliance with the Regional Plan has impacted the workload of the compliance staff, however.
TRPA has recently placed greater emphasis on remedial programs and abatement efforts, in contrast to regulation of new activities. Areas where remedial and abatement efforts have been initiated include: forest health, erosion and runoff control, SEZ restoration, wood heater controls, scenic resources, and hazardous spill controls. TRPA has also stressed environmental education, working to reach out to the public for their participation in and cooperation with TRPA's mission. Through participation in the Regional Economic Coalition (TREC), TRPA has promoted the concept of environmental-economic synergism, that is, the idea that a healthy environment and a vital economy can do more than co-exist, and can actually enhance each other.

Since the 1987 settlement, TRPA, local government, and the public have been working cooperatively to develop detailed land use plans, called community plans, for 22 commercial core areas around Lake Tahoe. To date, TRPA has adopted six community plans and is considering action on several more.

In the last five years, several significant legal cases have been resolved by judicial action in TRPA's favor or by settlement, including litigation involving the South Tahoe Airport, and several constitutional challenges to the Regional Plan. TRPA's compliance program focuses on major violations of the Compact and the Regional Plan.

After the settlement of litigation in 1987, TRPA's operating budget increased from $2.7 million in FY 87-88 to $3.8 million in FY 90-91 and FY 91-92. However, TRPA's operating budget decreased to about $3.5 million in FY 92-93, and to about $3.3 million in FY 93-94, which is approximately equal to the FY 89-90 budget. The budget for FY 94-95 is expected to decrease to about $3.1 million. At this time, budget constraints are adversely affecting service delivery (processing of permits, securities, and land capability determinations) and delaying environmental planning efforts.

Significant externalities affecting TRPA in the past five years have been the drought and the recession. The drought created more workload in the area of shorezone permitting and compliance activities, as TRPA attempted to help preserve water-oriented recreation opportunities, while preserving other environmental values as well. The recession may have reduced pressure for additional commercial and tourist development somewhat, was at least partly responsible for Region-wide interest in environmental-economic interaction and the Economic Coalition, and contributed heavily to budgetary reductions at the state and local levels and at TRPA.
V. PROBLEM ASSESSMENT: "Where Are We Now?"

On November 12, 1993, the TRPA Governing Board and senior staff held a strategic planning retreat to discuss the direction of the Agency and its goals and objectives. The following problem assessment incorporates the discussions at the retreat.

A. What's Going Well With TRPA?

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact establishes a forum for California and Nevada to work together. The Compact establishes procedures to identify activities which may have environmental impacts, and means to minimize those impacts. The Regional Plan package is a complete package which includes goals, policies, land use regulations, ordinances, guidelines, and improvement programs. To a large degree, TRPA's efforts are recognized nationally and set a standard for other areas.

TRPA has a diverse and committed Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission, representing a broad spectrum of opinion and expertise from throughout California and Nevada. The Board members are supportive of the staff and each other, and have the ability and desire to reach compromise on difficult issues.

TRPA has a well-trained, competent, cohesive staff, which has been able to shift its focus in response to changing circumstances and to adopt a problem-solving orientation. The staff have good expertise, maturity, and experience, and are active in the community.

TRPA staff have good relationships with local, state, and federal agency staffs. TRPA has successfully delegated some responsibilities to units of local government, and entered into MOUs with numerous agencies and entities to coordinate activities. The result of these efforts is that support from other agencies has increased, and they are willing to work with TRPA to accomplish mutual goals.

In general, the public is inclined to be supportive of TRPA's mission. TRPA involves the public in its processes more than in the past, facilitates conflict resolution, stresses environmental education, and, therefore, has improved credibility. TRPA receives thoughtful testimony from the public at its public hearings, and sees a trend toward more collaborative planning.

Accomplishments. In FY 91-92, TRPA completed two major efforts: the first five-year evaluation of the Regional Plan and threshold attainment (known as the '91 Evaluation), and the updated, integrated transportation-air quality plan. TRPA helped establish an inter-agency steering group for forest protection and assessment, convened a consensus-building process on forest health issues, and expanded the water quality and air quality monitoring programs.
In FY 92-93, TRPA enacted several of the recommendations of the '91 Evaluation, including adoption of a rental car mitigation program, and helping to establish the Economic Round Table. TRPA initiated a consensus-building process on the subject of forest health policy, and began a study of cumulative impacts of additional development in the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. The Nevada Legislature adopted a bill, recommended by TRPA, to allow the transfer of land coverage mitigation fees to the Division of State Lands for the purpose of retiring land coverage rights. However, another bill recommended by TRPA, to place a $20 million bond act before the voters to support erosion control and SEZ restoration in the Tahoe Region, was not adopted.

Also in FY 92-93, TRPA administered over $340,000 in state and regional transit funds, and completed a financing plan for the key implementation programs of the Water Quality Management Plan (208 Plan), required by the California State Water Resources Control Board.

Another important accomplishment during FY 92-93 was settlement of eight years of litigation over the future of the South Lake Tahoe airport. The Governing Board approved the settlement in August 1992, after lengthy negotiations. The settlement includes TRPA, the State of California, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and the League to Save Lake Tahoe, and is supported by the Federal Aviation Administration.

In the area of streamlining and delegation, TRPA has successfully reduced its project-review backlog and increased its efficiency. TRPA has continued to develop agreements with other public agencies, bringing the total number of delegation MOUs to three, and the total number of exempt activity MOUs to 23.

During both FY 91-92 and 92-93, TRPA continued to carry out its extensive project review and compliance functions, issuing over 2,570 permits during the two-year period, and conducting over 5,000 site inspections.

TRPA's experience with the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) is that it is working well, and in FY 93-94, TRPA moved the IPES line, consistent with the Regional Plan, in Douglas and Washoe Counties.

Other accomplishments in the areas of a new computer system and new office space have contributed to the overall effectiveness of TRPA. TRPA annually updates its Strategic Plan and Program of Work, and follows up regularly on the Program of Work to ensure that important deadlines are met and milestones reached.

B. What's Not Going As Well as TRPA Would Like?

At current funding levels, TRPA is unable to accomplish the work load and complete TRPA's mission without cutbacks in service delivery, and without environmental impacts from delays in key planning efforts and enforcements. Funding for TRPA operations is declining.

The Regional Plan package, particularly the Code, could be further simplified, to take into account day-to-day experience with
implementation. Many persons feel that the Plan is too detail-oriented, lacks flexibility, is too complex, and contains conflicting policies and rules. TRPA has not met with much success in delegating project review activities in the portions of the Region within Nevada. Together, these concerns create a shift in TRPA’s focus away from truly regional issues. TRPA must also revise the Plan on an ongoing basis to take into account changing conditions in the Region (e.g., drought, problems of forest health).

TRPA’s physical plant lacks adequate storage, particularly for project records, which are voluminous and would benefit from the application of micro-film or similar records management technology.

Despite improvements, image problems persist for TRPA, making TRPA’s already challenging job more difficult. Items which contribute to image problems are: the complexity of the Regional Plan and the Code; emphasis on process over product; wordy, lengthy documents; and residual resentment in the local community over past debates and decisions. Also, since TRPA is often on the cutting edge of planning and regulatory developments, it is difficult to “sell” the public on new plans, programs, and regulations. Some persons feel that public input is dominated by local interests, at the expense of the interests of the public at large outside the Tahoe Region.

In the area of long range planning, TRPA has not clearly communicated its vision of the future in areas such as recreation, transportation, SEZ restoration, and scenic quality improvements. TRPA and its cooperating entities have also been slow to finalize plans for rehabilitating the Region’s forests, and TRPA has been slow to adopt community plans for the commercial areas of the Region.

Finally, since TRPA has no authority to implement the non-regulatory programs of the Regional Plan, many persons are dissatisfied with the pace of implementation of erosion control projects, SEZ restoration, and mass transit improvements. Water quality in Lake Tahoe continues to deteriorate, despite the efforts of all the agencies involved in its protection.

C. External Factors That May Have An Impact on TRPA in the Next Three Years

On the positive side of the ledger of external factors, there is a growing personal, local, regional, state, and national awareness of the need for environmental protection and preservation. As a result, voluntary coalitions are emerging within the Tahoe Region to create positive environmental change. To some degree, this change is reflected in improved legislative perceptions of TRPA and in the interest of the California and Nevada congressional delegations in the environment of the Tahoe Region.
Legislative actions external to the Tahoe Region, such as the federal transportation act (ISTEA), the federal clean air act, and the California statutes creating and empowering the California Tahoe Conservancy also have a positive impact on TRPA.

The national economic recovery, coupled with local interest in revitalization and redevelopment and an emerging transportation plan, are also positive external factors.

With respect to external factors that may have a negative impact, declining governmental resources and cutbacks for all levels of government will continue to impact TRPA. In difficult economic times, it is especially hard to generate new commitments for programs such as erosion control and mass transit. And as the counties surrounding Lake Tahoe continue to grow, more of the counties' attention is focused on problems and issues outside the Tahoe Region.

External pressures on the Tahoe Region will continue to grow in relation to population growth in the Sierra Nevada and its foothill communities. At the same time, Tahoe is not well-positioned to handle these pressures, given its inadequate employee housing base, deteriorating residential neighborhoods (in some areas), a non-diversified local economy, and a prevalence of obsolete and declining tourist-serving infrastructure.
VI. THREE-YEAR GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

TRPA's overall goal, established in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, is to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds and applicable state, federal, and local air and water quality standards. In support of this goal, TRPA establishes the following specific goals and objectives.

The Program of Work for FY 94-95 is a separate document from this strategic plan. It presents detailed descriptions of 48 separate work elements, covering products, approaches, milestones, and resources.

Three-Year Goal: Establish and implement a coordinated program with state, local, and federal agencies to prioritize and secure funding requests.

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Capital Finance Committee to meet with affected agencies to maintain an updated priority project short-list for the Region (W.E. 11) Quarterly

TRPA staff to meet with CSWRCH, NDEP, EPA and California Resources Agency to coordinate requests for 319 and other grant programs, and budget augmentations (W.E. 11) 7-94

Submit ELPF request to support the 1996 Threshold Evaluation process (W.E. 7) 7-94

Meet with Calif. Resources Agency to investigate the feasibility of augmenting the 94-95 ELPF budget to accelerate the '96 Evaluation process (W.E. 7) 8-94

Meet with NDOT and Caltrans to identify funds for bikeway master plan and project development (W.E. 11) 9-94

TRPA staff to meet and work with Caltrans, NDOT, and local government to prepare applications for state and federal enhancement funds for erosion and runoff control on state highway network (W.E. 11) Annually

Meet with local governments to initiate assessment proceedings in areas targeted for assessments in 1992-96 (W.E. 11) 1-95

Make a minimum of three grant requests for SEZ restoration program implementation (W.E. 21) 6-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

Reevaluate and update water quality mitigation fee (W.E. 19) 6-96

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)
Three Year Goal: Facilitate completion of rehabilitation programs in North and South Shore

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Initiate South Shore (South Tahoe Wye) community plan process (W.E. 15) 8-94

Committee of 2 Governing Board members and TRPA staff to meet with North and South Shore redevelopment authorities to develop an action plan to promote redevelopment (W.E. 24) 1-95

Present North Shore community plans/FEIS (Washoe and Placer County) to Governing Board for adoption (W.E. 15) 2-95

Complete redevelopment action plan and incorporate into 3-year Strategic Plan/Work Program (W.E. 24) 6-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

(To be determined)

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)

Three Year Goal: Clarify and simplify the Code

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Streamlining Committee and TRPA staff to meet and identify additional Code amendments for clarification and simplification purposes (W.E. 12) 1-95

TRPA staff to draft amendments to Chapter 33 to simplify the Public Service/Recreation List process (W.E. 19) 2-95

TRPA staff to draft additional Code amendments regarding simplification and clarification for Board consideration (W.E. 19) 3-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

(To be determined)

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)
Three-Year Goal: Build public understanding and support for the TRPA mission.

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Hold annual Building/Erosion Control Awards (W.E. 10) 10-94

Complete BMP information pamphlet in cooperation with SCS, RCDs, and Extension Service (W.E. 10) 12-94

Conduct regional focus group meeting with TRPA staff, Governing Board committee and community members to provide feedback to TRPA (W.E. 10) 1-95

Each Governing Board member to make one contact each month with decision maker/staff to discuss TRPA's mission, and share results with the Board. (W.E. 10) Monthly

Complete brochure on thresholds and 1996 Evaluation process (W.E. 10) 5-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

(To be determined)

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)

Three Year Goal: Achieve additional physical improvements in the built and natural environments.

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Designate a program manager for each of the threshold categories, including the SEZ restoration program (W.E. 21) 8-94

Governing Board committee (Neft, Cronk, Bennett, Chimarusti, and DeLanoy) to secure loaned staff from Caltrans and NDOT to work with TTRC/TCORP to develop regional bicycle master plan (W.E. 24) 10-94

TRPA staff working with the Tahoe Transportation Coalition shall complete a parking management program for Governing Board adoption (W.E. 19) 12-94

Identify and prepare list of potential grants for implementation of water quality, transportation, air quality, recreation, scenic, vegetation, noise, fish and wildlife improvement projects (W.E. 21, 22, 23, and 24) 12-94
Work with Nevada State Lands to adopt an MOU regarding SEZ banking and restoration (W.E. 13) 12-94

TRPA staff to present Forest Health Consensus Group recommendations to Governing Board (W.E. 45) 1-95

Develop an understandable list of actions (with graphics) and dates necessary to attain each threshold (W.E. 20) 2-95

Develop list of priority SEZ restoration projects for implementation by June 2000 (W.E. 21) 6-95

Governing Board committee (Bennett, Lau, DeLanoy, and Kanoff) to identify MOUs that can be incorporated into the TEAM Tahoe plan and identify additional MOUs that are needed to enhance the plan (W.E. 24) 6-95

Identify and map four first priority disturbed, developed or subdivided SEZs (W.E. 21) 12-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

Prepare report of conclusions and recommendations regarding the results of the mapping of the four first priority SEZs (W.E. 21) 6-96

Identify and map all remaining disturbed, developed or subdivided SEZs (W.E. 21) 6-96

Develop list of remaining SEZ restoration projects for implementation after June 2000 (W.E. 21) 6-96

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)

Three Year Goal: Accelerate implementation of BMP Retrofit Program

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Complete direct mailing notice to property owners in Priority 1 watersheds (W.E. 10) 12-94

Conduct 4-6 neighborhood workshops in Priority 1 watershed areas (W.E. 10) 6-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

Complete direct mailing notice to property owners in Priority 2 watersheds (W.E. 10) 12-95

Conduct 4-6 neighborhood workshops in Priority 2 watershed areas (W.E. 10) 6-96
Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

Complete direct mailing notice to property owners in Priority 3 watersheds (W.E. 10) 12-96

Conduct 4-6 neighborhood workshops in Priority 3 watershed areas (W.E. 10) 6-97

Three Year Goal: Facilitate identification of remaining water/sewer capacity in Basin.

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Meet with water/sewer providers and affected agencies to identify remaining capacity issue and develop action plan (W.E. 3) 6-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

(To be determined)

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)

Three Year Goal: Organize public advisory/working groups for each threshold to support the 1996 Evaluation process

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Identify 1996 Evaluation information/data needs (W.E. 20) 12-94

Prepare draft work plans for '96 Evaluation advisory groups (W.E. 20) 2-95

Establish '96 Evaluation advisory/working groups and schedule first meeting (W.E. 20) 3-95

Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

(To be determined)

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)

Three Year Goal: Develop programs/actions in response to the Nevada Legislative Oversight Committee recommendations.

First Year Objectives (FY 94-95):

Identify required work tasks related to the Nevada Legislative Oversight Committee recommendations and incorporate into Work Program (W.E. 4) 7-94
Second Year Objectives (FY 95-96):

(To be determined)

Third Year Objectives (FY 96-97):

(To be determined)