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 Wednesday, November 13, 1996, at the Horizon Casino Resort, U.S. Highway 50, Stateline, Nevada. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

November 4, 1996

[Signature]
Jerry Wells
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.
Horizon Casino Resort
U.S. Highway 50, Stateline, Nevada

November 13, 1996
9:30 a.m.

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

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. 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 and Planning Matter 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 RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. Amendment of Chapter 26, Sign Standards to Adopt Substitute Sign Standards for the North Stateline Community Plan and Amendment of North Stateline Community Plan Design Guidelines to Add Historic Architectural Design Guidelines

B. Amendment of Code Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, and Chapter 7 of the Goals and Policies, Implementation Element, to Establish 1997 Residential Allocations

C. Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary Between Plan Area 057, Spooner Lake (Recreation), and Plan Area 060, Genoa Peak (Conservation), or Plan Area 061 Logan Creek (Residential), to Relocate Douglas County APNs 01-130-09, -12, -13, -14, and 016 from Plan Area 057 to Plan Area 060 or Plan Area 061

D. Draft EIS for the Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Status Report on Water Rights and Usage in the Washoe County Portion of the Tahoe Basin
B. Report on Future Commercial and Residential Allocations

C. Review of Transit and Air Quality Programs for the 1996 Regional Transportation Plan-Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP)

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
November 1, 1996

To:        TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From:      TRPA Staff

Subject:   Amendment of Chapter 26, Sign Standards, to Adopt Substitute Sign Standards for the North Stateline Community Plan and Amendment of North Stateline Community Plan Design Guidelines to Add Historic Architectural Design Guidelines

Proposed Action: The Crystal Bay Casino Association ("CBCA") is requesting TRPA to amend Chapter 26 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances to adopt substitute sign standards for the recently adopted North Stateline Community Plan Area (PAS 032), on the California-Nevada state line. The proposed sign standards are shown in Attachment A to this staff report and have been cooperatively developed between the CBCA and TRPA. If adopted, they will be added to the community plan design signage and parking standards which has previously been adopted as part of the Community Plan.

Additionally, TRPA staff proposes to amend the North Stateline Community Plan Design Guidelines and Standards (Appendix B of the adopted Community Plan), to add architectural design guidelines related to historic building design. The proposed guidelines are shown in Attachment B. This is a clean-up item from April 1996 which staff committed to completing as part of the adoption of the North Stateline Community Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC recommend to the Governing Board adoption of the substitute sign standards as shown in Attachment A. Staff further recommends that the APC recommend to Governing Board adoption of the architectural design guidelines shown in Attachment B.
Background: Chapter 26 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances permits substitute sign standards to be adopted for certain areas within the Region, including Plan Area 032, North Stateline. Chapter 26 recognized that the three plan areas containing concentrations of casinos may have unique land use and site development characteristics which warrant consideration of unique sign standards (e.g., very large developed sites with multi-story buildings and extremely large parking areas). The North Stateline Community Plan, adopted earlier this year, envisioned that special sign standards will be adopted. With the exception of the Hyatt Lake Tahoe Resort, North Stateline contains the north shore's only concentration of casinos. This process is similar to the one used to develop substitute standards for the South Stateline Casino Core.

Chapter 26 requires an evaluation be prepared prior to consideration of adopting substitute signs standards. The evaluation is intended to analyze whether the substitute ordinance standards, in combination with other urban design improvements which would be implemented would be "equal or superior" to TRPA’s standards (includes Chapter 26, Chapter 30 Design Standards and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program) with respect to attainment and maintenance of scenic resource and community design thresholds. A visual impact evaluation has been prepared by an independent expert retained under a cooperative agreement between TRPA and the CBCA. The evaluation is shown in Attachment C.

Because the sign standards proposed for casino cores typically are larger, taller and more numerous than those permitted under Chapter 26, the evaluation focuses on whether additional design improvements over and above TRPA's existing program elements are provided which can reasonably be expected to offset the visual impacts associated with the additional signage.

Discussion: The substitute standards are based on the premise that certain larger uses and project areas will be permitted to have larger and taller signs. The standards define three new classes of unique site characteristics which would be eligible for the substitute standards. All other sites would generally be regulated under existing Chapter 26 standards.

Under the proposed standards, building signs at the larger sites could be from 80 - 200 square feet per building frontage, compared to 40 square feet under Chapter 26. Building signs could be up to 40 feet above grade, compared to 15 feet under Chapter 26.

Freestanding signs at the larger sites could be between 330 and 500 square feet in area and could be up to 40 feet tall. TRPA's existing standards would permit freestanding signs up to 12 feet tall and 40 square feet in area using a sliding setback envelope where smaller shorter signs are permitted to be closer to the property line (5 feet minimum) and larger, taller signs set further back (20 feet or greater). Smaller uses such as the Nugget Casino and Garni Lodge Hotel would be allowed 100 square feet of freestanding sign area.
Based on information provided by the CBCA, nearly each of the existing free standing signs will be redesigned and improved as a result of implementing the standards. At least four existing freestanding signs will be reduced in area. Two large billboards have been or will be removed. There is also expected to be a significant reduction in building sign area at the Crystal Bay Club and the Tahoe Biltmore.

In order to mitigate scenic and community design threshold-related impacts which can be expected from the larger and taller signs, the proposed action includes both public and private design improvements. They are shown in Attachment C, the Scenic Threshold Evaluation for the North Stateline Signage Proposal for PAS 032. The proposed Nevada-side SR 28 Beautification Project is the major public improvement which the proposed action relies on to offset the visual impacts caused by the signs. It is recognized that the Beautification Project will likely enhance the appearance and the economy of the area. At this time, however, the project is unfunded and is only proposed for the Nevada side of the Plan Area. The CBCA has indicated an interest in contributing $200,000 to the $1.40 million Beautification Project cost sometime next year. The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) has also indicated it will contribute up to $200,000, Washoe County is expected to re-program $200,000 in air and water quality mitigation funds and other property owners are expected to contribute approximately $50,000. This leaves a funding shortfall of approximately $750,000. The project should be extended into California (which will add to the overall project cost shown above), to provide mitigation for the additional signs located there (e.g., Garni Lodge, Cal-Neva Lodge) and to take advantage of additional funding opportunities.

Two other significant features of the public improvements are also unfunded and not programmed for future funding. They are the utility undergrounding along both sides of the Plan Area and the development of the Lake Vista mini-park and viewpoint at the state line. Both items are contained in the Community Plan but have no funding source.

Recognizing the uncertainty of funding for nearly all of the offsetting projects, the concept of "provisionally conforming signs" has been introduced into the standards. It is shown on pages 1 and 5 of Attachment A and is generally modelled after a similar provision in the South Stateline Casino Core substitute sign standards.

Signs developed under the new ordinance would be considered to be conforming provided that the offsetting public and private design improvements are installed by certain interim target dates which coincide with the next two five-year threshold evaluation dates. The interim target is intended to ensure steady progress over time so that no one waits until the year 2007 to install all the offsetting improvements. This is consistent with interim targets scheduled for threshold attainment. If the first phase of the offsetting improvements are installed, the signs become conforming. If the
are installed, the signs become conforming. If the first phase improvements are not installed by the interim date (January 1, 2002), the signs are then declared not in conformance, and they must be revised or removed to conform with Chapter 26 standards.

**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 standards and guidelines were evaluated in a scenic evaluation and found to be equal or superior to the standards found in Chapter 26 of the Code.

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

   **Rationale:** The evaluation considered the proposed standards in regard to threshold attainment and found them to be equal or superior. The coordination with local government should enhance implementation of the standards and guidelines.

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 evaluation considered the proposed standards in regard to threshold attainment and found them to be equal or superior. The coordination with local government should enhance implementation of the standards and guidelines.

B. **Ordinance 87-8 Findings:** Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 requires the following findings prior to Code amendments. The proposed amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. The required findings and their rationales are:
1. The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds. The evaluation considered the proposed standards in regard to threshold attainment and found them to be equal or superior. The coordination with local government should enhance implementation of the standards and guidelines.

2. One of the following findings:

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

   b. The provision to be amended has been shown through experience to be counter-productive or ineffective and the amendment is designed to correct the demonstrated problem and is an equal or better means of implementing the Regional Plan package and complying with the Compact; or

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rationale: Finding b states the rationale for the proposed amendments.
Environmental Documentation: The proposed amendments were the subject of a scenic resources/community design evaluation. The results of the evaluation were used to complete an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC). Based on including the mitigation measures recommended by staff and the consultant, which are shown in Attachment C, staff recommends that a Finding of No Significant Effect be prepared for the proposed action.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. If you have any questions or comments concerning this agenda item, please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547.
NORTH STATELINE COMMUNITY PLAN
SUBSTITUTE SIGN STANDARDS SECTION

L. Signs in the North Stateline Community Plan Area: The standards for tourist plan areas shall apply to signs located in the North Stateline Community Plan area, except that the following standards shall replace or modify the standards listed in Sections 8.C, 8.E, 8.K, and 8.N as appropriate.

1. Definitions: Except as provided below, the definitions of Chapter 2 of the TRPA Code shall apply.

   a. Building Frontage: The two dimensional surface area of a building found within the perimeter bounded by the finished grade line, the cornice line, and exterior side walls in one plane not including intermediate walls perpendicular to such surface area which faces a street.

   b. Conforming Sign: A sign that is existing or approved, including exceptions, under Chapter 26 of the TRPA Code is a conforming sign.

   c. Provisionally Conforming Sign: A sign that complies with the applicable standards set forth in this section is a provisionally conforming sign. A provisionally conforming sign shall become a conforming sign once the scenic and community design improvements which are set forth in Appendix C of the North Stateline Community Plan have been implemented, in accordance with the schedule of implementation.

   d. Nonconforming Sign: A sign that is existing as of the effective date of this chapter which has not been approved under Chapter 26 of the TRPA Code or which does not comply with the applicable standards set forth in this Section is a nonconforming sign.

2. General Standards: Except as provided below, the standards set forth in Section 8.C shall apply.

   a. Sign Illumination: No sign shall be illuminated by or contain blinking, flashing, intermittent, or moving light or lights except:

      i. The time and temperature portion of a sign, and

      ii. The message portion of an electronic changeable message sign. The message and sign area illumination must remain constant except for that period of time when the message is being changed, which shall not exceed four (4) message changes per one (1) hour. Bulbs shall be 5 watts or
North Stateline Community Plan
Substitute Sign Standards Section
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less, fitted with color sleeves, and screened so as not to be visible when not in operation. The brightness of the sign shall be limited to the minimum necessary to accurately read the message.

3. **Building Signs:** Except as provided below, the standards set forth in subsection 8.K(1) shall apply to building signs:

a. Each primary use with a project area greater than 5 acres, a total floor area of 100,000 square feet or greater, and more than 100 linear feet of frontage along a public street may be allowed one square foot of sign area for each one linear foot of building frontage up to a maximum of 200 square feet of sign area per building frontage. Each use shall be allowed a maximum of two building frontages against which to calculate allowable sign area and on which to place the signage. No transfer of allowable building sign area between building frontages shall be permitted. Maximum height of building signs shall be 30 feet above grade.

b. Each primary use with a project area greater than 1 acre, a total floor area between 50,000 and 99,999 square feet, and more than 100 linear feet of frontage along a public street may be allowed one square foot of sign area for each one linear foot of building frontage up to a maximum of 150 square feet of sign area per building frontage. Each use shall be allowed a maximum of two building frontages against which to calculate allowable sign area and on which to place the signage. No transfer of allowable building sign area between building frontages shall be permitted. The maximum height of building signs shall be 20 feet above grade.

c. Each primary use with a project area greater than 1 acre, a total floor area between 14,000 and 49,999 square feet, and more than 100 linear feet of frontage along a public street may be allowed one square foot of sign area for each one linear foot of building frontage up to a maximum of 80 square feet of sign area per building frontage. Each use shall be allowed a maximum of two building frontages against which to calculate allowable sign area and on which to place the signage. No transfer of allowable building sign area between building frontages shall be permitted. The maximum height of building signs shall be 15 feet above grade.

d. All other primary uses which do not meet the minimum project area size, minimum total floor area and the minimum linear street frontage as set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this subsection shall comply with the provisions shown in subsection 8.K(1) for building signs.

e. The maximum allowable sign area for building signs which are used in a projecting sign shall be 20 square feet.
4. **Freestanding Signs:** Except as provided below, the standards set forth in subsection 8.K(2) shall apply to freestanding signs.

   a. Each project area which is greater than 5 acres, has a primary use with a total floor area of greater than 100,000 square feet and has more than 100 linear feet of frontage along a public street may be permitted one freestanding sign. The maximum sign area for a freestanding sign which may be permitted shall be no greater than 500 square feet and have a maximum height no greater than 40 feet. TRPA may approve more than one freestanding sign per project area provided that the criteria for permitting multiple freestanding signs found in subsection 8.J(2) are met and provided that that total sign area for the signs does not exceed 500 square feet.

   b. Each project area which is greater than 1 acres has a primary use with a total floor area between 50,000 and 99,999 square feet and has more than 100 linear feet of frontage along a public street may be permitted one freestanding sign. The maximum sign area for a freestanding sign which may be permitted shall be no greater than 330 square feet and have a maximum height no greater than 30 feet. TRPA may approve more than one freestanding sign per project area provided that the criteria for permitting multiple freestanding signs found in subsection 8.J(2) are met and provided that that total sign area for the signs does not exceed 330 square feet.

   c. Each project area which is greater than 1 acres has a primary use with a total floor area between 14,000 and 49,999 square feet and has more than 100 linear feet of frontage along a public street may be permitted one freestanding sign. The maximum sign area for a freestanding sign which may be permitted shall be no greater than 100 square feet and have a maximum height no greater than 20 feet. TRPA may approve more than one freestanding sign per project area provided that the criteria for permitting multiple freestanding signs found in subsection 8.J(2) are met and provided that that total sign area for the signs does not exceed 100 square feet.

   d. Project areas which do not meet the minimum project area size, minimum total floor area, and the minimum linear street frontage as set forth in either subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this subsection shall comply with the provisions shown in subsection 8.J(2) for freestanding signs.

   e. The minimum setback from the property line for freestanding signs which may be permitted in either subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this subsection shall be 10 feet. In instances where a 10 foot setback does not exist, TRPA may approve a minimum setback from the property line of five feet for a freestanding sign provided the area and height of the sign is reduced by a minimum of 10 percent of what would otherwise be approved.
f. All freestanding signs which may be permitted by either subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this subsection shall be incorporated into a landscape planter.

5. Pedestrian-Oriented Signs: Each primary use may be allowed one pedestrian-oriented sign per public entrance provided that the sign is displayed at or near the entrance, is not internally illuminated, has a maximum sign area of 5 square feet, and has a maximum height of 10 feet above grade.

6. Directional Signs: The following standards shall apply to directional signs.

a. Directional signs which are no greater than four square feet in area, no greater than 6 feet in height, contain no advertising copy, and are not located within the yard setbacks required by the applicable local jurisdiction, may be allowed, and shall not be included in the total allowable sign area for each use. Directional signs which do not meet these standards may be allowed provided they are counted as part of the total sign area allowed for building signs or freestanding signs, as applicable.

b. For project areas which meet the minimum area size, minimum total floor area and minimum street frontage criteria established in either subparagraphs 4(a), (b), or (c), the maximum area of directional signs may be increased up to 24 square feet provided all such signs are designed and installed using a consistent set of colors, materials, and mounting devices, without being counted in the total allowable sign area which is otherwise permitted.

c. For project areas which meet the minimum area size, the maximum height of directional signs on buildings, parking garages and porte cochere entrances/exits may exceed 6 feet, but shall be the minimum necessary to identify the entrance/exit. The sign shall not project outside or above any building wall or surface to which it is attached or appears to be attached.

7. Regulation of Existing Signs in the North Stateline Community Plan Area: Existing signs for purposes of this subsection are signs which are located within the North Stateline Community Plan areas which are legally existing or approved on the effective date of this chapter. Existing signs may include conforming, provisionally conforming, and nonconforming signs as defined in subsection 8.L(1). Existing signs shall be regulated as follows:

a. Conforming Signs: Conforming signs may remain.
b. **Provisionally Conforming Signs**: Provisionally conforming signs may remain provided the scenic and community design improvements which are set forth in Appendix C of the North Stateline Community Plan are being implemented in accordance with the implementation schedule set forth therein.

c. **Replacement of Provisionally Conforming and Nonconforming Signs**:

i. Nonconforming signs may be replaced with conforming or provisionally conforming signs.

ii. The replacement or modification of existing signs with conforming or provisionally conforming signs shall be permitted without requiring the entire project area or building frontage or other signs to come into immediate conformance provided that the project area is proceeding in accordance with the scenic and community design improvements implementation schedule set forth in Appendix C of the North Stateline Community Plan.

iii. The replacement or relocation on the same building or street frontage of conforming or provisionally conforming signs is permitted so long as the height or the sign area is not increased or the setback is not decreased.

d. **Removal of Nonconforming Signs**: Nonconforming signs shall be brought into conformance or provisional conformance with the standards in this section, or removed in accordance with the following schedule:

i. Where the cost of conforming the sign is less than $100 or where the sign is valued at less than $100, within one year after the effective date of this chapter.

ii. If a nonconforming sign is destroyed or damaged to an extent in excess of 50 percent of the sign value, immediately.

iii. If the sign is relocated, immediately.

iv. If the sign is altered structurally, or if the sign face is altered, except for changeable copy signs and maintenance, immediately.

v. By not later than January 1, 2002, all signs shall conform to Chapter 26 of the TRPA Code or the applicable provisions of Section 8.L.

e. **Conversion of Provisionally Conforming Signs to Conforming Signs**: Provisionally conforming signs shall become conforming signs following the implementation of the scenic and community design improvements set forth in Appendix C of the North Stateline Community Plan. If all scheduled improvements have not been implemented by January 1, 2002, and a scenic
analysis indicates inadequate progress in meeting scenic threshold interim targets, TRPA, and the Crystal Bay Casino Association shall develop an action plan to ensure threshold attainment by July 1, 2007.

f. Exceptions: Exceptions to subparagraphs (a) through (e) of this subsection may be approved for existing signs provided the following findings can be made for a sign package for the entire project area. Exceptions approved under these provisions shall be considered as conforming signs.

i. The exception is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the sign ordinance;

ii. There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved, or to the intended use of the property that are not contemplated or provided for by this ordinance;

iii. The approval of the exception will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare;

iv. Alternative signage concepts that comply with the provision to which the exception is required have been evaluated, and undue hardship would result if the strict adherence to the provision is required;

v. A scenic quality analysis demonstrates that the exception, if approved, will be consistent with the threshold attainment findings listed in the Scenic Resources Management Package Final Environmental Impact Statement, 1989;

vi. The exception which is approved shall not increase the number, area, and height of the existing sign or signs for which the exception is requested;

vii. The exception which is approved for a primary use or project area, whichever is applicable, shall not exceed the total permissible sign area for all signs;

viii. The exception is the minimum departure from the standards.

8. Qualified Exempt Activities: In addition to the provisions of Section 8.N, the following activities are considered qualified exempt.

a. The replacement of a corporate logo, provided the dimension, configuration and location of the sign are the same.

b. Any sign which is located within a building complex or under a porte cochere and which is clearly intended to be visible primarily to people located within the building area.
5. Historical Theme Architectural Guidelines. A consistent architectural theme is a powerful means to create and convey a sense of place. This does not mean that all buildings will or should look alike. It is the use of variation on a theme which can be an asset to the community. The historical theme being sought is "Alpine Elegance" or "Old Tahoe". The historic architectural design theme which uses modern building technology is the preferred theme for both new and redeveloping buildings. The following architectural elements should be used to convey the historic theme.

a. Building Form. Buildings should generally use steeply-sloping gable end or gambrel roofs to break up the roof facade. Buildings with hip roofs are also appropriate. Second story dormers or shed dormers are generally consistent with the historic theme and may be used. Commercial uses such as casinos should have a monumental scale to reflect its use.
b. **Porches.** Covered front porches which run the entire length of the building facade or wrap around the whole building are a simple design element which helps to communicate the historic theme. The porch should be big enough for people to encourage use. Porches may be raised, recessed in the form of a vestibule or may extend outside of the building envelope covered by a separate shed roof.

c. **Entries.** Entries should be clearly identified and act as a visual clue to passersby. They should be made of stone or native materials and be covered.
d. **Building Materials.** Building materials should consist of wood and/or natural stone sidings. Dimensional concrete products which look like wood may be used. Vertical and horizontal wood battens good materials but should be carried to the roofline. Plywood sidings (except for board and batten) and stucco are not appropriate. Treated fire retardant shake roofs are preferred.
c. **Roofs.** Roof design and their decorative features are important in defining the overall historical character. Appropriate roofs include the gambrel, hipped and gabled roof. The roofline should be broken by the use of second story and shed dormers. Breaking up the roofline will break up the large roof plane and add visual interest to the building.
Scenic Threshold Evaluation:

NORTH STATELINE SIGNAGE PROPOSAL FOR PAS 032

Prepared July 1996 for
The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

by
EDAW, Inc.
San Francisco, California
Background

The focus of this scenic threshold evaluation was the casino core portion of the North Stateline area within Roadway Unit 20. Thus, while the context of study includes visual conditions throughout Roadway Unit 20, the evaluation itself was confined only to the casino core - a strip along State Route 28 approximately 3 blocks long extending from the Tahoe Mariner site to the CaNeilvea entry road. There were two basic elements of the study. One considered what would be allowable under the ordinance contained in the Draft NORTH STATELINE SIGNAGE PROPOSAL FOR PAS 032, April 1996. The other examined in detail proposals for specific changes in casino signs and the proposed streetscape beautification plan for the casino core area. It was recognized that once approved the sign ordinance will apply to all signs within the North Stateline area, not just those of the casinos.

According to the North Tahoe Community Plans Environmental Impact Statement, Roadway Unit 20 is currently a non-attainment area for scenic thresholds. As stated above, the casino core area is only a portion of Roadway Unit 20. TRPA scenic thresholds are aimed at maintaining natural to natural-appearing landscape settings. Areas where urban development has occurred, such as the North Stateline casino core area, do not present a natural appearance.

The North Stateline casino core area along SR 28 is presently dominated by buildings and asphalt paving. There are a multitude of individual signs of various heights, sizes, shapes and colors that compete for the viewer’s attention. Distinctions between pedestrian and vehicular areas are often vague and confusing. There is a noticeable absence of natural elements such as shrubs and trees.

Evaluation Methodology

Following are the steps used to conduct the scenic threshold evaluation of the Draft NORTH STATELINE SIGNAGE PROPOSAL FOR PAS 032, April 1996.

- Reviewed pertinent reports and documents.
- Met with the North Stateline Signage Proposal team (casino representatives and their planning consultant) and TRPA representatives to review the project, review the scope of the evaluation, and confirm basic assumptions. Also selected camera stations for the preparation of two photo simulations showing proposed changes in place.
- Conducted on-site field observations and collected baseline photography.
- Prepared two photo simulations of the casino core area viewed from along SR 28 showing proposed changes to signs and the addition of elements contained in the proposed streetscape beautification plan.
- Distributed draft photo simulations for review and comment by the North Stateline Signage Proposal team and TRPA.
• Revised photo simulations based on review comments.
• Performed scenic threshold ratings for the casino core area using the photo simulations and consideration of other views. Ratings were conducting using TRPA's Criteria For Evaluating Views from the Road. The six components of the roadway rating process were evaluated which include Manmade Features, Physical Distractions to Driving Along the Roadway, Characteristics of the Roadway, Views of the Lake, Landscape Views, and Variety.
• Developed findings based on the scenic threshold ratings.
• Met with the North Stateline Signage Proposal team and TRPA representatives to present and review study findings.
• Developed recommendations and prepared study reports.

Assumptions Used in the Evaluation

The following list of improvements were assumed by EDAW in evaluating effects on the scenic threshold rating of the North Stateline Signage and Beautification Plan Proposal within the North Stateline Casino Core portion of Roadway Unit 20.

Signs

• Sign changes described in the Draft NORTH STATELINE SIGNAGE PROPOSAL FOR PAS 032, April 1996 were assumed in the evaluation (it is expected that these changes will be implemented between 1996 and 2002).

• Removal of the existing freestanding sign at the Nugget Casino and replacement with a dark green awning extending from the west-side building entrance to the sidewalk along SR 28.

• Modification of the existing Crystal Bay Club freestanding sign as depicted in the visual simulations including the conversion of the existing message portion to an electronic reader board.

• Replacement of the freestanding sign at the CalNeva Lodge (not in the Draft NORTH STATELINE SIGNAGE PROPOSAL FOR PAS 032) with a new sign of approximately the same height and size. The new sign might feature a design that reflects the existing building sign above the main entrance. It should use natural-appearing materials and colors with light-colored letters against a darker background. It should consist of one main panel only and should not have additional smaller panels mounted on the same mast as the existing sign does.

• The evaluation assumed the presence of "monument" signs as described in the Draft NORTH STATELINE SIGNAGE PROPOSAL FOR PAS 032. However, the visual analysis supports a policy decision to restrict each property to one freestanding sign.
only (thus prohibiting additional “monument” signs) on the basis that it would have the beneficial effect of limiting distractions along the roadway.

- Removal of the two existing billboards within the casino core area.

**Beautification Plan**

- Ten feet minimum sidewalks with 6 inch vertical curbs on each side of SR 28 extending from Reservoir Drive to CalNeva Drive.

- Bike lanes on both sides of SR 28.

- Elimination of on-street parking along SR 28 within the casino core area.

- Passenger drop-off pockets, as shown conceptually in the Streetscape Plan shown on page B-7 of the North Stateline Community Plan, in front of the Crystal Bay Club, Tahoe Biltmore, and Nugget Casino.

- Street trees every 50 feet on average with shrub pockets every 25 feet on average as shown conceptually in the Streetscape Plan shown on page B-7 of the North Stateline Community Plan.

- Shrub borders or hedges that screen parking lots, e.g. the Tahoe Biltmore lot along SR 28.

- Decorative pavers in plaza areas in front of the Tahoe Biltmore, Crystal Bay Club, and Nugget Casino.

- Decorative pavers in the main crosswalk between the Tahoe Biltmore and Crystal Bay Club.

- Benches, trash receptacles, and bus shelters placed at appropriate locations (to be determined).

- Redevelopment or rehabilitation of the Tahoe Mariner site with special attention to the eastern end of the site and its visibility to west-bound motorists on SR 28.

- Removal of overhead utility lines along SR 28 at the east and west end of the casino core area.

- Building rehabilitation/restoration of the White House, the addition of sidewalks along the property frontage on CalNeva Drive, and appropriate landscaping of the grounds.
• Landscaping or appropriate development of the existing vacant, bare property immediately east of the CalNeva entry road.

• Future development of a public park that provides at least limited views of Lake Tahoe, as shown conceptually in the Streetscape Plan on page B-7 of the North Stateline Community Plan, at the west end of the casino core area near the intersection of SR 28 and CalNeva Drive.

Findings

Reducing and limiting the height of freestanding signs has the positive effect of keeping them generally within the roof lines of the surrounding buildings and prevents them from protruding well above other elements of the scene and into the sky. Reducing the overall number of signs eliminates many distracting elements. The addition of trees and shrubs at the recommended average densities introduces natural features to the scene sufficient to reduce the visual dominance of the buildings. Shrub borders that screen parking reduce visual clutter and replace views of vehicles with natural plant material. The addition of sidewalks gives clear definition to the edges of the roadway and creates a greater sense of visual order. The sidewalks, bike lanes and crosswalks also define where pedestrians, cyclists and motorists are expected to be, thus improving safety and reducing confusion and distractions. Elimination of on-street parking reduces visual clutter and distractions. These and other changes and improvements identified in this report help to create an attractive and visually appealing landscape setting within the casino core area that, while comprised mostly of manmade features, appears closer to a balance between manmade and natural.

Based on the assumptions listed above and implementation of additional improvements identified in the North Stateline Community Plan and North Tahoe Community Plans Environmental Impact Statement, the North Stateline casino core area will achieve the minimum performance established by the TRPA for scenic thresholds by the year 2007 and will contribute to attainment of a rating of at least 16 for Roadway Unit 20.

Recommendations

In addition to the changes and improvements specified in the Draft NORTH STATELINE SIGNAGE PROPOSAL FOR PAS 032, April 1996, the Washoe County Community Plan for North Stateline and summarized in the North Tahoe Community Plans EIS, the following equal or superior actions are recommended to help ensure the casino core area is brought up to a minimum level of scenic threshold attainment.

• Building signs should be a maximum of 15 feet above the ground as measured from the bottom of the wall on which the sign is mounted to the bottom of the sign’s letters. This will ensure that building signs are within the general sight lines of pedestrians or motorists while limiting potential visual distractions.
- Restrict each property to one freestanding sign only and prohibiting additional "monument" signs whose primary purpose is to communicate advertising copy or cooperate logos. Directional and safety signs on the basis that it would have the beneficial effect of limiting distractions along the roadway.

- Removal of the existing freestanding sign at the Nugget Casino and replacement with a dark green awning extending from the west-side building entrance to the sidewalk along SR 28.

- Replace the existing freestanding sign at the CalNeva Lodge with a new sign of approximately the same height and size. The new sign might feature a design that reflects the existing building sign above the main entrance. It should use natural-appearing materials and colors with light-colored letters against a darker background. It should consist of one main panel only and should not have additional smaller panels mounted on the same mast as the existing sign does.

- Redevelop or rehabilitate the Tahoe Mariner site with special attention to the eastern end of the site and its visibility to west-bound motorists on SR 28.

- Remove overhead utility lines along SR 28 at the east and west end of the casino core area.

- Rehabilitate/restore the White House, add sidewalks along the property frontage on CalNeva Drive, and provide appropriate landscaping of the grounds.

- Landscape or develop an appropriate use on the existing vacant property (currently exposed earth) immediately east of and adjacent to the CalNeva entry road.

- Develop of a public park that provides at least limited views of Lake Tahoe, as shown conceptually in the Streetscape Plan on page B-7 of the North Stateline Community Plan, at the west end of the casino core area near the intersection of SR 28 and CalNeva Drive.
NORTH STATELINE CASINO CORE SIGNAGE AND
STATE ROUTE 28 ROADWAY BEAUTIFICATION PACKAGE

The following is a list of improvements needed to attain the minimum satisfactory TRPA scenic
threshold rating for the casino core area of Roadway Unit 20 by the year 2007. The TRPA may
approve revisions to the list substituting equal or superior improvements at any time. The TRPA
shall review this list and schedule at each of its five year threshold evaluations, and make
necessary adjustments to ensure threshold attainment.

I. SIGN REDUCTION

All signs shall become provisionally conforming by January 1, 2002. Exhibit 1 indicates
sign changes that were considered in the evaluation. These are expected to be completed by
1997. Upon review of any sign project relying on the provisions of ____, a schedule for
compliance for the entire project area shall be submitted consistent with this paragraph.

II. SCENIC IMPROVEMENTS

A. Phase I Improvements
The following improvements should be completed by January 1, 2002.

- Replace the existing freestanding sign at the CalNeva Lodge with a new sign of
  approximately the same height and size. The new sign might feature a design that
  reflects the existing building sign above the main entrance. It should use natural-
  appearing materials and colors with light-colored letters against a darker
  background. It should consist of one main panel only and should not have additional
  smaller panels mounted on the same mast as the existing sign does.

- Install ten feet minimum sidewalks with 6 inch vertical curbs on each side of SR 28
  extending from Reservoir Drive to CalNeva Drive.

- Install bike lanes on both sides of SR 28.

- Install passenger drop-off pockets, as shown conceptually in the Streetscape Plan
  shown on page B-7 of the North Stateline Community Plan, in front of the Crystal
  Bay Club, Tahoe Biltmore, and Nugget Casino.

- Install street trees every 50 feet on average with shrub pockets every 25 feet on
  average.

- Install shrub borders or hedges that screen parking lots, e.g. the Tahoe Biltmore lot
  along SR 28.

- Install pedestrian-scale street lights.

- Install decorative pavers in plaza areas in front of the Tahoe Biltmore, Crystal Bay
  Club, and Nugget Casino.
• Install decorative pavers in the main crosswalk between the Tahoe Biltmore and Crystal Bay Club.

• Install benches, trash receptacles, and bus shelters at appropriate locations (to be determined).

• Landscape or develop the existing vacant property immediately east of and adjacent to the CalNeva Lodge entry road.

B. Phase II Improvements
The following improvements should be completed by January 1, 2007.

• Redevelop or rehabilitate the Tahoe Mariner site with special attention to the eastern end of the site and its visibility to west-bound motorists on SR 28.

• Remove overhead utility lines along SR 28 at the east and west end of the casino core area.

• Restore the White House, add sidewalks along the property frontage on CalNeva Drive, and landscape the grounds.

• Develop a public park that provides views of Lake Tahoe at the west end of the casino core area near the intersection of SR 28 and CalNeva Drive.
November 4, 1996

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Code Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, and Chapter 7 of the Goals and Policies, Implementation Element, to Establish 1997 Residential Allocations

Background: The existing table of residential allocations in the Goals and Policies Plan and Chapter 33 expires at the end of 1996. The 1996 Evaluation Report recommends adoption of additional residential allocations. However, since TRPA must still complete the adoption package for the 1996 Evaluation Report, staff proposes to amend the Goals and Policies and Chapter 33 to provide additional residential allocations for 1997 only, at this time. APC is requested to make a recommendation on the staff proposal.

Staff will present recommendations on residential allocations for 1998 to 2001 upon completion of the 1996 Evaluation Report.

Staff Recommendation: TRPA staff recommends the APC hold a public hearing, consider the following 1997 allocation table and attached plan and ordinance amendments (see Attachment A, adopting ordinance), and recommend adoption of the proposed amendments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed 1997</th>
<th>Last Year (1996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPUD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTSA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The attached draft plan and ordinance amendments in Exhibit A are substantially similar to the previous plan and ordinance provisions with two exceptions: 1) there is no carry over of allocations, and 2) provisions are made for jurisdictions with water supply and sewage treatment capacity problems.

Discussion: The proposed table is based on average annual allocations from the 1992 to 1996 table in Chapter 33. Those averages, in turn, reflect the relative proportions of vacant parcels in the Region. The proportion of allocations in the STFUD and TTSA service areas in El Dorado County also reflects the percentage of vacant parcels in those areas.

The proposed table results in no change in allocations from 1996. At this time, there is a question of remaining water supply capacity for Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) service area. IVGID is preparing a plan to correct the water supply problem (see Agenda Item VI.A.). Depending on the outcome, some or all of the 1997 allocations in the IVGID service area will be released.

With respect to the carry over of allocations, the Goals and Policies and the Code do not provide for a carry over after 1996. A choice was made with the 1991 Evaluation to allow for a carry over into the 1991-1996 allocations. The current proposal for 1996-2001 residential allocations (see Agenda Item VI.B.) does not recommend a carry over from the 1996 allocations. This is because there is currently a surplus of unused allocations - mostly in Douglas County and Placer County. In order to redistribute the allocations and promote transfer, the new system proposes a new concept in which unused allocations, including some of the carry over allocations, are assigned to an allocation pool open to all jurisdictions. Therefore, the proposed one year extension does not include a carry over provision.

Findings: Prior to amending the Goals and Policies and Chapter 33, Chapter 6 requires that certain findings be made. Those findings and brief rationales are as follows:

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 Regional Plan contemplates the orderly build out of the existing vacant residential parcels. The environmental documents for the 1986 Regional Plan, the Code, and the 1988 208 Plan assumed 300 residences per year as the annual rate of growth for purposes of assessing environmental impacts.
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Construction of the residences will be in conformance with the Code, the plan area statements and maps, and adopted mitigation programs. The limitation of the residential allocations to one year will provide further assurance that development will not outstrip development and implementation of offsetting mitigation programs.

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

**Rationale:** Based on the completion of the Article V(g) checklist and the rationale above, it may be concluded that the 1997 allocations 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:** See Finding 2, above.

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

**Rationale:** See Findings 1 and 2, above.

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

**Rationale:** See Findings 1 and 2, above.

**Environmental Documentation:** Based on the one year limitation, the water and sewer limitation, and the completion of an IEC, staff recommends a finding of no significant environmental effect.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 96-

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDNANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING THE REGIONAL PLAN OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY; AMENDING THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES SUBELEMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION ELEMENT OF THE GOALS AND POLICIES PLAN; AMENDING CHAPTER 33 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATING TO 1997 ALLOCATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO.

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

Section 1.00 Findings

1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, by amending, as a portion of the TRPA's Regional Plan, Goal #2 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Implementation Element, the Goals and Policies Plan; and to amend Chapter 33 of the Code of Ordinances in order to further implement the Regional Plan of the Agency, as amended, pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended.

1.20 Pursuant to Article V(a) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, the Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") conducted a noticed public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Implementation Element of the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing. At those hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

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

1.40 The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Section 6.4 of the and 6.5 Code and Article V(g) of the Compact. The Governing Board further finds that such findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record.

1.50 The amendments to the Goals and Policies Plan and Code adopted by this ordinance continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.
1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

**Section 2.00 Amendment of Chapter 33 of the Code**

2.10 Subsection 6.10 of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended to amend subparagraph (1) thereof to read as follows:

6.10 **Plan Document**

*Amended (1) Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Goals and Policies, September 17, 1986, as amended by Ordinance Nos. 88-6, 88-24, 89-3, 89-15, 90-8, 91-9, 91-21, ____________.*

2.20 **Goal #2, Development and Implementation Priorities**

Subelement, Implementation Element of the document entitled Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Goals and Policies, September 17, 1986, as amended, is hereby amended by the addition of Policy 7 as set forth below:

Goal #2, new Policy 7.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3.00 Amendment of Adopted Community Plans**

Chapter 33, Section 33.2 is hereby amended to delete the stricken language and add the underlined language as set forth in Exhibit A, dated November 4, 1996, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.
Section 4.00 Interpretation and Severability

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

Section 5.00 Effective Date

Section 2.00 of this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its adoption. Section 3.00 of this ordinance shall become effective 60 days after the date of its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held November 20, 1996, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

John E. Upton, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
CHAPTER 33

ALLOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

Chapter Contents

33.0 Purpose
33.1 Applicability
33.2 Allocation Of Additional Residential Units
33.3 Allocation Of Additional Commercial Floor Area
33.4 Allocation Of Additional Tourist Accommodation Units
33.5 Regulation Of Additional Public Service Facilities
33.6 Regulation Of Additional Recreation Facilities
33.7 Election Of Conversion Of Use
33.8 Other Permits

33.0 Purpose: This chapter sets forth the requirements for regulating the rate and timing of growth within the region. In conjunction with other provisions of this Code and the Goals and Policies, this chapter, through issuance of allocations, distributes, in an orderly fashion, growth and development within the confines of attainment and maintenance of the environmental thresholds. An allocation issued pursuant to this chapter does not give the recipient thereof a right to develop a project.

33.1 Applicability: No person shall construct a project or commence a use or activity, which requires an allocation unless an allocation is obtained in accordance with this chapter; the parcel is eligible to use an allocation; and the project is approved by TRPA. For purposes of this chapter, where the term "existing" is used it shall not include structures or facilities that have become derelict. (See Chapter 2.)

33.2 Allocation Of Additional Residential Units: TRPA shall allocate the development of additional residential units as follows:

33.2.A Requirement Of Allocation: No person shall construct a project or commence a use, which creates one or more additional residential units, without first receiving an allocation approved by TRPA. This requirement does not apply to affordable housing units approved after January 1, 1986, but shall apply to conversions of such affordable housing to nonaffordable status. In order to construct the project or commence the use, to which the allocation pertains, the recipient of the allocation shall comply with all other applicable provisions of this Code.
(1) **Applicable Residential Uses:** The following residential uses referred to in Chapter 18 contain residential units: secondary residences; employee housing; mobile home dwellings; multiple family dwellings; multi-person dwellings; nursing and personal care facilities; residential care facilities; single family dwellings; and summer homes.

(2) **Definition Of "Additional Residential Unit":** Residential unit is defined in Chapter 2. A residential unit is considered "additional" if it is to be created pursuant to a TRPA approval issued on or after January 1, 1986. The conversion of an existing nonresidential use to a residential use constituting a residential unit is an additional residential unit requiring an allocation under this chapter. The following are not "additional" residential units:

(a) The reconstruction or replacement, on the same parcel, of a residential unit legally existing on or approved before January 1, 1986;

(b) The reconstruction or replacement, on the same parcel, of a residential unit which was allocated and approved pursuant to this Code;

(c) Legally established additions and accessory uses to an existing residential structures, that do not create additional residential dwelling units;

(d) A residential unit constructed on a foundation, the use of which is authorized by Chapter 11.

(e) The relocation of residential units legally existing on January 1, 1986, other than mobile home dwellings, through a transfer approved by TRPA;

(f) The relocation of a legally established mobile home dwelling with existing water, sewer, and electrical services to a mobile home development or to a multi-family dwelling of five units or more, pursuant to a transfer approved by TRPA; or

(g) An existing, legally established mobile home pad with water, sewer and electrical services, whether or not a mobile home is located thereon.
(3) **Maximum Number Of Units And Distribution Of Allocations Among Jurisdictions:** From January 1, 1992 to December 31, 1997, a maximum of 2/800 100 additional residential units may be authorized to receive permits for construction. The allocation and distribution of these units shall be pursuant to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
<th>TTSA</th>
<th>STPUD</th>
<th>City of SLT</th>
<th>Placer County</th>
<th>Washoe County</th>
<th>Douglas County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) A total of 1600 additional multi-residential development rights shall be available for 20-year life of this Plan as bonus units in conjunction with transfer of development rights and/or other TRPA incentive programs designed to attain the goals and objectives of this Plan. Multi-residential units shall be subject to the foregoing allocation limitations.

(b) Unused allocations may be added to jurisdictions' allocations through 1997. Unused allocations from years previous to 1997 shall not be added to a jurisdiction's successive year's allocations.

(c) Allocations assigned to the City of South Lake Tahoe and the STPUD service area within El Dorado County may be assigned to parcels within either jurisdiction provided the sending jurisdiction approves the reassignment. Such reassignment shall not be considered an allocation transfer.
33.2.B Distribution And Administration Of Residential Allocations: Residential allocations shall be distributed and administered in accordance with the Goals and Policies, this Code, and the Rules of Procedure.

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

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

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

(c) A complete application for transfer of a reserved allocation shall be filed no later than June 1 of the year it was distributed.

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

(2) Distribution: Distribution of allocations, within the limits set in Subsection 33.2.A and consistent with subparagraph (1) above, shall be determined by the counties and city. If any county or city chooses not to distribute allocations within its jurisdiction, then TRPA shall distribute the allocations pursuant to an allocation system adopted by TRPA.

(a) Each county and the city shall notify TRPA, in writing, of its election to distribute allocations for a given year or years. Notification must be received by TRPA no later than December 31 of the preceding year. The Governing Board may waive this deadline for good cause.

(b) TRPA shall deliver allocations to the counties and city no later than January 15, of the year for which the allocations are reserved, or within 15 days of the effective date of an ordinance providing for residential allocations for that year, whichever is later.

(c) Allocations which are carried over from previous years shall be delivered to the counties and city within 15 days of a determination by TRPA that the allocations are unused and may be reissued.

(d) Delivery of allocations shall be accomplished by providing each county and city with the number of allocation forms which corresponds to the allocations available to each county and city in that year. The counties and city shall determine the receiving parcels pursuant to their respective allocation systems and shall indicate the assessor's parcel number (APN) of the receiving parcel on the allocation form. The counties and city shall provide TRPA with a list of assessor parcel numbers which received an allocation. The original allocation forms shall be delivered to the owner of record of the receiving parcel and shall, in addition to the list, constitute evidence of receipt of an allocation.

(e) TRPA shall number each allocation as follows:
(i) The first set of letters shall signify the county or city of origin (e.g., WA, DG, PL, EL, SLT);

(ii) The first set of numbers shall signify the year of issuance (e.g., 87, 88, 89, 90, 91);

(iii) The second set of letters shall signify the type of allocation (e.g., O for original, R for reissued, LS for litigation settlement);

(iv) The second set of numbers shall signify the sequence of the allocation (e.g., for Douglas County the sequence will be 1 through 23).

(Example PL - 87 - R - 56
County-Year-Type-Number)

(f) The counties and city shall notify each owner of a parcel receiving an allocation.

(g) In the event an allocation is returned or forfeited for any reason, the county or city shall notify TRPA by returning the original allocation form and requesting a reissued allocation for assignment to another parcel. If the original allocation form cannot be returned to TRPA, the county or city shall notify TRPA of the reason therefor, and the allocation shall be cancelled by depositing in the U. S. Mail, first class, postage prepaid, a notice of cancellation addressed to the last known address of the owner of the receiving parcel.

(3) Administration: An allocation shall entitle the owner of the receiving parcel to either apply for a TRPA permit to construct an additional residential unit or to transfer the allocation to another parcel pursuant to Chapter 34. Distribution of, and other transactions concerning allocations, shall be tracked, accounted for and otherwise treated in accordance with Chapter 38.

(a) Upon receipt of the allocation form from the county or city, the owner of the parcel may file an application with TRPA to either construct a residential unit or transfer the allocation. Failure to either file a complete application or complete a transfer by the deadlines set in subparagraphs (b) and (c) below, shall result in the forfeiture of the allocation to the county or city of origin.
(b) Except as set forth in Section 33.2.C, Multi-Residential Allocations, and subparagraph (d), below, complete applications for construction of additional residential units shall be filed with TRPA no later than December 31 of the year in which the allocation was distributed.

(c) Transfer of allocations shall be complete no later than December 31, of the year in which the allocation was distributed. Transfers of allocations shall be deemed complete when the applicant has received a TRPA notice of eligibility for the transfer and the original allocation form has been signed by the owners of the transferor and transferee parcels, the county or city which issued the allocation, and TRPA. The signatures of the receiving and sending county or city shall be required for intercounty transfers.

(d) Upon transfer of an allocation, a complete application for an additional residential unit shall be filed no later than June 1 of the year after the issuance of the allocation. Failure to file a complete application by June 1 shall result in the forfeiture of the allocation to the city or county of origin.
November 4, 1996

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary Between Plan Area 057, Spooner Lake (Recreation), and Plan Area 060, Genoa Peak (Conservation), to relocate Douglas County APNs 01-130-09, -12, -13, -14, and -16 from Plan Area 057 to Plan Area 060 or Plan Area 061

Proposed Action: This item has been continued from the October Advisory Planning Commission meeting.

The proposed amendment by the property owners & TRPA staff is a modification of the TRPA Plan Area Statement Maps for Plan Area 057 Spooner Lake (Recreation), and Plan Area 060 Genoa Peak (Conservation). The proposal is to relocate five (5) Douglas County parcels located east of and adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 (See Attachment A & B for existing and proposed amendment) into PAS 060 and to create a Special Area #1 encompassing all of said parcels. The purpose of Special Area #1 is to make single family dwellings an allowed use and to establish scenic mitigation requirements (See Exhibit C for Special Policy #6).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC recommend adoption of the plan area statement amendment to the Governing Board.

Background: Staff met with the affected property owners to work out a solution per the APC’s direction. The proposed amendment is a modification of the TRPA Plan Area boundary between 057 Spooner Lake Recreation and 060 Genoa Peak Conservation. The amendment will move Douglas County APN 01-130-09, -12, -13, -14, and -16, into PAS 060 and create a Special Area #1 encompassing all of the parcels within PAS 060. The amendment will make single family dwellings an allowed use within Special Area #1 and will establish a scenic mitigation package for Special Area #1 which will include setbacks and vegetative screening.

Currently, TRPA does not recognize parcel 01-130-16 as a legal lot of record. Parcel 01-130-16 was created through a lot line merger that joined parcel 01-130-10 and -11 (see Exhibit D) to create -16. Although the merger is recorded by the Douglas County Assessor, it required TRPA review and approval, which did not occur. Prior to any project being approved on this parcel, the applicant will have to submit an application for a lot line adjustment. Exhibit D illustrates the legal lot of record recognized by TRPA.

JH: Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
The proposal to move the subject parcels into PAS 061, a residential plan area will not be pursued. Staff has made a determination that an error in mapping did not occur. Amending the PAS 061 boundary is considered a expansion to an existing urban boundary. In order to expand the urban plan boundary the applicant must make the 13.7.D(2)(b) finding. The applicant would have to submit a environmental mitigation package that would make progress toward one or more environmental thresholds without degradation to other thresholds as measured by the Chapter 32 indicators. Due to the cost of preparing such a mitigation package the applicant has decided not to pursue this option.

The parcels are currently zoned for recreational uses by TRPA and agriculture/residential uses by Douglas County. Under TRPA's land use classification, residential uses are not permissible in PAS 057, but are a special use in PAS 060. Moving the parcels into PAS 060 will place these parcels into a land use classification consistent with county zoning. Of the five parcels listed, three parcels are in private ownership and two are legal lots of record as of 1976 and have development rights. The third private parcel is tied to the lakeside parcel. The remaining two are in public ownership. The applicant has brought it to TRPA's attention that, because the lots were legally existing prior to the adoption of the Regional Plan and were in private ownership, they should have been included in a plan area that allowed single family development.

Prior to the adoption of the Regional Plan, the parcels were zoned General Forest. The provisions for General Forest did not allow for residential uses except in cases where the parcel was an existing lot of record as of February 10, 1972. Using this criteria, both private parcels qualified for one single family dwelling unit prior to the adoption of the Regional Plan.

Staff initially proposed to amend the boundary to add the parcels into PAS 060, where single family residential would be classified as a special use, requiring special use findings. The applicants have expressed concerns over having to make special use findings and the time and cost of having to get Governing Board approval.

Given the concerns raised by the applicants regarding the special use findings and the fact that the residential use is limited to only those privately owned parcels in the proposed Special Area #1, staff supports treating single family uses as the special area, single family uses allowed uses, limited to one dwelling unit per parcel (see Attachment C). In addition, prior to the approval of any project within Special Area #1, an approved TRPA scenic mitigation package will be required. The mitigation may include appropriate setbacks and vegetative screening.
Required Findings: The following must be made prior to adopting the proposed amendments:

A. Chapter 13 Findings:

1. Findings: The amendment is substantially consistent with the plan area designation criteria in Subsections 13.5.B and 13.5.C.

Rationale: The proposed plan amendment will bring five parcels into a Conservation land use designation. Conservation lands are areas with values as primitive and natural areas, with strong environmental limitations on land use. Two of the five parcels to be brought into the conservation plan area have already been set aside for conservation purposes (in public ownership).

The management strategy, Mitigation, will not change with the reclassification of the subject parcels.

The planning statements of the two plan areas are similar in design with the areas being managed for low level resource use with special emphasis on the protection of water and visual qualities. The proposed plan amendment is consistent with the general planning direction for the plan area.

B. Chapter 6 Findings:

1. Findings: 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 bring five parcels, two of which are private parcels with development rights into a plan area that allows single family dwellings as a permissible use. Currently the parcels are in PAS 057, a Recreation plan area that does not allow single family dwellings. Both private parcels are served by the Tahoe-Douglas Sewer District. As stated in the Chapter 13 findings, the two plan areas are similar in design with both having limitations on uses. Surrounding lands in this area have been set aside for conservation uses and the amendment will bring lands with conservation characteristics into a conservation land use.
2. Finding: That the project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The two private parcels each have a development right and are considered buildable based on IPES scores. Any project proposed due to the amendment will still be required to meet all aspects of the Regional Plan and Code, such as basic services requirements. A special policy will be added to PAS 060 that will require an approved scenic mitigation package prior to the approval of any project in Special Area #1. The package may include, but not be limited to, setbacks and vegetative screening.

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: Any new development will continue to be subject to the Regional Plan Package, Plan Area Statements, 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 (FONSI). As discussed above, the amendment will bring two private parcels with development rights and buildable IPES scores into a plan area that classifies single family residence as a permissible use. As part of the mitigation package, TRPA will require an approved scenic mitigation package prior to the approval of any projects in Special Area #1.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 589-4547.
060 -- GENOA PEAK

PLAN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification
CONSERVATION

Management Strategy
MITIGATION

Special Designation
NONE

DESCRIPTION:

Location: The Genoa Peak Plan Area includes the undeveloped back country area extending from Logan Shoals to Zephyr Cove and east to the Basin boundary. The boundaries of this Plan Area are depicted on TRPA maps H-11, H-12, H-13, H-14, H-15, H-16, and the Glenbrook and South Lake Tahoe Quadrangles.

Existing Uses: Highway 50 closely parallels the lake through this area. Public lands along a short stretch of the highway in the area north of Cave Rock provide access to the shorezone for sightseers, hikers, and fishermen. Dirt roads leading from Daggett Pass and paralleling the Basin boundary provide some off-highway vehicle use and opportunities for cross country skiing and hiking. There are private parcels in the planning area, but most remain undeveloped. Most of the planning area is managed for primitive recreation by the USFS.

Existing Environment: The majority of this planning area is undeveloped and classified as high hazard. Dominant plant communities include mature stands of mixed conifer fir, Basin sagebrush, willow, and manzanita. One of only two known active osprey nest sites in Nevada is located in this Plan Area. Shorezone tolerance districts are 3 and 5.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should be managed for low level resource use with special management emphasis on the protection of water and visual qualities.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Dirt roads lack significant improvements and contribute to localized erosion problems.
2. There is no public right-of-way on the south end of Genoa Peak Road.
3. The area serves as a scenic backdrop as viewed from the lake and highway corridor
4. This area serves as the headwater to seven small streams.
5. Snowmobile use in the area creates local nuisances to nearby residences.
6. The Agency Wildlife Map identifies goshawk habitat and deer migration routes in this Plan Area. Agency and USFS personnel have identified an active osprey nest site in this area.
7. The proposed Highway 50 bypass is located in the southern portion of this Plan Area.
8. Scenic Roadway Units 29 and 30 are within this Plan Area.
SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Some dirt roads in the planning area should have seasonal closures.

2. No snowmobile or off-road vehicle courses should be designated within the roadless area which is reserved for semiprimitive nonmotorized recreation.

3. Trail systems and a trailhead should be established and managed with routine maintenance.

4. The U.S. Forest Service should continue to study the wilderness potential of the Lincoln Creek Roadless Area.

5. High priority should be given to restoration of disturbed lands with management emphasis on watershed protection.

6. Prior to the approval of any new projects in Special Area #1, a TRPA approved scenic mitigation package that includes setbacks and vegetative screening shall be prepared to minimize scenic impacts.

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

- Domestic animal raising (S), single family dwelling (S), and summer homes (S).

Public Service

- Pipelines and power transmission (S), local public health and safety facilities (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), and transportation routes (S).

Recreation

- Day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), undeveloped campgrounds (A), off-road vehicle courses (S), snowmobile courses (S), beach recreation (A), and boat launching facilities (S).

Resource Management

- Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), selection cut (A), special cut (S), thinning (A), timber stand improvement (A), tree farms (S), 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), farm/ranch accessory structures (S), grazing (S), range pasture management (S), range improvement (S), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (A), insect and disease suppression (A), prescribed fire management (A), sensitive plant management (A), uncommon plant community management (A), erosion control (A), runoff control (A), and SEZ restoration (A).
Special Area #1: The following list of permissible uses is applicable in Special Area #1. (see Special Policy #6)

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

**Residential**

Single family dwelling (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 Districts 3 and 5**

**Primary Use**

Beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (S), safety and navigational devices (A), salvage operations (A), and water borne transit (A).

**Accessory Structures**

Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (A), breakwaters or jetties (S), shoreline protective structures (S), floating docks and platforms (A), 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>Summer Homes</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</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, except in the Lincoln Park roadless area where it is 25 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 50 corridor is 65 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:** Trailhead and 25 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 18 of Volume I of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

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

PLAN DESIGNATION:

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

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area includes Logan Shoals Marina, the Logan Creek Subdivision and other private uses such as Camp Galilee. The boundaries of this area are depicted on TRPA maps H-11 and H-12.

Existing Uses: The area is low density residential with one marina. This area is 40 percent built out.

Existing Environment: 90 percent of the area is high hazard, and ten percent is SEZ or moderate hazard. The shorezone tolerance district is 3 with prime fish habitats. The land coverage is 20 percent plus an additional 25 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue as residential with opportunities provided for maintaining recreational opportunities along the shorezone.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. The Logan Shoals marina lacks significant BMP improvements including drainage and sewage pump-out facilities.
2. Dirt roads are the only improvements to Logan Creek Unit 2.
3. Scenic Roadway Unit 29 and Scenic Shoreline Unit 26 are within this Plan Area.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The marina should be brought up to BMP standards including improvements to the fueling system and provision of pump-out facilities.
2. No development in Logan Creek Unit 2 should be permitted pending resolution of the subdivision status and improvements. TDR of development out of this area is the preferred solution.
3. New commercial uses are limited to the existing marina site (Special Area #1).

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 a Special Area #1).
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), and public utility centers (S).

Recreation
Participant sports facilities (S), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), rural sports and group facilities (S), 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 run-off 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:

Commercial
Eating and drinking places (S).

Recreation
Marinas (S).

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 3
Primary Uses
Safety and navigational devices (A) and salvage operations (A).

Accessory Structures
Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), shoreline protective structures (S), floating docks and platforms (A), and water intake lines (S).

Tolerance District 5
Primary Uses
Beach recreation (A), safety and navigational devices (A), water oriented outdoor recreation concessions (S), tour boat operations (S), marinas (S), boat launching facilities (S), construction equipment storage (S), salvage operations (A), and water borne transit (S).

Accessory Structures
Buoys (A), piers (A), fences (S), boat ramps (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), shoreline protective structures (S), floating docks and platforms (A), and water intake lines (S).
Tolerance District 8

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), structures (S), breakwaters or jetties (S), shoreline protective structures (S), floating docks and platforms (A), 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>
</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 55 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 50 corridor is 65 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 Surface Water Quality Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 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.)
MEMORANDUM

November 1, 1996

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

This item is an ongoing issue that is placed on the APC agenda each month throughout the comment period which has been extended to January 31, 1997.

For the last six months, TRPA staff, along with 24 other representatives of public and private interests, have been working in a partnership to gain consensus on the difficult issues highlighted in the Shorezone DEIS. The Shorezone Partnership Committee meets twice a month for all-day facilitated sessions.

Please contact John Hoole at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.

AGENDA ITEM V.D.
Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
October 28, 1996

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Status Report on Water Rights and Usage in the Washoe County Portion of the Tahoe Basin

Proposed Action: This is an informational item and requires no action; however, staff would appreciate any comments or suggestions.

Background: The TRPA Regional Plan has policies and regulations that prohibit approval of development that is not consistent with state water law. A recent letter (Attachment A) from the Nevada Division of Water Resources indicates there may be such a conflict in the portion of Washoe County serviced by the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID).

The basic issue is that IVGID is pumping water near or over its permitted water rights. For calendar years 1994 and 1995, IVGID reported pumping 4,061 and 3,895 acre feet respectively. The amount permitted by the State of Nevada’s Division of Water Resources is 3,905 acre-feet annually. As noted in the attached letter, the State Engineer is concerned about future development and is considering not approving any new land divisions. The State Engineer has requested that IVGID respond to a list of questions. TRPA staff has requested that a representative of the State Engineer’s office make a presentation at the Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board meetings to explain the issue and report on the progress in resolving the problem.

TRPA has made some inquiries to IVGID about the water issue since it does impact TRPA project and subdivision review. It also affects future planning decisions such as allocations and plan amendments. Attachment B is a response letter from IVGID acknowledging the water rights problem. IVGID indicates they have enough capacity for this year’s single family applications, but other applicants will have to commit to providing water rights, transferable to IVGID, in the amount equal to their projected annual water demand. TRPA staff has also requested that a representative from IVGID attend the meetings.
Memorandum to Advisory Planning Commission  
Status Report on Water Rights and Usage in the  
Washoe County Portion of the Tahoe Basin  
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Although TRPA cannot regulate interstate waters, it has specific regulations regarding approving development that is inconsistent with water right limitations. Attachment C is an excerpt of Goal #2, of the Public Service and Facilities Element of the Goals and Policies Plan. Attachment D an excerpt of Chapter 27 of the Code that applies to projects and subdivisions.

TRPA Response: At this point, TRPA is awaiting the State Engineer’s final determination. For the short term, TRPA is accepting IVGID’s representation that adequate capacity exists for the remainder of the year for single family dwellings. Since all unused allocations expire at the end of 1996, TRPA will need to address this issue as part of the 1997-2001 plus allocations and the threshold review process.

Regarding other projects and subdivisions, TRPA intends to require proof of adequate water capacity on a project-by-project basis. Because of the complexity of the water right issue, TRPA will request the State Engineer’s assistance in making the findings required by the Regional Plan.

As to Regional Plan amendments and allocations, TRPA is required by the Compact and the Regional Plan to address the impacts and provide mitigation.

In the long-term, assuming the problem is verified as expected, the solution will require a partnership approach with TRPA, the Nevada State Engineer, IVGID, Washoe County, and the Incline community. Some options that may be pursued include:

1. Obtain Additional Water Rights: IVGID or the applicants could obtain additional water rights which would be transferred from somewhere else in the Region.

2. Reduce System Leaks: IVGID has represented that approximately 18 percent of the water is lost between the pumps and service meters. IVGID could continue or increase programs to fix the water lines.

3. Implement Water Conservation: IVGID has opportunities to reduce water usage, especially in the area of outdoor use.

4. Change Measurement System: The current negotiations on the Truckee River Operating Agreement propose to measure usage at the water meter for jurisdictions that are 100 percent metered. Also, there is a proposed discount for snow making.

5. Regulation: Currently development regulations require basic services and allocation systems that link development to infrastructure progress. There are limited options in this area.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.
Daniel M. St. John, P.E.
Director of Engineering
Incline Village General
Improvement District
893 Southwood Boulevard
Incline Village, Nevada 89451

Dear Mr. St. John:

The review of your letter dated July 12, 1996, indicated that previous production meter data submitted to the Division of Water Resources may not have been consistent with data collected by this agency. This is a cause of great concern since IVGID's pumping is close to, if not exceeding, the amount permitted by the State Engineer. It was stated in the letter that the discrepancy was in the production meter readings at Burnt Cedar pump station. The discrepancy was that the production meter readings previously reported were 28.3% lower than the actual amount being pumped.

Subsequent telephone conversations with you and your letter of July 31, 1996, which identified a list of 286 units under construction only added to that concern. This concern extends to the point that the State Engineer is considering not signing additional subdivision maps or approval of parcel maps as it relates to water quantity.

The total production of IVGID for calendar years 1994 and 1995 was 4,061 and 3,899 acre-feet, respectively. The total amount permitted to IVGID is 3,905.80 acre-feet annually. Realizing your water audit showed that your "authorized" uses for 1994 and 1995 was 3,241 and 3,210 acre-feet, respectively, this agency looks at total production only when comparing that to the permitted amount. The two audits for the same years identified water losses as being 101 acre-feet in 1994 and 622 acre-feet in 1995. This appears to be a rather large increase in only one year since leakage is normally constant.
Your "Plan of Water Conservation" submitted to the Nevada Division of Water Planning in May 1992 was reviewed by that agency and found to be in compliance with S.B. 360. The plan did call for a leak detection and repair program to be put into place. Your interpretation of this leak detection lead you to mention in your letter of July 31, 1996, that the provisions of PL 101-618, more specific Section 204(b)(2)(C)(i), should apply in this instance. Since this settlement is not finalized and, therefore, not yet in place, I believe it is not relevant in this matter.

I am requesting certain items be submitted for this agency's review prior to consideration of additional subdivisions or parcel map approvals:

1. Please explain the reason for the difference between the identified losses in the years 1994 and 1995.

2. A statement that the list of new units under construction submitted in your July 12, 1996 letter, is indeed all inclusive. I make this request since there are only a few types other than dwelling units on that list.

3. A list of commitments, separate from item 2, in already approved subdivision or parcel maps not yet built or under construction.

4. The amount of water used on an average basis for each type of use, i.e., single family unit.

5. Resulting from items 2 and 3, the estimated amount of water to be used by those listed as an outstanding commitment for each new unit.

This office is willing to meet with you at mutual convenience, if you wish, to further discuss this matter.

Very Truly Yours,

[Signature]

Hugh Ricci, P.E.
Deputy State Engineer

HR/bk
cc: R. Michael Turnipseed
    Peter G. Morros
    Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
    Washoe County Comprehensive Planning
Mr. Rick Angelocci  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
775 North 700 West  
Salt Lake City, Utah  84116-2383

RE:  Blanket Will Serve - Single Family Residential

Dear Rick:

At the suggestion of Lyn Barnett, IVGID offers this letter to confirm that we have the capacity to provide water and sewer service to new single family residential projects within our existing general improvement district boundary. This statement shall not apply unilaterally to other projects such as commercial or multi-family residential. We will require such other projects to commit to providing water rights, transferable to IVGID, in the amount equal to their projected annual water demand.

We are currently evaluating our status with respect to water rights. Last calendar year, our total diversion for potable water supply was approximately 100 acre feet (AF) less than our total water rights 4,018.16 AF. This does not take into account water rights filed for snow making of 350 AF nor does it take into account the relatively low consumptive use of snow making demand. In addition, we are in discussions with the Nevada State Engineer relative to the applicability of federal public law 101-618 entitled "Fallon Paiute Shoshone Indian Tribes Water Rights Settlement Act of 1990". The Act stipulates that public water purveyors at Lake Tahoe can calculate diversions as the total "metered sales" as opposed to the total diverted from the Lake under certain circumstances. Obviously, this provision would reduce our "diversion" by the amount of our water leaks and other system losses which for us was about 18 percent last year. Although these considerations have not been fully resolved, they do point to the conclusion that IVGID does not face serious water shortages.
Therefore, we have concluded that we can continue to serve single family residential projects that may apply for new service through the end of this year's grading season. Please feel free to call me if you have any questions on this matter. I would ask you to include a copy of this letter in the project files of those single family residential that need to rely on this commitment.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Daniel M. St. John, P.E.
Director of Engineering

DMS/rb

cc: Roger Eggenberg
    Pat Finnigan
REDUCE WATER CONSUMPTION. EXISTING DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE RETROFITTED WITH WATER CONSERVATION DEVICES ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS IN CONJUNCTION WITH A PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM OPERATED BY THE UTILITY DISTRICTS.

Water conservation will be necessary to comply with the limits of the California-Nevada Compact (1969). The ability of the water purveyors in the Region to provide adequate water for domestic and other uses depends on water conservation programs. Coordination involving water issues should be pursuant to local, state, and federal law.

GOAL #2

CONSIDER THE EXISTENCE OF ADEQUATE AND RELIABLE PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES IN APPROVING NEW DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE PLAN.

To prevent the over-burdening of public services and facilities, all new development approvals consistent with the development priorities and the planning area statements also should consider the adequacy of services and facilities. It also will be necessary to monitor the ability of utility districts and other entities to provide public services and facilities.

POLICIES

1. **NO ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIRING WATER SHOULD BE ALLOWED IN ANY AREA UNLESS IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT THERE IS ADEQUATE WATER SUPPLY WITHIN AN EXISTING WATER RIGHT.**

This policy is necessary to prevent conflicts from arising between approved development and state water law. Conditional approvals may be appropriate in situations where the existence of a water right is uncertain.


It will be impossible to assess compliance with the California-Nevada Compact without a regular monitoring program. Such a program should be a cooperative venture of TRPA, the states, and the water purveyors.

3. **NO ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIRING WATER SHALL BE ALLOWED IN ANY AREA UNLESS THERE EXISTS ADEQUATE STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS TO DELIVER AN ADEQUATE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF WATER FOR DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION AND FIRE PROTECTION.**

The simple existence of a water supply does not, by itself, guarantee the ability of the water purveyor to deliver adequate quantities of good-quality water for domestic consumption and fire protection. These aspects are most commonly a function of system design, involving the distribution and storage of water. System design should take into account peak demands and necessary fire flows, pursuant to local, state, federal and utility district standards or Agency standards where no other standards apply.
27.3 Water Service: All projects described in Section 27.1 shall have adequate water rights and water supply systems.

27.3.A Water Rights: Additional development requiring water shall not be approved unless:

(1) There is an adequate water supply within an existing water right recognized under the laws of the state in which the use is to occur; or

(2) Adequate water rights recognized under the laws of the state in which the use is to occur are furnished with the development.

27.3.B Water Supply: Additional development requiring water shall not be approved unless there is distribution and storage or pumping systems to deliver an adequate quantity and quality of water to the development for domestic consumption and fire protection. A service connection to a water system or an approved well system shall be sufficient for domestic consumption.

(1) Fire Flow Requirements: The applicable local, state, federal or utility district standards shall determine adequate fire flow standards. If no such standards exist, the following standards shall apply:

TABLE 27-1

MINIMUM FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>FIRE FLOW (gallons per minute at 20 psi residual pressure)</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Conservation and Recreation Plan Areas (minimum)</td>
<td>250 gpm</td>
<td>2 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Residential Plan Areas (single family only)</td>
<td>500 - 750 gpm</td>
<td>2 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Residential Plan Areas (multi-residential)</td>
<td>750 - 1000 gpm</td>
<td>2 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Tourist Plan Areas</td>
<td>1000 - 1500 gpm</td>
<td>2 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Commercial/Public Service Plan Areas</td>
<td>1500 - 2500 gpm</td>
<td>2 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Hotel - Casino Areas</td>
<td>3500 - 6000 gpm</td>
<td>3 to 6 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Institutional (Hospitals, Schools)</td>
<td>2000 - 3000 gpm</td>
<td>3 Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 1, 1996

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Report on Future Commercial and Residential Allocations

Proposed Action: No action is required on this item. This is a report on the progress to create a preferred alternative for future commercial and residential growth. As part of the 1996 Threshold Evaluation Environmental Assessment, there will be public hearings on allocation proposals at the December Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board meetings.

Background: In May, TRPA staff presented a scope of work for the 1996 Threshold Evaluation Environmental Assessment (EA). It contained three alternatives. Staff indicated that we plan to work with interested parties to develop a preferred alternative that could be included in the EA if consensus could be reached. The Governing Board requested this matter be agendized in July for their consideration and approved continuance of the process.

A major concern for the EA alternatives has been future residential and commercial development. Thus, the focus of this memorandum and the working groups has been on those two subjects. It should be noted that the preferred alternative also addresses other issues such as the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), threshold attainment, and mitigation.

TRPA staff formed residential and commercial working groups. Each group met many times throughout the summer and fall. The latest working drafts (Attachments A and B) are included for informational purposes. The two groups represent a broad interest (see Attachment C) and have been very helpful in developing the basic concepts.

For the December meetings, TRPA staff will draft the necessary implementation language for consideration in a public hearing. The draft 1996 Threshold Evaluation Report will call for the adoption of these or similar allocation systems.

If you have any questions please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547.

GWB/rd

AGENDA ITEM VI.B.

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL ALLOCATION SYSTEM

I. TOTAL ALLOCATIONS: The commercial allocation for the Region will be 400,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor area and 200 tourist bonus units for the next ten years. This is in addition to the 300,000 plus sq. ft. and 200 units of unused 1987 - 97 allocations.

A. At the 2001 Threshold Evaluation or upon use of:

1. the first 100,000 sq. ft. of the CP/outside CP allocation or
2. the 150,000 sq.ft. of Special Project allocation and 100 units of the tourist bonus units,

the distribution of the remaining 150,000 sq.ft. of commercial allocations and the remaining 100 tourist bonus units will be considered.

B. The 200 additional tourist bonus units for Special Projects will be converted from the residential bonus pool and will be available only when matched by a transfer from sensitive land that has been restored.


III. OUTSIDE CP ALLOCATIONS: The outside community plan program and allocations will be extended to 2007.

IV. DISTRIBUTION OF ALLOCATION: The additional 400,000 sq. ft. of commercial allocations and 200 tourist bonus units will be distributed as follows:

A. 100,000 sq.ft. for CPs and Outside CPs. This allocation is governed by the existing allocation rules in Chapter 33 and the adopted community plans.

1. Beginning in 1997, 50,000 sq.ft. of allocation will be given to local jurisdictions to re-supply adopted CP areas and outside CP areas. Each jurisdiction will receive 10,000 sq.ft. to distribute if all community plan irrevocable commitments for that jurisdiction have been met. Allocation not qualified for shall be transferred to the Special Project pool.

2. In 1999, the remaining 50,000 sq.ft. will be distributed by TRPA based on a ranking comparison of the accomplishment of environmental improvements set forth in the community plans of that jurisdiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. 150,000 sq. ft. and 100 Bonus Units for Special Projects. The majority of the commercial allocations and all of the additional tourist bonus units will be given to a special projects pool administered by TRPA.

C. 150,000 sq. ft. and 100 Bonus Tourist Units Reserved for Future Distribution

V. SPECIAL PROJECTS: The Special Project Program goal is to promote major projects that result in the construction of threshold related environmental improvements, promote transfer of development that result in environmental benefits, and rehabilitate substandard development. This program will utilize the following concepts:

A. Eligibility: It will be open to major projects (includes assessment districts) in all jurisdictions

B. Evaluation Criteria: Projects will be judged (and conditioned) on construction of actual environmental projects that:
   1. Assist in the attainment of the environmental threshold carrying capacities by constructing projects such as the ones listed in the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (or equal or superior type projects).
   2. Are beyond the normal project and mitigation requirements of TRPA.
   3. Encourage the transfer of development from sensitive areas.

C. Location Criteria: As a first priority, the environmental improvements should be located in the jurisdiction for which the allocation is issued.

D. Public Assistance: Public-private partnerships are encouraged. Public assistance through redevelopment agencies, Tahoe Conservancy, local governments, and other such means can be considered in evaluating the proposed projects. Public projects that would happen anyway will not be counted for credit.

E. Maximum Amount: The maximum amount any project may acquire is 50,000 square feet of commercial allocation and 100 tourist bonus units.

F. Time Limit: Initial awards of allocations will expire in one year unless extended by TRPA upon a demonstration of diligent pursuit.

G. Applications: In July of each year (if allocations remain), TRPA will consider applications for the allocations. TRPA shall give appropriate notice of the availability of the allocations.
   1. Applications will include a project prospectus that includes site plans and elevations and preliminary environmental documentation.
   2. Notification will include the general criteria by which the projects will be judged.

H. Outside CP Areas: The following special findings will be required for projects located outside CP areas.
   1. The project is in an area where commercial is or should be concentrated and is easily served by transit.
   2. The nature and intensity of uses proposed is demonstrably consistent with the achievement of VMT reduction policies of the TRPA.
   3. The project will not encourage the maintenance or exacerbation of strip commercial development.

VI. CONVERSION OF USE: TRPA will permit conversion of existing tourist units to residential units and existing residential units to tourist units on a one unit for one unit basis. There can be no adverse impact on affordable housing resulting from the conversion. These conversions will be limited to special circumstances such as:

A. Transfers: Transfers from sensitive lands to nonsensitive lands with complete retirement and restoration of the parcel.

B. Conversions: Conversions from nonconforming use to conforming use with construction that meets standards for new development.
VII. SENSITIVE LANDS: TRPA will develop special criteria for transfers of allocations to sensitive lands.

A. Commercial Allocations. Allocations may be permitted in sensitive lands if:
1. matched by transfer of existing floor area from a like sensitive land on a one sq. ft. of transfer to two sq. ft. of allocation basis, or
2. in CPs where at least one SEZ restoration project has been completed and the local jurisdiction has submitted a CIP list pursuant to the residential allocation system.

B. Transfers. Existing units of use may be transferred to sensitive lands if:
1. there is a 25 percent reduction in land coverage onsite and no expansion in vehicle trips, parking, cubic volume of structures or other impacts, or
2. the transfer is from sensitive lands to like sensitive lands inside community plan areas.
3. the transfer of commercial floor area from nonsensitive lands to sensitive lands results in a restoration of like sensitive lands on a ratio of 1 sq.ft. of floor area requires removal and restoration of 2 sq.ft. of land coverage.

VIII. INDUSTRIAL/STORAGE PROVISIONS: TRPA will develop provisions to encourage location, relocation, and retention of storage/industrial facilities in CP or PAS designated industrial incentive areas. The floor area for commercial uses shall be calculated at half of the requirements of Chapter 33. Projects in these incentive areas with area-wide BMPs in place will only require half the normal amount required through allocation or transfer. However, if any floor area is transferred out of the incentive area, regardless if area-wide BMPs are in place, it will count at half the normal amount.

Local governments and TRPA at public hearings will consider designation of industrial incentive areas such as: Meyers CP industrial area, South Wye CP industrial area, Tahoe Vista CP National Ave., Kings Beach Industrial CP, Ponderosa CP, and Kingsbury CP Shady Lane.

IX. BANKING: TRPA should allow the banking of environmental credits with bonuses for tear downs. Environmental improvements occurring on a parcel that are not otherwise required by mitigation or by law maybe documented in a project file for consideration in approval of future projects on the parcel.

X. INCENTIVES: Create incentives to develop in CP areas (like the SLT enterprise zones). TRPA will develop streamlined procedures inside CP areas and give priority to processing CP projects. Also TRPA will develop mitigation fee accounts based on completed mitigation projects in lieu of the requirement to do actual projects.

XI. STREAMLINING: Reduce processing cost and speed up the processing time.
PROPOSED 1997-2001 RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATION SYSTEM

I. ALLOCATIONS: The existing allocations for the Region (300 per year) will be continued for the next five years. Starting in 1998 the individual jurisdiction’s allocations may be adjusted based on audits.

A. The local jurisdictions will continue to distribute the allocations.

B. The initial distribution of allocations for 1997 will be based on the current distribution of allocations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. There will be no carry-over from the previous allocation system.

II. GOALS: The allocation system will promote environmental improvements, transfers of development from sensitive lands, and MOU compliance.

III. PERFORMANCE REVIEW: In October of 1997, TRPA shall review the local jurisdiction progress on all the items in V. Review Criteria except V.A.2. For V.A.2, a review committee of local jurisdiction and TRPA representatives will commence the review in October of 1998 and for each two year period there after. The committee will review the performance of the permit issuing authorities (local jurisdictions and TRPA). TRPA Governing Board will then consider, in a November public hearing, allocations for the following year. The allocation review will be coordinated with IPES review criteria. For items where the local jurisdiction does not have an MOU, TRPA performance will be judged.

IV. LIMIT ON ADJUSTMENT: The annual audit/review will limit annual changes in allocations to 10 percent of the initial allocation.
V. REVIEW CRITERIA: The annual review will be based on the following environmental performance criteria:

A. Compliance

1. Permit Tracking: Prior to November 1, 1997, there will be a requirement to implement a direct "real time" reporting system to TRPA featuring computer issued permits that require permit information inputs before the acceptance of an application and the issuance of the permit. Delays caused by TRPA shall not require a reduction in allocations for participating jurisdictions. Failure by the local jurisdiction with an MOU (or TRPA for jurisdictions without an MOU) shall require a 10 percent reduction for the entire allocation period and a five percent (non-cumulative) reduction for each year after that entity fails to comply.

2. Permit Monitoring: Starting November 1, 1998, there will be an audit (10 percent random sampling) of permits issued by TRPA and local jurisdictions that addresses IPES criteria, permit review, and field inspections. A rating of less than 70 percent compliance for the local jurisdiction with an MOU (or TRPA for jurisdictions without a MOU) on the audit will result in a five percent a year reduction for the next two years. A rating of 70 percent or more will maintain or restore allocations permitted under this section.

B. Water Quality Improvements

1. Water Quality CIP: Prior to October 1, 1997, each local jurisdiction will be required to have a five year CIP list found to be consistent with the EIP Priority List and the 1996 Water Quality Threshold Interim Target. This will be updated each year and will be the same list used for mitigation fee releases. Failure by the local jurisdiction to submit a five year CIP list by October of 1997 shall result in 10 percent reduction in allocations for the entire allocation period. For each year thereafter of noncompliance, there will be a five percent reduction (non-cumulative) for the following year. Attainment of CIP performance targets shall result in a 5 percent bonus allocation (if available) for the following year.

2. Maintenance: Each local jurisdiction will demonstrate that adequate funding has been included in their budget for maintenance of their BMP facilities. Failure to achieve the target maintenance budget will result in a five percent reduction in allocations for the following year. Achievement of the budgeted amount or more will maintain or restore allocations permitted under this section.

C. Monitoring

1. WQ Monitoring: Each jurisdiction will contribute $85 for each allocation issued for the IPES water quality monitoring program. Failure to comply will result in a five percent reduction (non-cumulative) in the following year.
VI. **BMP RETROFIT PROGRAM:** The BMP Retrofit Program allocation criteria will be developed in partnership with the local jurisdictions.

A. Prior to Jan. 1, 1998, each local jurisdiction will join a cooperative program and provide special permitting procedures that streamline BMP implementation.

B. TRPA shall pursue a 208 Plan amendment to permit an additional 200 sq.ft. of land coverage on residential parcels:
   1. if the coverage is placed in land capability 4-7 or IPES 726+ classified lands,
   2. if a qualified exempt form is submitted to TRPA for minor structural (coverage for non-occupancy structures) or major structural/permit for all others,
   3. if RCD or TRPA has verified the site has BMPs, and
   4. if a fee is paid to retire hard coverage equivalent to the additional land coverage. TRPA will require the coverage be retired prior to payment of the fee.

VII. **ALLOCATION POOL:** Provisions will be made to adjust the allocation distribution to utilize unused allocations. The allocation pool is administered by TRPA as follows:

A. Allocations in the pool are supplied to the pool by:
   1. Adding the unused allocations each year
   2. Adding the allocations through the audit process due to noncompliance.
   3. Adding 100 carry-over allocations*.

B. Allocations in the pool are distributed:
   1. To individuals in any jurisdiction that retire a sensitive parcel. If this is successful TRPA will drop the 10% sensitive parcel allocation requirement.
   2. To jurisdictions that perform well on the audits.

* The 100 carry-over allocations are a “loan” to start the pool. As the pool is supplied by A.1 and A.2, the loan allocations will be phased out.
**Commercial Working Group**

Bill Combs, Placer County  
Steve Hust, El Dorado County  
Teri Jamin, City of South Lake Tahoe  
Sharon Kvas, Washoe County  
Keith Ruben, Douglas County  
Romany Woodbeck, Washoe County  
Bob McDowell, U.S. Forest Service-LTBMU  
Dan Siegel, California Attorney General's Office  
Rochelle Nason, League to Save Lake Tahoe  
Mary Gilanfarr, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council  
Stan Hansen, Heavenly Valley  
Lew Feldman  
Ron McIntyre, North Tahoe Chamber of Commerce  
Phil Gilanfarr  
Steve Teshara, Gaming Alliance  
Duane Wallace, South Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce  
Don Kornreich  
Kevin Cole  
John Upton

**Residential Working Group**

Bill Combs, Placer County  
Steve Hust, El Dorado County  
Teri Jamin, City of South Lake Tahoe  
Sharon Kvas, Washoe County  
Keith Ruben, Douglas County  
Romany Woodbeck, Washoe County  
City of South Lake Tahoe Building Department  
Douglas County Building Department  
El Dorado County Building Department  
Placer County Building Department  
Washoe County Building Department  
Rochelle Nason, League to Save Lake Tahoe  
Dan Siegel, California Attorney General's Office  
Mary Gilanfarr, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council  
John Falk, Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors  
Mike McKeen, South Lake Tahoe Board of Realtors  
Bob Dodds, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Wendell McCurry, Nevada Dept. Environmental Protection  
Joe Thompson, Natural Resource Conservation Service  
Bob Hedley
November 4, 1996

TO:      Advisory Planning Commission
FROM:    TRPA Staff
SUBJECT: Review of Transit and Air Quality Programs for the 1996 Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP).

Proposed Action: No action is being requested at this time, other than to seek input on the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan, draft Transit and Air Quality Program elements.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) consider the draft programs and projects and forward comments to the TRPA Governing Board for their consideration.

Discussion: Staff are currently preparing the 1996 RTP-AQP. In order to ensure that the RTP-AQP reflects the direction and intent of the APC and Governing Board, staff is seeking input early on in the planning process for the various programs and projects contained in the plan.

On October 10, 1996, TRPA staff met with members of the RTP-AQP Technical Advisory Committee to review the proposed Transit and Air Quality Programs for the 1996 RTP-AQP. The TAC was provided a 28 page draft Transit Program and a 16 page draft Air Quality Program.

The full text of these programs is not being provided to the APC at this time because of its size. Rather, staff are providing outlines of the programs, copies of the TAC meeting notes, and a list of the proposed projects for each of the two programs. Staff will lead a discussion of these programs at the APC meeting.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact Richard Wiggins at (702) 588-4547, extension 242. Thank you for your consideration of this request.
1. Introduction

2. Issues and Goals

3. Institutional Overview
   - Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
   - Tahoe Transportation District
   - Tahoe Douglas Transportation District
   - Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission
   - Tahoe Basin Transportation Authority
   - North Lake Tahoe Resort Association
   - South Shore Transportation Management Association
   - Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association

4. Municipal and County Transit

5. Legislative Issues

6. Regional Transit Planning Efforts
   - Tahoe Basin Short Range Transit Program (1994)
   - Coordinated Transit System (1995)
   - Lake Tahoe Waterborne Transit Study (1995)
   - City of South Lake Tahoe Fixed Guideway Feasibility Study (1995)
   - SR 89 Transitway Feasibility Study (1996)
   - Reno-Truckee-North Tahoe Intercity Transit Study (underway)
   - Tahoe Transportation District Private/Public Integration Study (underway)

7. Community and County General Plans

8. Inventory of Existing Transit Services and Providers
   - Fixed Route and Schedule
   - ADA Required and Other Social Service Transportation
   - Demand Responsive
   - Seasonal and Special Events
   - Casino Park-N-Roll
   - Local Shuttles
   - Airport Shuttles
   - Intercity
   - Taxi, Limousine and Charter
   - Passenger Facilities

9. Transit Funding
   - Capital and Operating Assistance Recipients
   - Operating Revenue
   - Farebox Revenue
   - Transportation Development Act
   - Mitigation Funds

10. Projects
TRANSIT PROGRAM DRAFT PROJECT LIST

1997-2002 PRIORITY PROJECTS

North Shore Transit Maintenance Facility

Purpose and Need: To provide a modern maintenance facility for the North Shore transit services. The existing facility is well beyond its useful life.

Description: Placer County will utilize federal and mitigation funds to construct a modern maintenance facility on county owned land near the Town of Truckee. This facility will serve the TART service, and other North Shore services.

North Shore Transit Service (TART)

Purpose and Need: To provide fixed route transit service to residents and visitors of Tahoe City, Incline Village and others along SR 28 and SR 89 in order to reduce traffic congestion and maintain air quality.

Description: Placer County will provide for the continued operation of 26-40 passenger buses on existing routes and schedules.

North Shore Transit Service (Night Rider)

Purpose and Need: To provide evening fixed route transit service to residents and visitors of Tahoe City, Crystal Bay and others along SR 28 and SR 89 in order to reduce traffic congestion and maintain air quality.

Description: Private contractor will operate 15-26 passenger buses on evening routes and schedules.

North Shore Fixed Route (FR) Transit Bus Replacement

Purpose and Need: Existing bus fleet averages 4-6 years old. Life expectancy is approximately 7 years. Older buses require greater maintenance and reduce service reliability.

Description: This project will provide for the purchase of five 26-40 passenger transit buses to replace existing vehicles.

North Shore FR Transit Frequency Improvements

Purpose and Need: Additional service is needed to increase ridership and achieve transit and air quality goals.

Description: This project will provide for the purchase of six 24-40 passenger transit buses to increase headway frequency from one hour to 30 minutes. Increase operating expenses and revenues to accommodate additional service.

North Shore Transit Marketing

Purpose and Need: Marketing transit services increase ridership through increased awareness of services.

Description: This project will involve the development and implementation of marketing materials for the North Shore transit services.
Tahoe City Trolley Services

Purpose and Need: The Tahoe City Trolley provides an attractive visitor experience while reducing the need for cars in the Tahoe City area.

Description: This project will provide for the operation of a summer trolley service between Dollar Hill and Tahoe City.

Tahoe City (Demand Responsive) DR Service Implementation

Purpose and Need: To expand the Tahoe City transit service area using a low cost, customer oriented approach.

Description: This project will provide for the implementation of a year-round, demand-responsive service using 7-15 passenger vans and mini-buses. The service would operate under a computerized dispatching center coordinated with the fixed-route and intercity services.

Incline Village and Crystal Bay DR Service Implementation

Purpose and Need: To expand the Incline Village and Crystal Bay service area using a low cost, customer oriented approach.

Description: This project will provide for the implementation of a year-round, demand-responsive service using 7-15 passenger vans and mini-buses. The service would operate under a computerized dispatching center coordinated with the fixed-route and intercity services.

South Shore Transit Maintenance Facility

Purpose and Need: The existing maintenance facilities owned by the CSLT need expansion, new equipment and some minor maintenance in order to enhance productivity and to prolong their useful life.

Description: This project involves the expansion of the existing building, repairs to the floor of the bus barn, installation of new bus washing equipment, and acquisition of additional transit maintenance equipment as appropriate.

South Shore FR Transit Bus Replacement

Purpose and Need: Four of the existing CSLT 26-40 passenger buses are 7 years old and are reaching the end of their useful life.

Description: This project will provide for the purchase of four 26-40 passenger transit buses to replace existing vehicles.

South Shore Transit Marketing

Purpose and Need: Marketing transit services increase ridership through increased awareness of services.

Description: This project involves the development and distribution of marketing materials for South Shore.

South Shore FR Transit Service (STAGE)

Purpose and Need: To provide fixed route and demand responsive transit service in the CSLT.
Description: CSLT will contract for services to operate fixed route and demand responsive services on existing routes and schedules to all areas within the city limits.

**Douglas County Transit Service**

**Purpose and Need:** To provide fixed route and demand responsive transit service in the Tahoe Basin portion of Douglas County.

**Description:** This project will provide for fixed route and demand responsive service provided in the Basin portion of Douglas County.

**South Shore CTS**

**Purpose and Need:** During 1996 there are numerous private and public transit operators providing similar, if not duplicative, mass transit services on the South Shore. These similar services confuse the general public and waste both public and private resources.

**Description:** The CTS project is a multi-faceted concept that is intended to eliminate the inefficiencies that currently exist. This project will provide for the coordination and central dispatching of both private and public vehicles fleets, installation of automatic vehicle location technologies, and the establishment of traveler information locations.

**Heavenly Ski Resort Gondola Construction**

**Purpose and Need:** To provide transportation for skiers directly to the ski area without the need to provide additional parking or fixed route transit service.

**Description:** This project will provide for the construction of a high speed, high capacity gondola that originates from the transit center to be built as part of the Park Avenue redevelopment, and goes to a new Gondola terminal at Heavenly Ski Resort.

**Park Ave. Transit Center Construction**

**Purpose and Need:** To provide a customer-oriented transit center that will also serve as the dispatch facility for the South Shore CTS project.

**Description:** This project will provide for the construction of a transit center that provides parking/staging areas for full-size buses, waiting areas and customer conveniences.

**Nifty-Fifty Trolley Service**

**Purpose and Need:** The Nifty-Fifty Trolley provides an attractive visitor experience while reducing the need for cars in the South Shore area.

**Description:** This project will provide for the operation of vintage style rubber tired trolleys between Zephyr Cove and Camp Richardson on a seasonal basis.

**Reno A/P-Truckee-No. Tahoe InterCity Service**

**Purpose and Need:** To provide a fixed-route, fixed-schedule intercity transit service open to the general public.
Description: Under contract to the NTRA, operate 26-40 passenger vehicles between the Reno-Tahoe International Airport, Truckee, Tahoe City and other destinations on the North Shore. This project will involve the acquisition of vehicles for the service as well as operating assistance.

Sesquicentennial Service Improvements

Purpose and Need: To accommodate anticipated an increase in tourism resulting from the commemoration of the discovery of gold and California statehood.

Description: In coordination with El Dorado, Placer, Nevada and Amador Counties, provide additional funding for marketing, trolley services and intercity transit during the Sesquicentennial period.

TTD Public/Private Integration and Service Coordination/Consolidation

Purpose and Need: In order to gain private sector support of TTD activities, the TTD needs to include private representation on its Board of Directors. With this representation, the TTD needs to begin the process of coordinating and consolidating duplicative services.

Description: This project will provide for the implementation of private sector representation on the TTD Board of Directors. Also initiate the process for the TTD to coordinate and eventually consolidate transit services in the Region.

Lake Lapper Service Expansion and Fleet Replacement

Purpose and Need: To provide for expansion of the Lake Lapper transit services for visitors and residents.

Description: Continue the Lake Lapper service beyond the 2 year demonstration period that is to expire in 1998. This project includes replacement of the three existing vehicles, acquisition of additional vehicles, and acquisition of additional operating assistance.

Douglas Co.-Carson City-So. Tahoe Vanpool Service

Purpose and Need: To provide transportation to the commuter market that travels both from the Carson Valley/Carson City area to the South Shore, and those that travel from the South Shore to the Carson Valley/Carson City area.

Description: Using a nationally recognized vanpool services company, this project involves the development of vanpools and implementation of service.

SR 28 Parking Lot Shuttle Service

Purpose and Need: In order to address the parking issues along SR 28 on the East Shore of Lake Tahoe, parking management strategies are needed. These may include the removal of parking from along the roadway shoulders. In order to have an effective program, alternate parking locations are needed. In order for visitors to use these alternative locations, transit shuttle services will be needed to move people between their cars and destinations.

Description: This project will provide for the operation of three to five 15-40 passenger shuttle vehicles on fixed routes and schedules during the peak summer days.
Tahoe City 64 Acre Transit Center

Purpose and Need: To provide Tahoe City with adequate transit facilities to serve their needs.

Description: This project will involve the construction of a transit center and parking facility for use with Tahoe City, Lake Lapper and ski resort transit services.

US 50 Dedicated Transitway Easement Acquisitions

Purpose and Need: To continue the effort to secure easements and right-of-way for future development of a transit bus lane or fixed guideway lane on US 50 in the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Description: As conditions of project approval, when appropriate, acquire easements along US 50.

Transit Passenger Facilities

Purpose and Need: Passenger shelters, benches, signs and other amenities are important for passenger comfort and attracting ridership.

Description: At various locations throughout the Region, construct and maintain bus shelters and install benches, signs and other amenities.

2002-2007 PROJECTS

North Shore Fleet and Equipment Acquisition - Existing Services
North Shore Fleet and Equipment Acquisition - Expanded Services
South Shore Fleet and Equipment Acquisition - Existing Services
South Shore Fleet and Equipment Acquisition - Expanded Services
Trolley Vehicles Acquisition - Existing Services
Lake Lapper Fleet Acquisition - Existing Service
Smart Card Equipment Acquisition
Passenger Shelters and Facilities

2008 – 2017 LONG RANGE PLANS

North/South Fleet and Equipment Acquisition - Existing and Expanded Service
Passenger Shelters and Facilities
Ward Valley to Alpine Meadows Gondola Construction
Tahoe City to Alpine Meadows Gondola Construction
1996 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN - AIR QUALITY PLAN

1997 - 2016 AIR QUALITY PROGRAM

1. Introduction

2. Issues and Goals

3. Involved Agencies
   - Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
   - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
   - California Air Resources Board
   - Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
   - Local Jurisdictions

4. Applicable Standards and Threshold Status
   - Redesignation Status
   - Threshold Recommendations

5. Legislative Issues

6. Inventory of Existing Air Quality Services, Programs and Regulations
   - Wood Heater Retrofit Program
   - Stationary Source Controls
   - Air Quality Mitigation Program
   - Rental Car Mitigation Program
   - Postal Service Mail Delivery Programs
   - Employer-Based Trip Reduction Ordinance
   - BMP Programs
   - Oxygenated Fuels Regulations
   - Enforcement Program
   - Lake Tahoe Airport Master Plan Settlement Agreement

7. Controlled Burns and Wildfires

8. Relationship to Transportation Programs
   - Transit Program
   - Pedestrian and Bicycle Program
   - Traffic Congestion and Highways Program
   - Parking Program
   - Aviation and Waterborne Program

9. Air Quality Program Funding

10. Projects
AIR QUALITY PROGRAM DRAFT PROJECT LIST

1997-2002 PRIORITY PROJECTS

Coordinated Transit System

Description: This project will provide for the coordination of private and public transit services on the South Shore. This will involve the acquisition of transit technologies and replacement of transit vehicles as provided for by U.S. EPA funding.

Postal Service Action Plan Update and Implementation

Description: This project will provide for the updating of the Postal Service Action Plan, including expansion of projects related to the North Shore and Alpine Meadows. Recommendations will be refined to address postal sorting area needs, postal box expansion and reduction where appropriate, business mail delivery, neighborhood delivery centers, cluster box installation and overall Postal Service coordination with TRPA.

Wood Heater Retrofit Program Revisions

Description: This project will provide for changes to the existing TRPA regulations regarding wood heaters. These recommendations may include a disclosure approach to verify compliance, or implementing a public education program that includes incentives to replace non-compliant wood heaters.

Lake Tahoe Airport Settlement Agreement Provisions

Description: This project will involve the implementation, as appropriate, of the air quality provisions of the Airport Master Plan Settlement Agreement.

Conformity Regulations

Description: This project will involve adoption of conformity regulations as required by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. These regulations will become part of the California State Implementation Plan. CARB has also included the Tahoe Basin in a state redesignation request so that the Basin may be designated as an attainment-transitional.

Interagency Consultation Process

Description: This project will involve establishing a regular coordination process for evaluating AQ impacts from projects subject to conformity regulations.

Maintenance Plan

Description: This project will involve the programs and enforcement necessary to meet the requirements established for designation as a maintenance area.

Updated Mitigation Program

Description: This project will involve the review and amendments to Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
Enhanced BMP Implementation

Description: This project will provide for the implementation of Best Management Practices to control wind blown silt and dust.

Alternative Fueled Transit Vehicles and Infrastructure

Description: This project will provide for the investigation, acquisition, testing, implementation and evaluation of alternative fueled vehicles and fueling infrastructure for transit fleets in the Region.

Alternative Fueled Rental Vehicles and Infrastructure

Description: This project will provide for the investigation, acquisition, testing, implementation and evaluation of alternative fueled vehicles and fueling infrastructure for rental car fleets in the Region.

Alternative Fueled Fleet Vehicles and Infrastructure

Description: This project will provide for the investigation, acquisition, testing, implementation and evaluation of alternative fueled vehicles and fueling infrastructure for private and public sector fleets in the Region.

US 50 Computerized Signal Enhancements

Description: This project will provide for the acquisition and installation of computer and/or detection technologies to upgrade the signal system on US 50 between Kingsbury Grade and the South Y as appropriate.
October 15, 1996

TO: 1996 RTP-AQP TAC

FROM: TRPA Staff

SUBJECT: Meeting of October 10, 1996

Thank you to all who attended this meeting. The following is a recap of the discussions. Also, don’t forget the next TAC meeting scheduled for October 29 to discuss the Traffic Congestion and Highways Program and the Parking Program. Draft texts of these will be mailed out prior to the meetings.

**Transit Program**

Staff suggesting including Goals for each program, in addition to the overall goals for the RTP-AQP.

Include a section discussing current federal and state legislative issues or initiatives for each program, i.e. ISTEA reauthorization, SB 1505, etc.

Highlight each program’s issues more clearly.

Additional discussion on the TTD is needed, especially language and status of the proposed Article IX amendments, coordination and integration of existing services and/or organizations, FTA planning grant scope of work and results/visions of upcoming TTD Board workshop. Clearly state basin-wide transit coordination and consolidation issues and objectives.

Clarify the roles and direction of the Lake Tahoe Resort Association and the two TMAs.

Expand the discussion on Private Transit to reflect the amount of private transit versus public transit.

Improve the discussion on the CTS project, including why it evolved, role of fixed route versus demand responsive, recent federal funding and current schedule.

Clearly state the recommendations in both the Short Range Transit Program and the Community Plans. Use these as a basis for the recommendations in the RTP-AQP. Describe what has been accomplished in these plans. Include greater discussion of the pending FTA planning grants, including the scope of works.

Include brief descriptions of what fixed route service is, what demand response service is, what seasonal services are, etc.

Emphasize importance, role and services related to ADA requirements and private social service transportation.

*Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land*
Include service schedules and fares for a snapshot in time of what the situation is at the time of this document.

Include discussion of the various funding categories and their allowed uses.

Provide a comparison of the total farebox collected with the total operating revenues.

Include in the list of projects some method to indicate the relative probability of acquiring funding for projects, as well as the relative need for the project. Also indicate the sources of information used.

Include financial summary and analysis, i.e. are there enough AQ mitigation funds? Define whether funds are current dollars or adjusted for inflation. Include 5 year project lists for the mitigation funds.

Add several other projects, including an SR 28 shuttle service, Incline Village-Crystal Bay demand responsive service and vehicle acquisition for the Reno-No. Tahoe intercity service.

**Air Quality Program**

Expand discussion of 3rd set of Conformity rules, including status in rulemaking process, highlights. Also include discussion of what is in CA/NV State Implementation Plans.

Expand discussion on enforcement of AQ regulations, in particular whether it is TRPA’s or APCD’s responsibility depending on jurisdiction.

Include description of the CARB Redesignation request to EPA, and the subsequent maintenance plan.

Clarify the problems with comparing the 1981, 1987 and 1995 base year VMT results.

Expand discussion of the TRPA AQ regulations. Highlight specifics.

Include AQ provisions of the Lake Tahoe Airport Settlement Agreement.

Include financial summaries of the AQ Mitigation and Rental Car Mitigation funds.

Expand Trip Reduction Ordinance discussion to include justification, federal and state legislation affecting TROs and recent TRPA changes. Consider renaming TRO.

Provide discussion relative to the Transit, Ped/Bike and Traffic Congestion programs and how those programs and related projects achieve AQ goals and objectives. Specify transit projects such as the North Shore CTS that also serve as AQ projects.

Define specific actions to be taken regarding mail delivery improvements. Assess viability of expanding private mail box services under the assumption that more locations would reduce trip lengths (rather than driving to one central location). Emphasize need for Tahoe City sorting facility.

Highlight the AQ Threshold TAC recommendations.
Consider a Wood Heater Disclosure regulation instead of an inspection process. Provide peer comparisons of wood heater programs in other communities.

Clarify policy regarding pass-by trips when used to determine the trip rates for project applications.

Include financial summaries of costs and revenues and probability of funding for AQ projects, and description of funding sources.

Include process for accounting of controlled burns and wildfires.

Clarify policy regarding uses allowed by the AQ Mitigation funds.

Include description of alternative fueled vehicles projects and process, including Dept. of Energy grant funds.

Emphasize new AQ programs, not just expansion or changes to existing ones.