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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, September 11, 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.

September 3, 1996

By: James W. Baetge
   Executive Director

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

Horizon Casino Resort U.S. Highway 50, Stateline, Nevada
September 11, 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. Draft EIS for the Lake Tahoe Shorezone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis

B. Amendment of Regional Goals and Policies Plan, Transportation and Land Use Elements, Relative to Transportation and Air Quality Goals

C. Amendment of Tahoe Vista Community Plan Boundary to Include Placer County APN 112-050-08

D. 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

E. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 110 Boundary, South "Y" (Commercial/Public Service), and Plan Area Statement 114, Bonanza (Residential), to Relocate El Dorado County APN 32-151-01 from PAS 114 to PAS 110; or Amendment of the Special Designation in PAS 114 to Allow the Transfer of Existing Development in Special Area #1 Only
VI. PLANNING MATTERS

   1. Air Quality
   2. Fisheries
   3. Wildlife
   4. Vegetation
   5. Noise
   6. Soils/SEZ
   7. Scenic Resources
   8. Recreation

B. Amendment of Chapter 73, Livestock Grazing

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

August 30, 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 Advisory Planning Commission each month throughout the comment period which will end October 25, 1996.

For the last five 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. These meetings are scheduled to continue through October, 1996 (see attached schedule).

Please contact Colleen Shade at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this matter.
September 6, 1996

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Revisions to the Regional Goals and Policies Plan: Transportation Element and Land Use Element, Air Quality Sub-Element

Proposed Action: No action is being requested at this time, other than to seek input on the Regional Goals and Policy Plan, Transportation and Land Use Elements, relative to transportation and air quality goals.

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

Background: The existing transportation and air quality goals were adopted in the Regional Goals and Policies Plan and the 1992 Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP) by the TRPA Governing Board under Ordinance No. 92-12 in April 1992. No changes or amendments have been made since that time.

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 to the goals as a first step in the 1996 RTP-AQP process.

Discussion: The Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin consists of several documents. One of these is the Regional Goals and Policy Plan, a document that sets the basic direction of the Regional Plan. The Regional Goals and Policy Plan integrates the requirements of the Compact, the thresholds, other plans and legal requirements, and the public’s input. Other documents of the Regional Plan, including the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan (RTP-AQP), must relate back to the Regional Goals and Policy Plan.

The Regional Goals and Policy Plan identifies goals that depict the desired ends or values to be achieved. It also specifies policies that establish the strategies necessary to achieve the goals. Over time, as progress is made on implementation of the Regional Plan, changes to the goals and policies are appropriate. As part of the development of the 1996 RTP-AQP, it is appropriate to update the transportation and air quality goals and policies. This will be a two step process.
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The first step is to consider revisions to the goals only. The transportation and air quality goals that are part of the Regional Goals and Policy Plan will set the direction for and be incorporated into the 1996 RTP-AQP. After the goals have been revised, programs and projects necessary to achieve the goals will be evaluated and recommended within the 1996 RTP-AQP. The second step of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan update will be to revise policies which guide the implementation of the 1996 RTP-AQP programs and projects. These policies will also be incorporated into the 1996 RTP/AQP.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Compact) includes several requirements related to transportation and air quality. Article V of the Compact directs that the Regional Plan include a Transportation Element that integrates development of a regional transportation system. The Compact states:

"The goal of transportation planning shall be:
(A) To reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes and of public transit to move people and goods within the region; and
(B) To reduce to the extent feasible air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles.

Where increases in capacity are required, the agency shall give preference to providing such capacity through public transportation and public programs and projects related to transportation. The plan shall provide for an appropriate transit system for the region.
The plan shall give consideration to:
(A) Completion of the Loop Road in the States of NV and CA; (B) Utilization of a light rail mass transit system in the South Shore area; and
(C) Utilization of a transit center in the Kingsbury Grade area."

Development of the 1996 RTP-AQP, with the associated amendments to the Regional Goals and Policy Plan, must be accomplished with these parameters from the Compact in mind.

In addition to the above goals, Article I(b) of the Compact establishes the agency’s power to establish environmental threshold carrying capacities. These are defined as "an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region." Air quality is one of TRPA’s environmental threshold categories, and as such includes both air quality and transportation standards.
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The air quality threshold standards differ from goals in one important way. As stated above, goals are an end to be achieved, a target to shoot for but not necessarily to hit. Environmental thresholds standards, on the other hand, are specific transportation and air quality targets that must be achieved. In order for any project in the Region to be approved, the Agency must find that the project will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan and will not cause the thresholds to be exceeded.

In addition to the regional standards established by the thresholds, California, Nevada and the federal government have other air quality and transportation standards that must be attained.

The current Regional Goals and Policy Plan and 1992 RTP-AQP identify five regional transportation goals, summarized below.

Goal #1 is to fulfill the requirements of the Compact.

Goal #2 is to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds and standards.

Goal #3 describes achieving a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation system that supports the regional economy and minimizes adverse impacts on the environment.

Goal #4 is to provide for the reactivation of the Tahoe Transportation District.

Goal #5 is to research potential sources of funding.

There are no distinct air quality goals identified in either the Goals and Policy Plan or the 1992 RTP-AQP other than environmental standards.

Staff has sought input on revisions to the goals from a 1996 RTP-AQP Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee includes twenty public sector representatives, and sixteen private sector representatives. Individual committee members had the opportunity to provide, from their perspective, what they considered to be the five most important transportation and air quality goals for the 1996 RTP-AQP. Written responses were received from eleven committee members. With these suggestions, and keeping the existing goals in mind, staff prepared new transportation and air goals. The revised goals were distributed to the Advisory Committee for additional comment. Only one member suggested changes to the proposed goal changes.

The following are the proposed replacement goals for the 1996 RTP-AQP and the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.

Goal #1: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to improve air and water quality and reduce traffic congestion by implementation and evaluation of transportation programs and projects, consistent with the requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and the environmental threshold carrying capacities.
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Goal #2: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to improve air and water quality by implementation and evaluation of air quality programs and projects that will reduce total emissions in the Region, consistent with the requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and the environmental threshold carrying capacities.

Goal #3: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to establish a safe, efficient, and intermodal transportation system that reduces reliance on the automobile, increases reliance on mass transit services, and provides for pedestrian, bicycle and alternative modes of transportation for both residents and visitors alike.

Goal #4: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to effect institutional changes to the administrative structure of mass transit services in the Region. Changes are needed in order to more efficiently and effectively expand, coordinate or consolidate mass transit services.

Goal #5: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to prioritize transportation and air quality programs and projects based on financial and technological feasibility and overall environmental impact, and to obtain additional local, state, federal and private sources of capital and operating funds.

Goal #6: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to support public-private partnerships for planning, financing and implementation of transportation and air quality programs and projects.

Goal #7: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to have visitors pay a fair share of their impacts on transportation and air quality in the Tahoe Region.

Goal #8: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to include the region’s transportation facilities and services as an integral component of the economy and to develop and market them as visitor attractions.

Goal #9: It is a goal of the RTP-AQP to implement a parking management program.

The 1996 Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan will be an integrated document, as it was in 1992. For this reason, staff are proposing to move the Air Quality Sub-Element in the Land Use Element as a Sub-Element in the Transportation Element in the Regional Goals and Policies Plan. The Transportation Element, Air Quality Sub-Element will include both transportation and non-transportation related air quality programs and projects.

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.
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To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Tahoe Vista Community Plan Boundary and PAS 024A, North Tahoe Recreation Area, to incorporate Placer County APN 112-050-08 into the Tahoe Vista Community Plan.

**Proposed Action:** To amend the boundary line between Plan Area Statement (PAS) 022, Tahoe Vista Community Plan Area, and PAS 024A, North Tahoe Recreation Area, to incorporate Placer County parcel (APN 112-050-08) which currently is in PAS 024A into PAS 022.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the APC make a recommendation to the Governing Board to adopt the proposed amendment. This is a staff initiated plan area amendment on Placer County’s behalf.

**Background:** As stated above this plan area amendment is staff initiated to amend the boundary line between PAS 022 and PAS 024A to add APN 112-050-08 into the Tahoe Vista Community Plan. See Attachment A for the existing conditions and Attachment B for the proposed boundary line amendment.

Currently this parcel is an existing commercial use, AmeriGas Propane. Current County zoning is C-4 (commercial). The parcel is a nonconforming use in PAS 024A. PAS 024A has a recreation land use classification, and commercial uses are not permissible.

During the planning process of the Draft Tahoe Vista Community Plan, this parcel was included in the community plan boundary, and was inadvertently removed during the preparation of the Final Tahoe Vista Community Plan. The parcel was mistaken as a North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) parcel and removed from the community plan.

**Discussion:** In evaluating the proposed plan area amendment, staff uses a three-step approach. The first step is to determine whether a mistake was made in mapping the original plan area boundaries and assigning permissible uses to the area. The second step is to determine whether something has changed in terms of the character at the location or pattern of land use to warrant amending the boundaries. The third step is to determine whether the amendment to the plan area would change land use patterns such that attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds is improved or enhanced.
Staff has determined that a mistake was made in the preparation of the Final Tahoe Vista Community Plan. The parcel has been an existing commercial use at the time of the plan preparation and was and should be part of the Community Plan. The parcel is currently a nonconforming use and is inconsistent with the policies of PAS 024A. Amendment of the Plan Area will bring the parcel into conformity and consistent with the policies of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan.

Staff recommends the APC make a recommendation of adoption of the plan area amendment to the Governing Board.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact John Hitchcock at (702) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

September 1, 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

Proposed Action: This applicant-proposed amendment is a modification of the TRPA Plan Area Statement Maps for Plan Area 057 Spooner Lake (Recreation), and Plan Area 060 Genoa Peak (Conservation), to incorporate five (5) Douglas County parcels located east of and adjacent to U.S. Highway 50 (See Attachment A). The applicant proposes to amend the boundary line between 057 and 060 to add the five parcel, currently located in PAS 057, into PAS 060, thereby allowing residential uses as a special use. See Attachment B for the proposed amendment.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC recommend adoption of the plan area statement amendment to the Governing Board. Staff recommends approval of the amendment because 1) new information has been provided by the applicant to justify amendment of the boundary line and 2) the amendment is to correct a possible mapping error that occurred during adoption of the Regional Plan.

Background: 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 add Douglas County APN 01-130-09, -12, -13, -14, and -16, into PAS 060. All five parcels currently are in PAS 057.

The parcels are currently zoned for Recreational Uses by TRPA and Agriculture/Residential use 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 bring these parcels into a land use classification consistent with county zoning. Of the five parcels listed, two parcels are in private ownership and are legal lots of record as of 1976 and the remainder 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.
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During the original drafting, it was thought that the five subject parcels were not private parcels, therefore they were included in PAS 057, precluding them from development of single family uses.

**Discussion:** In evaluating the proposed plan area amendment, staff uses a three-step approach. The first step is to determine whether a mistake was made in mapping the original plan area boundaries and assigning permissible uses to the area. The second step is to determine whether new information submitted to TRPA or something has changed in the land use character to warrant amending the boundaries. The third step is to determine whether the amendment to the plan area would change land use patterns such that attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds is improved or enhanced.

Based on the above three-step procedure, staff recommends approval of the plan area amendment. New information has been provided by the applicant showing that two of the lots were private legal lots of record prior to 1976 and therefore eligible for residential development. IPES scores have been issued for both private parcels. Rather than amending a residential plan area boundary to include the four parcels, staff recommends taking the five parcels out of the current recreation plan area and adding them to the adjoining conservation plan area. Single family uses are a special use in PAS 060 and will require Governing Board approval.

The location of the four parcels are located on lands classified as 1a and the topography is generally very steep. The area is limited to a few uses due to the steepness of the terrain. An IPES score evaluation will be required in order for either of the private parcels to be developed as single-family residential parcels. Recreation plan areas are areas with good potential for developed outdoor recreation, park use, or concentrated recreation. Due to the steep topography of this area it does not have good potential for developed outdoor recreation. The parcels are more suited for a conservation land use classification. Areas with value as primitive or natural areas, with strong environmental limitations on use. As stated earlier, two of the five subject parcels are already in public ownership. The State of Nevada and the U.S. Forest Service own the other three.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact John Hitchcock at (702) 588-4547.
057 -- SPOONER LAKE

PLAN DESIGNATION:

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

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This area extends east of Glenbrook to the Basin boundary and south from Skunk Harbor to the vicinity of Highway 50 and Spooner Summit. The boundaries of this area are depicted on the Agency maps H-10, H-11, Marlette Quadrangle and Glenbrook Quadrangle.

Existing Uses: Most of the Plan Area is in public ownership and currently is being managed by the USFS and Nevada State Parks for recreation and some timber management. The shorezone area has restricted vehicular access and is being managed for quality recreation experiences that include hiking, sunbathing, and other day use activities that require few, if any, support facilities. Developed day use facilities are provided by the Nevada Parks Department in the vicinity of Spooner Lake. The Lake provides fishing opportunities. Slaughterhouse Canyon offers excellent opportunities for hiking and cross country skiing. Other facilities in the area include a highway maintenance station and a U.S. Forest Service fire station.

Existing Environment: Extensive modifications or disturbances are mostly restricted to the highways that cross through the Plan Area. Dominant plant communities include mixed conifer, rabbit brush, Basin sagebrush, manzanita, red fir, and deciduous riparian vegetation. Most of the Plan Area is classified as high hazard. Shorezone on Lake Tahoe is tolerance districts 3 and 5.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should provide for low to moderate resource management and expanded recreational opportunities. New recreational facilities are acceptable if provisions are made for adequate treatment and disposal of sewage and if the new facilities and uses do not detract from the scenic entrance to the Basin.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Developed trail systems are inadequate to accommodate demand.
2. Heavy use by hikers and others is creating localized problems with erosion.
3. Parking along Highway 28 contributes to traffic congestion, highway hazards, and roadside erosion.
4. Private property restricts public access to Slaughterhouse Canyon.
5. Roadside cut-slopes and the highway maintenance yard detract from the scenic quality of the area.
6. The highway maintenance yard is being phased out.
7. There are three water filings on Glenbrook Creek that could exacerbate low flows in late summer.
8. The development of recreation facilities may be restricted due to the absence of sewer treatment facilities in the vicinity.
9. This area is a major entry point to the Basin and offers excellent potential for expanded recreational opportunities.

10. Scenic Roadway Units 27 and 28 and Shoreline Unit 26 are within this Plan Area.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. Access to shorezone and snow play areas should be accommodated with off-highway parking facilities and transit service.

2. Trail systems should be developed and maintained to discourage the proliferation of unmanaged trails and to provide expanded opportunities for hiking.

3. The visitor entry to the Basin should be enhanced with information services, recreation facilities, and improved scenic quality.

4. Recreational development within the area should be consistent with an approved master plan that incorporates long-term projections of proposed facilities on both state and federal lands.

5. Water circulation should be improved in Spooner Lake to help eliminate winter kill of fish populations.

6. Off-road vehicle courses should be designated only on U. S. Forest Service Land.

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

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

Residential
- Employee housing (S).

Public Service
- Cultural facilities (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), local post office (S), local public health and safety facilities (S), transmission and receiving facilities (S), transportation routes (S), and transit stations and terminals (S).

Recreation
- Cross country skiing courses (A), day use areas (A), riding and hiking trails (A), undeveloped campgrounds (A), developed campgrounds (A), off-road vehicle courses (S), outdoor recreation concessions (A), rural sports (S), group facilities (S), snowmobile courses (S), visitor information center (S), beach recreation (A), and boat launching facilities (S).

Resource Management
- Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), selection cut (S), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and nonstructural fish/wildlife habitat management (A), fire detection and suppression (A), fuels treatment (A), insect and disease suppression (A), sensitive and uncommon plant management (A), erosion control (A), SEZ restoration (A), and runoff control (A).
Shorezone: Within the specified shorezone tolerance district, the following primary uses may be permitted in the backshore, nearshore, and foreshore. Accessory structures shall be regulated pursuant to the regulations applicable to the primary use upon which they are dependent in accordance with Chapter 18. The following structures may be permitted in the shorezone as an allowed (A) or special (S) use only if they are accessory to an existing, allowed use located on the same or adjoining littoral parcel.

Tolerance Districts 3 and 5

Primary Uses
Beach recreation (A), boat launching facilities (S), and safety and navigational facilities (A).

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>Maximum Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>5 units per State Park Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Campgrounds</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Bonus Units: Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 0 units.

Maximum Community Noise Equivalent Level: The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 50 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 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 390 PAOT

Other: Trailhead parking and 26 miles of trails

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

1. Improvements required by the Surface Water 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 the Stream Environment Zone Restoration Program. (To be completed.)
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.

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).

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 the Surface Water Management Plan as shown on Figure VIII-1 through 18 of Volume 1 of the 208 Water Quality Plan.

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

September 1, 1996

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of PAS Boundary Between PAS 110, South "Y" (Commercial/Public Service) and PAS 114, Bonanza (Residential), to Relocate El Dorado County APN 32-151-01 from PAS 114 to PAS 110; or amendment of the Special Designation in PAS 114 to allow the Transfer of Existing Development in Special Area #1 Only

Proposed Action: The applicant proposes to amend Plan Area Statement (PAS) boundary between PAS 110, South "Y" (Commercial/Public Service) and PAS 114, Bonanza (Residential), to relocate El Dorado County APN 32-151-01 from PAS 114 to PAS 110 (See Attachment B). Staff has proposed an alternate action to this amendment. Staff proposes to amend the Special Use Designation to allow the transfer of existing development in Special Area #1 only (See Attachment D for proposed language change).

Staff Recommendation: Staff is not in support of the applicant’s proposed amendment and recommends that the APC recommend denial of the amendment to the Governing Board. Staff proposes an alternate action, to amend the Special Use Designation to allow the transfer of existing development. Staff recommends denial of the applicants request because: 1) the finding of a need for additional commercial floor area in the community plan cannot be made at this time; and 2) the applicant’s proposed use for the site is already a permissible use in the plan area under TRPA ordinance and requires a use permit from the City of South Lake Tahoe. Although staff is not in support of the amendment, staff supports the South "Y" community plan team taking a look at the community plan boundary issue when that community plan process begins. Through that process, it could possibly be determined that this particular parcel belongs in the community plan area. TRPA Code Section 14.3, Eligible Areas, states that preliminary boundaries may be adjusted as part of the community plan process.

Background: The applicant proposes to amend the boundary line between PAS 114, a residential plan area, and PAS 110, a community plan area, to add El Dorado County APN 32-151-01 into PAS 110. The applicant has proposed the development of a professional office building on the parcel. See Attachment A for existing conditions and Attachment B for the applicant’s proposed amendment.

JH:jf
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AGENDA ITEM V.E.
Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
Currently, there is an existing small construction business office located on the parcel. Current zoning for PAS 114 is Multi-Family Dwelling and Tourist Accommodation by TRPA and Tourist Commercial by the City of South Lake Tahoe. Permissible commercial uses in PAS 114, Special Area #1, include Professional Offices, Nurseries, and Schools-business and vocational. The subject parcel is located in Special Area #1 of PAS 114. PAS 114 is a residential plan area with the special area created to include the U.S. 50/California 89 corridor and permit certain non-residential uses. The intention of the Regional Plan is not to perpetuate the commercial strip down the scenic highway corridor by providing a wide range of commercial uses. Allowing strip commercial will have scenic and transportation threshold impacts. Special Policy #2 of PAS 114 states that this is a transitional area of mixed uses. These should be limited to uses compatible with scenic restoration, the intensity of Highways 50/89, and the background residential areas.

Discussion: In evaluating the proposed plan area amendment, staff uses a three-step approach. The first step is to determine whether a mistake was made in mapping the original plan area boundaries and assigning permissible uses to the area. The second step is to determine whether something has changed in terms of character at this location or pattern of land use to warrant amending the boundaries. The third step is to determine whether the amendment to the plan area would change land use patterns such that attainment and maintenance of environmental thresholds is improved or enhanced.

Based on the above three-step procedure, staff recommends leaving the boundaries the way they are. No mistake was made in drawing the PAS boundary. In evaluating this amendment, staff looked at the goals of creating a community plan area. The community plan process was initiated to encourage concentration of commercial development, discourage the maintenance or exacerbation of strip commercial development and discourage the creation of isolated areas of commercial or tourist accommodation unrelated to the central commercial area. The area within a community plan is a size consistent with the needs for additional commercial development established by the needs assessment which evaluated the entire area of the community plan. The City of South Lake Tahoe has previously completed a needs assessment for the South "Y" area which was the basis for the current 15,000 square feet of commercial floor area which has been allocated to the South "Y" Community Plan. The area of the community plan is approximately 335 acres, and 31.7 acres (1,380,853 square feet) of which is vacant land (see Attachment C) for which the 15,000 square feet can be used once this community plan is adopted. Based on the information currently available, finding of additional need for commercial development cannot be made. There is substantial number of vacant parcels within the community plan for which the 15,000 square feet can be used.

Using the criteria above set out in the Code of Ordinances, this amendment is not consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan. The amendment will extend the community plan boundary along U.S. 50 thereby continuing the strip commercial. In addition, a finding of need for additional commercial floor area in the community plan cannot be made at this time.
The applicant has shown an interest in building a professional office building on the site, which is already a permissible use in PAS 114 and will require a use permit from the City. Questions arose about whether a professional office building can house a real estate office. In Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances, the definition of professional office building includes real estate agencies as a suitable use. The City of South Lake Tahoe also allows real estate agencies within a professional office building. Staff agrees with the applicant that a professional office building is an acceptable use for the parcel but disagree with the proposal to amend the community plan boundary. Staff recommends leaving the boundary as it currently exists, and to allow the community plan process to examine the boundary issues.

Although professional office buildings are an allowed use, there is no mechanism to transfer in commercial floor area. Staff proposes to amend the Special Use Designation to allow the transfer of existing development. Amending the TDR designation will allow for the transfer of commercial floor area into Special Area #1 of PAS 114 (See Attachment D). Any proposed project will have to comply with all aspect of the Code, Scenic Restoration Program, and the policies of PAS 114.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact John Hitchcock at (702) 588-4547.
114 -- BONANZA

PLAN DESIGNATION:

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

1. Multi-Residential Units

2. Existing Development (Special Area # 1 Only)
   MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM
   (Special Area # 1 Only)

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This 192 acre Plan Area is located adjacent to the South Tahoe "Y" and is located on TRPA maps F-19 and G-19.

Existing Uses: This Plan Area contains primarily residential uses including single family residences, apartments and a large trailer park. There is also some commercial use. The area is 80 percent built out.

Existing Environment: This area is covered with a mixed-age stand of pine trees and varying understory vegetation. There is one large SEZ which traverses the area and which includes 76 undeveloped residential lots. The area is 40 percent SEZ, 55 percent low hazard, and five percent moderate or high hazard. The land coverage is 30 percent plus an additional 30 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This Plan Area should continue to develop as a residential area, maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. The large SEZ in this area may represent a constraint on additional development depending on the extent of modification.

2. The SEZ drainage is extensively disturbed.

3. Periodic flooding occurs in the SEZ drainage area.

4. There is a significant lack of adequate drainage improvements on existing developed properties and roads.

5. The Highway 50 corridor in this Plan Area is in need of restoration. The Agency, in coordination with Caltrans, should develop a mutually-acceptable restoration plan to be implemented by Caltrans.
SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. The upper Bonanza area is characterized by high erosion. A revegetation program in this area would help reduce the problem.

2. Special Area #1, bisected by Highway 50/89, is a transitional area of mixed uses. The entire area within this special area should be limited to uses compatible with scenic restoration, the intensity of Highway 50/89 and the background residential areas.

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 areas #1, #2 and #3).

Residential
- Single family dwelling (A).

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

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

Resource Management
- Reforestation (A), sanitation salvage cut (A), special cut (A), thinning (A), early successional stage vegetation management (A), structural and non-structural 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 to Special Area #1.

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

Residential
- Nursing and personal care (A), mobile home dwelling (S), residential care (A), and multiple family dwellings (A)

Tourist Accommodation
- Bed and breakfast facilities (S) and hotel, motels and other transient dwellings (S).

Commercial
- Nursery (S), professional offices (S), and schools - business and vocational (S).

Public Services
- Cultural facilities (S), government offices (S), social service organi-
zations (S), membership organizations (S), publicly owned assembly and entertainment facilities (S), local assembly and entertainment (S), and day care centers/pre-schools (S).

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

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

- **Residential**
  - Multiple family dwellings (S) and mobile home dwellings (A).

- **Tourist Accommodation**
  - Bed and breakfast facilities (S).

**Special Area #3:** The following list of permissible uses is applicable to Special Area #3.

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

- **Residential**
  - Multiple-family dwellings (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><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwellings</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Area #1 &amp; #2</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Area #3</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>25 persons per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Dwellings</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourist Accommodation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast Facilities</td>
<td>10 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel and Other Transient Dwellings</td>
<td>40 units per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units for Special Area #1 which may be permitted for this Plan Area is 50 units.

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

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


4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway 50 and 89 corridors.
110 -- SOUTH "Y"

PLN DESIGNATION:

Land Use Classification
COMMERCIAL-PUBLIC SERVICE

Management Strategy
REDIRECTION

Special Designation
PRELIMINARY COMMUNITY PLAN AREA

TDR RECEIVING AREA FOR:

1. Existing Development
2. Multi-Residential Units (S.A. #2 only)

PREFERRED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AREA
MULTI-RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM
(S.A. #2 only)

SCENIC RESTORATION AREA

DESCRIPTION:

Location: This is the commercial area around the Highway 50 - Highway 89 intersection in South Lake Tahoe. This area is located on TRPA maps G-18, G-19, F-18, and F-19.

Existing Uses: The area is a mixture of commercial, tourist, residential and public service uses. The area is 80 percent built out.

Existing Environment: The area is classified as 65 percent low hazard, ten percent moderate hazard and 25 percent SEZ. The land coverage is 55 percent with an additional 20 percent disturbed.

PLANNING STATEMENT: This area should continue to be a regional commercial area but should be redirected for more efficient use.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

1. The area experiences traffic congestion during peak periods.
2. Scenic Roadway Units 1 and 35 are in this area and are targeted for scenic restoration as required by the scenic threshold.
3. There are access and parking problems along Highways 50 and 89.
4. There are flooding and SEZ encroachment problems.
5. There are occasional noise and odor complaints directed at the refuse company.
6. Barton Hospital operates a waste incinerator and gas-fired boiler.
7. The northern portion of this area is in need of additional fire hydrants and water mains.

SPECIAL POLICIES:

1. A community plan is the preferred method of guiding new development.

2. A community/redevelopment plan should emphasize commercial activity centers, transit-oriented services, multi-family housing, and SEZ restoration.

3. Uses incompatible with the scenic restoration plan should be encouraged to relocate off of Highways 50 and 89.

4. Properties in Special Area #1 should be considered a preferred area for industrial type uses. Properties in Special Area #2 should be considered a preferred area for multi-residential, professional offices and hospital-related uses.

5. The TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency will evaluate all or portions of this Plan Area for a Special Designation as Eligible for Redevelopment Plans after substantial progress has been made toward implementation of the redevelopment plan in PAS 089, 091 and 092.

6. Light industrial, wholesale/storage and other similar uses should be located in the industrial area north of the “Y” (Special Area #1) and residential and medical uses should be located by Barton Hospital (Special Area #2).

7. Senior citizen housing should be encouraged in this area.

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

General List: The following list of permissible uses is applicable throughout the Plan Area (except as noted in Special Areas #1 and #2).

Residential

- Employee housing (S) and multiple family dwelling (S).

Tourist Accommodation

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

Commercial

- Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (S), building materials and hardware (S), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (S) service stations (A), amusements and recreation services (A), privately owned assembly and entertainment (S), outdoor amusements (S), animal husbandry services (S), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (S), financial services (A), health care services (A), laundries and dry cleaning plant (S), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), sales lots (S), schools - business and vocational (S), secondary storage (S), printing and publishing (S), small scale manufacturing (S), vehicle storage and
parking (S), and warehousing (S).

Public Service

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

Recreation

Day use areas (A), participant sports facilities (S), outdoor recreation concessions (S), riding and hiking trails (S), and visitor information center (S).

Resource Management

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

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

Residential

Mobile home dwelling (S).

Commercial

Auto, mobile home and vehicle dealers (A), building materials and hardware (A), eating and drinking places (A), food and beverage retail sales (A), furniture, home furnishings and equipment (A), general merchandise stores (A), mail order and vending (A), nursery (A), outdoor retail sales (A), service stations (A), animal husbandry services (A), auto repair and service (A), broadcasting studios (A), business support services (A), contract construction services (A), financial services (A), health care services (A), laundries and dry cleaning plant (A), personal services (A), professional offices (A), repair services (A), sales lots (A), schools - business and vocational (S), secondary storage (A), food and kindred products (A), fuel and ice dealers (A), industrial services (A), industrial services (A), printing and publishing (A), small scale manufacturing (A), storage yards (A), vehicle and freight terminals (A), vehicle storage and parking (A), warehousing (A), and wholesale and distribution (A).

Public Service

Churches (S), collection stations (A), cultural facilities (A), day care centers/pre-schools (A), government offices (S), local assembly and entertainment (S), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organizations (S), public utility centers (A), regional public health and safety facilities (S), social service organizations (S), pipelines and power transmission (A), transit stations and terminals (A), transportation routes (S), and transmission and receiving facilities (A).
Recreation
Day use areas (A) and participant sports facilities (S).

Resource Management
Same as General List.

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

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

**Tourist Accommodation**
Bed and breakfast facilities (S).

**Commercial**
Nursery (S), animal husbandry services (S), health care services (A), professional offices (A), schools - business and vocational (S), secondary storage (S), and vehicle storage and parking (S).

**Public Service**
Airfields, landing strips and heliports (new non-emergency sites prohibited) (S), churches (S), cultural facilities (S), day care centers/pre-schools (A), government offices (S), hospitals (A), local assembly and entertainment (S), local post office (A), local public health and safety facilities (A), membership organizations (S), schools - kindergarten through secondary (S), social service organizations (S), pipelines and power transmission (S), transit stations and terminals (S), and transportation routes (S).

**Recreation**
Day use areas (S), recreation center (S), and participant sports facilities (S).

**Resource Management**
Same as General List.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 unit per parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Dwelling</td>
<td>15 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Dwelling</td>
<td>8 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-person Dwelling</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Personal Care</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care</td>
<td>25 people per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Housing</td>
<td>As per limitations above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourist Accommodation

- Bed and Breakfast: 10 units per acre
- Hotel, Motel and other Transient Units
  - with less than 10% of units with kitchens: 40 units per acre
  - with 10% or more units with kitchens: 15 units per acre
- Timeshare: As per the limitations set forth in this table

**RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS:** Pursuant to Chapter 35, the maximum number of residential bonus units which may be permitted for this Special Area #2 of this Plan Area is 175 units.

**MAXIMUM COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVEL:** The maximum community noise equivalent level for this Plan Area is 65 CNEL except for Special Area #2 which is 55 CNEL. The maximum community noise equivalent level for the Highway 89 and 50 corridors 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

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

1. Improvements required by Volume IV of the Water Quality Management Plan.
2. The highway and transit improvements indicated in the Transportation Element of the Regional Goals and Policies Plan.
4. The scenic restoration and landscaping improvements indicated in the Scenic Quality Implementation Program for the Highway 89 and 50 corridor.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

308 Doré Court
Elks Point, Nevada

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527
Email: trpa@sierra.net

MEMORANDUM

August 30, 1996

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Report on the 1996 Threshold Evaluation

Proposed Action: No action is requested at this time; however, APC comments would be appreciated since a final report and amendments will be prepared in November for APC action. This is a continuation of a series of presentations to inform the APC about the 1996 Evaluation Report.

Presentations: The presentations are based on the enclosed draft Executive Summary. It provides an overview of the status of threshold attainment and the responding staff recommendations. If you desire a full draft report (two inches thick), please contact Roxie Duer at our office to obtain a copy.

At this meeting, the program managers will present the findings and recommendations for:

1. Air Quality – Bridget Cornell
2. Fisheries and Wildlife – Coleen Shade
3. Vegetation – Steve Chilton
4. Scenic and Recreation – Andrew Strain

If you have any questions, contact the program manager or Gordon Barrett at 702-588-4547.

AGENDA ITEM VI.A
September 3, 1996

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment to Chapter 73 (Grazing) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances

Proposed Action: No action is requested at this time. Staff requests the Advisory Planning Commission to conduct a public hearing and provide comments on the proposed amendments (attached) for possible action in October.

Background

Currently, there are a total of about 650 cow/calf pairs and 75 horses and mules grazing an area of approximately 34,900 acres in the Tahoe Basin (see Exhibit 1). Volume 1 of the 208 Water Quality Management Plan adopted in November, 1988 (pages 102, 152-153) provides direction to TRPA with regard to the management of livestock confinement facilities and wildland pasture grazing. Grazing and livestock confinement facilities are identified in the 208 Plan as contributing to water quality problems, particularly if livestock are allowed to trample seasonally wet areas or stream channels, or if overgrazing causes a loss of native vegetative cover. It also states that controls are needed on grazing and livestock confinement to protect SEZs and seasonally wet soils from trampling, compaction, or storage of animal wastes, and that any previously disturbed areas be restored.

TRPA is further directed to review the grazing BMPs of TRPA and the U.S. Forest Service and, if appropriate, revise or refine the grazing BMPs in cooperation with affected segments of the public, within 1 year of the date of adoption of the amended 208 Plan amendments (November, 1988). The SEZ restoration program, Volume III of the Plan, includes several projects which involve the reduction or elimination of grazing impacts upon SEZs.

In addition, the B List from the 1991 Threshold Evaluation on page 2, subsection III.A. (1) requires that TRPA revise the BMP Handbook to make TRPA guidelines for livestock confinement facilities and grazing consistent with updated requirements of the U.S. Forest Service and the Lahontan Board, and to amend Chapter 73 of the Code of Ordinances to make BMP requirements applicable to both new and existing grazing operations, coordinate implementation efforts with the USFS, and expand BMP monitoring.

The amendments presented in this staff summary are designed to meet the requirements contained in both of these documents.
CURRENT CHAPTER 73 CODE LANGUAGE

Livestock Grazing

Chapter 73 is the Code Chapter which deals with the regulation of livestock grazing in the Basin, with the purpose of controlling soil erosion, water pollution, and destruction of vegetation, and to limit competition with wildlife. This chapter is divided into two main parts, one dealing with livestock grazing and the other with livestock confinement facilities.

Subsection 73.2 which deals with livestock grazing, sets standards with regard to season of use, soil moisture conditions, grazing level, sensitive plant protection, migration routes, water quality standards, and exclusion from streambanks. Subsection 73.4 requires a grazing management plan for a new grazing permit, and specifies the minimum requirements. Permittees are required to submit an annual plan.

In reading the Code language, grazing occurring prior to the adoption the Code language is not subject to the provisions of Chapter 73. If it is considered existing grazing a TRPA permit is not required. As written no change can be made in current grazing activities, even though the grazing may be violating one or more of TRPAs thresholds.

Livestock Confinement Facilities

Subsection 73.3 of the Code requires that existing livestock confinement facilities be brought into compliance with BMPs contained in Volume II of the Tahoe Basin 208 Plan, by July 1, 1992. These BMPs (Exhibit 2) include a 100 foot setback from SEZs, location away from areas subject to overland flow from upslope areas, location on slopes less than 5%, location in areas where depth to groundwater is greater than 48 inches, prevention of runoff flow from facilities into SEZs, containment of waste piles, and installation of infiltration facilities.

At this time only one livestock confinement facility, the Sunset Stables has a permitted plan for compliance with these BMPs. However, this plan has yet to be implemented.

Adequacy of Code Language

The BMPs for livestock confinement facilities seem to be adequate, however, two problems have been identified. These are: 1) The definition of livestock containment facilities in Chapter 2 of the TRPA Code (see Exhibit 3), and 2) the need to incorporate the BMP requirements contained in the 208 Plan directly in Chapter 73 of the Code.

The definition of livestock containment facilities does not clearly differentiate them from a fenced pasture area which contains livestock, but is being grazed. A definition which includes a specific containment facility size and density or amount of animals is needed.

The application of the BMPs for livestock containment facilities would be greatly facilitated if they were incorporated directly into Chapter 73, instead of just being left in Volume 2 of the 208 Plan (BMP Handbook).
Current List of Grazing Activities in the Tahoe Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>No. &amp; Type of Animals, Dates of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Baldwin Beach</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>50 horses/mules 7/1 to 12/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Trout Creek</td>
<td>15,032</td>
<td>66 cow/calf pairs 7/1 to 9/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Cold Creek</td>
<td>5,026</td>
<td>20 cow/calf pairs 6/15 to 10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>Headwaters - (1300 riparian)</td>
<td>11,275</td>
<td>200 cow/calf pairs (suspended?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Cold &amp; Trout Creek below Lake Christopher</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65-70 cow/calf pairs 7/1 to 9/30 (suspended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovacchini</td>
<td>Cold Creek</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>50-60 cow/calf pairs 7/1 to 9/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Meadows</td>
<td>Meadows on both sides of Highway 50 along Upper Truckee River &amp; Trout Creek</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>190 cow/calf pairs 6/15 to 10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>Meadow between Round Hill and Marla Bay between HWY 50 and Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>50 - 70 acres (?)</td>
<td>10 - 15 horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Cattle</td>
<td>Between Loop Road and Kingsbury south of HWY 50 acres (?)</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>25 - 30 cow/calf pairs 7/15 to 10/15 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Ranch</td>
<td>South Upper Truckee Road 60 acres Meyers</td>
<td>5 - 15 horses / to /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIVESTOCK FACILITIES

Definition

Livestock containment facilities are structures built or used to hold livestock, includes but not limited to, corrals.

Purpose

To reduce the problem of degraded runoff resulting from the confinement of livestock.

Applicability

Applicable to areas where livestock are concentrated, such as horse corrals, feed yards, and holding pens. Runoff from these facilities can be high in nutrients from animal feed and manure and create water quality problems, especially if located near a stream environment zone.

Advantages

1. If properly located, designed, and constructed, livestock containment facilities can prevent the discharge of degraded runoff.

Disadvantages

1. These facilities need periodic checking and immediate repair and cleanup if there are problems.

Planning Criteria

The location of livestock containment facilities is important and sites should be carefully chosen based on the following guidelines.

1. Facilities shall not be located within 100 feet of a stream environment zone (SEZ).

2. Facilities shall not be located in areas subject to overland flow from upslope areas.
3. Facilities must be located on gently sloping to flat land (5% slope or less).

4. Facilities shall not be located in areas which have less than 4 feet from the soil surface to the groundwater table at any time of the year.

In addition to the proper location of livestock confinement facilities, the following guidelines must be followed:

1. Surface runoff from these facilities or animal waste stockpiles shall not be allowed to flow into an SEZ.

2. Stockpiling of animal wastes within 100 feet of an SEZ is prohibited.

3. No manure storage or waste piles are to be located on the site unless they are protected from precipitation and surface runoff.

4. Facilities shall be equipped with an infiltration system designed for the 5 year, 6-hour storm or have an area of natural vegetation capable of infiltrating and providing treatment of the runoff.

5. Manure shall be properly disposed of.

**Installation**

Livestock confinement facilities shall be located, designed, and constructed under the direction of qualified professionals. If the facility is to be served by vehicle, the site must have loading-unloading areas that are outside of SEZs.

**Maintenance**

If properly designed, maintenance should be much easier.

**Effectiveness**

Properly maintained and operated facilities can be effective in preventing the discharge of degraded runoff from these facilities.
Littoral Parcel: A parcel of land adjoining or abutting the high water elevation of a lake.

Littoral Processes: See Chapter 50.

Livestock: Domestic animals, such as cattle or sheep, raised and used for commercial purposes.

Livestock Containment Facilities: Structures built or used to hold livestock, includes but not limited to, corrals.

Local Assembly and Entertainment: See Chapter 18.

Local Post Office: See Chapter 18.


Lock-off unit: A lock-off unit is a tourist accommodation unit within a residential design timeshare use which exists within a split-use unit and consists of one or more bedrooms (or sleeping quarters) and baths, but does not contain kitchen facilities. A lock-off unit is created by "locking-off" the kitchen and one or more baths and bedrooms (or other sleeping quarters) in the split-use unit thereby creating a hotel-type tourist accommodation unit which may be rented or leased separately from the remainder of the split-use unit. A lock-off unit constitutes one tourist accommodation unit of the two tourist accommodation units which constitute, or are required for, a split-use unit, except as set forth in Chapter 15. [Amended 12/20/95]

Log Culverts: Logs placed in a stream to facilitate crossing by equipment.

Log and Scatter: A slash treatment method where limbs and tops of felled, dead or damaged trees are cut into short lengths and scattered throughout an area without any concentration. The method requires that no portion of the slash shall be more than twenty inches above the ground and that all unmerchantable chunks are scattered.

Lot: See Parcel.

Low Level Boat Lift: A device with forks attached to a pier that reaches under a boat to lift it from the water for temporary storage.

Low Water Elevation: The established lower surface elevation for fluctuation within a body of water. (For Lake Tahoe, the low water elevation is 6223.0 Feet Lake Tahoe Datum.)

Mail Order and Vending: See Chapter 18.
Chapter 73 - Livestock Grazing Amendments
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The general livestock grazing standards, even if fully implemented, are not up
to current standards for management of riparian pastures as defined by
recent research. A full discussion of current ideas and research would be
helpful before developing any Code amendment language.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND BMPs FOR GRAZING

BMPs as a practice or combinations of practices that have been determined by
state or areawide planning agencies to be most effective and practical means
of preventing or reducing the amount of pollution generated by nonpoint
sources to a level compatible with water quality and related riparian/stream
habitat goals.

Grazing can have impacts on riparian stream habitats and include:

1) reduction or elimination of riparian vegetation, causing
   a) channel aggradation or degradation, and/or
   b) widening or incision of channels changing streambank morphology,
      and as an accumulative result lowering surrounding water tables.

In reviewing the recent literature on grazing management, the following six
step planning process for grazing riparian areas is suggested:

1) determine what factor, bank instability or loss of woody plants is of
   concern;

2) determine site potential and capability

3) determine suitability of affected sites for livestock grazing

4) determine kind and class of livestock best suited to graze site,
   duration and intensity of livestock grazing best suited to the area.

5) Determine best grazing strategy; and

6) apply the proper grazing intensity in keeping with animal distribution
   patterns.

Grazing Management

Once it has been determined that livestock grazing can and should continue on
a riparian area, management practices in any grazing system must provide for
regrowth of riparian plants after grazing and leave sufficient vegetation
after grazing for maintenance of plant vigor and streambank protection.

There are four main components to grazing management in Riparian Areas. These
are:

1) Grazing Effects

2) Grazing Systems
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3) Utilization Standards

4) Season of Use

Some of the management techniques used to achieve utilization standards include:

1) Establish special use riparian areas.

2) Develop alternate water sources away from riparian areas.

3) Locate stock driveways outside of riparian areas.

4) Periodic herding of cattle away from riparian areas.

5) Place salt for cattle outside of riparian areas.

6) Control utilization rates.

U.S. Forest Service

The Environmental Assessment for the Meiss Meadow allotment, completed by the USFS in 1993, provides a comprehensive list of their most recent grazing management strategies and BMPs. The following techniques include the principles contained in the grazing management guides referred to above:

1) Fencing to create 2 new pastures for a total of 3.

2) Resting one pasture each year

3) Season of use set at 7/15 to 10/15, could vary from this.

4) Reduce the number of permitted cow-calf pairs.

5) Creation of riparian pasture, fencing Meiss Meadow from "upland" portions of the Meiss allotment area. Big Meadow and Meiss Riparian pasture would be rested until desired future condition is achieved. This will take 3 to 5 years. Then the riparian pastures would be grazed only under controlled conditions.

6) Herding of cattle to ensure forage utilization standards are not exceeded

7) Establishment of forage utilization standards for forage particularly in the riparian pastures.

8) Reduce the grazing season in half to 6 weeks instead of 12, to allow for regrowth of vegetation.

9) Change order of pasture use.

10) Long term rest until desired future condition standards are met. Then monitor every 5 years to assess resource conditions.
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11) Since the willows are heavily grazed by cattle, grazing of willows should be after spring when plants have adequate carbohydrate storage for the next spring's growth. Grazing is most damaging when root reserves reserves are at their low points, usually in the spring when growth begins;

12) In general terms cattle prefer to graze on level terrain. Riparian areas will usually be overgrazed under passive continuous grazing without intensive herding to distribute them properly around riparian areas; and

13) Development of alternative watering sites to keep cattle out of stream channels. Tramping and chiseling are a measure of the degree of livestock utilization. LTEMU chiseling and stamping standards is 10% of any stream with endangered/threatened fish species; 20% standard for reaches with other fish species.

The attached Chapter 73 amendments proposed by staff, with the addition of a clarification of the definition of livestock containment facilities contained in Chapter 2, and the incorporation of the Livestock Facility BMPs directly into the Commercial Livestock Containment Facilities subsection (73.3) are consistent with the recommendations made in the most current references on the subject of grazing management, are consistent with the updated requirements of the U.S. Forest Service, meet the requirements of Volume III of the 208 Plan for the Tahoe Basin, and will allow TRPA to bring the impacts of grazing into compliance with other TRPA thresholds.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Joe Pepi, at (702) 588-4547.
CHAPTER 73
LIVESTOCK GRAZING

Chapter Contents

73.0 Purpose
73.1 Applicability
73.2 Livestock Grazing Standards
73.3 Existing Livestock Containment Facilities
73.4 Grazing Management Plans
73.5 Annual Report

73.0 Purpose: The purpose of this chapter is to regulate livestock grazing in order to control soil erosion, water pollution and destruction of vegetation, and to limit competition with wildlife.

73.1 Applicability: TRPA, if approved, shall be required for any new livestock-grazing, and confinement-project or activity involving ten or more head of stock, expansion of an existing activity outside the current range, or increase in historical levels of ten or more head at one time.

All commercial Livestock Grazing operations and Containment Facilities will be required to submit a grazing management plan and/or Best Management Practices (BMP) plan for all activities involving ten or more head of stock.

73.2 Livestock Grazing Standards: Grazing pursuant to a TRPA approval shall comply with the following standards:

73.2.A Seasonal Limits: Livestock grazing shall be limited to the period from June 15 through September 15, at which firm soil (soil moisture below field capacity) conditions exist in the pastures, until September 15. The removal date may be adjusted based on annual growing conditions. The removal date for livestock must allow sufficient time for a minimum of two inches of regrowth of vegetation to occur prior to the first hard freeze. The combination of residual stubble height and regrowth should be a minimum of four inches, inclusive, each year.

73.2.B Grazing in Areas of Critical Fish Habitat: A minimum stubble and regrowth height of six inches shall be maintained in areas of critical fish habitat.

73.2.C Grazing of Woody Vegetation: Grazing of willows should begin after the plants have reached the full leaf stage to provide sufficient time for plants to buildup carbohydrate storage for the next springs growth.
73.2.D. **Seasons of Rest:** In order to improve the vigor of riparian plant species, several seasons of rest should be given to the most degraded portions of the pasture.

73.2.BE. **Firm Soil:** Livestock shall be allowed onsite only when the soil is firm (soil moisture below field capacity) enough to prevent damage to soil and vegetation.

73.2.EF. **Grazing Level:** The livestock grazing level shall not exceed the carrying capacity of the range as determined by a qualified range professional. The grazing level must provide for regrowth of riparian plants after grazing, leaving sufficient vegetation for maintenance of plant vigor, and streambank stability and water quality protection.

73.2.BG. **Sensitive Plant Species:** Livestock shall not be allowed in areas where sensitive plant species could be jeopardized.

73.2.EH. **Migration Routes:** Range improvements shall not interfere with migration routes of deer and other wildlife.

73.2.FI. **Water Quality Standards:** Livestock use shall not conflict with the attainment of water quality standards.

73.2.GJ. **BMPs:** All livestock confinement containment facilities shall be in conformance with BMPs.

73.2.HK. **Exclusions:** Livestock shall be excluded from banks of streams where soil erosion or water quality problems exist, by the use of fencing to create riparian pastures. Access to the stream channel will only be at breaks in the fencing where low water crossings are installed. These crossings shall be amored with rock or other approved materials in order to protect the banks from erosion. Cattle access to the stream for watering purposes shall be at these crossings only. Any alternative man-made watering facilities should be located away from stream channels and riparian areas.
Existing Commercial Livestock Confinement-Containment Facilities: Existing commercial livestock confinement containment facilities which are not in conformance with BMPs shall be brought into conformance within five years from the effective date of the Regional Plan, July 1, 1987 by October 15, 1992 with the following standards.

73.3.A Distance from Stream Environment Zones (SEZ): Livestock containment facilities shall not be located within 100 feet of a Stream Environment Zone (SEZ).

73.3.B Areas Subject to Overflow: Livestock Containment Facilities shall not be located in areas subject to overland flow from upslope areas.

73.3.C Slope of Facilities Site: Livestock Containment Facilities must be located on gently sloping to flat land (5% slope or less).

73.3.D Depth to Groundwater: Livestock Containment Facilities must not be located in areas which have less than 4 feet from the soil surface to the groundwater table at any time of the year.

73.3.E Surface Runoff From Livestock Containment Facilities: Surface runoff from livestock containment facilities or animal waste stockpiles shall not be allowed to flow into an SEZ.

73.3.F Stockpiling of Animal Wastes: Stockpiling of animal wastes within 100 feet of an SEZ is prohibited.

73.3.G Manure storage or Waste Piles: No manure storage or waste piles are to be located on the site unless they are protected from precipitation and surface runoff.

73.3.H Runoff Infiltration: Livestock Containment Facilities shall be equipped with an infiltration system designed for the 5 year, 6-hour storm or have an area of natural vegetation capable of infiltration and providing treatment of the runoff.

73.3.I Manure Disposal: Manure shall be disposed of so that there is no negative impact on water quality.
73.4 **Grazing Management Plans:** An applicant-for-a-grazing-permit shall submit a grazing management plan prepared by a qualified range consultant professional by May 30, 1999.

73.4.A **Minimum Requirements:** The grazing management plan shall include at a minimum:

1. The location and acreage of the range.
2. Present condition of the range, particularly regarding vegetation, soil erosion and compaction, and water quality.
3. The type of animal to be grazed.
4. The carrying capacity of the proposed range.
5. Establishment of a yearly trend study to provide for adjustment of use as appropriate.
6. Description and location of confinement containment facilities, if any.
7. Description of proposed range improvements.
8. Identification of the length of grazing season.
9. Certification by the range consultant professional that the plan complies with the provisions of this Code.

73.4.B **Confirmation of Plan or Permit:** TRPA may require, at the applicant's or permittee's operator's expense, confirmation of the adequacy of the grazing management plan or confirmation of compliance with the plan and the TRPA approval. The management plan should state why a particular system was chosen and provide a literature review that fully justifies the use of that grazing management system.

73.5 **Annual Report:** The permittee operator shall submit an annual report each spring, prior to the start of grazing.

73.5.A **Report Contents:** The report shall include the following information for the previous year:

1. Results of the trend study;
2. Season of use; and
3. Number of animals grazed.
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1996 EVALUATION REPORT - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES AND THE REGIONAL PLAN PACKAGE FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

September, 1996
... and at last the lake burst upon us—a noble sheet of blue water lifted six thousand three hundred feet above the level of the sea, and walled in by a rim of snow-clad mountain peaks that towered aloft full three thousand feet higher still! It was a vast oval, and one would have to use up eighty or a hundred good miles in traveling around it. As it lay there with the shadows of the mountains brilliantly photographed upon its still surface I thought it must surely be the fairest picture the whole earth affords.

The forest about us was dense and cool, the sky above us was cloudless and brilliant with sunshine, the broad lake before us was glassy and clear, or rippled and breezy, or black and storm-tossed, according to Nature’s mood; and its circling border of mountain domes, clothed with forests, scarred with landslides, cloven by canyons and valleys, and helmeted with glittering snow, fitly framed and finished the noble picture. The view was always fascinating, bewitching, entrancing. The eye was never tired of gazing, night or day, in calm or storm; it suffered but one grief, and that was that it could not look always, but must close sometimes in sleep.

So singularly clear was the water, that where it was only twenty or thirty feet deep the bottom was so perfectly distinct that the boat seeming floating in the air! Yes, where it was even eighty feet deep. Every little pebble was distinct, every speckled trout, every hand’s-breadth of sand. The water was not merely transparent, but dazzlingly, brilliantly so.”

--excerpts from
Roughing It, by
Mark Twain (1871)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's second comprehensive evaluation of environmental threshold carrying capacities, adopted in 1982, and the subsequent Regional Plan package, adopted in various parts from 1984 to the present.

The 1996 Evaluation Report is intended to provide information and recommendations to the TRPA Governing Board to assist in making necessary adjustments to the environmental threshold carrying capacities and the Regional Plan package, in compliance with the provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, along with other state and federal environmental legislation, establishes TRPA's mission. TRPA's Mission and Statement of Principles is set forth in Figure 1. In addition to its mission under the Compact, TRPA is also responsible for certain planning activities under the Federal Clean Air Act, the Federal Clean Water Act, the California Transportation Development Act, and the California Clean Air Act.

In August 1982, TRPA adopted Resolution No. 82-11, adopting environmental threshold carrying capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region. The Compact defines "environmental threshold carrying capacity" as "an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region."

Throughout the Regional Plan package and this report, TRPA commonly refers to "environmental threshold carrying capacities," "threshold standards," or simply "thresholds." These terms are interchangeable.

Prior to adopting Resolution 82-11, TRPA considered lengthy public testimony, an Environmental Impact Statement, and a study report on the establishment of the threshold standards. The thresholds set forth in Exhibit A of Resolution 82-11 address the following nine components of the environment of the Tahoe Region: water quality, soil conservation, air quality, vegetation preservation, wildlife, fisheries, noise, recreation, and scenic resources.

The threshold standards guide virtually all aspects of TRPA's planning and operating functions. Article V(c) of the Compact requires TRPA to amend the Regional Plan so that, "at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules and regulations, achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities. Each element of the plan shall contain implementation provisions and time schedules for such implementation by ordinance."

Article V(d) of the Compact also requires the Regional Plan to "provide for attaining and maintaining Federal, State, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the region for which the standards are applicable." Each element of the plan, where applicable, must identify the means and time schedule by which air and water quality standards will be attained.
Figure 1

Statement of Mission

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

Statement of Principles

Preamble

TRPA shall interpret and administer its plans, ordinances, rules, and regulations in accordance with the provisions of the Compact. This statement of principles is intended to confirm the policies set forth in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551, December 19, 1980), in its specific provisions and as a whole, so as to guide the Agency in resolving conflicts, in charting the future direction, and in enhancing public understandability. The following statement of general policy provides TRPA with direction and consistency for enactment and implementation of the Regional Plan and increases TRPA and public understanding of the TRPA Goals and Policies.

Principles.

1. The Tahoe Region exhibits unique and irreplaceable environmental and ecological values of national significance which are threatened with deterioration or degeneration.

2. The purpose of TRPA is to:

   a. Maintain the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural, and public health values provided by the Region; and

   b. Insure an equilibrium between the Region's natural endowment and its manmade environment.

Together these will encourage the wise use of the waters of Lake Tahoe and the resources of the area, preserve public and private investments in the Region, and preserve the social and economic health of the Region.

3. In accomplishing its purpose, TRPA is to:

   a. Establish environmental threshold carrying capacities, defined as environmental standards necessary to maintain significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, or natural values of the Region or to maintain public health and safety within the Region, including but not limited to standards for air quality, water quality, soil conservation, vegetation preservation, and noise;

   b. Adopt and enforce a Regional Plan and implementing ordinances which achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities; and

   c. Pursue such activities and projects consistent with the Agency's purposes.

Source: TRPA Goals and Policies, 1996
Finally, Article V(g) of the Compact requires TRPA to make specific written findings prior to approving any project in the Region. These findings must "insure that the project under review will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan and will not cause the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities of the region to be exceeded."

Although the thresholds do not address the economy of the Tahoe Region, TRPA recognizes the interdependence of environmental quality, economic health, and social well-being in the Tahoe Region. The Regional Plan Goals and Policies (1986) provide that TRPA will monitor economic conditions, report on the state of the Region’s economy, consider the impacts of the Regional Plan on the Region’s economy, and consider adjustments to the Regional Plan consistent with the attainment of the threshold standards.

Resolution 82-11 states that the threshold standards shall be reviewed at the time of adoption of the Regional Plan to ensure that the plan and the thresholds are consistent, and at least every five years thereafter. The thresholds shall be amended where scientific evidence and technical information indicate: (a) two or more thresholds are mutually exclusive, or (b) substantial evidence to provide a basis for a threshold does not exist, or (c) a threshold cannot be achieved, or (d) a threshold is not sufficient to maintain a significant value of the Region or additional thresholds are required to maintain a significant value.

The Regional Plan Goals and Policies (Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement) and the Code of Ordinances, in Chapter 32, also require TRPA to evaluate the thresholds and the Regional Plan package at least every five years. Although Regional Plan litigation in the mid-1980s created uncertainty as to the date of the first five-year review, the Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region (TRPA, 1988) established the date for the first evaluation as September, 1991.

The 1996 Evaluation Report consists of an Executive Summary with findings and conclusions and nine chapters, which include the evaluation results for the various categories of threshold standards and the economy of the Region.

There are three appendices. Appendix A contains the list of control measures and related information prepared pursuant to Chapter 32 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Appendix B contains a schedule of implementation for the many recommendations of the 1996 Evaluation Report. Appendix C is the Technical Appendices.

TRPA would like to express its gratitude to the numerous individuals who assisted with this evaluation through participation, formally and informally, as technical advisors, commenters, and reviewers. Their names are listed in the acknowledgments. Without their assistance, preparation of this report would not have been possible.
THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

The Tahoe Region is a special place. To those who have visited Lake Tahoe and its surroundings, from earliest pre-history to the present, the Region is an exceptional, inspiring place of spiritual proportion.

The Tahoe Region was once a place of inestimable beauty. The American author Samuel Clemens ("Mark Twain") wrote of its beauty over a century ago. Photographer Ansel Adams captured it in his photographs.

Yet, like other natural places in California and the Great Basin, its beauty has been severely compromised. As at Yosemite, Pyramid Lake, the lakes and marshes of the Pacific flyway, San Francisco Bay and the California Delta, the progress of modern life has diminished the unique values that make the Tahoe Region so extraordinary.

With ever-increasing pressure upon the Region as a recreational resource and an urban center, preservation of the values of the Tahoe Region is vitally important and--at the same time--immensely difficult. The Region acts as a haven from the urbanized and urbanizing areas surrounding it, and for others who travel from afar to appreciate it. Ironically, the millions who enjoy the area simultaneously endanger it with their very presence.

About the Tahoe Region

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

Lake Tahoe is the dominant feature of the Region and is world renowned for its crystal clear water and beautiful setting. Lake Tahoe is approximately 12 miles wide and 22 miles long, with a surface area of 192 square miles and 75 miles of shoreline. With a maximum depth of 1,645 feet, Lake Tahoe is the tenth deepest lake in the world. Maximum elevation of the Lake's surface is 6,229 feet above sea level.

The topography of the Region consists chiefly of steeply sloping mountains with a few flat or moderately sloping areas where most development has occurred. Elevations of the peaks surrounding Lake Tahoe range from about 8,000 feet to almost 11,000 feet above sea level.
Long, relatively mild winters and short, dry summers characterize the climate of the Region. Precipitation normally falls as snow during the winter months. During the summer, there are infrequent thunderstorms. The western side of the Region receives about twice the precipitation as the eastern side.

Most development and urbanization of the Tahoe Region occurred during and following the Squaw Valley winter Olympics in 1960. Since that time, the population of the Region has increased over five times, with about 80 percent of the population residing in California. The summer population in 1995 is estimated at 102,000.

There are about 20 developed towns and communities; however, the City of South Lake Tahoe is the only incorporated city. The Region is home to about 42,800 residences, 9,600 vacation homes, 11,500 tourist accommodation units, and 2,500 campground units. Figure 2 is the TRPA Regional Plan map which generally matches the land use pattern of the Region.

Casino gaming areas are located at the north and south stateline areas, and in Incline Village. These areas provide tourist, commercial, and indoor entertainment facilities.

The undeveloped areas of the Region are predominantly publicly owned. Public ownership is increasing, largely through the efforts of federal and state land acquisition programs. Outdoor recreation use of the Region is extensive.

The dominant transportation system in the Region is the highway system. There are seven highways that allow access to the Region, four in California and three in Nevada. The dominant form of transportation is the private automobile, but buses, taxis, and other modes accommodate some trips. The South Tahoe Airport, located in the City of South Lake Tahoe, serves the Region.

Effects of Human Activity

There is extensive evidence of the adverse impacts of human activity in the Tahoe Region. Lake Tahoe itself suffers from cultural eutrophication, an increase in algal productivity that will continue until the Lake's nutrient budget is balanced. Even with aggressive management, Lake Tahoe's water quality trends will change slowly, due to the Lake's long residence time, approximately 700 years. Runoff from the watershed carries nutrients to Lake Tahoe; other nutrients come from the air.

Violations of water quality standards and guidelines for tributary streams and urban runoff are common. Water quality is best in watersheds draining relatively undeveloped areas. Accidental discharges from sewage collection and treatment systems and discharges of toxic and hazardous substances during transport or storage have occurred and endanger water quality and public health and safety.
The Region has many examples of soil conservation problems: erosion and runoff associated with urbanization; unstable cut and fill slopes, particularly associated with roads; denuded and compacted areas; stream channelization; and damage from outdoor recreation, off-road vehicles, and grazing.

Although a portion of the Region in California did not attain the federal, state, and TRPA air quality standards for carbon monoxide, due to the presence of a "hot spot" near the south Stateline-California monitoring station, recent monitoring indicates the entire Region is now in attainment. TRPA ozone standards continue to be exceeded in recent years. Based on data from more sophisticated monitors, the Region appears to be in non-attainment for some standards for visual range. The Region still does not meet one of the California inhalable particulate standards, a health-related standard. Other fine particles found in the air include high proportions of wood smoke for which TRPA has not met its threshold target to reduce emissions by 15 percent.

Traffic congestion is common in certain parts of the Region in both summer and winter. TRPA estimates that 1.73 million vehicle miles were traveled (VMT) in the Region on an average peak summer day in 1995. Although VMT projections have improved and improvements have occurred, the land use pattern still suffers from strip development, loss of view corridors, inefficiency in the distribution of uses, and automobile dependency. As indicated in the Summary Table, TRPA still does not meet its threshold targets for vehicle mile reductions.

Vegetation in the Region suffers from poor diversity, a result of the even-aged timber stand left by logging in the late 1800s and current fire suppression practices. Insects have attacked the forest, already weakened by stress, and have killed hundreds of millions of board feet of trees. Recent data still indicates that common vegetation does not meet the threshold, and there is a need to upgrade the thresholds for such things as old growth timber. As to fish and wildlife habitat, progress is being made toward attainment of thresholds which call for restoration of previous human disturbance that decreased the value of fish habitat and wildlife habitat.

Both single-event and cumulative noise affect the tranquility of the Tahoe Region. Although most communities meet noise criteria, some suffer from elevated noise levels from traffic, the dominant noise source in the area. With the adoption of the South Tahoe Airport Master Plan, many of the issues of airport-related noise have been addressed.

Roads, buildings, signs, powerlines, and fences reduce the outstanding scenic attributes of the Region. The Regional Plan designates about 50 areas for scenic restoration. 1996 surveys indicate the Region has improved in the urban areas and has fallen behind in some rural and shoreline areas.

Although outdoor recreation facilities are heavily used during peak winter and summer periods, TRPA is behind in meeting its targets for outdoor recreation. During peak summer periods, there is a shortage of developed campsites, day use facilities, and trails. During peak winter days, capacity limits at developed ski areas and on the highway system are sometimes exceeded.
Concern, Preservation, and Remediation

Tahoe has a long history of concern for environmental quality, preservation of its unique values, and remediation of its most serious problems. The individuals involved in this over the years are too numerous to list. TRPA, the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (CTRPA), and their forerunners in the 1960s have prepared a series of comprehensive plans for the Region. The U.S. Forest Service and state parks departments have planned for, preserved, and managed large tracts of land.

The Forest Service, through the Burton-Santini program, the California Tahoe Conservancy, and the Nevada Division of State Lands have purchased thousands of environmentally sensitive parcels to place them under the protection of public ownership. These same agencies have contributed mightily to the ongoing program of erosion and runoff control in the watershed and have led the way with pilot projects to restore stream environment zones. Units of local government generally construct and maintain these remedial projects.

From a very small program in the early 1960s, interagency monitoring efforts have grown to include almost 30 permanent water quality monitoring sites and five air quality monitoring sites, using the most up-to-date equipment and analysis, with a cost of about $1 million annually. These monitoring programs provide information to direct and evaluate the control measures of the Regional Plan.

The City of South Lake Tahoe has been a leader in redevelopment of sub-standard urban areas, and redevelopment programs in North Lake Tahoe are now in progress.

These are just a few examples of the long history of concern for environmental quality and action in the Tahoe Region.

Institutional Arrangements

Numerous public agencies govern the Tahoe Region, and other agencies assist with the provision of public services. The Water Quality Management Plan for the Region identifies 24 agencies with responsibilities in water quality alone. A partial list of the cooperating agencies follows:

**Federal Agencies:** Environmental Protection Agency, Forest Service, National Resource Conservation Service, Army Corps of Engineers

**State Agencies:** CALTRANS, California Air Resources Board, California Department of Forestry, California Department of State Parks, California Regional Water Quality Control Board--Lahontan Region, California State Lands Commission, California State Water Resources Control Board, California Tahoe Conservancy, Nevada Department of Transportation, Nevada Division of State Parks and Recreation, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Nevada Division of Forestry, Nevada Division of State Lands
Local Government: City of South Lake Tahoe, Carson City, Douglas County, El Dorado County, Placer County, Washoe County

Other Local Agencies: Douglas County Sewer Improvement District, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District, Incline Village General Improvement District, Nevada Tahoe Conservation District, North Tahoe Public Utility District, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, South Tahoe Public Utility District, Tahoe City Public Utility District, Tahoe Resource Conservation District

Regional Agencies: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Tahoe Transportation District

SUMMARY OF THE 1996 EVALUATION

This is a brief summary of the 1996 Evaluation, Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and the Regional Plan Package. It gives the reader an overview of the full Report. This summary contains:

Basic Assumptions and Recommendations
Summary of Trends, Status, and Recommendations for Individual Thresholds

Basic Assumptions and Recommendations: The 1996 Evaluation Report was prepared with some basic assumptions of policy and direction. The assumptions and the findings of the Report set the groundwork for the recommendations that follow.

Assumption #1. There are no major changes to the environmental thresholds proposed with this Evaluation. TRPA recognizes that many of the major studies needed to evaluate threshold amendments were not completed as proposed in the 1991 Evaluation. This Evaluation recommends a stronger effort be made to complete these studies, especially the water quality modeling studies. Where data does exist to support changes, this study does make appropriate recommendations.

Assumption #2. The focus of the TRPA for the next five years will be on implementing environmental improvements. The 1991 Evaluation recommended developing an integrated environmental improvement program to coordinate and assure implementation of all the projects, programs and studies needed to achieve and maintain environmental thresholds. Following on this recommendation, the 1996 Evaluation recommends focusing efforts of all entities in the Region upon implementing the Environmental Improvement Program with an emphasis on a 'Top Priority List' of projects for the next five years. Included with this recommendation is a refocusing of TRPA staff efforts on implementation that will be made possible through streamlining, delegation, and partnership efforts.
Assumption #3. The allocations of development for the next ten years will be within that projected by previous plans and EISs. It is the recommendation of this Evaluation that any major changes in growth limits would be premature based upon current progress on threshold attainment.

Summary of Trends, Status, and Recommendations for Individual Thresholds: For a brief summary of the individual thresholds, see Table 1 that follows. The table displays, for each threshold category, the trend toward attainment, the status of the threshold, and the report’s recommendations. The table also provides recommendations for the Region’s economy.

The recommendations are classified as “A List,” which means the recommendations will be completed by TRPA as part of the 1996 Evaluation. Those recommendations classified “B List” will be completed by TRPA before the 2001 Evaluation. Those recommendations classified as “C List” will be completed; but, many of these recommendations will require additional funding, staffing, or cooperation from other agencies.
## TABLE 1
### SUMMARY OF 1996 EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE INDICATOR TRENDS</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-1 CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-2 O₃</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-3 Particulate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-4 Visibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-5 U.S. 50 Traffic Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-6 Wood Smoke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-7 VMNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-8 Atmospheric Nutrient Loading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. WATER QUALITY/SOIL CONSERVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-1 Turbidity (Shallow)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-2 Clarity, Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-3 Phytoplankton PFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-4 Tributary Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-5 Runoff Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-6 Groundwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-7 Other Lakes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-1 Impervious Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-2 Naturally-Functioning SEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. VEGETATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-1 Relative Abundance and Pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-2 Uncommon Plant Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-3 Sensitive Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. FISHERIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1 Lake Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2 Stream Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-3 In-Stream Flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. WILDLIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-1 Special Interest Species</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-2 Habitats of Special Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. SCENIC RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-1 Travel Route Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-2 Scenic Quality Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-3 Public Recreation Area Scenic Quality Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-4 Community Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. NOISE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-1 Single Event (Aircraft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-2 Single Event (Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-3 Community Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. RECREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1 High Quality Recreational Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 Capacity Available to the General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive Trend ↑  Negative Trend ↓  No Trend =
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WATER QUALITY THRESHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WQ-6</td>
<td>Stormwater runoff</td>
<td>Surface discharge to</td>
<td>Surface water infiltration onto the groundwater shall comply with the</td>
<td>TRPA shall prepare a mitigation plan of urban runoff at the point of discharge.</td>
<td>Non-attainment for interim and long term. Typically, surface discharge to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality</td>
<td>groundwater</td>
<td>Uniform Regional Runoff Guidelines. For total nitrogen, 5 mg/l; total</td>
<td></td>
<td>groundwater does not meet state standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phosphorus, 1 mg/l; total iron, 4 mg/l; turbidity, 200 NTU; grease and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oil, 40 mg/l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations:
1. Complete urban runoff model to evaluate impacts of urban runoff and to help prioritize future water quality projects. (B List)
2. Develop and implement a BMP Maintenance Program for large projects and continue to implement the BMP Retrofit Program. (B List)
3. Refine current monitoring program to collect urban runoff on a flow-weighted basis in the Upper Truckee River and Third Creek watershed, rather than focus on grab samples throughout the Basin. (B List)
4. Develop a performance-based CIP list coordinated with the Environmental Improvement Program for each jurisdiction. (A List)

WQ-7
Other Lakes
California-Nevada Other Lakes

For other lakes in Nevada and California, the standards are the same as the tributary standards.

TRPA shall determine the status of developing standards by September, 1996.

Attainment: Under current State standards, the lakes are typically within the Standards.

Attainment for interim. Nevada is currently revising its tributary standards. TRC is currently preparing a report on California Other Lake Standards.

Recommendations
1. Complete feasibility assessment of the need for establishment of water quality standards for California Other Lakes. (C List)
# Table 1
## Summary of 1996 Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC-1</td>
<td>Impervious Land Coverage</td>
<td>Additional Land Coverage, by project (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>Impervious coverage shall comply with the land capability classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin</td>
<td>Spend 80% of excess coverage mitigation fee funds</td>
<td>Non-attainment for coverage reductions, Non-attainment for interim. Nevada has not purchased land coverage with the fees. California is in attainment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of land coverage limitations related to water quality improvement by developing a water clarity model. Recommendations regarding changes to the land coverage program should be a goal of the model. (C List)

2. A full inventory and model of coverage within the Basin should be made by land capability type. (C List)

3. Work with the USFS and State Parks to target up to 80% of coverage removed from the obliteration of unpaved roads be permanently retired. (C List)

4. Amend excess coverage mitigation fee calculations to ensure the ability to retire the targeted coverage amount. (A List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC-2</td>
<td>SEZ Restoration</td>
<td>Acres Restored</td>
<td>Restore 25% of the SEZ in developed, disturbed, and subdivided areas. restore 100% in outlying areas for 5% overall increase.</td>
<td>By December 31, 1992. TRPA shall adopt interim targets.</td>
<td>Non-attainment. Only a quarter of the 1103 acres of SEZ have been restored. Non-attainment for interim. TRPA has not adopted interim targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Amend the Code of Ordinances to provide language that clearly protects SEZs from disturbance and vegetation removal or conversion except under approved management plans. (A List)

2. All SEZ lands within the subdivided, developed, or disturbed parts of the Region acquired by the U.S. Forest Service, California Tahoe Conservancy, or Nevada State Lands should be evaluated by qualified personnel for their restoration potential. (C List)

3. Local governments should help fund the evaluation of publicly acquired SEZ lands for their restoration potential and inclusion in the EIP. (C List)

4. Four hundred acres of SEZ should be included in the EIP as a priority for restoration over the next five years. (A List)

5. A classification system of SEZ type by function both in terms of wildlife, fisheries, and hydrology should be created. (B List)

6. An assessment and determination of the value of man-made SEZ should be made for purposes of both water quality and/or wildlife habitat improvements. (C List)
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VEGETATION THRESHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-1</td>
<td>Vegetation Protection</td>
<td>Common Vegetation</td>
<td>Increase plant and structural diversity of forest communities as measured by species richness, relative abundance and pattern.</td>
<td>To be determined pending completion of next U.S. Forest Service vegetation inventory.</td>
<td>Attainment for species richness and pattern. Non-attainment for relative abundance of deciduous riparian (low acreage), yellow pine forest (high acreage) and red fir forest (high acreage).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
1. Adopt Vegetation Goals and Policies to reflect ecosystem/forest health approach to resource management. (B List)
2. Adopt Old Growth/Late Successional Stage Threshold to protect and perpetuate old growth stands in the urban and non-urban areas and single trees of significance in the urban areas. (A List)
3. Amend Chapter 74 of the Code of Ordinances to provide additional protections to stream environment zone vegetation. (A List)
4. Amend Chapter 71 of the Code of Ordinances to reflect ecosystem/forest health approach to resource management. (B List)
5. Develop and implement high priority vegetation EIP projects. (B List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendations
1. Complete an underwater survey of Lake Tahoe deep water plant communities by remote operated vehicle. (C List)
2. Provide for annual protection measures for Freel Peak Community. (C List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-3</td>
<td>Vegetation Protection</td>
<td>Sensitive Plants</td>
<td>Maintain a minimum number of population sites for each species.</td>
<td>By September 1996, TRPA should prepare a study and recommendation regarding possible listing of Arabis rigidissima v. demota and Silene invisa.</td>
<td>Non-attainment of Rorippa. High water has reduced sites to less than 10. Attainment of Lewisia, and both Draba species as of 1993 Attainment with respect to the interim target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations
1. For Rorippa, develop and implement California State Lands' Stewardship Program. Continue population inventory surveys. Conduct biological study of Rorippa's genetic makeup, the effects of inundation, reproductive biology, population viability, root morphology, and habitat. (C List)
# TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF 1996 EVALUATION

## FISHERIES THRESHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>Fisheries Habitat Protection</td>
<td>Lake Habitat</td>
<td>A non-degradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe. Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat.</td>
<td>Develop a restoration program for Lake fisheries by September 1997.</td>
<td>Non-attainment - However the fish study and mapping indicate a reduced number of acres in need of restoration. Non-attainment for interim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Revise the location standards relative to fish habitat for shorezone structures, enhance controls in the Code, and fund enforcement of lake bed manipulation based upon the Shorezone Final EIS. (B List)
2. Amend in-Lake fish habitat map to more accurately reflect habitat conditions. (A List)
3. Conduct an in-Lake fish habitat restoration study in order to provide scientifically accurate recommendations for restoration projects in the shorezone. (B List)
4. Develop a Fish Habitat Improvement Program in the EIP incorporating recommendations from restoration study. (B List)
5. Conduct a mountain whitefish survey to analyze its population status. (C List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-2</td>
<td>Fisheries Habitat Protection</td>
<td>Stream Habitat</td>
<td>Maintain the 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat as indicated by the map on page 76 of the EIS for the establishment of the environmental thresholds.</td>
<td>25 stream habitat miles from good to excellent, and 45 miles from marginal to good, provided that TRPA adopts a new rating system, substitute targets will be adopted simultaneously.</td>
<td>Non-attainment for long-term standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Amend Stream Habitat maps to reflect the changes that have occurred as a consequence of re-rating. (A List)
2. Adopt Appendix C-1 of the 96 Evaluation with the amended stream ratings and potential ratings for each stream. (A List)
3. Once the Riparian Assessment project is complete incorporate the biological information into a revised rating system. (B List)
4. Improve the fish habitat improvement program for the Region’s streams based on the potential a stream has in becoming good or excellent fish habitat. This should become part of the EIP. (B List)
5. Amend the Code of ordinances to protect the SEZs consistent with non-degradation standards found in both the fisheries and wildlife thresholds. (A List)
6. Conduct feasibility study for the reintroduction of amphibians within the drainages that are rated marginal fisheries habitat and whose potential to provide fish habitat is marginal. (C List)
7. Facilitate the development of a beaver management program in coordination with the resource management agencies of the Region. (On-going)
8. Conduct a mountain whitefish survey to analyze its population status. (C List)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-3</td>
<td>Instream Flows</td>
<td></td>
<td>A non-degradation standard shall apply to instream flows until instream flow standards are established in the Regional Plan to protect fishery values.</td>
<td>Adopt numerical instream flow standards for studied streams by June 1997.</td>
<td>Unknown for long term because of lack of monitoring data. Non-attainment for interim but will be adopted with this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. Adopt the instream flow requirements recommended in the 1987 report. (A List)
2. Develop monitoring protocol to evaluate current and long-range compliance with the adopted instream flow numerical standards. (B List)
3. Facilitate the exchange of water from stream diversions to lake uptake. (On-going)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILDLIFE THRESHOLDS</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-1 Wildlife Protection</td>
<td>Special Interest Species</td>
<td>Provide a minimum number of population sites and distance zones for the following six species: Goshawk - 12 sites; Osprey - 4 sites; Bald Eagle = 2 winter, Bald Eagle = 1 nesting; Golden Eagle = 4 sites; Peregrine = 2 sites; Waterfowl = 18 sites; Deer =</td>
<td>To be determined based on further monitoring.</td>
<td><strong>Attainment</strong>: Goshawk, Waterfowl, Osprey, Bald Eagle Nesting and Wintering and Deer are known to be in attainment. <strong>Non-attainment</strong>: Peregrine Unknown - Golden Eagle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Conduct golden eagle survey and study. (B List)
2. Conduct annual waterfowl survey. (On-going)
3. Conduct a study that evaluates the overall population dynamics and habitat utilization of wildlife species in the Region. (B List)
4. Evaluate the current controls on OHVs (to include snow mobiles and jet skis). Included in this study should be an analysis of the adequacy of the noise standards on wildlife. (C List)
5. Study human impacts in the South and East Shores of Lake Tahoe on wintering bald eagles. (C List)
6. Amend the Code of Ordinances to protect SEZs consistent with the non-degradation standards found in both the wildlife and fisheries thresholds. (A List)
7. Update maps and data base for special interest species. (B List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-2 Wildlife Habitat Protection</td>
<td>Habitat of Special Significance</td>
<td>A non-degradation standard shall apply to significant wildlife habitat consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations</td>
<td>See SC-2</td>
<td>Non-attainment - See SC-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Amend the Code of Ordinances to protect the SEZs consistent with the non-degradation standards found in both the wildlife and fisheries thresholds. (A List)
2. Revise Code of Ordinances to make land coverage mitigation requirements consistent between SEZ and backshore. (B List)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-1</td>
<td>Travel Route Scenic</td>
<td>Roadway and Shoreline</td>
<td>1982 Threshold Rating Values for Roadway and Shoreline Travel Route Units shall be maintained or improved. Restore scenic quality in Roadway Units rated 15 or below and in Shoreline Units rated 7 or below.</td>
<td>Targets on Table SR-1.</td>
<td>Non-attainment for long term. Although the same 23 roadway units are still non-attainment, 9 showed improvement, 9 non-attainment shoreline units, and 0 showed improvement. Non-attainment for interim targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

1. Integrate the Scenic Quality Improvements into the EIP. Seek dedicated funding for the needed threshold improvements. (A List)

2. TRPA should develop standards for upland of the shorezone for setbacks for bulk and mass, height, lot size, maximum glass area standards, and account for visual absorption capability. (B List)

3. Implement mitigation measures for shorezone structures based upon the final shorezone EIS. (B List)

4. Request the State of California to keep Rule 20/32 Program for undergrounding utilities, and work with Nevada to develop such a program. (B List)

5. Amend Code Chapter 26, Signs (and substitute ordinances) to trigger amortization/conformance with any permit action (A List). Fund a sign enforcement coordinator. (C List)

6. Develop an off-site mitigation program for scenic mitigation. (B List)

7. Develop a scenic mitigation credit system for projects. (B List)

8. Amend Guidelines and Code to include specific color requirements for visually sensitive areas and to allow longer driveways for scenic setbacks. (B List)

9. Work with the State of Nevada and utility providers to develop utility undergrounding program. (C List).

Recommendations

Threshold Description Parameter Standard Interim Target Attainment Status
SR-2 Mapped Scenic Resources Roadway and Shoreline Scenic Quality Ratings 1982 Threshold Ratings Values for individual resources shall be maintained or improved. Targets on Table SR-2 Non-attainment Five of 202 roadway ratings and 184 shoreline ratings had reductions in score. Non-attainment For interim targets.

Recommendations

1. Update the SQIP to identify degraded resources and list program mitigation needs to be included in the EIP. (A List)

2. Conduct the post construction review for Caltrans viaduct project in the Emerald Bay. (B List)

3. Integrate the threshold into the Real-Time Monitoring Program. (B List)

Recommendations

SR-3 Recreation Area Scenic Resources Bikeway and Public Recreation Area Scenic Quality Ratings 1993 Threshold rating values for individual resources shall be maintained or improved. N/A Unknown Just recently adopted.

Recommendations

1. Integrate the threshold into the Real-Time Monitoring Program. (B List)

2. Add Spooner Lake State Park and Tahoe Valley State Recreation Area/Washoe Meadows State Park to the facilities covered by the threshold. (B List)

3. Work with recreation area managers to enhance threshold attainment and maintenance. (B List)
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#### SCENIC THRESHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-4</td>
<td>Community Design</td>
<td>Design of Built Environment</td>
<td>The Built Environment Shall be Compatible With the Natural Environment</td>
<td>Implement Sign Amortization Code Revisions</td>
<td>Non-attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. Amend Chapter 30 to revise standards for exterior lighting of recreation areas and for building and landscape lighting, and develop standards for transportation corridor design. (B List)

2. Amend Chapter 26, Sigma, and substitute sign ordinances to require more stringent requirements for conformance, to coordinate amortization, limit sign heights on buildings, to revise color and illumination standards, and to limit exemption policies. (A List)

3. Hold a design workshop to consider implementation of the scenic improvements and the delay of the Loop Road improvements for the South Stateline area. (B List)

4. Amend Chapter 22 to clarify and revise definitions, clarify and revise additional height provisions, and revise findings for additional height. (B List)
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### NOISE THRESHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Atainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-1</td>
<td>Aircraft Noise</td>
<td>Single-event (aircraft)</td>
<td>80dBA at 6,500 meters from start of takeoff/roll: 84dBA for general aviation and commuter, and 86dBA for transport aircraft at 2,000 meters from the runway threshold approach: 77.1 dBA between the hours of 8:00 pm and 8:00 am.</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2 Noise Mitigation of the Airport Settlement Agreement</td>
<td>Atainment: Transport and commuter aircraft. Non-attainment: One instance of violation for 19,000 plus GAO operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. Implement the noise mitigation measures listed in the South Tahoe Airport Master Plan. (B List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Atainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. TRPA should undertake a long-term single-event noise monitoring program for the major noise generators, such as personal water craft and those listed in the threshold. (B List)

2. Establish a noise enforcement MOU with local state and federal agencies. Additional single event standards in the Meyers CP and the Northshore CPs should be considered for the Region. (C List)

| Threshold | Community Noise Levels | Community Noise Equivalent Levels (CNEL) | High Density Residential Areas: 55dBA; Low Density Residential Areas: 50dBA; Hotel/Motel Facilities: 55dBA; Commercial Areas: 65dBA; Urban Outdoor Recreation Areas: 55dBA; Rural Outdoor Recreation Areas: 50dBA; Wilderness and Roadless Areas: 25dBA; Critical Wildlife Habitat Areas: 25dBA; TRPA should prepare a report on possible CNEL changes. | | Non-attainment: Monitoring performed May 6-20, 1996, indicates 33 out of 40 sample sites in attainment. Atainment: On interim, TRPA recommends changes in wilderness and commercial CNELs. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOISE THRESHOLDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 50: 65dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways 89, 107, 28, 267, and 431: 55dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe Airport: 60dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. Commercial/public service plan areas, which are predominantly tourist or retail in use, should be lowered to 60 CNEL. (A List)
2. Wilderness and roadless areas and critical wildlife habitat areas should be amended to account for evening and night time CNEL penalties. (A List)
3. The threshold rule “background noise levels shall not exceed existing levels, or the following levels, whichever is less” should be reevaluated. (C List)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Quality of Recreation Experience</td>
<td>High Quality Recreational Experience</td>
<td>Preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience including undeveloped shoreline.</td>
<td>Survey of public opinion on recreation</td>
<td>Unknown on long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional public access Regional Recreation Plan</td>
<td>Attainment on interim target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. User satisfaction surveys should occur on a regular (preferably annual) basis. (On-going)
2. Continue support and participation in TCORP. (On-going)
3. Implement the projects listed in the EIP for recreation. (On-going)
4. TRPA shall develop a more detailed regional recreation plan including measurable performance targets and a priority acquisition list of high quality lands suitable for low density recreation by the general public. (B List)
5. Recreation providers need to allocate adequate resources to the upkeep and repair of existing recreation facilities. A comprehensive and systematic program of maintenance and repair should be provided by each recreation entity. (On-going)
6. TRPA should adopt a policy statement which encourages local governments to retain public rights-of-way or easements which provide or can provide public access to the Lake. (A List)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Public recreation opportunities</td>
<td>Outdoor recreation capacity available to the general public</td>
<td>PAOTs to public outdoor recreation projects. Establish and ensure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation available to the general public.</td>
<td>Estimate recreation resource capacity needs. Interim PAOT development targets.</td>
<td>Unknown on long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment on interim target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. Recreation projects which implement the threshold should be integrated into TRPA's Environmental Improvement Program (A List).
2. As part of the recreation plan update, provide criteria for a more clear understanding of how to measure the threshold. Add additional uses which implement the additional developed outdoor recreation targets (B List).
3. TRPA should improve its tracking and information gathering systems in regards to recreation. (B List) TRPA should become an information clearing house and provider of recreation data (C List).
4. TRPA must revise its project review procedures to require findings that sufficient resource capacity remains to achieve the Regional Plan's recreation goals (C List).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMICS</th>
<th></th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Interim Target</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Interim Target</td>
<td>Attainment Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

1. *Continue participation in TTREC. (On-going)*
2. *Gather economic data for key economic indicators. (C List)*
3. *Initiate a study of the local economy to determine key business relationships and impacts of development guidelines including mitigation programs. (C List)*
4. *Initiate a study of commercial needs for the Basin based on its tourist/service nature. (C List)*
5. *Study the rate of absorption of available commercial allocations by business type and location. (C List)*
6. *Develop a model of the local economy to determine significant contributors to local economic growth. (C List)*
7. *Study the recreational nature of the local economy to determine how this relates to the commercial needs of the Region. (C List)*