TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (TRPA)
TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TMPO)
AND TRPA COMMITTEE MEETINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Wednesday, June 23, 1999, commencing at 9:30 a.m., the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting. The meeting will take place at the Tahoe Seasons Resort, Saddle Road at Keller, South Lake Tahoe, California. The agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

Governing Board Committee items are action items unless otherwise noted.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on June 23, 1999, commencing at 8:30 a.m., in the same location, the TRPA Finance Committee will meet. The agenda will be as follows: 1) public interest comments (no action); 2) receipt of the May 1999 financial statement and check register; 3) adoption of TRPA FY 99-00 operating budget; 4) approval of FY 98-99 budget revisions; 5) Douglas County request for water quality mitigation funds ($35,916) for Maria Bay Tahoe Bond Act Project (Phase II); 6) release of $10,000 from the shorezone mitigation fund for scenic consultant; and 7) member comments. (Committee: Neff, Heller, Galloway, Solaro, Bennett)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on June 23, 1999, commencing at 8:30 a.m., in the same location, the TRPA Legal Committee will meet. The agenda will be as follows: 1) public interest comments (no action); 2) discussion of IPES line/acquisition programs; and 3) member comments. (Committee: Waldie, Sandoval, Miner, DeLaNoy, Giles, Medina)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on June 23, 1999, in the same location, following action by TRPA on the Consent Calendar, the Governing Board of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) will meet. The TMPO agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that on June 23, 1999, during the lunch break at 12:00 noon at the Tahoe Seasons Needles Restaurant, the TRPA Rules Committee will meet. The agenda will be as follows: 1) public interest comments; 2) amendment of Policy 2.2 (Paid Absences), Policy 2.6 (Vacation), and Policy 3.3 (Salary and Pay Period), of the Personnel Procedures Manual; and 3) member comments. (Committee: Solaro, Neff, Heller, Galloway, Medina)

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that on June 23, 1999, during the lunch break at 12:00 noon at the Tahoe Seasons Needles Restaurant, the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program Implementation Committee (EIPIC) will meet. The agenda will be as follows: 1) public interest comments; 2) support for Congressional bill authorizing a $300 million appropriation over ten years for EIP projects via the Forest Service; 3) finance plan for EIP; 4) Phase II of the regional revenue feasibility study; and 5) member comments. (Committee: Waldie, Cole, Perock, Miner, Bennett, DeLaNoy)

June 14, 1999

Jerry Wells
Deputy Executive Director
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY GOVERNING BOARD AND
TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION GOVERNING BOARD

Tahoe Seasons Resort
South Lake Tahoe, California

June 23, 1999
9:30 a.m.

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

Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily
be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

AGENDA

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Governing Board on any agenda item not listed as a Project Review, Public Hearing, RTPA, TMPO, Appeal, or Planning Matter item may do so at this time. However, public comment on Project Review, Public Hearing, RTPA, TMPO Appeal, and Planning Matter items will be taken at the time these agenda items are heard.

THE GOVERNING BOARD IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR (see agenda page 3)

VII. MEETING OF THE TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TMPO)

A. Public Interest Comments

B. Receipt of Report of the Tahoe Transportation District

C. Results of the Nevada Statewide Transportation Technical Advisory Committees (STTAC) Enhancement Project Selection

D. Public Hearing on the Adoption of the 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (This will be a joint hearing with the TRPA Governing Board.)
VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS (Reconvene as TRBA)

A. Adoption of the 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (This will be a joint hearing with the TMPO Governing Board; see item VII.D.) Page 51

B. Shorezone Ordinance Environmental Impact Statement Page 57

C. Lake Tahoe Source Water Assessment and Protection Program Page 59

IX. PROJECT REVIEW

A. Mountain Ventures/Buehler Center, Lake Vista 67-Unit Multi-Family Affordable Units, Special Use Determination and Assignment of Residential Bonus Units, Douglas County APNs 007-180-05 and -16, File #980865 – 1:30 p.m. Page 61

X. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Discussion on Code Chapter 28, Natural Hazard Standards, Relative to Floodplain Maps – 11:00 a.m. Page 105

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Appointment of Nevada Lay Member to the Advisory Planning Commission Page 109

XII. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND BOARD ACTION

A. Finance Committee

B. Legal Committee

C. Rules Committee

1. Resolution to Amend Policy 2.2 (Paid Absences), Policy 2.6 (Vacation) and Policy 3.3 (Salary and Pay Period) of the TRPA Personnel Policy Manual Page 111

D. Environmental Improvement Program Implementation Committee (EIPIC)

1. Resolution Supporting Congressional Authorization for $300 Million Appropriation Over Ten Years for EIP Projects Via the Forest Service

2. Finance Plan for the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP)

3. Phase II of the Regional Revenue Feasibility Study

XIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director Monthly Status Report
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1. Status Report on Project Applications

B. Legal Division Monthly Status Report

C. Governing Board Members

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. May Financial Statement and Check Register</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TRPA FY 99-00 Operating Budget</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TRPA FY 98-99 Operating Budget Revisions</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Douglas County Request for Water Quality Mitigation Funds ($35,916) for Marla Bay Tahoe Bond Act Project (Phase II)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Harrah's Tour Boat, Douglas County APN 05-230-12</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Douglas County/Kahle Park, Land Capability Challenge, APN 007-130-04</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taormino, Land Capability Challenge, El Dorado County APN 16-143-10</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hilton, Land Capability Challenge, El Dorado County APN 34-434-03</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. White, Land Capability Challenge, Douglas County APN 03-191-03</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Release of $10,000 from Shorezone Mitigation Fund for Scenic Consultant</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TRPA Three-Year Strategic Plan and FY 1999-00 Work Program</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These consent calendar items are expected to be routine and non-controversial. They will be acted upon by the Board at one time without discussion. The special use determinations will be removed from the calendar at the request of any member of the public and taken up separately. If any Board member or noticed affected property owner requests that an item be removed from the calendar, it will be taken up separately in the appropriate agenda category.
Four of the members of the governing body from each State constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the agency. The voting procedure shall be as follows:

(1) For adopting, amending or repealing environmental threshold carrying capacities, the regional plan, and ordinances, rules and regulations, and for granting variances from the ordinances, rules and regulations, the vote of at least four of the members of each State agreeing with the vote of at least four members of the other State shall be required to take action. If there is no vote of at least four of the members from one State agreeing with the vote of at least four of the members of the other State on the actions specified in this paragraph, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

(2) For approving a project, the affirmative vote of at least five members from the State in which the project is located and the affirmative vote of at least nine members of the governing body are required. If at least five members of the governing body from the State in which the project is located and at least nine members of the entire governing body do not vote in favor of the project, upon a motion for approval, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken. A decision by the agency to approve a project shall be supported by a statement of findings, adopted by the agency, which indicates that the project complies with the regional plan and with applicable ordinances, rules and regulations of the agency.

(3) For routine business and for directing the agency's staff on litigation and enforcement actions, at least eight members of the governing body must agree to take action. If at least eight votes in favor of such action are not cast, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

Article III(g) Public Law 96-551

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Stateline 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.
NOTICE OF AMENDED AGENDA
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the regular June 23, 1999, Governing Board meeting agenda for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is hereby amended by adding the following Planning Matter item:

X. PLANNING MATTER

B. Approval of Work Program for the South Wye Industrial Community Plan

June 15, 1999

[Signature]

By: ________________________________

Jerry Wells
Deputy Executive Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Stateline and Al Tahoe, California.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

Granlibakken Conference Center
Tahoe City, California

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Larry Sevison called the regular May 26, 1999, meeting of the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to order and asked Vice Chairman Don Miner to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Dr. Miner, Mr. Waldie, Mr. DeLanoy, Mr. Montgomery (for El Dorado County), Mr. Cole, Ms. Bennett, Mr. Giles, Mr. Perock, Ms. Neft, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Sandoval, Ms. Medina, Mr. Sevison

Members Absent: Mr. Reis (for Nevada Secretary of State Heller), Mr. Neumann

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Mr. Jim Hildinger, South Shore resident, commented on decreasing water clarity and recommended implementation of an inspection and enforcement program for BMPs similar to programs in Lafayette and in Los Angeles.

Mr. Waldie advised that in a recent tour on the U.C. Davis research vessel, the California and Nevada Attorneys General were advised that the secchi disk readings on Lake Tahoe showed visibility at 33 feet in the middle of the Lake – the lowest level ever.

Mr. Donald Komreich, Incline Village resident, distributed several copies of a May 18 memo regarding 100 improvement projects to be accomplished in the Incline Village/Crystal Bay area over the next 10 years; total price tag $100 million. He commented also on the $6.6 million grant to the Parasol Foundation and the progress of legislation in Nevada related to Tahoe improvements.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Deputy Executive Director Jerry Wells advised of the following: 1) X D. Glenbrook Plan Area Statement amendment continued for 90 days at request of applicant; 2) X. B. Chapter 28 Floodplain Map discussion – staff requested a continuance to June when the Army Corps of Engineers could be present. The Board may wish to have some discussion today, however. 3) X.E. Highway 28 resolution to be taken up after the TMPO matter. 4) the North Lake Tahoe Historical Society had arranged a luncheon tour of the Gatekeepers Museum for Board members during the noon recess.

MOTION by Dr. Miner to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.
V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Dr. Miner to approve the April 28, 1999, regular meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Wells advised that staff had received a phone message from an adjoining property owner on item 6 (Wilson). The neighbor’s concerns had been addressed in a staff memo distributed to the Board. The neighbor had not requested the matter be taken off the calendar. Also, David Byerman wished to speak to the Board on item 9.

Mr. David Byerman, Nevada's Chief Government Liaison for the Department of Commerce, spoke on the importance of an accurate count in the upcoming census as a mechanism to provide funding for various programs in the Tahoe Basin. The programs awarded on a per capita basis worked to the core values and goals of TRPA. $1.9 billion in mass transit funding was awarded last year on a per capita basis; $218 million in community facilities funding; $181 million in air quality and mitigation funding, and $121 million in rural and non-urbanized transportation funding. Overall, nation-wide, on a per-year, per capita basis, $182 billion was awarded for various activities and programs, amounting to $670 per person per year. Missing one family of four in the upcoming census in the Tahoe Basin would amount to a loss of $25,000 over the next ten years. Mr. Byerman distributed written material to the Board members and noted the importance of maximizing the census numbers to improve funding possibilities and quality of life, educational resources and the environment. He responded to questions.

Finance Committee Chairman Kay Bennett advised that her committee had recommended approval of items 1, 3, 4, and 5.

MOTION by Dr. Miner to approve the consent calendar. The motion carried unanimously.

(Following are items approved on the consent calendar:

1. April Financial Statement and Check Register
2. RTPA Resolution Accepting RTPA Transportation Development Act Triennial Performance Audit for FYs 95-96, 96-97, and 97-98 (RTPA Resolution No. 99-8)
3. Request for Water Quality Mitigation Funds ($320,000) to Washoe County for the Incline Village Commercial and the Lower Wood Creek Water Quality Improvement Projects
4. Request for Water Quality Mitigation Funds ($109,000) and SEZ Mitigation Funds ($74,000) to South Lake Tahoe for Water Quality and SEZ Projects
5. Allocation of Excess Fines and Forfeitures Account
6. Wilson, New Commercial Building and Residential Unit, 3100 N. Lake Boulevard, Dollar Hill, Placer County APN 25-001-69 and 69, File #99-15017
7. Lake Tahoe Community College, Two Modular Classrooms Addition, One College Drive, South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APN 25-010-54 File #990117

VII. MEETING OF THE TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TMPO)

Chairman Sevison recessed the TRPA Board and convened the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) Board. Mr. Juan Palma joined the Board.
A. Public Interest Comments – no comments

B. Prioritization of Nevada Transportation Enhancement Act Project Applications

Transportation Team Leader Richard Wiggins noted the requirement for the new TMPO to prioritize and submit to the Nevada Statewide Advisory Committee a list of those projects proposed for funding. The list of projects (one Douglas County and three in Washoe County) were developed at the local level and were reviewed and recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee to the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). The Douglas County project was the first priority for submittal to NDOT and sought $41,000 for sidewalk improvements on Highway 50 at Nevada Beach. The Statewide Technical Advisory Committee would work with the MPOs in the state on the project submittals. Approximately $37 million were requested and $7.2 million was available.

Mr. Perock asked whether the list of Nevada State Parks projects in the Spooner area had to be on this priority list request. He would check with State Parks to find out why the projects were not listed and what needed to be done to get them submitted.

Mr. Don Kornreich, from Incline Village, explained the first ISTEA application was submitted in 1993; sidewalks were finally built in 1998. There was often a time lag between submittal and construction.

Mr. Galloway suggested that “pathway” was a more appropriate term than “sidewalk.”

MOTION by Dr. Miner to recommend approval of the proposed prioritization of applications. The motion carried unanimously. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Sevison adjourned the TMPO and reconvened the TRPA Board. (Mr. Palma left the dais.)

X. PLANNING MATTERS

E. Resolution Supporting Restricting Parking Along Highway 28

Transportation Team Leader Richard Wiggins described proposed NDOT erosion control work this summer and next on Highway 28 north of Highway 50, projects that had been in the planning stages for several years. Previous discussions by transportation and transit groups had focused on transit, parking, and carrying capacity of the Highway 28 corridor. The Forest Service was cooperating with NDOT on an environmental document to assess impacts of additional parking space construction. The Forest Service had come up with an appropriate number of people who could use the Highway 28 beaches at one time (Persons At One Time, or PAOTs) and had equated that figure with cars and boats accessing the area. As the first step in the EA process to review the impact of additional parking spaces in designated parking facilities, the Board was being asked to support a parking restriction along the highway. Enforcement of the restrictions would be done in close coordination with the Nevada Highway Patrol and the Sheriff’s Office, and parking fees to support amenities and shuttle services would be worked out with the Tahoe Transportation District and Forest Service. The Board was being asked to provide its support conditioned on awareness of NDOT’s construction activities and
resulting disruption and the need for coordination with public information, enforcement, and transit services.

Mr. Juan Palma, Forest Supervisor with the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, explained safety and erosion problems caused by people parking along Highway 28 and walking down to the beaches on unimproved slopes. The intent was to enhance the trail system so that continuing erosion would cease. Currently because the infrastructure and sanitation facilities were limited, only a certain number of people could be handled at one time. Safety was also a concern, particularly on peak summer days when people parked bumper to bumper along the highway, and cyclists and drivers drove the highway. Other problems related to water quality and scenic impacts caused by people walking down the unprotected slopes. The proposal now was to expand and enhance the two existing Forest Service parking lots and to construct an additional parking lot for summer use and for use as a water retention basin in the winter. Having these three parking areas would allow removal of all parking along the Highway 28 shoulders. He had agreed in concept to ask the public to pay for the infrastructure (enhancement of clean-up, restroom facilities, and summer shuttle system). He responded to Board member questions about the possibility of garbage removal by boat; balancing the enhancements with the impacts of increased access/availability; increased usage and negative impacts resulting from an improved trail system; signage; problems caused by exceeding capacity in summer months; conditioning any improvements on cooperation between NDOT, TRPA and the Forest Service; the importance of transit to satisfy the demand; the inability of parking fees to support transit and all proposed enhancements; the trail construction requirements under the Americans With Disabilities Act; and the focus on the carrying capacity of the resource.

Mr. Dave Roberts, for the League to Save Lake Tahoe, spoke in support of the resolution, removal of the roadside parking, and the need for a functioning transit system. The League supported parking fees and a PAOT figure for the beaches. He thanked NDOT for its aggressive efforts to complete a master plan for Highway 28 and for its cooperation with other entities.

**MOTION** by Mr. DeLanoy to adopt TRPA Resolution No. 99-9 supporting restricting parking along Highway 28. The motion carried unanimously.

**VIII. PROJECT REVIEW**

A. Sierra Nevada College, New College Dormitory for 126 Students, Special Use Determination, 291 Country Club Drive, Incline Village, Washoe County APN 127-040-08

Acting Project Review Division Chief Lyn Barnett presented a history of the planning process dating back to the 1994 certification of the EIS and the current proposal to build a 63-student affordable housing residence hall and an additional 47 parking spaces. The buildings identified in the 1994 EIS as having residential bonus units allocated to them were not constructed. These bonus units were designated affordable housing and were exempt from the TRPA allocation system. The bonus units which were allocated to the project had expired because they were not used within five years. The original EIS also contemplated a parking garage, which was never constructed. Since that time, a parking area was constructed for the existing residence hall in the area where the garage was to have been built. What was before the Board today was a single college
residence hall with multi-purpose facilities and a parking area. The APC and Board several months ago considered the College's request to proceed with a design not addressed in the 1994 EIS. At that time it was disclosed that this project may be moving forward before certification of a new EIS and in reliance on the 1994 document. Mr. Barnett distributed revised special conditions to the Board and further revisions proposed by the College. He had met with the College on its revisions and was in agreement but with some additional modifications. The issues considered by staff in the review of the project related to consistency with the 1994 EIS; use of the additional parking spaces and the county parking requirements; the requirement for a parking analysis; allocation of bonus units for the new project based, in part, on possible over-allocation of bonus units for the existing occupants; whether students qualified for affordable housing under TRPA's requirements; and the College's plans to evict residents of the nearby College Park mobile home park. Mr. Barnett described additional changes proposed by staff to the Proposed Amended Special Condition submitted by the applicant. These included: 1) Condition 3(f), The permittee shall submit an annual report to the TRPA Executive Director that clearly reasonably demonstrates that... ; 2) Condition 3(f), ... To the extent that college residents in the approved residence do not qualify for affordable housing as provided herein above the number of TRPA residential bonus units allocated to Sierra Nevada College shall may be adjusted downward... ; 3) Parking condition 4a, "... Demonstrating a bona fide special physical situation or hardship, including but not limited to resident students with a permanent or temporary disability."

Agency Counsel John Marshall suggested further amendment of Condition 3(f), in part, The permittee shall submit an annual report to the TRPA Executive Director that clearly reasonably demonstrates that all college... " He also suggested that parking condition 4.b.(ii) be amended to add at the end a sentence reading, "A technical parking analysis shall be completed and approved by TRPA prior to construction of said additional spaces."

Mr. Galloway explained that Washoe County's parking requirements were different from TRPA's. Washoe County would not permit the dorm to be built without construction of the parking spaces. If the parking analysis had to be completed first, there would be a delay in construction of the dormitory. If the parking analysis found that parking spaces could be reduced, the County would agree to the reduction and Sierra Nevada College would agree to pull them out.

Ms. Diane Severance, with the College, explained the College's concern with delays in commencement of construction. The goal was to open the facility for fall 2000 and to pull a Washoe County permit within the next two weeks. The College was not opposed to building the parking and removing spaces if the study showed the spaces were not needed, if Washoe County concurred.

The Board members discussed the parking issues, the College's efforts to stay within the scope of the 1994 certified EIS, and the current inconsistencies with Washoe County parking and building requirements.

Mr. Galloway suggested that parking condition 4.b.(ii) be amended by deleting Mr. Marshall's new sentence on the technical parking analysis and instead be amended, in part, increase the number of parking spaces by 47 additional parking spaces sufficient
to bring the total parking spaces up to the number required by Washoe County. The County's Community Development Director had indicated this number was 127.

Mr. Baetge suggested this discussion was occurring because the applicant had not prepared a consultant's report. He favored continuing the matter for a month in order that the report be completed.

Ms. Bennett commented on the difficulties encountered in trying to approve a project which did not comply with the certified environmental document and the message being sent to other developers who had gone to great expense preparing accurate project documentation.

The Board discussed problems with the college not having sufficient parking spaces to accommodate the uses and the potential for problems during snow removal conditions.

Dr. Vance Peterson, Sierra Nevada College President, explained that nothing was being done outside the 1994 EIS. That document authorized 300 parking spaces with an appropriate traffic study being done for the new Lake Campus. The only change was the siting of the parking area and switching it with the residential hall. The College wished to begin the construction of the residence hall in June for a fall 2000 opening. (It was noted during the discussion that TRPA staff had concurred with the Colleges request for deletion of condition 3(a) related to revision of the site plan to eliminate additional resident student parking on the affected property.) After staff clarification, Dr. Peterson advised that the College could accept in condition 3(f) the deletion of 'clearly' and 'reasonably' and the requirement that the bonus units allocated to the College shall be adjusted downward to the extent residents in the residence hall do not qualify for affordable housing. While recognizing the public need for affordable housing in Incline, he objected to shifting the burden to pay for it to the College, as suggested in condition 5. No public body had ever determined that the mobile home park constituted affordable housing. The College Park Mobile Homes housed 90 students; the College owned 45 of the 90 units in the park. The long-term thinking was to close College Park coincident with the opening of the new residence hall and to make the parcel available for sale, with the proceeds being used for an endowment for the College.

Mr. Barnett explained that the original EIS noted the mobile home park units may be affordable housing. If they were, the Board had previously taken a position that losing them would have an environmental impact in need of mitigation. The pending application now on hold to develop a condominium-style subdivision at this site required a determination on whether the units were considered affordable housing. If so, mitigation was required. Staff was asking in condition 5 that units from the mobile home park not be removed or demolished that were affordable housing until the new EIS for the College was certified. Staff did not yet have the affordable housing unit numbers and did not want to lose the units prior to completion of the new EIS for the College. Staff needed to ensure that the students using affordable housing units qualified for the units.

The Board discussed the impact of Incline employees commuting from Carson City because they could not afford to live in Incline, how the College qualified for bonus units, uncertainties regarding the number of affordable housing units, potential loss of affordable housing units, staff's desire to have documentation showing that affordable housing units would not be lost, the criteria for college students to qualify for affordable
housing, and problems encountered in relying on an old EIS in the review of a modified project.

MOTION by Mr. DeLanoy to continue the project for one month for clarification of issues relating to parking and bonus units.

Mr. Dan Reaser, attorney for the College, clarified some misunderstandings and explained that bonus units were for multi-family units, not absolutely for affordable housing. In this case, staff was applying the affordable housing component to the project, with the College's agreement. There were 1,600 bonus units available in the Basin for affordable or multi-family housing. In the last 12 years only 200 of them had been allocated. Everything the College was asking for was totally within the 1994 EIS. The only change was reversing the location of the dormitory and the parking lot. In its conditions, staff wanted to assure that, as noted in the EIS, there was an inventory analysis done so that if any of the mobile home units were affordable housing they could account for them in the EIS and impose appropriate conditions. The College was prepared to agree with condition 5 and was confident it could identify that the College Park units were not affordable housing or that there were few such units in the 69 person mobile home park. Seventy-five percent of the students at the College were eligible for academic aid. Mr. Reaser presented more information on the parking space numbers and Washoe County requirements and agreement on conditions negotiated with staff.

Mr. Cole noted that bonus units did not have to be purchased if they were designated affordable housing units. There was an advantage for the applicant to use this type of units. They essentially were a free allocation and did not have to be purchased.

Motion repeated by Mr. DeLanoy to continue the matter for one month to clarify the issues and to complete the traffic study.

Mr. Galloway asked that there be a straw vote, since it appeared that there was acceptance by the applicant of the conditions as modified.

Mr. Reaser noted that a one-month delay would hold the project up for a year.

The Board asked for clarification on the conditions that were acceptable to the applicant.

Mr. Marshall explained that the "Proposed Amended Special Conditions" with the changes as discussed were acceptable, along with the agreement to drop staff's addition to condition 4.b.(ii).

Mr. James Seymour, a mobile home park resident and representative of College Park Homeowners Association, explained the distinction between affordable and low-cost housing and spoke in favor of staff's condition 5 requiring that units in the Park not be demolished until the EIS was certified. If the units were demolished when the condominium subdivision request was considered, there would be no mobile home units in existence needing to be replaced on a unit-for-unit basis. He objected to the revised condition because it did not protect the units. The 1994 EIS Alternative 2 analysis indicated that College Park would continue in existence as lower cost housing for faculty and residents of Incline Village. If the dormitory was predicated on that statement, demolishing College Park would change the ground rules and the statements in the EIS.
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The Board was correct in requiring that College Park be preserved until the unit-for-unit replacement analysis could be done. Mr. Seymour responded to questions.

Mr. DeLancy withdrew his motion.

Mr. Galloway asked that there be a straw vote on whether the findings could be made and project approval granted, based on the conditions as discussed and modified. Condition 5 as proposed by the College was acceptable to staff.

Chairman Sevison explained for new Board members that a straw vote was a non-binding vote. After taking a hand count of Board members, he determined that a vote to approve the project would not receive the required 5:9 vote.

After discussion, the Board decided to continue the project to the afternoon session and directed staff to work with the applicant to try and resolve the issues of affordable housing, the future of College Park, and what conditions were being agreed to.

Mr. Barnett explained that the 1993 EIS assumed that there would be no significant changes to the upper campus and College Park. That was not within the purview of the study of that original document.

Mr. Marshall explained that the issue of concern revolved around the old master plan and the new master plan and whether this one project could proceed apart from the new master planning effort. Based on the College's analysis, staff was comfortable that a Board approval was defensible.

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

B. Resolution for Board Members

Chairman Sevison read Resolution No. 99-7 commending former Board member John Upton for his service while on the Board from 1992 through 1998.

MOTION by Ms. Neft to approve Resolution No. 99-7 for John Upton. The motion carried unanimously.

In accepting the plaque and resolution, Mr. Upton commented on the importance of the planning effort at Tahoe during his tenure on the Board. He commented on completion of two five-year threshold evaluations, his role as president of the California State Association of County Supervisors, Code simplification, work on funding of the EIP and the legislative packet, state bond measures in both states, the alternative revenue study, and getting to the project-being-the-fix philosophy.

The meeting recessed for a lunch break from 12:00 to 1:30 p.m.

IX. PLANNING MATTERS

F. Special Projects Allocation, Commercial Floor Area, Request for Time Extension
Acting Senior Planner Kathy Canfield requested that the Board extend the approved allocation of commercial floor area to specific projects from May 31, 1999, to August 25, 1999. Staff had received three requests for extensions and recommended approval.

**MOTION** by Dr. Minar to adopt resolution No. 99-10 approving the extension to August 25, 1999, as recommended. The motion carried unanimously. (Members absent: Galloway, Reis)

**VIII. PROJECT REVIEW**

**C. Ruvo, Existing Residence Relocation From Douglas County APN 01-190-09 to APN 01-070-26**

Associate Planner Charles Donaldson presented the summary of the proposed relocation of the existing white beach house to the Glenbrook rodeo grounds. TRPA previously approved a residential rebuild on the beach house parcel, and pursuant to the permit, the existing structure was to either be relocated or demolished. The applicant wished to relocate the structure. A condition of the permit would require the applicant to remove or change the use of the residential living area so that there was no increase in density on the parcel. Special condition 4 (page 6 of the staff summary, page 92 of the packet) should be modified to read, in part, “As a condition of approval the applicant is required to permanently remove or change the use of at least one of the...” A memo distributed to Board members contained a new condition 10, requiring that prior to demolition of any residential structure, the applicant was to submit a report to TRPA documenting that the structure to be demolished was not a potential historical resource.

Mr. Paul Kaleta, on behalf of the property owner, concurred with the changes outlined by staff.

**MOTION** by Dr. Minar to make the findings for approval of the Ruvo project. The motion carried unanimously. (Member absent: Mr. Reis)

**MOTION** by Mr. DeLanoy to approve the project as conditioned. The motion carried unanimously.

**IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, by Adoption of New Delegation MOU With the City of South Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Agency**

Project Review Division Chief Rick Angelocci explained this was the first request for approval of an MOU to delegate review and approval of small commercial projects to a local jurisdiction. South Lake Tahoe recently approved the MOU.

No one wished to comment in the public hearing.

**MOTION** by Mr. Cole to make the findings (Chapter 6 and a Finding of No Significant Effect) for approval of the MOU. The motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION** by Mr. Cole to adopt Ordinance No. 99-16.
Chairman Sevison read the ordinance by title:

An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 87-9, as Amended, by Amending Chapter 4 of the Code of Ordinances of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Relating to the Exempt Activities; Providing for a Memorandum of Understanding Between the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the City of South Lake Tahoe to Exempt Certain Activities from TRPA Review; and Other Matters Properly Related Thereto

The motion carried unanimously.

B. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 93, Bijou, to Create Special Area #1

Mr. Angelocci explained that in the City's amendment of its plan and adoption of TRPA's Plan Area Statements there was one small difference between the TRPA's land use districts and the City. The City requested amendment of 093 to include two areas which would be designated as Special Area #1 and limiting density to one single family dwelling unit per lot of record. This would make the uses consistent with past historical zoning in the area. The APC had recommended approval.

MOTION by Dr. Miner to make the findings for approval of the Plan Area Statement amendment.

Mr. Sam DeLulio, a resident on Fairway Avenue in South Lake Tahoe, noted his property was within the special area. He commended staff for correcting the inconsistency between City zoning regulations and existing PAS provisions. He had submitted a petition at the APC meeting supporting the amendment.

Mr. Cole noted that the City had taken the lead as a local jurisdiction in adopting the Plan Area Statements and the MOU to take on review functions associated with small commercial projects. He hoped the Board would see fewer and fewer cases involving local issues related to configuration of zoning and small commercial uses, so long as the local decisions remained within the parameters of TRPA environmental concerns. He urged the TRPA Board to focus on the larger issues.

The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Dr. Miner to adopt Ordinance No. 99-17.

Chairman Sevison read the ordinance by title:

An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 87-9, as Amended, by Amending the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Amending the Bijou Plan Area Statement 093 to Designate Special Area #1, and Providing for Other Matters Properly Relating Thereto

The motion carried unanimously.

C. Amendment of the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan

1. Amendment to the Permissible Uses Matrix
2. Amendment to Redistribute Commercial Square Footage

3. Amendment to Objective 2, Policy B, Regarding Construction of the Required Infrastructure Within Ski Run Village"District (3b)

Associate Planner John Hitchcock summarized the three parts of the proposed amendment being requested by the staff of South Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Cole explained that 7,000 square feet of commercial floor area had been languishing for a long time at the foot of Ski Run. Action on this amendment in the Ski Run pedestrian area would see some activity in the way of curbs and gutters, landscaping and scenic improvements and permit the Community Plans to become a reality.

Mr. Kornreich asked that the curbs be rolled, rounded curbs, not rectangular curbs.

MOTION by Mr. Galloway to make the findings to approve the amendments. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Cole to adopt Ordinance No. 99-18.

Chairman Sevison read the ordinance by title:

An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 87-9, as Amended, by Amending the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency; Amending the Stateline/Ski Run Community Plan to Amend the Permissible Use Matrix, to Amend the Ski Run Boulevard Commercial Floor Area Allocation, and Amend the Ski Run Village"Infrastructure Policy, and Providing for Other Matters Properly Relating Thereto

The motion carried unanimously.

X. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Authorization for Executive Director to Enter Into MOU With Douglas County to Establish a Land Coverage Bank

Deputy Executive Director Jerry Wells asked for Board approval to allow the Executive Director to enter into a land bank with Douglas County similar to one TRPA now had with the California Tahoe Conservancy. Currently property owners in Douglas County had to go to the private market to do land coverage exchanges. This would permit TRPA to handle these exchanges.

Mr. Cole questioned how the banking would be affected by the fact that both California and Nevada lands were contained within one hydrologic area.

Mr. Wells explained that, even though there was one hydrologic area, the coverage would be banked and used within the affected jurisdiction. He assumed that any banking procedures across state lines would have to receive local approval. Staff would need to research this further when the MOU was drafted.
MOTION by Dr. Miner to authorize the Executive Director to enter into the land bank MOU with Douglas County. The motion carried unanimously.

VIII. PROJECT REVIEW

A. Sierra Nevada College, New College Dormitory for 126 Students, Special Use Determination, 291 Country Club Drive – continued from the morning discussion (see page 4-8 of these minutes)

In the continuing discussion, Acting Project Review Division Chief Lyn Barnett explained that one of the issues expressed by the Board members involved protections afforded the existing College Park residents who were not students.

College President Vance Peterson explained that the College, as landlords of the Park, were required in a change of use to give at least six months' notification of a contemplated change. The College had advised the tenants who were renting space in the Park from the College of the estimated timetable. The College was required to pay for the full cost of relocating any unit to another park of the individual's preference within a 50-mile radius. Dr. Peterson presented more information on agreements reached between the Park tenants and the College.

Mr. Reaser, for the College, asked that condition 5 be modified to read as follows:

The permittee shall not:

a. Remove or demolish any residential units owned by the permittee in the College Park mobile home park that are affordable housing units as defined in the TRPA Code of Ordinances until the new EIS for Sierra Nevada College is certified by TRPA; provided, however, that this condition shall not prevent the College from:

i. Substituting other units owned by the permittee within College Park mobile home park as affordable housing units to allow removal or demolition of any units to the extent necessary or proper for public safety or environmental reasons; or

ii. Relocation of units within the College Park mobile home park

b. Exercise its rights as to non-student residents to close College Park Mobile Home Park until the new EIS for the Sierra Nevada College is certified by TRPA.

If the EIS is withdrawn by Sierra Nevada College from further TRPA review, the college may apply to TRPA under separate application to remove or modify College Park.

Mr. Reaser explained that it would be up to the EIS to determine the one-for-one replacement; the College would be bound by that determination. It was understood that the units referenced in new condition 5 a. referred to all units currently owned by the permittee.

Mr. James Seymour, on behalf of College Park Homeowners, noted that it was represented that the conditions would maintain the status quo. This was true except for
those located people in the proposed new parking lot area on the upper campus. They had been given notice that they had the right to have their homes moved into the Park, which was a Washoe County condition. No permit had been issued by TRPA. He understood that the application for the parking lot to TRPA was included in the EIS, so the College could not build the parking lot until the EIS was certified. He wanted the four remaining homes to be able to stay in the status quo condition until the new EIS was approved.

The Board members discussed the parking lot, movement of mobile homes and relocation of its resident and the timing in relation to certification of the EIS.

Ms. Margo Osti spoke in favor of one-for-one replacement of affordable housing and suggested there be consistency in the application of criteria for those using it, whether they were students or workers.

MOTION by Mr. Galloway to make the findings to approve the Sierra Nevada College project with the corrected additional conditions. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION BY Mr. Galloway to approve the project with the conditions as amended. The motion carried with Ms. Medina voting in opposition. (Mr. Reis was absent.)

B. Rosemeyer, Existing Pier Relocation and Expansion, Placer County APN 117020-09, File #980224

Associate Planner Charles Donaldson explained the proposal to expand and relocate an existing single use pier structure, which extended five feet lakeward of the highwater line. The proposed pier would expand the pier to a total of 78 feet in length, as measured from the highwater line. Based on available information, staff had determined that the existing structure was never intended to extend beyond the highwater line and was never intended to be a shorezone structure. Staff could not find that the pier was legally existing or approved on the effective date of the Regional Plan or subsequently legally constructed, commenced or approved pursuant to necessary permits. A review of old records recovered an application originally submitted to TRPA in 1979 for a recreation pier and parking deck. TRPA approved the project but the Corps of Engineers denied it based on fish habitat. Because approval was required from all agencies with jurisdiction, the proposed pier project was never built. Currently, it was unclear when the existing structure was built. The project was visible from scenic shoreline and roadway units. If the Board approved the project, staff requested a condition requiring submittal of a scenic mitigation plan to include residing of the residence, landscaping and slope stabilization. Staff recommended denial of the project. Mr. Donaldson responded to Board member questions.

Agency Counsel John Marshall advised it was within the Board's discretion to determine the legally existing question, given the facts presented. The Board may arrive at a different conclusion from the staff. Staff could not find a permit for the landing as it was currently constructed, particularly extending out over high water. That would have required a permit from the Army Corps; that permit was never issued.

Mr. Larry Hoffman, attorney for the Rosemeyers, distributed pictures of the shoreline and structure and copies of Chapter 52 (Existing Structures in the Shorezone) and described the other shoreline structures in Agate Bay; the previous permit requirements at the
local, state, CTRPA/TRPA, and federal levels, and the beneficial impacts of project approval to achieve slope stabilization and scenic improvements. He suggested that shorezone regulations drafted in the mid-1980s were to have allowed the improvement and upgrading of existing structures. The Code provided that by December 31, 1994, TRPA was to have notified non-conforming structure owners regarding status of their structures for removal or modification by December 1999. The property owner at the time was never notified, in spite of TRPA's obligation to notify him if there were concerns with the structure. The Agency now was putting the burden on the applicant to verify previous permit and construction activity. Currently, California State Lands, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the California Department of Fish and Game had granted approvals for a pier. All agencies, with the exception of TRPA, had granted approval.

The Board members discussed with staff and the applicant's representative differences in shorezone regulation interpretation, changes in the shoreline over time and effects on the structure, differences between the 1979 application and what was constructed, the history of the three elements of the original application (parking deck, access structure to the pier and the pier), historic levels of field and enforcement inspections, Caltrans construction that had changed the configuration of the shoreline, Caltrans road practices and resulting buildup of sediment along highway properties, environmental benefits of installing BMPs on the site, storm damage in 1997 and resulting erosion of the shoreline.

Deputy Executive Director Jerry Wells explained that the Code defined *existing* as legally present or approved on or before the effective date of the Regional Plan. If the Board concurred with Mr. Hoffmans' interpretation that, because TRPA had not completed a Code-required inventory by December of 1990, and subsequently notified property owners of the outcome, every structure on the Lake today was automatically legally existing, this would mean thousands of buoys, as an example, and other structures could be found to be legal. That was not the intent of the ordinance. The study was to identify nonconforming structures.

Mr. Giles explained that his voting in favor of the request was not based on Mr. Hoffmans' interpretation of Section 52.3.H of the Code. The staff had done the right thing in recommending denial of the request and leaving to the Board the decision of whether to grant the permit. He was swayed by the 1979 application submittal termed a "pier plan" and the fact there likely were not sufficient staff to check projects in the field to ensure compliance with approvals. It was a close call. There was an opportunity here to improve the shoreline. Given the needed improvements in the shoreline, he did not have a problem based on what happened in 1979 determining that what was intended for this site was a pier and that it existed for that reason — not because of an interpretation of Section 52.3.H of the Code.

Mr. Cole agreed that this was a close call. If an approval was granted previously and the current approval would achieve shorezone stabilization and scenic improvements, he would vote in favor of the project.

Mr. Gordon Barrett, Chief of the Long Range Planning Division, provided historical background on the drafting of the ordinance provisions regarding conforming and nonconforming structures.
Chairman Sevison suggested that, if the Board wished to approve the project, it not base its findings on Mr. Hoffman's interpretation of Section 52.3.H of the ordinance. This interpretation would have a much larger effect on buoys and other shorezone structures.

Mr. Donaldson noted that, should the Board wish to approve the application, special conditions of approval were set forth in the packet materials.

No one in the audience wished to speak on the application.

**MOTION** by Mr. Giles to make the findings for approval of the Rosemeyer pier but not based on Mr. Hoffman's interpretation of Section 52.3.H of the Code.

Mr. Donaldson explained that the staff had not recommended a finding regarding the unserviceability of the structure over the past five years. The Board may wish to address serviceability in its findings.

Mr. Giles included a finding that the Rosemeyer structure was serviceable over the last five years. The motion carried on the following vote:

- **Ayes:** Ms. Neft, Ms. Bennett, Mr. Giles, Mr. Sandoval, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. DeLanoy, Mr. Cole, Dr. Miner, Mr. Sevison
- **Nays:** Ms. Medina, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Perock
- **Abstain:** None
- **Absent:** Mr. Reis

**MOTION** by Mr. Giles to approve the Rosemeyer pier with the conditions as outlined in the staff summary. The motion carried on the same vote.

(Mr. Sandoval left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.)

**IX. PLANNING MATTERS**

**A. Discussion on Movement of the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) Line in El Dorado and Placer Counties**

Senior Planner Joe Pepi distributed a one-page description of the IPES program and how it was linked to the Bailey land capability system. He described the basic features of the IPES system, the five criteria for movement of the IPES line, administrative activities for staff to undertake to address the low scoring lot situation, enhanced coordination with public and private land acquisition agencies to increase the rate of parcel retirement, and studies and data analysis to evaluate the potential impact of changes to the 208 Water Quality Plan and Code Chapter 37 (IPES).

Agency Legal Counsel John Marshall briefly addressed issues relating to potential inverse condemnation claims and the fairness issue stemming from the fact the line had moved in Nevada but not in California.

Mr. Larry Hoffman, on behalf of the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council (TSPC), suggested the strategies laid out by staff to address the IPES line problem were not going to work, since it would still be years yet before the line would move. He wanted a decision from the Board on other options, even if the decision were in opposition to his
position. The need for the IPES line was no longer present, since the requirement for land acquisitions and water quality improvements had long since been met. He had presented his arguments and how the system was intended to have worked to the Board in April. Although the IPES system had been a good one for rating properties, he had repeatedly asked the Board for an amendment to the system to eliminate the pass/fail line. Even though there may be 8,000 to 10,000 vacant single family lots in the Basin, the line was not needed because only 300 home starts were permitted per year spread through the jurisdictions. This limit provided sufficient management of growth and impacts in the Basin. Mr. Hoffman described various land use cases involving property rights and suggested that TRPA could not continue to accept regulations prohibiting building, even for short periods of time, based on the greater good of the environment. TRPA's problem was that because it could not acquire properties it instead had regulated them. There were two fixes, including a cranked up, expedited buy-up effort at fair market (not discount) value and a change in the regulations to eliminate the pass/fail line and the zero score. He wanted to know if he had the votes on the Board to make the changes. Litigation was not a threat; it was a reality if the changes were not made.

Agency Counsel John Marshall explained there was significant and justified resistance on the part of acquisition agencies to bumping up the fair market value of vacant lots in the acquisition programs. The lots were appraised taking into account the existing, applicable regulations. Changing the acquisition programs would set a precedent for all other similar state and federal programs. It was an interesting and potential avenue to study, but the institutional resistance would be significant.

Executive Director Jim Baetge suggested there were many ways to accelerate the acquisition programs. They would require affected agencies to deal with policy issues relating to CC&Rs on the affected properties and the status of vegetation on the sites.

Considerable discussion followed on various aspects of the IPES program, acquisition programs, creating a demand for the coverage on sensitive lots, liability, legality of the system, options, fair market value, required environmental documentation to change the formula, 208 Plan amendments, the increased need to protect the Lake, the need to focus TRPA's staff and fiscal resources on protecting Lake Tahoe rather than on costly litigation, the Board's unwillingness to eliminate the line or restrictions on SEZ lots, setting the valuation of unbuilt lots based on the value of recreating wetlands, getting the players together to discuss options for accelerating the acquisition programs, and setting up a mechanism to sell sensitive lot coverage for more coverage on higher capability lots,

Mr. Marshall noted that the staff was very sensitive to the issues and Mr. Hoffmann's concerns. Everyone placed a high priority on fixing the problem — not only getting the IPES line moved but also accelerating retirement of sensitive lots. The solutions would not happen quickly. There were options to be considered, but they would not happen in a snap and they would not be implemented in a snap. The process was ongoing and would continue. He wished to come up with an array of fixes to satisfy TSPC, the League, and the California AG's office and at the same time meet and accomplish required thresholds.

Ms. Bennett asked that staff return to the Board with a report on progress being made within 60 to 90 days.
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Mr. Giles urged the Board to move as quickly as it could to resolve the issues. The Agency needed to make more of a commitment to resolving the issue — whether that resolution pleased Mr. Hoffman or not. As much as he wanted to accommodate the land owners, that may not be possible.

Mr. Galloway asked that the various actions be broken down into categories, including what steps could be taken without amendment of the 208 plan and what steps required 208 plan amendment without extensive analysis and data gathering.

Mr. Dan Siegel, for the California Attorney General’s Office, spoke on the historic aspects of IPES and the importance to the AG’s office of the vacant lot formula found not only in IPES but also in the 208 Plan. The suggestion to throw away or weaken the IPES line and restrictions on SEZ lots would be a disaster. Lake clarity was being lost at a rate of 1 foot each year, and abandoning the IPES line would be like declaring defeat. The potential development of 1,500 fragile lots plus an additional 500 SEZ or wetland lots would be a total disaster. Staff’s approach was sound, especially proposals to reduce the inventory by beefing up the acquisition programs. Mr. Siegel presented more thoughts on options proposed by staff to remedy the problems with the IPES program and reasons for why the acquisition programs were slowing down and lots were not selling. Mr. Siegel responded to Board member questions about the impact of litigation should the Agency lose in litigation involving a takings. In his opinion, the impact of a finding of a taking would be similar to allowing 2,000 environmentally fragile and SEZ lots to be developed. It would be a disaster.

Mr. Giles suggested that, since the outcome of such litigation was not known, it made sense for TRPA to come up with a middle position or some other plan — rather than sticking with something that for a certainty was going to result in a lawsuit and put the Lake’s future at the risk of a coin toss.

Mr. Siegel responded that development of sensitive lots would be a disaster. If a lawsuit were filed, there also was a risk. If TRPA lost, the Agency would likely be going to the Federal Government and California and Nevada to request funds to pay property owners. He did not know how it all would play out, but the Lake would not have been hurt. He appreciated the Agency’s position and would like to see a way of avoiding a lawsuit and protecting the Lake. The number one mission of the Agency had to be to protect the Lake.

Ms. Rochelle Nason, for the League to Save Lake Tahoe, disagreed with previous speakers that the acquisition programs were dwindling. It was true for a period of years there was a reduction in funding for Forest Service purchases. This was no longer the case, because of the renewed commitment to make acquisitions happen. The top priority of the partnership group seeking funding in Washington, D.C. was land acquisitions in the Tahoe Basin. Senators Feinstein and Reid were introducing legislation to assure that the Federal Government would increase its contributions to the EIP and make a significant change in the acquisitions program. There were also greatly increased resources at the state level. The League also had a strong commitment to work with private parties and real estate groups to see what could be done to accelerate the programs. The acquisition picture was bright. All those who had earlier attended a meeting to discuss IPES options had come away feeling very optimistic about the ability to get the lots tied up faster than reasonable amendment of the 208 plan could occur. In the League’s opinion, the acquisition programs were the only way to go here and to
protect the Lake. The League would be happy to participate in a brainstorming session to address how to increase the rate of acquisitions. Enormous progress had been made in the last few years in learning to work together, with this collaborative effort having been recognized at both state and national levels. It was in no one's interest to see this go to court or become an explosive political issue. If TRPA were going to be sued, however, it was important to get a settlement and not to give away the store without commitments in return. The point was to protect the rapidly deteriorating Lake.

Executive Director Jim Baetge suggested that, because of the legal questions that had been raised, it would be appropriate for the Legal Committee to spend some time on this at its monthly meetings and to report back to the Board. If there were a problem, the Committee could bring it forward to the whole Board. Having this discussion before the Board every month was very time-consuming and was not resulting in a decision.

Chairman Seovison suggested that the issue seemed to have been narrowed down to how to deal with the lot valuation issue and getting the sensitive lots acquired. This was the preferred approach rather than going to court.

Mr. Marshall suggested that prior to next month's meeting he would be asking affected parties to get together to discuss these issues in depth and to report back to the Legal Committee on a continual basis on what progress was being made.

Legal Committee Chairman Waldie concurred with this approach.

Mr. Giles asked that, in response to Mr. Cole's suggestion that there be a discussion on a mechanism to purchase coverage off of sensitive lots, staff prepare a list of agencies and entities who would have to be involved or whose permission would have to be sought for modifications in the system.

Mr. Marshall suggested that the group look at preparing a laundry list of options – both pros and cons – along with a quick summary of what was needed to get things done. All the other staff-recommended work program activities (enhanced coordination with public/private land acquisition agencies, studies and data analyses) and proceeding with other litigation needed to be aggressively pursued in conjunction with this effort, since they would provide the background necessary for future action and evaluations.

Mr. Cole asked to meet with the staff to go over what the coverage purchase option would look like. Dr. Miner asked to participate as well.

Chairman Seovison noted that this item would appear on the Legal Committee agenda in June and shortly thereafter there would likely be a package of options for the whole Board to consider.

(Mr. DeLanoy left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.)

B. Discussion on Code Chapter 28, Natural Hazard Standards, Relative to Flood Plain Maps

Board member Galloway asked that, since the Army Corps of Engineers would not be present until June, this item be continued to the June meeting. This was the second time the Chapter 28 discussion was on the agenda without a quorum being present.
Deputy Executive Director Jerry Wells explained he had met with an affected project proponent on this matter and had agreed to meet with him and the Army Corps of Engineers to see if there was a way to resolve his specific issue.

Mr. Galloway noted there were several projects being held up pending resolution of the flood plain issues. The Board may not wish to approve a specific action in June, but he at least would like to be able to propose an action.

Mr. Wells asked if it would be acceptable for the Corps to share its information on flood plains next month and the Board decide at that time if it wished to direct staff to bring something back in the form of a Code amendment or some other action. He was hesitant to schedule specific action for June without knowing at this time what form that action could take.

Mr. Galloway concurred.

Mr. Gary Midkiff, on behalf of the project proponent who would be meeting with the Corps and Mr. Wells, suggested the need involved a policy determination and ordinance interpretation. While the staff could address the project-specific concerns, Board direction would be needed on the policy considerations and the long-term picture.

Mr. Wally Auerbach, representing an affected property owner in the Tahoe City commercial core, urged the Board to reach a solution.

**MOTION** by Mr. Galloway to continue the Chapter 28 item to the June Board meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Discussion on Issues Relating to the Urban Boundary

Mr. Gordon Barrett, Chief of Long Range Planning, noted this was a staff summary only and not project-specific. No Board action was necessary. The urban boundary concept was one used in many cities as a method of identifying areas where development would be concentrated while, at the same time, protecting a community's open space and recreation areas. The 175 plan areas in the Basin were identified as either urban or non-urban. The uses permitted in urban areas were commercial/public service, tourist, or residential; the non-urban areas were identified for recreation and conservation uses. In the settlement of a lawsuit filed by the League to Save Lake Tahoe in the 1990s, TRPA agreed that expansion of the urban boundary could occur only if the Board found that the original boundary was in error, that the boundary change would result in improvement of an environmental threshold, or that the change involved a public health and safety issue and there was no reasonable alternative.

Mr. Cole asked that the Board at some point decide whether modification of a boundary in one area accompanied by a similar reduction in another, with no net increase overall, was considered an expansion.

Mr. Dan Siegel, from the California Attorney General's office, explained that the 1988 adopted 208 Plan required TRPA to maintain existing urban area boundaries. The same interpretation of the plan was made by the California State Water Resources Control Board and EPA in certification of the EIS. Although the Agency's findings for amending urban boundaries went beyond what was permitted in the 208 Plan, the AG determined
at that time not to challenge TRPAs ordinance, recognizing that the 208 Plan was going to be amended no later than 1997. The AGs office had not waived its rights to challenge the ordinance as being inconsistent with the 208 Plan. In his opinion there was no flexibility to alter the urban boundary; any change should be explored in the context of 208 Plan amendments.

Ms. Rochelle Nason, for the League to Save Lake Tahoe, commented on the outcome of the litigation and concurred with the AGs interpretation of the 208 Plan. In the drafting of the provisions in the settlement agreement, there was never a suggestion that there would be gerrymandering of the urban boundary, as was being considered now. The League had always been a supporter of affordable housing in the Basin, but the answer to that problem was not putting affordable housing outside the urban boundary. The existing code did permit a change in the boundary if it was because of an error.

Ms. Nason and Mr. Siegel responded to Board member questions.

Mr. Herb Wheeler, a Round Hill resident representing the Round Hill homeowners and Elks Point, spoke in opposition to any proposal to change the urban boundary in the Round Hill area. The land was classified as recreation originally and should remain recreation. The Forest Service had indicated that the reason the property was not identified for buyout was because it was classified as recreation. Development of the property for commercial uses with roads and parking would cause ecological problems. The residents of and visitors to the area would not benefit from anything other than recreation on the parcel.

Executive Director Jim Baetge reminded the Board that this was not a project-specific agenda item but only for the purpose of providing the Board with an overview of the urban boundary concept.

Ms. Helen Wallace, an owner of property in Round Hill, spoke on the need to improve Tahoe’s water quality problems. The owners of property in the area had sacrificed to keep the land around them pristine and had already accepted the impacts of the approved, nearby Round Hill Vacation Resort timeshare project. For more than eight years, the property owners had paid the highest tax base in the State of Nevada to cover for bonds for undeveloped land surrounding the Round Hill properties. The land was later sold to the Forest Service to prevent development. Ms. Wallace submitted a petition with 181 signature requesting the urban boundary not be changed.

Mr. Lew Feldman, on behalf of Falcon Capitol, explained his client was required to submit an application to the Agency for expansion of the urban boundary as part of the Round Hill Vacation Resorts project approval. The discussion today was to provide background information for the Board on the urban boundary concept. If the Board felt there was justification under the ordinance to modify the boundary, it could do so if it could make findings. It was not appropriate to change the policy at this meeting. Because all the facts were not before the Board today, he requested that the Board recognize the ordinance and measure any request against the requirements of that ordinance. The nine acres in question owned by Falcon Capitol had some permitted uses today, one of which was an RV park. This allowable, permissible use would have consequences.
Ms. Margo Osti, on behalf of Our Lady of Tahoe Catholic Church, suggested gerrymandering had been going on since the map was adopted, since the Agency encouraged acquisition of SEZ lands within the urban boundary. The urban communities suffered because of the loss of lands that could have accommodated other uses. There currently was not sufficient land in communities to construct needed schools and other public uses. A piece of property should not become an estate for the rich if it was able to accommodate the poor. Recently the Board allowed the demolition of residential units in exchange for tourist units. This would result in workers having to go to the Carson Valley for their housing if they could not find it locally.

Ms. Zona Zahasian, an Elk Point resident, read a letter from Becky Darrow, owner of buildings in Elk Point Plaza, objecting to urban boundary changes proposed by Falcon Capitol. She also read a similar objection letter from Ms. Deborah Palmer, a lawyer representing Elk Point Country Club.

Mr. Baetge suggested that what he was hearing now was that the ordinance not be changed - that it was appropriate. He didn't think this was a 208 Plan issue. The ordinance had criteria for how to change urban boundaries, and this was what TRPA used to analyze any requests for expansion.

Chairman Sevison asked that these requests continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis as they came in.

Mr. Barrett explained that when the urban boundary agreements were made, Mr. Siegel provided his input into the process regarding the connection with the 208 Plan. The staff and Agency counsel at that time did not agree with his interpretation. The ordinance proceeded to adoption, and staff felt the Board could take action to amend the boundary using the criteria set forth in the ordinance.

The Board continued to discuss the issues with staff, Mr. Siegel and Ms. Nason.

Mr. Baetge suggested that modification of the ordinance to allow gerrymandering as an appropriate finding for amending the urban boundary was a 208 issue. The ordinance as it was currently adopted would allow a request to be submitted and to be reviewed based on the existing criteria.

Ms. Rita Bienz, a Round Hill resident, suggested that the project proponent had gotten approval to tear down 187 units of affordable housing in exchange for timeshare units. She urged the Board not to change the boundary for a developer.

Chairman Sevison explained that the comments were focused on a specific project not now before the Board. The comments should be brought to the Board's attention when and if a request was brought forward. The consensus among the Board appeared to be that there would no change to the ordinance.

D. Discussion on Request for Qualifications for Phase II of the Regional Revenue Source Analysis

Mr. Baetge advised that there would be a bidders' workshop at the TRPA office on May 28. It was an open workshop for anyone to attend and participate.
XII. REPORTS

A. Finance Committee

1. Discussion on Changes to Current Building Lease

Deputy Executive Director Jerry Wells advised that because the Agency's budget coming from the two states looked like it was going to be approved staff would be adding some additional staff. Staff had entertained an offer from the landlord to lease the entire building where the office was currently located. Rates were comparable to the going rates, and the landlord was willing to keep the lease within the confines of the existing terms for four more years. This would allow TRPA at the end of the lease to still keep its options open. Nothing in the proposed lease provided for a purchase option.

Ms. Neft noted that rent for the current TRPA building was $330,000 per year. Several years ago (when rent was $220,000 per year) she had suggested that TRPA should think about purchasing its own property. She asked that at the appropriate time, TRPA look at building or buying its own office in an area designated for redevelopment. A TRPA facility in the redevelopment area of Kings Beach or South Lake Tahoe, as an example, would be a huge cornerstone and a big plus for that area. TRPA should not be looking at Round Hill as an area to construct a new facility.

Chairman Sevison suggested this was a good point and should be kept in mind in the discussion on other office space.

XIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director


Chairman Sevison asked that staff prepare a letter of thanks for the luncheon put on by the North Tahoe Historical Society.

B. Legal Division Monthly Status Report – no report

XIV. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Julie D. Frame
Clerk to the Board

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA office, 308 Dorla Court, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: - May Financial Statement and Check Register
- TRPA FY 99-00 Operating Budget
- TRPA FY 98-99 Operating Budget Revisions

Requested Action: Staff will be discussing these three items with the Finance Committee prior to the full Board meeting on Wednesday, June 23. Requested action, should the Finance Committee concur, is receipt and/or approval.
June 11, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Release of Water Quality Mitigation Funds in the amount of $35,916 to Douglas County for the Marla Bay Tahoe Bond Act Project (Phase II).

---

Proposed Action: Authorize the release of $35,916 in water quality mitigation funds to Douglas County for the above mentioned project (see Map attached).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends granting the release of all funds subject to the conditions cited below.

Summary: Douglas County Commissioners allocated the above amount to the Marla Bay Project at their June 3, 1999 meeting. This project is the second phase of the approved 1996 Tahoe Bond Act project for Marla Bay. The water quality mitigation funds will provide part of the match for bond act funds. The estimated total cost of the project is $198,000, and this phase of the project will provide additional water quality treatment to address a long time discharge problem to Lake Tahoe.

Staff recommends approval of release subject to the conditions cited below.

Conditions:

1. The County shall only use the funds for the Incline Village Commercial and the Lower Wood Creek Projects approved by TRPA.

2. The County shall keep complete records of all funds expended on the projects and how they were used. Such records shall be made available for review and audit by TRPA upon written request.

3. Any unused mitigation funds shall be returned to TRPA, or TRPA approval shall be acquired before their re-allocation to another project is made.

4. Signage used to identify the project(s) during construction shall include all funding sources.

If you have any questions regarding this item please contact Larry Benoit, Associate Planner, at (775) 588-4547.

LFB/
Larry Benoit  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Project Review Division  
P.O. Box 1038  
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448-1038  

RE: Douglas County TRPA Water Quality Mitigation Fund Request  
Marla Bay General Improvement District Erosion Control Project, TBA99-009  

Dear Mr. Benoit:  

At their June 3, 1999, meeting, the Board of County Commissioners allocated $35,916 in Douglas County TRPA Water Quality Mitigation Funds to the 1996 Tahoe Bond Act Marla Bay General Improvement District Erosion Control Project, TBA99-009.  

Douglas County requests that TRPA release a total of $35,916 in Douglas County TRPA Water Quality Mitigation Funds for this project. The TRPA Water Quality Mitigation Funds will be used for the 25% local match that is required by the Bond Act. Please place this request on the agenda for the June 23, 1999, TRPA Governing Board meeting.  

Please call me at 782-6239 if you have any questions or need additional information to respond to this request.  

Sincerely,  

[Signature]  

Ronald J. Roman, P.E.  
Associate Engineer  

c: Eric Teitelman, Engineering Manager/County Engineer  
Bob Nunes, Director, Community Development  
Jan Rowan, Accountant  
Richard Mieldazis, Marla Bay GID  
Chris Freeman, Division of Conservation Districts  

c:\nuoffice\winword\rj\bond-act\rmdc\trpa.2
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: Harrah's Tour Boat

Application Type: Shorezone / New Tour Boat

Applicant: USDA Forest Service / Harrah's Lake Tahoe

Agency Planner: Charles Donaldson, Associate Planner

Location: Round Hill Pines Marina, Douglas County, Nevada

Assessor's Parcel Number / File Number: 05-230-12 / 990061

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

Project Description: The applicant proposes to change the use of the seasonal operation of the boat the Tahoe Star. The existing 49 passenger boat is owned and operated by the Harrah's Lake Tahoe out of Round Hill Pines Marina. The proposal would change the operation from complimentary use to cash sales. Passengers will purchase tickets from Harrah's Lake Tahoe and be transported by shuttle to the Round Hill Pines Marina.

Site Description: The proposed project will be based out of the Round Hill Pines Marina, where the boat is moored in an existing slip. The existing marina is owned by the USDA Forest Service and operated by a concessionaire. The parcel is approximately 124.86 acres in size. The project area shoreline has been mapped as feed and escape cover habitat.

Issue: The proposed project involves the addition of a new tour boat on Lake Tahoe and therefore requires Governing Board review and approval.

Staff Analysis:

A. Environmental Documentation: The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the completed IEC will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

B. Plan Area Statement: The project is located within Plan Area Statement #68, Round Mound. The land use classification is Recreation and the Management Strategy is Mitigation. Agency staff has reviewed the subject Plan Area and has determined that the project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. Commercial Boating / Tour Boats are listed as an Special Use in the applicable Shorezone Tolerance District (Shorezone Tolerance District 8)

C. Shorezone Tolerance District: The subject parcel is located within Shorezone Tolerance District 8. The project, as conditioned, complies with the shorezone tolerance district standards.
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D. **Land Coverage:** The parcel is approximately 124.88 acres in size. No changes in coverage are proposed under this application.

E. **Required Findings:** The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 33, 50, and 51 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

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

   (a) **Land Use:** The project is located within Plan Area Statement # 68, Round Mound. The existing use (marina) of the subject parcel is a special use within the applicable Plan Area Statement. Tour Boats are listed as a Special Use in the Plan Area Statement. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable Shorezone Tolerance District (Shorezone Tolerance District 8). Special Policy number 1 of the Plan Area Statement states "A recreation master plan should be prepared for the public lands in this plan area." Special Policy number 2 states "Until such time as a master plan is approved for the public lands in this area, the site should be managed consistent with the level of historic use. Allowances to increase the use capacity of the site beyond historical levels shall be approved in conjunction with the adopted master plan." No master plan has been completed for the public lands in this Plan Area Statement. This project does not propose to increase the use capacity of the site. The project is also consistent with the Land Use Element of the Regional Plan. The surrounding land uses are residential and undeveloped National Forest lands.

   (b) **Transportation:** The existing marina is owned by the USDA Forest Service and operated by a concessionaire. Passengers will purchase tickets from Harrah's Lake Tahoe and be transported by shuttle to the Round Hill Pines Marina. The proposed project will not result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) or dyte (daily vehicle trip ends) generated to the site. There is no evidence that the proposed project will adversely affect implementation of the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan.

   (c) **Conservation:** The project, as conditioned, is consistent with the fisheries, shorezone, and scenic subelements of the Conservation Element of the Regional Plan. No new structures or grading are associated with the project. The proposed project is located within a Priority 3 watershed, as a condition of approval the applicant will be required to install Best Management Practices (BMPs) by October 15, 2011.

   (d) **Recreation:** The proposed project will not adversely impact public recreation on Lake Tahoe. The project will provide improved access and additional recreational facilities to the general public. The project will not interfere with public access along the shoreline and is consistent with the Recreation Element of the Regional Plan.
(e) **Public Service Facilities:** This project does not require any additions to public services or facilities.

(f) **Implementation:** The proposed project will not adversely impact the Implementation Element of the Regional Plan. Forty-nine (49) Summer Day Use PAOTs shall be allocated to the project in accordance with the requirements of the TRPA Code.

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

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled 'Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings' in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at the TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

4. **There is a need for the project.**

The applicant has expressed to staff that there is a need for the project. The existing tour boat is for complimentary use of guests of Harrah's Hotel and Casino. This proposed project would allow the tour boat to be open to the general public. The project would also allow the general public increased access to recreation on Lake Tahoe.

5. **The project complies with the Goals and Policies, the applicable plan area statements, and Code.**

The project is located within Plan Area Statement #68, Round Mound. The existing use (marinas) of the subject parcel is a special use within the applicable Plan Area Statement. Tour Boats are listed as a Special Use in the Plan Area Statement. The surrounding land uses are residential and undeveloped National Forest lands. The proposed project is consistent with the Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statement 068, and the Code.

6. **The project is consistent with TRPA's 20-year targets for outdoor recreation, which are 6,114 people at one time (PAOT) in overnight facilities, 6,781 PAOT in summer day-use facilities, and 12,400 PAOT in winter day-use facilities, as well as the allocations set forth in the plan area statements, or the pools or reserved PAOT capacity.**

Plan Area Statement 068, Round Mound, does not have any PAOTs allocated to it at this time. The proposed project requires that 49 PAOTs be allocated from
the Summer Day Use Pool. Specifically, the PAOTs will be allocated from the 2,000 PAOT Summer Day Use Pool reserved for expansions of marinas and boat launching facilities.

7. The project meets the findings adopted pursuant to Article V(g) of the Compact as set forth in Chapter 6 as they are applicable to the project's recreational service capacity; and

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at the TRPA.

8. If the project requires PAOT allocation, it is consistent with the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program.

The proposed project requires that 49 PAOTs be allocated from the Summer Day Use Pool. There is no evidence in the file or record the proposed project will negatively impact implementation TRPA’s Environmental Improvement Program.

9. The proposed project will not adversely impact: (1) littoral processes; (2) fish spawning; (3) backshore stability; and (4) on-shore wildlife habitat, including wildfowl nesting areas.

The proposed project will not have an impact on littoral processes. No changes to existing shorezone structures are proposed. The proposed project is not located within an area that is mapped as on-shore wildlife habitat and will not affect backshore stability. The project is not located in an area identified as spawning fish habitat. The backshore area is presently stable and the proposed project will not have an affect on the backshore. No construction or grading is proposed as a part of this project.

10. There are sufficient accessory facilities to accommodate the project.

The proposed project involves the modification of an existing seasonal operation from complimentary guest use to cash sales. The proposed project will be based out of the Round Hill Pines Marina. The facility is owned by the USDA Forest Service and operated by a private concessionaire. Passengers will purchase tickets from Harrah's Lake Tahoe and be transported by shuttle to the Round Hill Pines Marina. There are adequate support facilities to accommodate the proposed project.

11. The project is compatible with existing shorezone and lakezone uses or structures on, or in the immediate vicinity of, the littoral parcel; or that modification of such existing uses or structures will be undertaken to assure compatibility.

The project does not require the construction or modification of any shorezone structures. The proposed project is compatible with other shorezone uses in the
vicinity. The proposed tour boat will be based out of the Round Hill Pines Marina and is consistent with the lake recreation use of that site.

12. The use proposed in the foreshore or nearshore is water-dependent.

The tour boat will utilize the nearshore and foreshore of Lake Tahoe and is water-dependent.

13. Measures will be taken to prevent spills or discharges of hazardous materials.

This approval prohibits the use of spray painting and the use of tributyltin (TBT).

14. Construction and access techniques will be used to minimize disturbance to ground and vegetation.

The proposed tour boat operation does not require the construction or modification of any structures.

15. The project will not adversely impact navigation or create a threat to public safety as determined by those agencies with jurisdiction over a lake's navigable waters.

The proposed project does not involve additional structures. The US Coast Guard has certified that the vessel is safe to carry 49 passengers. There is no evidence that the project will adversely impact navigation or create a threat to public safety.

16. TRPA has solicited comments from those public agencies having jurisdiction over the nearshore and foreshore and all such comments received were considered by TRPA prior to action being taken on this project.

This project must receive approval from the Nevada Division of State Lands and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Comments from these agencies, as well as the Nevada Division of Wildlife, were solicited as part of the review of this project. None of the agencies indicated that they had negative concerns regarding the proposed project.

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

The proposed project involves the modification of an existing seasonal operation from complimentary guest use to cash sales. The existing boat has operated out of Round Hill Pines Marina since 1988. The proposed tour boat operation does not require the construction or modification of any structures. The existing use (marinas) of the subject parcel is a special use within the applicable Plan Area Statement. The proposed tour boat will be based out of the Round Hill Pines Marina and is consistent with the lake recreation use of that site.

18. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region.
There is no evidence that the proposed project will be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region.

19. The applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant's property and that of surrounding property owners.

The proposed project is located within a Priority 3 watershed, as a condition of approval the applicant will be required to install Best Management Practices (BMPs) by October 15, 2011.

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

Tour Boats are listed as a Special Use in the Plan Area Statement. There is no evidence in the file or record that the proposed project will detrimentally affect or alter the purpose of the applicable Plan Area Statement. This project does not propose to increase the use capacity of the site or marina. The project is also consistent with the Land Use Element of the Regional Plan. The surrounding land uses are residential and undeveloped National Forest lands.

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

I. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section E above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect for the project.

II. A motion to approve the project based on this staff summary subject to the conditions listed below:

(1) The permit shall change the use of the existing seasonal operation of the Harrah's tour boat the Tahoe Star. This permit shall change the operation from complimentary to cash sales. Passengers will purchase tickets from Harrah's Lake Tahoe and be transported by shuttle to the Round Hill Pines Marina.

(2) The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment S where applicable.

(3) By acceptance of this permit, the permittee acknowledges that the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires that this property, located within a Priority 3 watershed group, install and maintain all Best Management Practices (BMPs) prior to October 15, 2011.

(4) A maximum of 49 PAOTs are hereby allocated to the approved tour boat project from the PAOT Marina pool.
(5) By acceptance of this permit, the permittee acknowledges the tour boat will not be in Emerald Bay from ½ hour past sunset to ½ hour prior to sunrise. In addition, the use of loudspeakers and spotlights are prohibited in Emerald Bay.

(6) No signs are approved in accordance with this permit. New signs shall require separate TRPA review and approval.

(7) By acceptance of this permit, the permittee acknowledges that all passengers must be shuttled to the Round Hill Marina from Harrah's Lake Tahoe. No parking for tour boat passengers will be onsite.
MEMORANDUM

June 11, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Challenge; Douglas County, 07-130-04: 236 Kingsbury Grade, Douglas County, Nevada

Proposed Action: The applicant, Douglas County, requests that the Governing Board review the proposed Land Capability Challenge on a portion of the parcel and, if appropriate, approve it.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the land capability challenge on a portion of the parcel, changing the land capability class from 1a and 3 to 5. (See Attachment B.)

Background: The subject parcel is shown as land capability class 3 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the JeD (Jabu coarse sandy loam, shallow variant, 5 to 15 percent slopes) soil map unit. The JeD soil map unit is consistent with the E-2 geomorphic unit classification. The Jabu soil formed in alluvium derived from mainly granitic sources.

A land capability verification was completed on this parcel in November 1993, and the parcel was verified as land capability classes 3 and 1a. A land capability challenge was filed to confirm the soil series and land capability for the parcel.

Findings: This parcel is 17.92 acres in size and is located on Kingsbury Grade in Douglas County. The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-2 (Outwash, till and lake deposits, low hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The soils investigation was completed by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist, and a report was prepared. Based on two soil pits, one representative soil profile was described (see Attachment A). After a visit to the parcel on June 8, 1999, the soils on a square foot portion of APN 07-130-04 were determined to be consistent with land capability classes 5, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974).

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Joe Pepi, at (775) 588-4547.

Attachments

JP/dmc
INTRODUCTION
A soil investigation was conducted on a portion of APN 07-130-04, Douglas County, on June 11, 1999. This parcel is 17.92 acres in size and is located on Kingsbury Grade in Douglas County. A land capability verification was completed in November 1992 at the request of the property owner, by TRPA staff. Staff verified that the parcel should be classified as land capability class 3 and 1a.

A land capability challenge was filed with TRPA in February 1999 to determine the appropriate land capability class for this parcel based on a soil investigation.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING
This parcel is shown as land capability class 3 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the JeD (Jabu coarse sandy loam, shallow variant; 5 to 15 percent slopes) soil map unit.

The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-2 (Outwash, till, and lake deposits, low high hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The JeD soil map unit is consistent with this geomorphic unit classification.

The Jabu soil formed in alluvium derived from mainly granitic rocks. This parcel is on a northwest facing slope. The natural slope is 2 to 9 percent.

The parcel is mostly devoid of natural vegetation, but is planted with a cover of mulch, small pines, sagebrush and grasses.

PROCEDURES
Five soil pits were dug on this parcel, three using a backhoe and two using hand tools. After examination of these pits, two were described in detail and one was chosen as representative of the soils on the parcel. A copy of this description is included in this report. Slopes were measured with a clinometer.

FINDINGS
One soil series and soil map unit were identified on this parcel. The soil on this parcel is deep and is well drained. It is characterized as having a brown and yellowish brown gravelly sandy loam surface layer over light yellowish brown very stony sandy loamy sand upper underlying layer. The lower underlying layer is a light yellowish brown and very pale brown very gravelly coarse sandy loam.

A soil investigation report was submitted by Sid Davis of Davis Consulting Earth Scientists, in which he concluded that the soils on this parcel were consistent with the land capability class 5.

CONCLUSION
Based on the results of the site visit on June 11, 1999, the soil on APN 07-130-04 was determined to be consistent with land capability class 5, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974) and is 25 percent allowable coverage.

Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist
ARCPACS No. 2372
Representative Soil Profile:

Soil Classification: loamy-skeletal, mixed, frigid, Entic Xerumbrepts

Soil Series: Unnamed in Tahoe Basin

Oi  ½ to 0 inches; pine needles and twigs, abrupt smooth boundary.

A1  0 to 6 inches; brown (10YR 5/3) gravelly sandy loam, brown (10YR 4/3) moist; weak fine subangular blocky structure; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; weak very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; clear smooth boundary.

A2  6 to 14 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) cobbly sandy loam, dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; gradual wavy boundary.

AC  14 to 30 inches; brown (10YR 4/3) very stony sandy loam, dark grayish brown (10YR 4/2) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; gradual wavy boundary.

C1  30 to 41 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 5/3) very stony sandy loam, brown (10YR 5/4) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

C2  41 to 50 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 6/4) cobbly sandy loam, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; medium acid; gradual wavy boundary.

C3  50 to 60 inches; very pale brown (10YR 7/4) very gravelly coarse sandy loam, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; gradual wavy boundary.
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Challenge; David Taormino, 16-143-10: 616 Winton Drive, El Dorado County

Proposed Action: The applicant, David Taormino, requests that the Governing Board review the proposed Land Capability Challenge on the parcel and, if appropriate, approve it.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the land capability challenge on a portion of the parcel changing the land capability class from 1a and 3 to 4 and 6. (See Attachment B.)

Background: The subject parcel is shown as land capability classes 1a and 3 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the JaD (Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0 to 9 percent slopes) and MsE (Meeks very stony loamy coarse sand, 15 to 30 percent slopes) soil map units. The MsE soil map unit is consistent with the E-1 geomorphic unit classification. The Jabu soil formed in alluvium derived from mainly granitic sources. The Meeks soil formed in glacial outwash derived predominantly from granitic sources.

A land capability verification was completed on this parcel in September 1998, and the parcel was verified as land capability classes 5 and 3. A land capability challenge was filed to confirm the soil series and land capability for the parcel.

Findings: This parcel is 15,454 square feet in size and is located on North Lane in the Rubicon Properties subdivision in El Dorado County. The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-1 (Moraine land, undifferentiated, moderate hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The soils investigation was completed by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist, and a report was prepared. Based on three soil pits, one representative soil profile was described (see Attachment A). After a visit to the parcel on June 2, 1999, the soils on APN 16-143-10 was determined to be consistent with the EbE (Elmira gravelly coarse sand, 9 to 20 percent slopes), and the EbC (Elmira gravelly coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes) soil map unit and capability classes 4 and 6, respectively in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974).

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

Attachments

JP/dmc
INTRODUCTION
A soil investigation was conducted on a portion of APN 16-143-10, El Dorado County, on June 2, 1999. This parcel is 15,454 square feet in size and is located on North Lane in El Dorado County. A land capability verification was completed by TRPA staff in September 1998 at the request of the property owner. Staff verified that the parcel should be classified as land capability classes 3 and 5. A land capability challenge was filed with TRPA in November 1998 to determine the appropriate land capability class for this parcel based on a soil investigation.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING
This parcel is shown as land capability classes 1a and 3 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the JaD (Jabu coarse sandy loam, 0 to 9 percent slopes) and MsE (Meeks very stony loamy coarse sand, 15 to 30 percent slopes) soil map units. The MsE soil map unit is consistent with the E-1 geomorphic unit classification. The Jabu soil formed in alluvium derived from mainly granitic sources. The Meeks soil formed in glacial outwash derived predominantly from granitic sources.

The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-1 (Moraine land undifferentiated, moderate hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The MsE soil map unit is consistent with this geomorphic unit classification.

The Jabu soil formed in alluvium derived from mainly granitic sources. The Meeks soil formed in glacial outwash derived predominantly from granitic sources. The natural slope is 5 to 17 percent. The natural vegetation is mainly Jeffrey pine, white fir, manzanita, chinquapin, and sagebrush.

PROCEDURES
Three soil pits were dug on this parcel using hand tools. After examination of these pits, one was chosen as representative of the soils on the parcel and described in detail. A copy of this description is included in this report. Slopes were measured with a clinometer.

FINDINGS
One soil series and two soil map units were identified on this parcel. The soil on this parcel is deep and is well drained. It is characterized as having a dark yellowish brown and yellowish brown gravelly loamy coarse sand surface layer over a pale brown gravelly loamy coarse sand upper underlying layer. The lower underlying layer is a light yellowish brown very gravelly coarse sandy loam.

CONCLUSION
Based on the results of the site visit on June 1, 1999, the soil on APN 16-143-10 was determined to be consistent with the EbC (Elmira gravelly coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes) soil map unit and land capability class 6, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974) and is 30 percent allowable coverage.

Joseph Pepi
Certified Professional Soil Scientist
ARCPACS No. 2372
Representative Soil Profile:

Soil Classification: mixed, frigid, Alfic Xeropsamment

Soil Series: Unnamed in Tahoe Basin

Oi 3 to 0 inches; pine needles and twigs, abrupt smooth boundary.

A1 0 to 4 inches; brown (10YR 4/4) gravelly loamy coarse sand, dark yellowish brown (10YR 3/4) moist; single grain to massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interststitial pores; 20 percent gravel; clear smooth boundary.

A2 4 to 11 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) gravelly loamy coarse sand, dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interststitial pores; 20 percent gravel; gradual wavy boundary.

AC 11 to 23 inches yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) gravelly loamy coarse sand, dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interststitial pores; 20 percent gravel; gradual wavy boundary.

C1 23 to 34 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 6/3) very gravelly loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 5/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine roots; many very fine and fine interststitial pores; 20 percent gravel; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

C2 34 to 47 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 6/4) very gravelly loamy coarse sand, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine roots; many very fine and fine interststitial pores; medium acid; gradual wavy boundary.

47 inches; stopped by gravels.
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Challenge; Stan Hilton, 34-434-03: 616 Wintoon Drive, El Dorado County, California

Proposed Action: The applicant, Stan Hilton, requests that the Governing Board review the proposed Land Capability Challenge on the parcel and, if appropriate, approve it.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the land capability challenge on a portion of the parcel changing the land capability class from 3 to 6. (See Attachment B.)

Background: The subject parcel is shown as land capability class 3 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the JbD (Jabu coarse sandy loam, seeped, 2 to 15 percent slopes) soil map unit. The JbD soil map unit is consistent with the E-1 geomorphic unit classification. The Jabu soil formed in alluvium derived from mainly granitic sources.

A land capability verification was completed on this parcel in November 1993, and the parcel was verified as land capability class 3. A land capability challenge was filed to confirm the soil series and land capability for the parcel.

Findings: This parcel is 12,800 square feet in size and is located on Wintoon Drive in the Tahoe Paradise Unit No. 20 subdivision in El Dorado County. The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-1 (Moraine land, undifferentiated, moderate hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The soils investigation was completed by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist, and a report was prepared. Based on two soil pits, one representative soil profile was described (see Attachment A). After a visit to the parcel on June 1, 1999, the soils on APN 34-434-03 was determined to be consistent with the Ebc (Elmira gravelly coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes) soil map unit and capability classes 6, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974).

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

Attachments

JP/dmc
INTRODUCTION
A soil investigation was conducted on a portion of APN 34-434-03, Douglas County, on June 1, 1999. This parcel is 12,800 square feet in size and is located on Wintoon Drive in El Dorado County. A land capability verification was completed by TRPA staff in April 1998 at the request of the property owner. Staff verified that the parcel should be classified as land capability class 3. A land capability challenge was filed with TRPA in February 1999 to determine the appropriate land capability class for this parcel based on a soil investigation.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING
This parcel is shown as land capability class 3 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the JbD (Jabu coarse sandy loam, seeped, 2 to 15 percent slopes) soil map unit.

The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit E-1 (Moraine land undifferentiated, moderate hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The JbD soil map unit is consistent with this geomorphic unit classification.

The Jabu soil formed in alluvium derived from mainly granitic rocks. This parcel is on a south facing slope. The natural slope is 2 to 6 percent.

The natural vegetation is mainly Jeffrey pine, white fir, manzanita, chinquapin, and sagebrush.

PROCEDURES
Three soil pits were dug on this parcel using hand tools. After examination of these pits, one was chosen as representative of the soils on the parcel and described in detail. A copy of this description is included in this report. Slopes were measured with a clinometer.

FINDINGS
One soil series and soil map unit were identified on this parcel. The soil on this parcel is deep and is well drained. It is characterized as having a dark yellowish brown and yellowish brown gravelly loamy coarse sand surface layer over a pale brown gravelly loamy coarse sand upper underlying layer. The lower underlying layer is a light yellowish brown very gravelly coarse sandy loam.

CONCLUSION
Based on the results of the site visit on June 1, 1999, the soil on APN 34-434-03 was determined to be consistent with the EbC (Elmira gravelly coarse sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes) soil map unit and land capability class 6, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974) and is 30 percent allowable coverage.

Joseph Pepi
Certified Professional Soil Scientist
ARCPACS No. 2372
Representative Soil Profile:

Soil Classification: mixed, frigid, Alfisol Xeropsamment

Soil Series: Unnamed in Tahoe Basin

Oi 3 to 0 inches; pine needles and twigs, abrupt smooth boundary.

A1 0 to 4 inches; brown (10YR 4/4) gravelly loamy coarse sand, dark yellowish; brown (10YR 3/4) moist; single grain to massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 20 percent gravel; clear smooth boundary.

A2 4 to 11 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) gravelly loamy coarse sand, dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine and fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 20 percent gravel; gradual wavy boundary.

AC 11 to 23 inches yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) gravelly loamy coarse sand, dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 20 percent gravel; gradual wavy boundary.

C1 23 to 34 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 6/3) very gravelly loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 5/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 20 percent gravel; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

C2 34 to 47 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 6/4) very gravelly loamy coarse sand, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few very fine roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; medium acid; gradual wavy boundary.

47 inches; stopped by gravels.
MEMORANDUM

June 11, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Land Capability Challenge; Eugene White, 03-191-03: 1220 Highway 50, Douglas County, Nevada

Proposed Action: The applicant, Eugene White, requests that the Governing Board review the proposed Land Capability Challenge on a portion of the parcel and, if appropriate, approve it.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the land capability challenge on a portion of the parcel changing the land capability class from 1a, 1b, 2, and 4 to 1a, 1b, 4, and 6. (See Attachment B.)

Background: The subject parcel is shown as land capability class 2 and 4 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the CaE (Cagwin-Rockoutcrop complex, 15 to 30 percent slopes) and the CaD (Cagwin-Rockoutcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes) soil map units. The CaE and CaD soil map units are consistent with the C-1 (Granitic foothills) geomorphic unit classification. The Cagwin soil formed in residuum derived from granitic bedrock.

A land capability verification was completed on this parcel in August 1998, and the parcel was verified as land capability classes 4, 2, 1a and 1b. A land capability challenge was filed to confirm the soil series and land capability for the parcel.

Findings: This parcel is 120,979 square feet in size and is located on U.S. Highway 50 in Douglas County. The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit C-1 (Granitic foothills, moderate hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The soils investigation was completed by Joseph Pepi, Certified Professional Soil Scientist, and a report was prepared. Based on three soil pits, three representative soil profiles were described (see Attachment A). After visits to the parcel on April 27, 1999 and May 13, 1999 the soils on APN 03-191-03 were determined to be consistent with land capability classes 1a, 1b, 4, and 6, in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974).

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

Attachments

JP/dmc
SOIL INVESTIGATION FOR
DOUGLAS COUNTY APN 03-191-03
1120 US HIGHWAY 50

INTRODUCTION
A soil investigation was conducted on APN 03-191-03, Douglas County, on April 27 and May 13, 1999. This parcel is 120,950 square feet in size and is located on US Highway 50 in Douglas County. A land capability verification was completed by TRPA staff, in August 1998 at the request of the property owner. Staff verified that the parcel should be classified as land capability classes 4, 2, 1a and 1b.

A land capability challenge was filed with TRPA in February 1999 to determine the appropriate land capability class for this parcel based on a soil investigation.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING
This parcel is shown as land capability class 2 and 4 on the TRPA Land Capability Overlay Maps. The Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin places this parcel within the CaE (Cagwin-Rockoutcrop complex, 15 to 30 percent slopes) and the CaD (Cagwin-Rockoutcrop complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes) soil map units. The CaE and CaD soil map units are consistent with the C-1 (Granitic foothills) geomorphic unit classification. The Cagwin soil formed in residuum derived from granitic bedrock.

The parcel is mapped within geomorphic unit C-1 (Granitic foothills, moderate high hazard lands) on the TRPA Geomorphic Analysis Map of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The CaE and CaD soil map units are consistent with this geomorphic unit classification.

The Cagwin soil formed in residuum derived from granitic bedrock. This parcel is on a northwest facing slope. The natural slope is 2 to 20 percent.

The natural vegetation is Jeffrey pine, white fir, manzanita, antelope bitterbrush and chinquapin.

PROCEDURES
Five soil pits were dug on this parcel, one using a backhoe and two using hand tools. After examination of these pits, three were described in detail as representative of the soils on the parcel. A copy of these description are included in this report. Slopes were measured with a clinometer.

FINDINGS
Three soil series and four soil map units were identified on this parcel. The soils on this parcel are moderately deep and deep and well drained. The first soil is characterized as having a very dark grayish brown and dark yellowish brown gravelly stony and very stony loamy coarse sand surface layer over dark yellowish brown very stony loamy coarse sand upper underlying layer. The lower underlying layer is a dark yellowish brown and yellowish brown very gravelly loamy coarse sand.

This soil is unnamed in the Soil Survey for the Lake Tahoe Basin, but would best fit land capability class 6 under the Bailey Land Capability Classification system.

The second soil is characterized as having a dark brown loamy coarse sand surface layer over dark yellowish brown very stony loamy coarse sand upper underlying layer.
The subsoil is a brown, dark yellowish brown and brownish yellow sandy loam. This soil is similar to the Tahoma soil series identified in the Soil Survey of the Tahoe Basin, and is in land capability class 6.

The last soil found on the parcel is characterized as having a dark brown and dark yellowish brown loamy coarse sand surface layer over dark yellowish brown very stony loamy coarse sand lower surface layer. The underlying material is brown, gravelly loamy coarse sand. The slope ranges for this soil are 15 to 30 percent. This soil is not identified in the Soil Survey of the Tahoe Basin, but would best fit in land capability class 4.

A soil investigation report was submitted by Sid Davis of Davis Consulting Earth Scientists, in which he concluded that the soils on this parcel were consistent with the land capability class 1a, 1b, 4 and 6.

CONCLUSION
Based on the results of the site visits, the soil on APN 03-191-03 were determined to be consistent with land capability classes 1a, 1b, 4, and 6 in accordance with the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Bailey, 1974) and are assigned 1, 20, and 30 percent allowable coverage, respectively.

Joseph Pepi
Certified Professional Soil Scientist
ARCPACS No. 2372
Representative Soil Profile No. 1:

Soil Classification: sandy-skeletal, mixed, frigid, Entic Xerumbrept

Soil Series: Tahoma

Oi 2 to 0 inches; pine needles and twigs, abrupt smooth boundary.

A1 0 to 7 inches; brown (10YR 3/3) stony loamy sand, very dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) moist; weak fine subangular blocky structure; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 15 percent gravel, 20 percent cobble and 5 percent stones; clear wavy boundary.

A2 8 to 19 inches; dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) stony loamy coarse sand, dark brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine and few medium roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 15 percent gravel, 25 percent cobble and 5 percent stones; gradual wavy boundary.

AC 19 to 25 inches; dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) very stony loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium and coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 20 percent gravel, 20 percent cobble, and 5 percent stones; gradual wavy boundary.

C1 25 to 40 inches; dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) very stony loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium and few coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 15 percent gravel, 30 percent cobble and 10 percent stones medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

C2 40 to 50 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) very gravelly loamy coarse sand, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common medium and few coarse roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 30 percent gravel, and 15 percent cobble; medium acid; gradual wavy boundary.

C3 50 to 60 inches; yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) very gravelly coarse sandy loam, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 40 percent gravel, and 10 percent cobble.
Representative Soil Profile No. 2:

Soil Classification: coarse-loamy, mixed, frigid, Ultic Haploxeralf

Soil Series: Unnamed in Tahoe Basin

Oi  
½ to 0 inches; pine needles and twigs, abrupt smooth boundary.

A1  
0 to 7 inches; very dark grayish brown (10YR 3/2) loamy coarse sand, very dark brown (10YR 2/2) moist; weak fine subangular blocky structure; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine, and few medium roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; gradual wavy boundary.

A2  
7 to 19 inches; brown (10YR 4/3) loamy coarse sand, dark brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine and few medium roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; gradual wavy boundary.

BA  
19 to 30 inches; brown (10YR 5/3) sandy loam, dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium and coarse roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; gradual wavy boundary.

IIBt1  
30 to 43 inches; dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/6) sandy loam, brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium and few coarse roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; medium acid; clear wavy boundary.

IIBt2  
43 to 60 inches; brownish yellow heavy sandy loam, (10YR 4/6) yellowish brown (10YR 5/6) moist; massive, soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common medium and few coarse roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; medium acid; gradual wavy boundary.
Representative Soil Profile No. 3:

Soil Classification: mixed, frigid, Dystric Xeropsamment

Soil Series: Unnamed in Tahoe Basin

Oi  1 to 0 inches; pine needles and twigs, abrupt smooth boundary.

A1  0 to 6 inches; dark brown (10YR 3/3) loamy coarse sand, very dark brown (10YR 3/2) moist; weak fine subangular blocky structure; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine, and few medium roots; many very fine and fine interstitial pores; 10 percent gravel; gradual wavy boundary.

A2  6 to 15 inches; brown (10YR 3/4) loamy coarse sand, dark brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; common very fine and fine and few medium roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 10 percent gravel; gradual wavy boundary.

AC  15 to 27 inches; dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium and coarse roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 10 percent gravel; gradual wavy boundary.

C1  27 to 35 inches; brown (10YR 5/3) gravelly loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 4/3) moist; massive; soft, very friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few fine and medium roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 15 percent gravel medium acid; clear smooth boundary.

C2  35 to 44 inches; brown (10YR 5/3) gravelly loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 5/3) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium and coarse roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 15 percent gravel medium acid; clear smooth boundary.

C3  44 to 53 inches; light yellowish brown (10YR 6/4) gravelly loamy coarse sand, brown (10YR 5/3) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 25 percent gravel medium acid; abrupt smooth boundary.

C4  53 to 60 inches; pale brown (10YR 6/3) silty loam, brown (10YR 5/3) moist; massive; soft, friable, nonsticky and nonplastic; few medium roots; common very fine and fine interstitial pores; 10 percent gravel; medium acid.
MEMORANDUM

June 11, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Release of $10,000 from the Shorezone Mitigation Fund for a Scenic Consultant

Proposed Action: Staff is requesting that the Governing Board authorize the expenditure of up to $10,000 of the Shorezone Mitigation Fund for a consultant to complete the scenic review system. By this action, the requests for funds for watercraft enforcement are cancelled.

Justification: Implementation of a scenic review system is a critical mitigation measure for threshold attainment in the Shorezone. Since 1987 TRPA has not demonstrated attainment and has allowed three units to go into non-attainment.

It is staff's opinion that, in order to complete the scenic ordinance and EIS sections, this assistance is necessary. It is critical to achieve consensus, to make the needed corrections in a timely manner, and to provide credibility for the product.

In order to complete the Shorezone Ordinance and EIS in a timely manner, staff needs assistance from the scenic consultant, Stephen Shepard, who has been instrumental in designing the new scenic review system. He has provided us with a rough work program, cost, and schedule (see Attachment A). It is staff's estimate that $10,000 would cover his cost and the panel cost.

Funding: As of April 30, 1999, the Shorezone Mitigation Fund had a $64,363 reserve. The money requested from this fund in March and April for watercraft enforcement will not be needed, as the two states provided ample money in the FY 99-00 budget for watercraft enforcement. Therefore, it appears that there is there are sufficient funds for this proposal.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Gabby Barrett, at (775) 588-4547.
INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SHOREZONE SCENIC TECHNICAL TEAM
(Based on discussions with the Partnership Group on June 7, 1999, South Lake Tahoe.)

Tasks

1. Mapping and Clarification Tasks (office based, short-term):
   a) Use GIS to clarify/identify locations (and overlap) of sandy beaches
      • SE soils
      • Tolerance Districts 1 and 7
      • Visually Sensitive Shoreline Character Types (as mapped)
      • Scenic Resources which are based on sandy beach characteristics
      • White versus darker sandy beaches.
   b) Confirm appropriate definitions of sandy beaches versus Visually Sensitive
      Shorelines, using shoreline photography/videos (the panel attempted to identify
      only the paler, sandy beaches in the Visually Sensitive Shoreline Type).
   c) Outline possible strategies for resolving scenic management issues on sandy
      beach areas.

2. Refine point score system to develop hybrid of menu point core system and
   amended calculation procedure, taking into account such items as color, elevation
   above water, mass, etc.

3. Revise point scores to be allocated to quasi-public areas, based on number of
   owners/users, length of shoreline affected, number of piers/buoys, etc.

4. Shorezone Scenic Inventory (fieldwork-based):
   a) Inventory of all pier and shorezone structures (boat based, without pier access or
      physical measurement of all items), i.e., key attributes and associated point
      scores, aiming at the 80-90% accuracy level.
   b) Field mapping of sandy beaches (boundaries) as defined in 1a) above.
   c) Field mapping and verification of Man-Dominated Shoreline Character Types
      (boundaries).
   d) Possible field mapping and verification of all Shoreline Character Type
      boundaries
   e) Assessment of upland Scenic BMP compliance on littoral parcels (possibilities
      include just in representative sample locations, or on all lots, verifying against
      current definitions of Scenic BMPs as defined in the Ordinance; alternatively, we
      could try to develop a 'short-cut' surrogate classification of 3-5 levels of BMP
      compliance, using overall visual dominance of upland features as a quick overall
      analysis (without developing a point scoring or detailed visual magnitude
      system).
   f) Assessment of actual scenic BMP costs for representative sample of actual
      homes, using the inventory and cost calculations revised from those in Appendix
      3 of the DEIS.

5. Revise Scenic Package to reflect new findings, increased incentives, and
   Partnership group input.
Schedule and Resources

It seems that all tasks should involve John Hitchcock, and inventory should be conducted jointly with a Project Review staff member. Other Management staff should be consulted or selectively included to work thorough more complicated issues. Consultants from the Scenic Review Panel would most likely be needed to establish or verify the procedures used, test them, train John/staff in implementing the inventory, and review or make final modifications to the ordinance/system.

Rough cost estimates for consulting input at this level are around $5.5-7.5K for Tasks 1-4, including:
- 2-3 days on Tasks 1, 2, and 3 (no travel, working with TRPA staff remotely)
- 4-5 days on Task 4, including 2-3 days in the field, and one trip to Tahoe.

Task 1 should be accomplished quickly (possibly within the next two weeks?).

Tasks 2-3 should be done between now and the inventory dates (mid July?). There is considerable inventory planning to be done before the serious field work begins. The inventory could be completed in time for the August 11th meeting, with findings to bring back to the table.

Task 5 would have to be done for the Final EIS.
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Three Year Strategic Plan Update and Program of Work for FY 1999-2000

Proposed Action: Governing Board approval of the July 1999-July 2002 Strategic Plan and FY 1999-2000 Program of Work

Discussion: The TRPA management team and the Governing Board held a planning workshop in May to update the Agency's Three Year Strategic Plan and commence preparation of the Program of Work for FY 99-00. The updated Strategic Plan and Program of Work for FY 99-00 are being distributed under separate cover to the Governing Board for review and approval.

The proposed Program of Work has been developed in conjunction with the Agency's Three Year Strategic Plan, workload model and proposed budget for FY 99-00. Specific staff resources have been allocated to each work element based on the staffing level contained in the proposed FY 99-00 budget.

It is anticipated that the Program of Work will be modified periodically throughout the fiscal year to respond to changes in workload and work priorities. Each of the work elements contained in the Program of Work will be reviewed on a monthly basis by the TRPA management team to monitor work progress in accordance with the proposed completion schedules (milestones) and to make any necessary adjustments. In order to keep the Governing Board informed on the status of the Program of Work, staff will make semi-annual progress reports on those priority milestones which are directly related to the Strategic Plan goals.

Additional copies of the updated Strategic Plan and Program of Work for FY 99-00 will be made available at TRPA and at the June Governing Board meeting upon request. If you should have any questions on this matter, please contact Jerry Wells, Deputy Executive Director, at (702) 588-4547.

JW/ Consent Calendar Item No.11
MEMORANDUM

June 13, 1999

TO: Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

FROM: Richard Wiggins, Transportation Programs Manager

SUBJECT: Report of the Tahoe Transportation District

Proposed Action: Review the attached TTD Agenda for June 11, 1999 and the attached action sheet.

Staff Recommendation: Seek clarification as necessary.

If there are any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Richard Wiggins at (775) 588-4547.
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Friday, June 11, 1999, commencing at 9:00 a.m., the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors will conduct its regular Board meeting at the City of South Lake Tahoe City Services/Council Chambers, 1900 Lake Tahoe Blvd., South Lake Tahoe, California. The agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on Friday, June 11, 1999, commencing at 8:15 a.m., in the same location, the Finance Committee will meet. The agenda will be as follows: 1) public interest comments (no action); 2) receipt of April 1999 monthly financial report; 3) review of final FY 1999/00 agency budget; 3) review of TTD Trolley Use and Lease Agreements; 4) grants status report; and 5) member comments (Committee: McIntyre, Bennett, Hansen)

PLEASE NOTE THE CHANGE IN TIME FOR THE FINANCE COMMITTEE. 8:15 a.m.

June 4, 1999

Richard Wiggins
Transportation Programs Manager

NOTE: Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada and Stateline and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, CA, at the Incline Village GID office in Incline Village, NV, and at the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce in Tahoe City, CA.
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

City of South Lake Tahoe Council Chambers  
1900 Lake Tahoe Blvd.  
South Lake Tahoe, California  

June 11, 1999  
9:00 a.m.

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

AGENDA

I. GENERAL MATTERS

A. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

B. Approval of Agenda

C. Approval of Minutes of May 5, 1999

D. Appointment of Mr. John Carney of Incline Village as At-Large TTAC Member

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Finance Committee Report  
   Oral Report

B. April 1999 Monthly Financial Report (TTD)  
   Receive/Fila

C. Trolley Use Agreement with the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association  
   Approve

D. Trolley Use Agreement with the South Shore Transportation Management Association  
   Approve

E. Trolley Lease Agreement with Area Transit Management, Inc.  
   Approve

IV. PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING MATTERS

A. Adoption of FY 1999/00 Operating Budget  
   TTD

B. Approval of Resolution Supporting and Adopting FY 1999/2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program  
   TTD/TTC

C. Update on Status of Regional Transportation Plan  
   TTD/TTC
V. OPERATIONS AND PROJECT MATTERS
   A. Presentation by Fallon Multimedia Regarding the Development of Transit
      Marketing Materials
      TTD
   B. Discussion Regarding the Initiation of Commercial Air Service at Lake
      Tahoe Airport.
      TTD

VI. POLICY MATTERS
   A. Responsibilities of the TTD, TRPA and CTS MCO as they Relate to the
      CTS Project
      TTD
   B. Discussion of USFS SR 28 Parking Lot Environmental Assessment and
      Approval of Resolution Supporting Restricting Parking
      Along SR 28
      TTD

VII. REPORTS AND INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   A. Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
      Discussion of TTAC Agenda for 5/27/99 meeting
   B. Board Members
   C. Staff
      1. USPS Master Plan Status
      2. ITS Strategic Deployment Plan Status
      3. CNG Program Status

VIII. OTHER
   A. Next Meeting: July 9, 1999 at 9:00 a.m. at a location to be determined.
      Please let the Chair know if you have any agenda items to be included. (Regular
      Board meetings are held on the second Friday of each month).

IX. ADJOURNMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. GENERAL MATTERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS</td>
<td>(None)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. April 1999 Monthly Financial Report (TTD)</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Trolley Use Agreement with TNTTMA</td>
<td>Pulled for Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Trolley Use Agreement with SSTMA</td>
<td>At a later time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Trolley Use Agreement with ATM</td>
<td>Approval w/Change to Lease Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. A. Adoption of FY 99/00 Operating Budget</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Approval of Resolution OWP FY 99/00</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Update on Status of RTP</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. A. Presentation by Fallon Multimedia</td>
<td>Item to be brought back to TTAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Initiation of Commercial Air Service</td>
<td>Status Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. A. Responsibilities of TTD, TRPA, CTS MCO With Regard to CTS Project</td>
<td>Postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. USFS SR 28 Parking Lot EA, Approval of Resolution – Approval w/changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. A. TTAC Agenda Discussion</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Board Members</td>
<td>Discussion/Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 1. USPS Master Plan Status</td>
<td>Discussion/Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ITS Strategic Deployment Plan Status</td>
<td>Discussion/Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CNG program Status</td>
<td>Discussion/Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Next Meeting – July 9, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Adjournment @ 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

June 13, 1999

To: Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: Richard Wiggins, Transportation Programs Manager

Subject: Results of the Nevada Statewide Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (STTAC) Enhancement Project Selection

 Proposed Action: Review the results of the STTAC.

Staff Recommendation: Seek clarification as necessary.

Discussion: At the May TMPO Board meeting, the Board approved a list of prioritized TEA projects that was submitted to NDOT. Subsequently, three out of the four projects submitted received preliminary approval for funding by the NV STTAC. The Nevada Transportation Board must still approve the Tahoe project funding, as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal TEA</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Yr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>Sidewalk Impr. US 50/Elks Pt.</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 498,400</td>
<td>Sidewalk Impr. SR 28 @ Incline</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>Sidewalk Impr. SR 28 @ Incline</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $1,048,600

The STTAC acted positively upon a proposal by NDOT Director Stephens to add an additional year of funding to the TEA estimate used to select projects. The Director's proposal changed the amount available from $8,326,479 to $11,995,085.

The following shows statewide results of the STTAC recommendation.

Clark MPO    Seven Projects   $4,181,100
Washoe MPO   Seven Projects   2,376,200
Rural NV     Six Projects     2,153,800
Parks/SHPO   Five Projects    2,081,100

If there are any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Richard Wiggins at (775) 588-4547.
MEMORANDUM

June 10, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Adoption of the FY 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program

Proposed Action: Review the proposed FY 1999-2000 Overall Work Program for Transportation Planning and adopt the attached resolutions, one from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and one from the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the TRPA and TMPO adopt the FY 1999-2000 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program by approving the attached resolutions.

Background: Each year TRPA is required to adopt an Overall Work Program (OWP) that describes the TRPA transportation planning program. The OWP must include all transportation revenues and expenditures, and describe work elements within the OWP that staff will complete during the fiscal year. In addition, the OWP must now meet federal requirements of metropolitan planning organizations.

The proposed FY 1999-2000 OWP includes $1,199,101 in revenues and expenditures. This amount does not include the carryover from FY 1998-99 of the federal planning funds available.

The Overall Work Program for FY 1999-2000 varies quite a bit from previous OWPs in that it has several new funding sources, and incorporates the requirements of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization. The OWP this year includes funding from thirteen different sources. This includes PL funds (available to MPOs for transportation planning) from California and Nevada, as well as special discretionary funding sources. There are several special funding sources programmed to complete specific projects (i.e., California State Planning & Research (SP&R) funds, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA); Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Deployment Plan (ITS SDP)).

Approximately 39% ($465,009) of the total funding is budgeted to be applied to staff salaries and benefits. The funding available for staff is a significant increase over previous years. In order to accomplish all the requirements and goals of the TMPO, TRPA will be required to increase current staffing levels.
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This OWP includes work tasks that are the responsibility of the TMPO, TRPA, Tahoe Transportation District and the advisory bodies to each of these entities. The OWP describes the role and responsibilities of each of the entities, and how they differ and/or overlap. The products identified for each work element show who the responsible agency should be, but it is not shown for each task. TRPA staff will perform all of the tasks identified in the OWP and will serve as staff to the TRPA, TTD and TMPO.

Work tasks in the FY 1999-2000 OWP will focus on refinement of the MPO planning process, project development, consensus building, completion of the RTP-AQP, and air quality and alternative energy.

The first section of the OWP provides a setting and background for the transportation planning conditions that currently exist in the Tahoe Region. This section describes how the TMPO fits into the process in Tahoe, and how the existing entities (TRPA, TTD) will work together with the TMPO. A status of the FY 1998-99 work program is provided, as well as how the projects proposed in the FY 1999-2000 OWP fit into the federal planning and strategy areas. A series of tables is then provided that summarizes the financial conditions of the document. Overall revenues and expenditures are identified, as well as funding source by work element and funding for staff and other expenses (direct, contract, etc.) by work element.

Each work element is described individually in the final section. Tasks and products are identified, and the funding summary is shown for each work element. Completion dates have been estimated for each product.

Members of the TRPA and TMPO Governing Board have received a copy of the full OWP in addition to the Governing Board packet. The document is available for review at TRPA, or by calling the phone number below.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact Richard Wiggins at (775) 588-4547.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
TRPA RESOLUTION NO. 99-__

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY 1999-2000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING OVERALL WORK PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) is
the document required for programming of federal and state transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, sitting as the Regional Transportation
Planning Agency, is responsible for developing transportation and air quality plans, programs
and projects designed to attain and maintain environmental thresholds pursuant to the Tahoe
Regional Planning Compact; and

WHEREAS, TEA 21 provided for the establishment of a metropolitan planning
organization for the Lake Tahoe Basin, and that the Governors of California and Nevada
designated the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization in 1998; and the Tahoe Metropolitan
Planning Organization is responsible for the adoption of transportation plans, programs and
projects consistent with the Bi-State Compact; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District is established under Article IX of the
Compact, as amended, and is charged with the operation and ownership of public transportation
and parking systems; and

WHEREAS, the local jurisdictions of the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County,
Placer County, Washoe County, Carson City and Douglas County are represented in the
transportation planning process by membership on the Boards of the Tahoe Planning Agency,
the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, the United States Forest Service is a member of the Tahoe Metropolitan
Planning Organization and the Departments of Transportation for the States of Nevada and
California are ex-officio members of the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, this document has been properly noticed for review at the Tahoe
Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and the Tahoe Transportation District, and that a
Public Hearing was properly noticed and held by the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Governing Board, sitting the Regional Planning Agency, this ___ day of June, 1999, adopts and
approves the FY 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program.

Ayes:

Nayes:

Abstain:

Absent:

Larry Sevison, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
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AGENDA ITEMS VII. D. AND VIII.A.

53
WHEREAS, the Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) is the document required for the programming of federal and state transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, sitting as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is responsible for developing transportation and air quality plans, programs and projects designed to attain and maintain environmental thresholds pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact; and

WHEREAS, TEA 21 provided for the establishment of a metropolitan planning organization for the Lake Tahoe Basin, and that the Governors of California and Nevada designated the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization in 1998; and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization is responsible for the adoption of transportation plans, programs and projects consistent with the Bi-State Compact; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District is established under Article IX of the Compact, as amended, and is charged with the operation and ownership of public transportation and parking systems; and

WHEREAS, the local jurisdictions of the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Washoe County, Carson City and Douglas County are represented in the transportation planning process by membership on the Boards of the Tahoe Planning Agency, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, the United States Forest Service is a member of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Departments of Transportation for the States of Nevada and California are ex-officio members of the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, this document has been properly noticed for review at the Tahoe Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and the Tahoe Transportation District, and that a Public Hearing was properly noticed and held by the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Board of Directors, this ___ day of June, 1999, adopts and approves the FY 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program and budget and certifies that its planning process will be implemented through this document in accordance with:

- Section 134 of Title 23, U.S.C.; FTA 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Section 5303; and Title 23, CFR 450, Subpart C;
- Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d));
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each state under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

AGENDA ITEMS VII.D. and VII.A
Section 1003(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Pub. L. 97-242, section 105(f), 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR Part 23); and


Ayes:

Nayes:

Abstain:

Absent:

Larry Sevison, Chairman
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
MEMORANDUM

May 28, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Shorezone Ordinance Environmental Impact Statement

After a brief presentation, staff requests that the Governing Board open this item up for a public hearing.
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff


Proposed Action: This is an information item only; no action is required of Governing Board with regards to this agenda item. The purpose of this status report is to advise the Governing Board, interested stakeholders, and the general public of the progress which has been made regarding development of the Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program. In addition to keeping the Board informed (This is the second status report to the Board), this public hearing item will allow interested stakeholders an opportunity to present relevant program information to the Board and staff.

Staff Action: Staff is developing this program in accordance with the USEPA approved work program described in the contract by and between TRPA and USEPA for the SWAPP Regional Coordination Project Assistance Agreement. The Lake Tahoe Source Water Group has been formed and is working with USEPA and TRPA staff to develop the program. In addition, a list of interested parties (Stakeholders) has also been created. The Stakeholders are encouraged to review and comment on development of the program.

Background: Because Lake Tahoe is a source of drinking water for the basin, the USEPA has provided funding under the Safe Drinking Water Act to TRPA to ensure protection of public health. The Lake Tahoe Water Quality Management Plan, also referred to as the 208 Plan, has served the region indirectly towards the protection of drinking water sources for many years. However, the 208 Plan is not focused on drinking water quality concerns. The requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act are unclear where the development of source water assessment and protection plans involve interstate source water areas. The Lake Tahoe Source Water Protection Program includes development of a Coordination Plan that will integrate the preparation of state source water assessment and protection plans in the Lake Tahoe Region. The Coordination Plan will be developed using a watershed approach. USEPA is looking for this plan to serve as a model for application to other interstate watersheds in the United States.

This program is one of several Presidential Commitments described in the status report entitled "The Clinton-Gore Commitments of the Lake Tahoe Presidential Forum."

JPK/dmc

AGENDA ITEM VIII.C.
$50,000 has been awarded and is budgeted for this contract. The original contract period was April 1, 1998 through April 1, 1999; EPA has granted an extension of the period to September 30, 1999.

**Scope of Work:** TRPA staff and the Lake Tahoe Source Water Group are in the process of developing a program with at least four components: 1) Public Outreach Plan. 2) Data Management Plan. 3) Capital Improvements Plan. 4) Coordination Plan. TRPA staff and the Source Water Group will coordinate California and Nevada efforts towards developing Source Water Assessment and Protection Plans. TRPA will identify EIP projects and programs aimed at the protection of drinking water sources in the Lake Tahoe Region. The Draft Coordination Plan continues to be developed, and upon its completion, will be presented to the Board for approval.

One component of the data management plan currently being developed is a Regional Source Water Inventory Map. A Geographic Information System (GIS) inventory database is being compiled which forms the basis for this map. This GIS product will include the generation of buffer zones around each drinking water source (Interim Protection Zones). When proposed projects are located within an Interim Protection Zone, project planners will be alerted, and will review these projects to insure protection of the nearby drinking water source.

TRPA staff will seek Governing Board approval of the Coordination Plan and other program deliverables on August 25, 1999. In addition, program approval will be sought from the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this program, please contact Jon Paul Kiel at 775-588-4547, extension 261.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

Project Name: Lake Vista Apartments

Application Type: Multi-Family Residential, Special Use Determination

Applicants: Randy Lane, Mountain Ventures, LLC, and Barry Buehler, Mountain Ventures

Applicants' Representative: Lewis Feldman, Law Offices of Feldman, Shaw and DeVore

Agency Planners: Lyn Barnett and Kara Russell, Project Review Division

Location: 259 Kingsbury Grade, adjacent to Market Street, Douglas County, Nevada

Assessor's Parcel Number (APN)/TRPA Project Number: APN 007-180-05 & 16/#880865

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project. The recommended conditions of approval are listed in Section F of this staff summary.

Project Description: The applicants are proposing to construct 67 multi-family residential units on the affected property. These units will be housed in ten separate buildings. All buildings will be two stories in height with the exception of one building which will be three stories. All buildings will have gable roofs and will be constructed of materials similar to that found in an adjacent residential neighborhood. A mixture of studio, one and two bedroom units are proposed. Approximately 99 surface parking spaces are proposed. The project also includes a recreation room, laundry, computer laboratory for resident use, various walkways, lighting, landscaping and TRPA required water quality improvements. The project is proposed to be managed as affordable housing. Affordable Housing is defined in Chapter 2 of the TRPA Code as:

Residential housing for lower-income households (income not in excess of 80 percent of the respective county's median income) and for very low-income households (income not in excess of 50 percent of the respective county's median income), which are designed and occupied in accordance with local, regional, state and federal standards for the assistance of households with such incomes. Such housing units shall be made available for rental or sale at a cost that does not exceed the recommended state and federal standards. Each county's median income will be determined according to the income limits published annually by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
Site Description: The affected property is largely vacant, but contains a small commercial development (Buehlers Center) on the north end of the site adjacent to Kingsbury Grade and an unauthorized plant nursery storage area on the south end of the property. About one-fifth of the property was graded in the past for a commercial corporation yard. This use has ended, but the site is still severely disturbed, and lacks vegetation and water quality improvements. The remaining area of the property is lightly to moderately wooded with native, small and medium diameter trees. This area also has good ground cover with grasses and shrubs. The wooded portion of the property was thinned within the past ten years to remove dead and dying trees. Numerous dirt roads and trails are located on the property. Lake Tahoe is partially visible from the affected property, approximately one and one-quarter mile away. A portion of the proposed project will be visible from Kingsbury Grade, a TRPA designated scenic highway.

Storm water runoff from Buehlers Center discharges directly into an existing storm drain with no treatment for sand and oil removal. This drain carries a high volume of urban and non-urban drainage through the site to Kahle Park and Burke Creek. Market Street, an improved private street is located along the western property line of the project area and serves an adjacent commercial development. Surrounding land uses are commercial (north and west), single family residential (east) and vacant land (south). Kahle Park is located a short walking distance across the Highway on Kingsbury Grade. The affected property is located approximately one-mile from the Stateline casino core area.

Issues: The proposed project involves construction of an affordable housing development with more than four units, and will result in a significant increase in traffic as defined in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and therefore requires Governing Board review in accordance with Chapter 4, Appendix A, of the TRPA Code. The project also requires special use findings in accordance with Chapter 18 of the TRPA Code. The primary project related issues are:

1. **Relationship to Other Projects:** The subject application is being proposed, in part, as mitigation for the loss of existing multi-family housing on Kahle Drive. In March, 1999, the Governing Board approved the Round Hill Vacation Resort (RHVR) project and the Kahle Drive Urban Storm Water Treatment Basin Linked Project. The RHVR project involves the construction of 138 hotel/motel design tourist accommodation condominium timeshare units in Round Hill Nevada, and the Kahle Drive Urban Storm Water Treatment Basin Linked Project involves the demolition of a 187 multi-family apartment complex and conversion of the site to a water quality treatment area. Conversion of the residential units on Kahle Drive to tourist accommodation units for RHVR was approved in accordance with Subsection 33.7.D, and other provisions of the TRPA Code. Please see Exhibit A for a list of additional mitigation measures that were approved by the Governing Board and added to the environmental assessment (EA). For more information, please contact staff for copies of the following documents which are related to the current proposal:

- March 1999, Staff Summary for RHVR Project and Kahle Drive Urban Storm Water Treatment Basin Linked Project.
- Round Hill Vacation Resort/Lake Vista Apartments Environmental Assessment, March 1999. Please see Exhibit A in this staff summary for a list of modifications.
• TRPA Governing Board Minutes from March 1999, Governing Board Meeting.
• TRPA Permit for RHVR, with conditions of approval and Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE).

2. Project Area: The project area consists of two lots of record. The larger of these lots (APN 007-180-05) is located entirely within the Kingsbury Community Plan. The lesser parcel (APN 007-180-16) is located entirely within TRPA Plan Area 078 - Middle Kingsbury. If approved, all proposed buildings and parking areas will be constructed on APN 007-180-05 only. APN 007-180-16 has been added to the project area to allow additional land coverage for the project, and may be used by the applicants for a future lot line adjustment. The applicant plans to eventually separate Buehler's Commercial Center on Kingsbury Grade from the proposed residential development. To do this, the lot line between the affected parcels would be relocated, resulting in a separation of the existing and proposed uses, but not causing a new subdivision as defined by TRPA (i.e., the creation of an additional lot of record). This lot line adjustment, if submitted, will be reviewed under separate application. Although it is uncommon to have a project area which is split-zoned between two plan areas, staff has determined that this does not negatively affect the project, and may help preserve the character of the adjacent residential neighborhood by preserving a vacant residential property in that subdivision.

3. Density: Assessor's Parcel Number APN 007-180-05, which is located entirely within the Kingsbury Community Plan, is allowed 15 residential dwelling units per acre (equal to 70 units on the roughly 4.67 acre property). In accordance with Subsection 21.3.B of the TRPA Code, affordable housing projects may be permitted to increase allowable density by 25 percent if the following specific findings are made:

1. The project, at the increased density, satisfies a demonstrated need for additional affordable housing, and

2. The additional density is consistent with the surrounding area.

Staff has determined that the first finding can be made because TRPA has identified Douglas County as a jurisdiction needing approximately 1,456 affordable housing units according to the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, Draft Fair Share Report, dated December 1996, by TRPA. At present, there is no designated affordable housing developments in Douglas County's portion of the Lake Tahoe Region.

Staff is unable, however, to make the second finding for the project as currently proposed. Compared to the adjacent single family residential neighborhood, the proposed project's density of 14.3 units per acre exceeds the neighborhood's density of 3.6 residential units per acre by nearly four times. This number assumes that there is, or will eventually be, one single family residential unit constructed per parcel as allowable in the applicable plan area statement. The adjacent residential neighborhood is currently in a near 'build-out' condition.
If the Governing Board finds that the proposed project density is consistent with the surrounding area, then up to 87 residential units could be constructed for affordable housing. This density, however, would only be only permissible if the site were to be made completely vacant by the removal of Buehler's Center (which is not part of the current proposal).

Projects with multiple uses are subject to the mixed-use density provisions of Subsection 21.4.B of the TRPA Code. Staff has determined that this project falls within "Category E" of this subsection. For Category E projects, the maximum residential density is the maximum density established in the community plan multiplied by the ratio of residential floor area to the total floor area in the project area. Staff has calculated that there is approximately 5,820 square feet of existing commercial floor area on the property and approximately 53,771 square feet of proposed residential floor area. Therefore, potential maximum allowable residential density is calculated as follows:

- Commercial Floor Area + Residential Floor Area = Total Project Floor Area
  \[ 5,820 \text{ Square Feet} + 53,771 \text{ Square Feet} = 59,591 \text{ Square Feet} \]

- 53,771 SF of Residential Floor Area = 90.23 Percent of Total Floor Area

- 70 Units \(^{(1)}\) x 0.9023 = 63 Units (Round-Down)
- 87 units \(^{(2)}\) x 0.9023 = 78 Units (Round-Down)

Notes:  
1. Market rate, or affordable without Finding No. 2 as described above.  
2. Affordable, if Finding No. 2 is made by the Governing Board.

In summary, the 67 residential units that are proposed are fewer in number than the allowable number for market rate and affordable housing single use densities, and for affordable housing using the mixed-use category calculation. However, as shown in Table 1, below, the proposed 67 unit project would exceed the mixed-use density allowance for market rate housing by 4 housing units. This is the density that would be permitted on the affected parcel if Finding No. 2 in Subsection 21.3.B of the Code were not made by the Governing Board. For this reason, staff recommends that the Governing Board only approve 63 affordable residential units rather than the 67 that are proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 – Maximum Allowable Densities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing (25% Density Bonus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Community Support and Opposition to the Proposal: Multi-Family Dwellings are a special permissible use in the affected community plan. These findings are listed and discussed in Section E, below. During review of this application staff received many comments from the public on the merits of the project. These comments were made.
either in writing, in person, or by telephone. Several of the telephone calls were received anonymously. These comments generally ranged from support of the project to strong objection to the proposal. Two community town hall meetings were held by the applicants to present the project to area residents. The first of these meetings was in December 1998, and was poorly attended. The second meeting was held in May, 1999, and was attended by about 60 persons.

Those who support the project generally want new, clean, and well-managed affordable housing in Douglas County, especially within walking distance to the Stateline casino core area. Those who voiced opposition generally did so for some or all of the following reasons:

- The potential affect the project may have on adjacent private property values,
- Potential increases in crime in the adjacent neighborhood if the project is constructed,
- Dislike of potential affordable housing tenants based on perceptions of race, ethnicity, national origin, and/or economic class,
- Potential rental competition with other non-affordable housing units,
- Potential negative noise and air quality effects of the project,
- Loss of open space, including views of Lake Tahoe, and
- General dislike of government entitlement and subsidy programs in all forms.

While many of these objections have in the past been considered as "local issues" by the Governing Board (such as property value protection and loss of lake views), several of these issues relate to TRPA's special use findings (discussed in Section E, below). Staff has worked with the developer to address the issue of crime. Although not required in the TRPA Code, the developer is proposing that the apartments be designated as a drug-free zone and will implement a neighborhood crime watch program at the site. In addition, the project includes an on-site recreation room and other amenities that should enhance quality of living at the apartments. Please see Exhibit B for more details. Also, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan which increases vegetation between adjacent residential properties and the proposed development. The applicant shall also construct six-foot tall wooden fences between the proposed development and adjacent residential properties at his cost for those residents who desire such fencing. Finally, the permittee shall submit an urban re-forestation plan, prepared by a Registered Forester, that re-establishes a healthy forest density and species mix within the project area to TRPA for review and approval.

5. **Allocation of Residential Bonus Units for Affordable Housing.** Residential bonus units are available to bona fide affordable housing developments in accordance with Chapter 35 of the TRPA Code. Residential bonus units are intended to substitute for TRPA development rights which are usually acquired from off-site locations. Affordable housing is exempt from the TRPA residential allocation requirements found in Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code. There are an adequate number of bonus units in the Kingsbury Community Plan to facilitate the proposed project.
6. **Scenic Quality:** This project is located within Scenic Roadway Unit 44, Kingsbury Grade, which is not in attainment with TRPA scenic quality standards. The TRPA Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP) emphasizes the importance of buffer planting and screening, location and design of access drives and parking areas, signage, placing utilities underground, setbacks, and re-vegetation for mitigating visual impacts associated with urbanization in this area.

The proposed project includes ten buildings, only one of which will be significantly visible from Kingsbury Grade. This building, would be set back 150 feet from the Scenic Roadway Unit and would not extend above the forest canopy or block views of the ridge of the Carson Range when viewed from Kingsbury Grade. Visual simulations have been prepared that depict the existing and proposed views of the site from Kingsbury Grade. Architectural design, building colors and materials, and landscaping have been incorporated into the design of the project so that the general appearance of the site is maintained to the greatest extent possible. The EA concluded that there are no scenic impacts associated with the proposed apartments.

In addition to the proposed apartments, the simulations show the existing Buehler Center, currently painted white with blue-green trim, with a new medium-brown color scheme. While Staff has determined that construction of the Lake Vista Apartments will not detract from the area's overall appearance, the proposed color change of the Buehler Center will improve the area's overall visual character and is viewed by staff as a positive improvement.

7. **Traffic, Air Quality, and Parking:** The proposed project includes 99 parking spaces in two parking lots connected by a paved pathway. Paved pathways will also be provided from the parking areas to the apartment buildings and from the northern parking lot to Kingsbury Grade. Access to the parking areas would be from Market Street (a private easement) through two driveways from the street. There will be stop signs at both parking lots for vehicles exiting the site to Market Street. No street connections are proposed or required to the adjacent residential neighborhood. A traffic analysis was prepared to evaluate the existing conditions at the site and determine the impacts of the project on traffic, air quality, and parking, and is included in the project EA.

As proposed, the non-signalized intersection of Kingsbury Grade and Market Street will operate at a Level of Service (LOS) "A." This is the highest rated (best) intersection Level of Service measurement (compared to Level "F," which is the worst). The project will result in the same LOS as the current condition but with an additional delay of just 0.2 seconds per vehicle. The project will result in an additional 1,512 vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) which, basin-wide, is only an increase of 0.09 percent. The intersection of Kingsbury Grade and Market Street currently exceeds the minimum required sight distance in both directions, and the additional vehicles will not result in an 'undue safety hazard' according to the traffic engineer who prepared the traffic analysis.

The proposed parking area has 10 fewer spaces than the number normally required in the community plan for the proposed project. However, the Lake Vista Apartments are to be managed as affordable housing for low and very low income households, and 99
spaces are considered to be adequate to meet the needs of the apartments according to the traffic and parking analysis. In addition, the project site is within walking distance of the Stateline Casino core area, and Coordinated Transit System (CTS) facilities are to be provided on-site to reduce VMT and the need for private automobiles. As a condition of approval, the project proponents will be required to pay an Air Quality Mitigation fee based on the number of new daily vehicle trip ends (dvte) generated by the project to offset any impacts.

Staff has determined through the EA and the traffic analysis, and with the proposed mitigation measures, that the project with the will not have a significant impact on area traffic, or to regional and sub-regional air quality.

8. **Land Capability Challenge**: A land capability challenged was previously approved by the TRPA Governing Board for the affected project area. All fees and/or required mitigation measures for the Challenge have been completed.

**Staff Analysis:**

A. **Environmental Documentation**: The applicant has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), and has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA), including a traffic and parking analysis and a scenic quality analysis, in order to assess the potential environmental impacts of the project. No significant environmental impacts were identified and staff has concluded that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the completed IEC and EA will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

B. **Plan Area Statement**: The project is located within Plan Area 078 - Middle Kingsbury, and Special Area Number 4 - Kingsbury Community Plan. The Land Use Classifications are Residential and Commercial/Public Service, respectively. The Management Strategies are both Mitigation. The Kingsbury Community Plan has been designated as a Preferred Affordable Housing Area. Staff has reviewed the subject plan area and community plan and has determined that project is consistent with the applicable planning statement, planning considerations and special policies. The proposed activity (multi-family dwellings) is listed as a special use.

C. **Land Coverage**.

1. **Land Capability Districts**:

   The project area has 6 verified land capability class districts (determined as part of a TRPA Land Capability Challenge). These districts are: Classes 1b (Stream Environment Zone), 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7. Total project area (both parcels) is approximately 224,747 square feet (5.16 acres).

2. **Land Coverage Calculations (all numbers in square feet)**: The project area parcel has a complex matrix of land capability districts, including several rock outcroppings which are protected from disturbance in Subsection 30.5.A(1) of the TRPA Code. Table 1, below, summarizes TRPA land coverage calculations for the proposed project.
### Table 2 – PROJECT AREA LAND COVERAGE CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,636</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26,088</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>132,078</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33,020</td>
<td>39,804</td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>73,346</td>
<td>+33,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,174</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>+772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31,694</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9,508</td>
<td>6,995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,978</td>
<td>+8,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224,747</td>
<td>50%&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>46,840</td>
<td>51,637</td>
<td>10,062</td>
<td>94,820</td>
<td>+43,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Coverage Calculation Notes:**

1. Existing land coverage was verified by TRPA under separate application.
2. Total land coverage allowed within the project area (base land coverage plus transferred coverage) is 50 percent because the project is located within an approved community plan area (Subsection 20.3.B(3), TRPA Code). All transferred land coverage must be existing hard coverage (Section 20.3.C(2), TRPA Code). Total allowable land coverage for the project area (base plus transferred) equals 112,374 square feet. No transferred land coverage is permitted in Class 1, 2, or 3 lands.

3. **Land Coverage Mitigation:**

Based on the above coverage figures, the project area contains approximately 10,062 square feet of existing excess land coverage. To mitigate the excess land coverage and new off-site land coverage the applicant shall be required to either pay a mitigation fee, or reduce existing land coverage pursuant to Subsection 20.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Transferred land coverage is exempt from TRPA water quality mitigation fees.

D. **Building Height:** Ten individual residential buildings are proposed for the project, in addition to a small laundry building. Allowable and proposed building heights are described in Table 3, below. Height findings are listed in Section E of this staff summary.
Table 3 – ALLOWABLE AND PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Number</th>
<th>Roof Pitch</th>
<th>Bldg. Cross Slope</th>
<th>No. of Stories</th>
<th>TRPA Code Max. Allowable Height</th>
<th>Proposed Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>22 feet – 8 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>28 feet – 8 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 feet – 3 inches</td>
<td>28 feet – 1 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>25 feet – 1 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>26 feet – 3 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>27 feet – 1 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>29 feet – 4 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>31 feet – 5 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4:12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31 feet – 9 inches</td>
<td>25 feet – 5 inches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed laundry building is one story in height and conforms to TRPA height limits.

E. Required Findings: The following is a list of the required findings as set forth in Chapters 6, 18, 20, and 22 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Following each finding, Agency staff has briefly summarized the evidence on which the finding can be made.

Note: Findings 1 through 3, below, are required in Chapter 6, TRPA Code.

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

(a) Land Use: The proposed use (multi-family dwellings) is a permissible special use in the applicable community plan. The proposed development will act as a buffer between an existing low density residential neighborhood and an existing developed commercial neighborhood. Affordable housing is encouraged for the affected neighborhood in accordance in the community plan.

(b) Transportation: The proposed development will result in a significant increase in daily vehicle trip ends (398 dvte) as defined in the TRPA Code as determined by a traffic analysis prepared for the project. The applicant shall be required to submit an air quality mitigation fee for this increase in accordance with the TRPA Code. No significant impacts to Level of Service or Regional or Sub-Regional air quality were identified in the traffic analysis. The proposed project has adequate parking to facilitate the use.
(c) **Conservation:** No TRPA special interest species are known to be within, or near to, the project area. In addition, there are no known historic or pre-historic resources on the affected property. The project, as demonstrated in a scenic quality analysis, will result in an incremental increase in scenic quality as viewed from Kingsbury Grade, a TRPA scenic highway. The applicant shall be required to install all required water quality improvements on the affected project area.

(d) **Recreation:** There no known impacts to recreation from this residential project. The project is within walking distance to Kahle Community Park, and a recreation room is included on-site in the project design.

(e) **Public Service and Facilities:** The proposed project has adequate water, sewer, and electrical service, and is served by a paved road.

(f) **Implementation:** No allocations of residential use are required for this affordable residential project pursuant to Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code. TRPA shall allocate residential bonus units in-lieu of the requirement to transfer residential Development Rights to the affected project area.

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

The basis for this finding is provided on the checklist entitled Project Review Conformance Checklist and Article V(g) Findings in accordance with Chapter 6, Subsection 6.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. All responses contained on said checklist indicate compliance with the environmental threshold carrying capacities. A copy of the completed checklist will be made available at the Governing Board hearing and at TRPA.

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

(Refer to paragraph 2, above.)

**Note:** Findings 4 through 6, below, are required Special Use Findings (Chapter 18 of the TRPA Code).

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

The proposed multi-family residential units will be located within a commercial/public service community plan area. The development will help transition the uses in the affected neighborhood from commercial to residential, and the
proposed apartments will buffer adjacent commercial development from existing residential development. Although the new development will have a higher residential unit per acre density than the adjacent residential neighborhood, the number of buildings housing the units will be comparable to the number of residential buildings existing in the adjacent area. No direct street connections are proposed between the development and adjacent residential areas. All street access will be directly to Kingslury Grade via Market Street. The Kingsbury Community Plan is a designated multi-residential incentive area for affordable housing. The traffic analysis prepared for the project indicates that affordable housing developments require fewer parking spaces than comparable market rate housing developments.

5. The project, to which the use pertains, will not be injurious or disturbing to the health, safety, enjoyment of property, or general welfare of persons or property in the neighborhood, or general welfare of the region, and the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect against any such injury and to protect the land, water and air resources of both the applicant’s property and that of surrounding property owners.

The proposed project shall include all TRPA required water quality improvements. No wood-burning devices will be allowed in the proposed apartments. Although the project will increase traffic, no significant air quality impacts were identified in the traffic analysis prepared for the project. The project includes participation in a neighborhood crime watch program and the applicant is seeking to have the affected area declared a Drug-Free Zone which will increase penalties to anyone caught with drugs on the property. Additional landscaping and trees will be incorporated into the project design, and fences will be added were identified by neighbors to help screen the project from adjacent residential properties. Exterior lighting shall not shine directly onto adjacent properties or any off-site location. All project design elements shall be in conformance with the design requirements of the Kingsbury Community Plan and the TRPA Code, where applicable. The architecture of the proposed buildings will include gable roofs and building materials similar to roofs and materials found in the adjacent residential area.

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

The proposed project is in compliance with the requirements of the Kingsbury Community Plan. Although the affected property could be developed with new commercial or public service development in accordance with this plan, the proposed residential development will help transition and buffer existing residential development from existing commercial development. At least 50 percent of the project area will remain in a landscaping. This amount of landscaping far exceeds the amount of landscaping existing on many adjacent
commercial properties. Exterior lighting shall not shine directly onto adjacent properties or any off-site location. All project design elements shall be in conformance with the design requirements of the Kingsbury Community Plan and the TRPA Code, where applicable. The architecture of the proposed buildings will include gable roofs and building materials similar to roofs and materials found in the adjacent residential area.

Note: Findings 7 through 9, below, are land coverage findings (Chapter 20, TRPA Code).

7. The relocation of land coverage is to an equal or superior portion of the parcel or project area, as determined by reference to the factors in Subsection 20.5.C(1) of the TRPA Code.

Portions of the project area have been disturbed by previous commercial activities. Relocated land coverage will be to areas with similar slope and soil fragility. Large undisturbed rock outcrops will be avoided and preserved as a condition of project approval.

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

All relocated land coverage will be restored and re-vegetated in conformance with all TRPA requirements.

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

All relocated land coverage will be to equal or higher land capability districts. Total low land capability land coverage within low capability land will be reduced as a result of this project.

Note: The following is a height finding (Chapter 22, TRPA Code).

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

The visual simulations prepared by the project proponents demonstrate that Building 1 will not extend above the forest canopy or block views of the ridge of the Carson Range when viewed from Kingsbury Grade. Building 1 is the only proposed building that will be visible from Kingsbury Grade.

F. Required Actions: Agency staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the project by making the following motions and findings based on this staff summary and the evidence contained in the record:
I. A motion based on this staff summary, for the findings contained in Section E above, and a finding of no significant environmental effect.

II. A motion to approve the project, based on the staff summary, subject to the following conditions:

1. This permit authorizes construction of a 63-unit (not 67 units) multi-family affordable housing development and associated accessory improvements.

2. The Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Attachment R.

3. Prior to final permit acknowledgement, the following special conditions of approval shall be satisfied:

   A. The site plan shall be revised to include:

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

      (2) Vegetation protective fencing around all construction areas.

      (3) Parking barriers to restrict parking to approved parking surfaces only.

      (4) Final land coverage calculations acceptable to TRPA. No additional land coverage shall be added in low capability lands.

   B. The permittee shall submit final building material and color samples to TRPA for review and approval consistent with the environmental assessment prepared for the project.

   C. The permittee shall submit a rock out-crop protection plan to TRPA for review and approval. All existing rock out-crops shall be protected from disturbance in accordance with Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code and applicable community plan design standards unless approved by TRPA. Minor disturbances to rock out-crops may occur to provide access to otherwise buildable sites.
D. The permittee shall transfer all necessary land coverage to the project in accordance with applicable provisions of the TRPA Code. Final land coverage transfer requirements will be determined upon submittal of final plans. Transfers of land coverage require separate application to TRPA.

E. A water quality mitigation fee shall be paid to TRPA at the rate of $1.34 per square foot for additional land coverage being created as a result of the project (transferred land coverage is exempt from this requirement in accordance with Chapter 20 of the TRPA Code).

F. The permittee shall submit and air quality mitigation fee to TRPA for the generation of additional daily vehicle trip ends consistent with the Traffic Analysis prepared for the project. This fee is based on $240 per additional daily vehicle trip ends (dvt) generated by the project.

G. The security required under Standard Condition A.3 of Attachment R shall be equal to 110 percent of all required Best Management Practices required for the project, but not less than $25,000. Please see Attachment J, Security Procedures.

H. The applicant shall pay an offsite coverage mitigation fee assessed at $5 per square foot for the creation of any impervious coverage in the public right-of-way.

I. The applicant shall mitigate excess land coverage on this property by submitting an excess coverage mitigation fee, or by removing coverage within Hydrologic Transfer Area Number 4, South Stateline (see attached map).

The excess coverage mitigation fee shall be calculated as follows:

(1) Estimated Project Construction Cost x 0.0225

Please provide a construction cost estimate by your contractor, architect, or engineer. In no case shall the mitigation fee be less than $100.00.

Excess land coverage may be removed in lieu of an excess coverage mitigation fee. To calculate the amount of excess coverage to be removed use the following formula:

(2) Excess coverage mitigation fee (per formula (1), above) divided by $5.00 per square foot. If you choose this option, please revise your final site plan and land coverage calculations to account for the coverage removal.
J. The permittee shall pay TRPA a fee in the amount of $1,500 for construction inspection services during all phases of construction, including pre-construction, intermediate, and final inspections.

K. The applicant shall submit 5 sets of final construction drawings and site plan to TRPA.

L. All mitigation measures contained in the Round hill Vacation Resort/Lake Vista Apartments Environmental Assessment are incorporated by reference as conditions of project approval. The permittee shall submit an EA mitigation measure compliance plan to TRPA for review and approval for all mitigation measures identified in the EA.

M. The permittee shall submit a final Best Management Practices plan to TRPA for review and approval. This plan shall include, at minimum, adequate conveyance of off-site storm water through the project area, pre-treatment (sand/oil separator) and infiltration of on-site storm water run-off for the TRPA design storm, re-vegetation of disturbed areas, temporary and permanent erosion control measures.

N. The permittee shall submit a final landscaping plan which increases vegetation between adjacent residential properties and the proposed development to create a dense visual buffer.

O. The permittee shall submit an urban re-forestation plan, prepared by a Registered Forester, that re-establishes a healthy forest density and species mix within the project area to TRPA for review and approval.

P. The permittee shall record a deed restriction, acceptable to TRPA, which ensures that the approved residential units satisfy all TRPA affordable housing requirements. Please contact TRPA for deed restriction language and format.

Q. The permittee shall submit a report to the TRPA Executive Director that clearly demonstrates that all residents in the approved development qualify for affordable housing as defined in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and as required in the TRPA approved deed restriction for the affected property.

R. Final building elevations for all buildings, including the laundry building.
S. The permittee shall submit a community plan compliance report demonstrating that all applicable design standards and guidelines contained in the Kingsbury Community Plan (KCP) are satisfied in the final project design. Design guideline in the KCP may be waived for good reason if reviewed and approved by staff, and if requested in writing by the permittee with the report submittal.

T. The permittee shall submit a Coordinated Transportation Systems (CTS) participation plan to TRPA for review and approval. This plan shall include proposed location of all required CTS facilities (including pedestrian waiting areas), and necessary agreements to implement a CTS facility on the affected property.

U. The applicant shall submit an additional $195.00 application fee.

V. The applicant shall submit a projected construction completion schedule to TRPA prior to commencement of construction. Said schedule shall include completion dates for each item of construction, as well as BMP installations for the entire project area.

W. The applicant shall provide a fertilizer management plan in accordance with the standards required in Sections 30.7 and 81.7 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances for TRPA review and approval.

X. The applicant shall provide evidence that all basic service requirements for minimum fire flow will be met or exceeded in accordance with Section 27.3.B, Table 27.1 of the TRPA Code.

Y. The permittee shall submit a long term maintenance and monitoring plan (minimum period of 10 years) to TRPA for review and approval for all required water quality improvements and BMPs. This plan shall include annual sampling of storm water runoff, and shall compare the sampling results to adopted TRPA water discharge standards. By accepting this condition, the permittee agrees to correct any violation of TRPA discharge standards in a manner and timeframe acceptable to TRPA.

4. The permittee shall construct six-foot tall wooden fences between the proposed development and adjacent residential properties at the permittee's cost for those residents who desire such fencing. This condition expires upon final release of security by TRPA.

5. Wood-burning devices are prohibited in the proposed apartments.
6. A maximum of 63 residential bonus units are hereby allocated to the approved project from the Kingsbury Community Plan Area.

7. Prior to the return of the security referenced above, the permittee shall submit post-construction photographs demonstrating that the project satisfies the mitigation requirements of the scenic quality analysis prepared for the project.

8. No signs are approved in accordance with this permit. New signs require separate TRPA review and approval.

9. Excavation shall not exceed five feet in depth without TRPA approval based on a ground water hydrology report.

10. All unauthorized commercial activities within the project area shall cease.
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ADDITIONAL MITIGATION MEASURES
ROUND HILL VACATION RESORT/LAKE VISTA APARTMENTS
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

(Approved by the TRPA Governing Board on March 24, 1999)

Mitigation 3-2:

A. A phasing plan shall be submitted to TRPA for demolition of the Lake Park
   Apartments and construction of Round Hill Vacation Resort. This plan shall
   include the following:

   (1) The first 24 tourist accommodation units, administration building, parking
       areas, pool, walkways, and accessory areas, may be constructed using
       TAU's "banked" on-site.

   (2) Construction of the remaining 114 TAU's at Round Hill Vacation Resort
       may not commence until TRPA permits are issued and final
       acknowledgements obtained for the following:

       (a) Demolition of the Lake Park Apartments on Kahle Drive and
           conversion of the site to an urban storm water treatment basin,
           and

           (b) Construction of the 67-unit Lake Vista Apartments on Kingsbury
               Grade and Market Street.

   (3) Demolition of the Lake Park Apartments shall occur over a 24-month
       period to allow the gradual relocation of residents into other housing. In
       addition:

       (a) Eviction rates due to demolition of the apartments shall not
           exceed 8 rental units in any one month unless the permittee
           demonstrates to TRPA, in writing, that all the evicted tenants in
           the applicable month have found replacement housing in Douglas
           County.

       (b) The permittee shall demonstrate that they have conferred with the
           Western Sunset, Aspen Grove, Meadows, Stanford Square, and
           Nevada Royal Apartment managers to give rental priority to
           eligible displaced Lake Park Apartment tenants. Eligibility
           requirements shall be outlined in all confirming correspondence.
(c) Occupants in the last 67 rental units shall not be evicted due to demolition until the completion of construction of the Lake Vista Apartments as evidenced by the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by Douglas County. Income eligible residents shall receive priority for relocation to the Lake Vista Apartments.

(4) The permittee will agree to not demolish the North Lodge Apartments on Kahle Drive for at least three years from the TRPA Governing Board approval date for the Round Hill Vacation Resort project unless demolition is approved by Governing Board.

(5) The permittee shall notify Lake Park Apartment tenants about the availability of United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 rental subsidy vouchers. The permittee shall submit a plan to TRPA for review and approval demonstrating the method proposed for notification of tenants on the availability of these subsidies. The permittee agrees to work in good faith to contact all Lake Park Apartment tenants within three months of the issuance of a TRPA permit for demolition of the apartments to advertise the availability of Section 8 vouchers.

(6) No later than six months from the issuance of a TRPA permit for demolition of the Lake Park Apartments, the permittee shall submit evidence that they have made satisfactory progress with Douglas County and the City of South Lake Tahoe to either construct replacement housing in Douglas County or alternatively, rehabilitate and/or construct replacement housing in the City of South Lake Tahoe. Eviction of tenants due to demolition from the Lake Park Apartments shall cease if the TRPA Executive Director cannot find that adequate progress, pursuant to this requirement, has been made by the permittee. Replacement housing shall include at least 70 residential units.

B. The applicant's proposed housing mitigation measures (Exhibit "A" in the TRPA staff summary) shall be added as Technical Appendix "K" in the environmental assessment.
June 14, 1999

Larry Sevison
Chairman, Placer County Supervisor's Appointee
P.O. Box 108
Tahoe Vista, CA 96148

Affordable housing in the '90's has become a development with most of the bells and whistles of a market rate product.

Through government oversight the development of affordable housing must include design features that will blend into the surrounding community. Site features must include services that will accommodate all age groups in the family. For example, Tot Lot, recreation activities for teenagers and barbecue area for all family members. Management must adopt the principles of customer service, senior living along with handicap assessable and adaptable units.

Management is a team approach that includes residents as team members. Management must first live up to their responsibilities with concurrent requirement of residents to abide with all rules and regulations.

Resident Activities
A. Resident Advisory Group  
B. Neighborhood Watch  
C. Drug-Free Zone  
D. Tutoring Program, K-12  
E. Computer Learning Center, K-12

Management Activities
A. Drug-Free Zone  
B. Neighborhood Watch  
C. Tutoring Program, K-12  
D. Computer Learning Center, K-12

Management in the 1990's with the customer service approach is a major factor in building strong communities. Residents take a vested interest in their living environment as management services resident work request in a 24-hour period.

Sincerely,

John E. Nisby
Consultant/Development Coordinator

EXHIBIT B
TRPA HEIGHT CALCS

Pitch = 6:12
Slope @ bldg = 4%
Allowable = 32'-2"
Proposed = 11'-10 1/2"

SIDE ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"

LACE VISTA APARTMENTS
LAUNDRY FACILITY
Dayton's Floors
Keith Benton

872 Harris Road ♦ Minden, NV 89423
Phone 775-884-2463 ♦ Fax 775-287-9596 ♦ Email DAYFLOOR@AOL.COM

June 3, 1999

Lynn Barnett
T.R.P.A.
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

SUBJECT OF LAKE VISTA APARTMENTS

Dear Mr. Barnett

I have been living in Lake Tahoe since 1958 and have never seen a more ludicrous proposal then that being proposed by Lake Vista Apartments. The proposal to put 67 housing units on Market Street, that exits directly on to an already traffic congested Kingsbury Grade is just the beginning of the nightmare! How many children do you think might be crossing Kingsbury to get to the park?? It is already difficult to exit onto Kingsbury from the streets and business that currently exist!

When I purchased my home, Market Street was zoned for light commercial and a single family residence. When did this change? To build a single car garage at my home I had to apply for a variance, notify my neighbors of my intentions, attend a County commissioners meeting for approval and was still only allowed 20% coverage on my property.

T.R.P.A. equals Robin Hood in reverse - the wealthy seem to play by an entirely different set of rules!! Glen Hartman the developer (who doesn't even live in this area ) has been allowed to come into our County and make his own rules. Does anyone really know how many business names he uses??

I am familiar with low cost housing projects and they are full of crime and soon they are run down and derelict. Why would families with no investment respect the properties they live in? The proposed number of people in a small area is bound to create the problems that happen in these complexes. No Public Relations Man can convince me otherwise! We do not need another slum area at Lake Tahoe!

I resent the fact that this proposal will be funded by my tax dollars to aid a very rich man to become even richer and totally ruining the property values in the surrounding very nice neighborhood! My belief is if you can't afford to live here... then don't.

Please use all of your common sense and stop this project before all of Stateline Nevada suffers from poor decisions made by the people who can.

Sincerely,

Keith Benton, Property Owner
431 Woodland
Stateline, Nevada
June 01, 1999

Lynn Barnett
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Barnett:

Are you willing to take the responsibility of ruining the property values and the enviroment of lower Kingsbury Grade?? If allowed, Lake Vista Apartments would do just that! Are you willing to create the second slum area on the Nevada side of Lake Tahoe??

The impact of 67 families (a minimum of 268 People) in a one block area would be devastating to this area. Over 100 cars exiting on to an already over burdened Kingsbury Grade would create a traffic nightmare. Are you willing to put in another traffic signal to let approximately another 135 cars and who knows how many children cross safely?

All of us that have lived at Lake Tahoe know that Lake Park Apartments was a crime scene. They tried many different management companies to try and control their tenants and property appearances, all with no success. Now you are considering moving this area to lower Kingsbury?

Regarding the public relations man Lake Vista Apartments has brought in from P.A.M. Even if he could convince me that their projects are managed and maintained differently, this company has made no committment or signed any contract with Lake Vista Apartments AKA Falcon Capital.

Their plan is to put 3 story aparments less then 10 feet away from residential property lines. These homes now have small Lake views, trees and mountains from their gardens. This proposal would give these homes the view of apartment walls, parking lots and many people.

There are many people that work at the casinos that cannot afford to live at Lake Tahoe, they commute! Why should our tax dollars pay for people to live where they cannot afford to live! I have worked hard to own my home here and I don't feel that families that cannot afford it should be subsribized to live here.

It will be interesting to see just how much power Glen Hartman (who doesn't even live here), Randy Lane and Lou Feldman have with the dollars in their hands!

Sincerely,

Susan E. Davis

Susan E. Davis, Property Owner
100 Hawthorne
Stateline, Nevada
May 14, 1999

Lyn Barnett
TRPA
P O Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV  89448

Dear Mr. Barnett:

We, Hannelore and Peter Greil, live at 108 Hawthorne Way adjacent to the proposed building site of the Lake Vista Apartment complex. Our neighbors and we strongly object to the construction of this complex.

According to your plan, there will be 70 to 80 parking spaces for the complex. Can you imagine the noise and the pollution with so many vehicles confined to a small area? Many of our beloved trees will have to go. Most of the time the wind blows from the west, which will in turn blow the pollution and noise in the direction of our neighborhood and home. With so many apartments in one location, history has shown that our neighborhood crime rate will increase.

In 1985, there was a Greyhound Station on Market Street and we were not able to enjoy our backyard because of the pollution in the air. Thanks to TRPA that problem was solved and we greatly appreciated their help. To quote a recent letter to the editor concerning TRPA needs a review of its own policies by G. Renfro, “The most recent is their streamlining (TRPA PAS), supported by developers and builders, which may degrade single-family neighborhoods. Have they consulted the residents of those neighborhoods which will be affected by these expansions and developments?” Do you realize the depreciation in value of the homes on Hawthorne and nearby areas that will result from this project?

Sincerely,

Peter and Hannelore Greil
P O Box 4189
Stateline, NV  89449

Cc:  Michael Hayes, Planning Commission
     Don Minor, County Commissioner
     John Doughty
     Bob Nunes
     Don Holler, County Manager
     Jim Baetge, TRPA
     John E. Nisby
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Discussion on Code Chapter 28, Natural Hazard Standards, Relative to Flood Plain Maps

The Governing Board discussed this matter at the April meeting and continued it to the May meeting, in order that a representative of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) could be present to respond to questions and to present more information on the Corps flood plain maps. No representative was able to attend the May Governing Board meeting. However, Mr. Dail Hatch and Mr. Phil Brozek, of the Army Corps Sacramento District, will attend the June board meeting to make a presentation.

Staff will be prepared to answer any questions that the Board may have as to the Agency policy on floodplains.

If there are any questions, please contact Joe Pepi at (775) 588-4547.

AGENDA ITEM X.A
MEMORANDUM

January 4, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Approval of the South Wye Industrial Community Plan Work Program

Proposed Action: Staff proposes the following work program (see exhibit A) for completion of the South Wye Community Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the proposed work program for the South Wye Community Plan.

Advisory Planning Commission Recommendation: The Advisory Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed work program as submitted by City and TRPA staff.

Discussion: The proposed work program is an modified planning process for the completion of the South Wye Community Plan. Subsection 14.6.E of the Code provides provisions to propose an alternative community plan process to those provided for in Subsection 14.6.A and 14.6.B, if it would better facilitate the planning process. The modified process is based on the following:

- An inventory of existing conditions has been completed;
- This is an existing industrial area and the theme will not change;
- A man-modified determination has been under way the past twelve (12) months and preliminary results are scheduled in July;
- The City and TRPA has committed staff resources to this community plan;
- The City and TRPA’s 1999 Work Program is to complete this plan in 1999, and
- Information meetings with property/business owners will occur as part of the planning process.

Requested Action: Staff Recommends the Governing Board approve the Work Program, based on the rationale listed above.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact John Hitchcock at 775-688-4547, or via email at trpa@sierra, if you have any comments regarding this item.

JH/dmc
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Proposed Work Program for the South Wye Community Plan

1999
July  Initial Scoping Meeting with Property/Business Owners
July  Review and Update the 1993 Existing Conditions Report including Needs and Opportunities
July  Review Preliminary Man-Modified Determination
July  Scoping Meeting with Affected Agencies on Preliminary Results/Establish Preferred Industrial Solution
August Finalize Direction of Preferred Industrial Solution with Property/Business Owners
August Prepare Draft Community Plan
August Circulate/Review Draft Plan with Property/Business Owners and Affected Agencies
September Finalize Community Plan
October Prepare Negative Declaration/FONSE
November Circulate Negative Declaration
December Present Plan to APC and Governing Board for Action
May 28, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Appointment of a Nevada Lay Member to the Advisory Planning Commission (APC)

Background: The two-year Nevada lay member term of Bob Jepsen expires the end of June 1999. (Mr. Jepsen serves as the Chairman of the APC.) If reappointed, his term would expire the end of June 2001. Mr. Jepsen has expressed an interest in staying on the APC for another two-year term.

Recommendation: The staff recommends that the Board take action to appoint a Nevada lay member to the APC.

For your information, following is the current status of lay member appointments on the APC:

**California**
- Jim Haen
- Leo Poppoff
- Kevin Cole

**Nevada**
- Bob Jepsen
- Paul Morgan
- Randy Lane

**Bistate**
- Jay Kehne (NRCS)
- Merle Lawrence (TTD)

Term Expires/Expired
- August 1999
- February 2001
- October 2000
- June 1999
- November 2000
- August 1999
- March 2001
- July 1999

jf

AGENDA ITEM XIA
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Resolution to Amend Policy 2.2 (Paid Absences), Policy 2.6 (Vacation) and Policy 3.3 (Salary and Pay Period) of the TRPA Personnel Policy Manual

Proposed Action: Adoption of a resolution which amends the TRPA Personnel Policy Manual to modify Policies 2.2, 2.6 and 3.3 pursuant to Exhibits "A", "B" and "C" (attached).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board review the proposed amendments, make the required findings, and adopt the attached resolution.

Rules Committee Recommendation: The Governing Board Rules Committee will report on their recommendation at the time this agenda item is heard by the full Board.

Discussion:

1) Policy 3.3 – Salary and Pay Period

The Agency’s audit report for last year recommended that the current pay period provisions be modified to provide a more efficient and effective way of managing and tracking payroll accounting. Policy 3.3 currently provides for 24 semi-monthly pay periods for all TRPA staff on the 15th and the last day of each month. Due to the varying number of working days in each month, this results in an uneven hourly rate of pay being applied to grants. Also, as time sheets are not received until after payroll has already been processed, vacation, sick leave, and overtime accruals have to be calculated using spreadsheets rather than by using the built-in capabilities of the payroll-processing module of the Agency’s automated accounting system.

Based on the auditor’s experience with other governmental agencies, a bi-weekly pay period with a lag time of one week is the most efficient method of processing payroll. Not only would bi-weekly payroll processing allow the Agency to fully utilize the payroll computer system, but it would reduce the amount of time that the finance department spends per month on payroll, would allow a consistent pay rate to be applied to grants, and would allow real time tracking of all salary related expenses relative to grants and other special fund accounts. Such a policy would also allow for bi-weekly reporting of benefit accruals to employees directly on their pay stubs.
The proposed language for this policy amendment is shown in Exhibit 'C' (attached).

2) Policy 2.2 – Paid Absences

Policy 2.2 currently provides for the accrual of eight hours of sick leave per month. Given the proposed changes to Policy 3.3 above, it is necessary to convert the sick leave accrual provisions from hours per month to hours per bi-weekly pay period as indicated in Exhibit 'A' (attached).

3) Policy 2.6 – Vacation

Policy 2.6 currently provides for the accrual of vacation based on a pro rata schedule in days per month. Given the proposed changes to Policy 3.3 above, it is necessary to convert the vacation accrual provisions from days per year to hours per bi-weekly pay period as indicated in Exhibit 'B' (attached).

Findings: Chapter 6 of the TRPA Code requires the following findings be made for the proposed amendments.

1. The amendment is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, plan area statements and maps, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs.

Rationale: The amendments are purely procedural in nature, and are consistent with and will not affect implementation of the Regional Plan.

2. The amendment will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The amendments are procedural in nature and will not affect the thresholds.

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

Rationale: See finding 2, above.

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

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2, above.

Environmental Documentation: Due to the procedural nature of these amendments, staff recommends a finding of no significant effect.

If there are any questions regarding this agenda item, please contact Jerry Wells, Deputy Executive Director, at (702) 588-4547.

JW

AGENDA ITEM XII.C.1.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 99 –

RESOLUTION OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
AMENDING POLICIES 2.2, 2.6 and 3.3 OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY PERSONNEL POLICY MANUAL

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Personnel Policy Manual are necessary and desirable to promote, and are reasonably related to the public health, safety and general welfare of the Tahoe Region; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments comply in all respects, procedural and substantive, with the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, the Regional Plan, ordinances and rules of TRPA, and are necessary to effectuate and implement same; and

WHEREAS, prior to adoption of these amendments, the Governing Board made the findings required by Chapter 6 of the Code of Ordinances;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Personnel Policy Manual, Policies 2.2, 2.6 and 3.3 be amended as per Exhibits "A", "B"and "C" attached hereto and incorporated hereby by reference;

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency on this 23rd day of June 1999, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

Larry Sevison, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Exhibit A

POLICY 2.2 – PAID ABSENCES

Employees will accrue eight hours 3.69 hours of sick leave per each month bi-weekly pay period of completed service.

If an employee has insufficient sick leave, he or she may make up the deficit by working hours missed in the same pay period with prior approval of his or her supervisor. Otherwise the employees pay will be adjusted in accordance with their exempt or nonexempt status.

Portions of a day missed due to illness will be charged to sick leave.
Exhibit B

POLICY NO. 2.6 – VACATION

The vacation year is based upon the employee's date of hire. The Agency believes that adequate time must be provided to employees annually for rest and relaxation. However, vacation hours may be accumulated up to and including 240 hours on the anniversary date of hire. Any accumulation over 240 hours must be approved by the Executive Director. There shall be no forfeiture of vacation even if accrued in excess of 240 hours.

Additional vacation time is not granted if the employee is sick during the vacation period. All requests for advance vacation pay must be submitted to the Finance Division five working days prior to the pay day when the employee will be away.

1. ALLOWANCE

During employment with the Agency, vacation allowance will be based upon a pro rata schedule accrued monthly, with the exception of the Executive Director and Agency Counsel positions, for which vacation allowances shall be set by the Governing Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Length of Service</th>
<th>Days of Vacation Per Year</th>
<th>Bi-Weekly Vacation Hours Accrued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First through Second Year</td>
<td>10 Days</td>
<td>3.08 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third through Fifth Year</td>
<td>15 Days</td>
<td>4.62 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Sixth Year</td>
<td>16 Days</td>
<td>4.92 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Seventh Year</td>
<td>17 Days</td>
<td>5.23 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Eighth Year</td>
<td>18 Days</td>
<td>5.54 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Ninth Year</td>
<td>19 Days</td>
<td>5.85 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of Tenth Year +</td>
<td>20 Days</td>
<td>6.15 Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the beginning of the sixth year and each year thereafter (up to the tenth year), the additional day of vacation shall be credited on the anniversary date of the employee's date of hire in accordance with the above schedule. Part-time employees shall accrue vacation in accordance with the above schedule on a pro rata basis. Additional vacation days beyond that provided for in this schedule may be granted in accordance with Policy 3.13 – Recognition Program.

2. Leaving Employment With TRPA

All permanent employees who leave employment with TRPA will receive payment for any unused vacation allowance. Employees who leave employment with the Agency and are rehired at a later date shall be given credit for their previous length of service for purposes of determining the amount of vacation allowance to be accrued per year beginning on their new date of hire.
3. Procedure

In December of each year, supervisors/managers will be apprised of the vacation allowance of the employees under their supervision and given the worksheet for planning vacations within their department.

All requests for advance vacation pay must be submitted to the Finance Department five days prior to the pay day that the employee will be away.
Exhibit C

POLICY NO. 3.3 – SALARY AND PAY PERIOD

Employees shall be paid on or about the 15th and the last day of each month. Employees shall be paid every other Friday for each preceding two week period beginning on Sunday and ending on Saturday. The Finance Department shall prepare an annual payday schedule at the beginning of each fiscal year. Employees must turn in timesheets to the Finance Department for the preceding two week period by 9:00 a.m., on the Tuesday prior to each payday. The gross pay amount shall be determined by dividing the annual salary by 24-26. Net pay shall be the gross minus all deductions required by law, by other TRPA policies, and any other elections made by the employee. An employee's salary shall be full compensation for full time service in the position. Full time service is defined as the number of hours which constitute the scheduled weekly period of service, namely 40 hours. Non-exempt Employees working less than 40 hours per week shall have the gross pay adjusted to be in proportion to the pay hours compared to 40.
MEMORANDUM

May 17, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Status Report on Project Applications

Project Review Applications: The following applications are currently under review by the Project Review Division and have been complete for more than 120 days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Application Type</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-410-11</td>
<td>Fallen Leaf Lodge HOA</td>
<td>Tourist Accommodation Addition</td>
<td>12/11/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-20-03</td>
<td>University of CA Board of Regents</td>
<td>Coverage Verification</td>
<td>11/25/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-70-05</td>
<td>Truckee Tahoe Lumber Co.</td>
<td>Coverage Verification</td>
<td>02/11/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review of the Fallen Leaf Lodge application referenced above has been delayed due to snow conditions and the need to coordinate a site visit with the applicant. A site visit has been scheduled for early July at which time the applicant will be available to meet on-site with TRPA staff. Review of the other two projects has been delayed due to snow. Staff has been performing site visits twice a week to reduce the site visit backlog and staff anticipates completion of these projects prior to the July Governing Board hearing. If you have any questions, contact Paul Nielsen in Project Review.

Land Capability and IPES Applications: The following applications exceed the 120-day limit due to the winter weather conditions or pending technical data. If you have any questions, please contact Joe Pepi in Long Range Planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85-341-05</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Pallfy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-320-01</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>McNeil/Kaufman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122-181-64</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Laughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-212-19</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Curry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-082-01</td>
<td>Alt. Bldg.</td>
<td>Bazlen/Kaleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-390-01</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Backhus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-141-22</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Throgmorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-020-16</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Greenspan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-362-02</td>
<td>IPES APPL</td>
<td>McCall/Basin Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-311-06</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Morford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AGENDA ITEM XIII A.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-090-31</td>
<td>LCV</td>
<td>Ruvo/Kaleta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126-251-11</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Skeie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-412-14</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Tomasello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-226-44</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Erickson/Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-174-05</td>
<td>New IPES</td>
<td>Plottel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

June 14, 1999

To: TRPA Governing Board Members

From: Jim Baetge, Executive Director

I will be out of the office on vacation starting on June 21 and will return on July 16.

During this period I have delegated full responsibility to Jerry Wells to act on my behalf on all matters assigned to the Executive Director by the Board.

I will keep Julie Frame apprised of telephone numbers where I can be reached during this period.

JWB:jf
June 1, 1999

Mr. Carl Hasty
Tahoe Regional Planner Agency
P. O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448

Dear Carl:

Congratulations! The Sacramento Valley Section APA has selected both of your nominations, the EIP Program and Jim Baetge, for planning awards. As award winners, your nominations will be forwarded to the California Chapter of the American Planning Association for judging in the state planning award program.

The awards judges have requested that I work with you in making a few changes to the nomination packages so that they will be more competitive in the state competition. I will contact you within the next few days to discuss the specific modifications. I will also discuss with you an acceptance presentation at the awards dinner.

Nominees are entitled to complimentary admission to the Sacramento Valley Section awards dinner on Friday, June 18 at the Lake Natoma Inn, 702 Gold Lake Drive, Folsom, (916) 351-1500. Additional attendees are also welcome. The cost is $25 for APA members, $30 for non-members, and $15 for students and first-year planners. Please provide me with the name(s) address(es), and telephone number(s) of your attendees by June 11, and the name of the individual who will accept the award. Please reserve a spot for only those individuals who are certain they will attend, as we will have to charge for no-shows.

We provide one award in the name of each nominee. Additional awards may be ordered for others involved in the nominations at our cost of $60 per award. For additional awards, please provide the name of each recipient as it should appear on the award, accompanied by your payment of $60 per additional award (please make checks payable to: Sacramento Valley Section CCAPA).

I hope to see you and others involved with your nominations on June 18.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey M. Goldman, AICP
Awards Coordinator

c/o Parsons HBA
2233 Watt Avenue, Suite 330
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 483-0481 • (916) 483-3364 (fax)
Jeff_Goldman@parsons.com
June 09, 1999

The Honorable Larry Sevison, Chair
The Governing Board
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
Post Office Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Re: Shorezone Alternatives.

Dear Chairman Sevison & members of the Governing Board:

Our organization has had an opportunity to review the April '99 draft “Lake Tahoe Shorezone Ordinance Amendments E.I.S.” and to consider the four alternatives for shorezone use as presented in that document. We have also been involved in the Shorezone Partnership consensus-building group which has been meeting recurrently for some eighteen months or more. After careful deliberations within our organization’s committee structure, and upon the advice of our local government relations staff, the Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors® has adopted a policy position in support of Shorezone Alternative #2. The TSBOR Board of Directors took this formal policy stance after reviewing the extensive work of the consensus committee, TRPA staff, and various interest groups from across the political spectrum. Alternative #2, referred to as the “Preferred Alternative” in the EIS document, is a well-crafted balance between the rights, freedoms, and personal liberties embodied in the private property rights perspective and the mandate to protect and enhance the natural environment for this and future generations. It is no small task to generate an ordinance for the shorezone that meets both individual and collective objectives, protecting and advancing the interests of both, yet Alternative #2 addresses these interests with sensitivity to the needs of all concerned. Thus, we urge you to adopt and implement Alternative #2.

If we were to offer one suggestion to fine-tune the Preferred Alternative (i.e., Alt. #2) it would be in the area of scenic regulations. Acknowledging that scenic values are of importance and worthy of our stewardship, it must also be acknowledged that scenic restrictions are by their very nature arbitrary and subject to interpretation. While attempts have been made to apply the methods of science to scenic matters, in the end such decisions are subjective, based upon taste and one’s sense of “fit” into the greater scheme of things. Issues of “flow”, “fit”, “visual integrity”, and “blend” are more art than science. As such, the placement of scenic restrictions within the code based upon points or other contrived
methodology to measure scenic impact and outcomes seems to miss the mark. Rather, we suggest that scenic matters be afforded greater latitude in regard to how they are addressed by creating a set of "scenic guidelines" as a companion document to the more cut and dry regulations to be adopted by ordinance. An ordinance that creates an artificial scenic point system seems ill-advised for many reasons, not the least of which is the case law that has shown time and again that scenic regulations are the weakest (i.e., most vulnerable) "regulatory takings" defense. Scenic restrictions weaken the Agency's position as it relates to takings shielding, and we do not want to see the Agency's work compromised by the potential for additional litigation. This is not to say that TRPA should forgo management of scenic aspects of the shorezone, but rather simply to suggest that guidelines, offering 'preferred/encouraged' and 'discouraged' forms of use, afford both latitude and control over the resource.

In conclusion, while the scenic aspect of the proposed ordinance deserves a second look with an eye towards establishing scenic guidelines, we are confident that Alternative #2 will best serve both environmental and economic concerns. Please accept this correspondence as our formal commentary on the draft E.I.S. We are pleased to be able to offer up our support for Alternative #2, which reflects the hard work of so many individuals and organizations. We look forward to the long awaited implementation of comprehensive shorezone regulations so as to allow appropriate improvements to occur. Thank you for accepting our input and for allowing us to participate in this process and product.

Sincerely,

Mr. Nelson Van Gundy, President
Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors®, Inc.

cc: John R. Falk,
TSBOR Governmental & Public Relations Coordinator
6 June 1999

Board of Governors
TRPA
Zephyr Cove, Nevada

Dear TRPA Board of Governors,

I object to having your general manager, Mr. Baetge, appearing in an infomercial paid by Heavenly Valley to sell time shares in their new project. The infomercial is repeated several times a day on cable channel 12 in South Lake Tahoe. I do not think it is proper to show such a bias by TRPA that favors one time share over another, or any time share for that matter.

Frank Thomas
South Lake Tahoe
TAHOE BASIN
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
OVERALL WORK PROGRAM
FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000

Prepared for:
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Transportation District
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization

JUNE 11, 1999
RESOLUTION BY THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADOPTING THE FY 1999-2000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING OVERALL WORK PROGRAM

TRPA RESOLUTION NO. 99-__

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) is the document required for the programming of federal and state transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, sitting as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is responsible for developing transportation and air quality plans, programs and projects designed to attain and maintain environmental thresholds pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact; and

WHEREAS, TEA 21 provided for the establishment of a metropolitan planning organization for the Lake Tahoe Basin, and that the Governors of California and Nevada designated the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization in 1998; and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization is responsible for the adoption of transportation plans, programs and projects consistent with the Bi-State Compact; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District is established under Article IX of the Compact, as amended, and is charged with the operation and ownership of public transportation and parking systems; and

WHEREAS, the local jurisdictions of the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Washoe County, Carson City and Douglas County are represented in the transportation planning process by membership on the Boards of the Tahoe Planning Agency, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, the United States Forest Service is a member of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Departments of Transportation for the States of Nevada and California are ex-officio members of the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, this document has been properly noticed for review at the Tahoe Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and the Tahoe Transportation District, and that a Public Hearing was properly noticed and held by the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board, sitting the Regional Planning Agency, this ___ day of June, 1999, adopts and approves the FY 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program.

Ayes

Nayes

Abstain

Absent

Larry Sevison, Chair
RESOLUTION BY THE TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
ADOPTING THE FY 1999-2000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING OVERALL WORK PROGRAM

TMPO RESOLUTION NO. 99-___

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) is the document required for the programming of federal and state transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, sitting as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is responsible for developing transportation and air quality plans, programs and projects designed to attain and maintain environmental thresholds pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact; and

WHEREAS, TEA 21 provided for the establishment of a metropolitan planning organization for the Lake Tahoe Basin, and that the Governors of California and Nevada designated the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization in 1998; and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization is responsible for the adoption of transportation plans, programs and projects consistent with the Bi-State Compact; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District is established under Article IX of the Compact, as amended, and is charged with the operation and ownership of public transportation and parking systems; and

WHEREAS, the local jurisdictions of the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Washoe County, Carson City and Douglas County are represented in the transportation planning process by membership on the Boards of the Tahoe Planning Agency, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, the United States Forest Service is a member of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Departments of Transportation for the States of Nevada and California are ex-officio members of the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, this document has been properly noticed for review at the Tahoe Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and the Tahoe Transportation District, and that a Public Hearing was properly noticed and held by the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization Board of Directors, this ______ day of June, 1999, adopts and approves the FY 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program and budget and certifies that its planning process will be implemented through this document in accordance with:

- Section 134 of Title 23, U.S.C.; FTA 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Section 5303; and Title 23, CFR 450, Subpart C;
- Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d));
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each state under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;
• Section 1003(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Pub. L. 97-242, section 105(f), 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR Part 23); and
• The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and USDOT regulations “Transportation for Individuals with Disabilities” (49 CFR Parts 27, 37 and 38).

Ayes
Nayes
Abstain
Absent

Larry Sevion, Chair
RESOLUTION OF THE TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
SUPPORTING AND ADOPTING THE FY 1999-2000 TAHOE BASIN
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING OVERALL WORK PROGRAM

TTD RESOLUTION NO. 99-__

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) is the
document required for the programming of federal and state transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, sitting as the Regional Transportation
Planning Agency, is responsible for developing transportation and air quality plans, programs
and projects designed to attain and maintain environmental thresholds pursuant to the Tahoe
Regional Planning Compact; and

WHEREAS, TEA 21 provided for the establishment of a metropolitan planning organization for
the Lake Tahoe Basin, and that the Governors of California and Nevada designated the Tahoe
Metropolitan Planning Organization in 1998; and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
is responsible for the adoption of transportation plans, programs and projects consistent with
the Bi-State Compact; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District is established by Article IX of the Compact, and
is charged with the operation and ownership of public transportation and parking systems; and

WHEREAS, the local jurisdictions of the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer
County, Washoe County, Carson City and Douglas County are represented in the
transportation planning process by membership on the Boards of the Tahoe Planning Agency,
the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, the United States Forest Service is a member of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning
Organization and the Departments of Transportation for the States of Nevada and California
are ex-officio members of the Tahoe Transportation District; and

WHEREAS, this document has been properly noticed for review at the Tahoe Transportation
Technical Advisory Committee and the Tahoe Transportation District, and that a Public Hearing
was properly noticed and held by the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Tahoe Transportation District Board of
Directors this ____ day of June, 1999 supports and adopts the FY 1999-2000 Tahoe Basin
Transportation Planning OWP.

Ayes
Nayes
Abstain
Absent

__________________________
Ron McIntyre, Chair
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INTRODUCTION
SETTING

The Tahoe Region is located on the border of the States of California and Nevada, between the Sierra Crest and the Carson Range. Approximately two-thirds of the Region is located in California with one-third within the State of Nevada. The Tahoe Region contains an area of about 501 square miles, of which approximately 191 square miles comprise the surface waters of Lake Tahoe. Lake Tahoe dominates the features of the Region and is the primary focus of local environmental regulations to protect its exceptional water clarity.

Located within the California portion of the Tahoe Region are the City of South Lake Tahoe, and portions of El Dorado County and Placer County. This part of the Region is within the first and fourteenth Congressional Districts of California. The resident population of the Tahoe Region is approximately 51,775 (1990 census), of which 38,093 people reside within the California portion.

Lake Tahoe and the surrounding areas provide a major recreational opportunity for residents of the surrounding states. The primary market for recreation at Lake Tahoe is from northern California, primarily the Sacramento and Bay areas. During the summer, the population of the Tahoe Region can double with approximately 46,500 overnight visitors. Some 34,500 of these overnight visitors (seventy-four percent) stay in the California portion of the Region. Resident population is projected to increase to 58,500 persons by the year 2005, a 27.7 percent increase. The overnight visitor population is expected to increase by 38.2 percent, to a total of 64,000 visitors.

Serving the resident and visitor populations are both public and private fixed route transit, shuttles, trolleys, demand-responsive services, as well as air transportation via the South Lake Tahoe Airport and a local and regional highway network. There are seven major entrances to the Basin from outside the region. The majority of traffic to the region is from California, with most of the traffic travelling U.S.Highway 50 to reach the area. A variety of state route segments encircle the Lake. Portions of the Region are served by bicycle facilities and waterborne excursion services. Public transit is provided on the north shore by Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART), operated by the County of Placer. Public transit service on the south shore is provided by the City of South Lake Tahoe and Douglas County which contract the operation of South Tahoe Area Ground Express (STAGE) to Area Transit Management (ATM). Both the North and South Shores are now served by visitor trolley services funded by a combination of public and private funds.
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

FY 1999-2000 will find a new look to the Tahoe Basin transportation planning institutional structure. As a result of TEA 21 and actions by the Governors of California and Nevada in 1998, a metropolitan planning organization has now been created for the Region. With this development has come a realignment of the roles and functions of transportation policy boards and technical committees addressing transportation issues. FY 1999-2000 will see a continued refinement of this structure.

One important premise guiding the development of this structure was to keep the number of distinct bodies (either policy or technical) to a minimum. This effort at streamlining may seem to have failed by the number of bodies described below, but in reality new boards requiring separate staff and office space have been avoided.

The following is a description of each of the bodies that has a role in the policy or technical decision-making process.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is governed by a fourteen member Governing Board, with a non-voting federal representative as the fifteenth member. Each state has seven representatives, with each local jurisdiction within the Region also being represented. TRPA is unique because of its responsibilities under the Compact for land use planning, transportation planning, project review and approval, enforcement of TRPA ordinances, and the achievement of environmental goals.

TRPA is charged by the Compact to develop an integrated, regional transportation plan for the Tahoe Region, and accordingly adopted the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan in 1992, later affirmed in 1994, 1996 and 1998. The Compact also states that the goal of transportation planning shall be to reduce, to the extent feasible, air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles. Transportation and air quality planning by TRPA is for the express purpose of attaining or maintaining the applicable federal, state, local, and TRPA air quality threshold standards. These standards include reductions in Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) and traffic volumes.

Regional Transportation Planning Agency (California Only)

TRPA is statutorily designated by the State of California as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Tahoe Region. As an RTPA, TRPA must fulfill various statutory requirements, including those of the Transportation Development Act, coordination with Caltrans on the development of Regional Transportation Plans and Regional Transportation Improvement Programs and other project related activities. The TRPA Governing Board indicates that it is sitting as the RTPA when taking a policy action, but no changes to the membership of the Governing Board occurs.
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization

The Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) is the policy body responsible as the forum for the cooperative decision-making process that will take the required actions under federal regulations regarding metropolitan planning organizations. The physical boundaries of the TMPO jurisdiction are the same as that of the TRPA. The TMPO Board of Directors is comprised of the fourteen voting members of the TRPA Governing Board, and a voting representative of the United States Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (USFS). The TMPO voted to provide that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the TRPA serve as Chair and Vice-Chair of the TMPO unless the TMPO votes otherwise. The TMPO meeting is held during the TRPA meetings, so notices and agendas are mailed at the same time. The TRPA Board must adjourn and the TMPO Board then convenes after being joined by the USFS. Once TMPO actions are taken, the TMPO adjourns and the TRPA reconvenes without the USFS. Changing the fifteenth, non-voting member of the TRPA Board to the USFS is being considered.

It is important to note that these two policy bodies, although comprised of many of the same individuals, have different missions and perspectives. The TRPA overriding obligation is adherence to the Compact, including attaining and maintaining environmental thresholds. The TMPO’s mission, on the other hand, is to provide policy decisions on transportation plans and programs. In many circumstances these two differences will be minor, while in some cases conflicting philosophies may develop. TRPA will have ultimate authority with respect to the ability to approve any transportation projects for implementation.

Tahoe Transportation District

Article IX of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact also created the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). TTD has responsibility for implementing transportation plans, programs and projects. TTD may acquire, own and operate public transportation systems and parking facilities serving the Tahoe Region and providing access to convenient transportation terminals outside of the Region. The TTD was originally governed by a Board of Directors representing the counties within the Region and the City of South Lake Tahoe. Article IX was amended in 1997 to provide for private participation on the Board. Board membership now includes two Transportation Management Associations in the Basin, an at-large member representing transit providers, and representative of any special transit districts formed under California law. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) each have non-voting members on the Board of Directors.

Tahoe Transportation Commission

As TMPO implementation issues were being discussed following passage of TEA 21, concern was expressed that, given the nature of the TRPA meetings, transportation issues would not be afforded sufficient opportunity to be discussed in the manner envisioned by TEA 21 and regional transportation stakeholders. Using a format similar to the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission, the suggestion was made to establish a Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) to be devoted to debate on only transportation and air quality issues. The TTC would then serve as policy guidance to the full TRPA and TMPO where additional debate could take place prior to final actions being taken.
With the concern that this would create another transportation group, it was suggested that the TTD serve as the basis for the TTC, much in the same manner as the TRPA formed the basis for the TMPO. In this fashion, both the TTD and the TTC could meet at the same date and time, one agenda be posted, etc. Because of the distinctions between the two groups however (TTD as an operations entity, TTC as an MPO policy advisory board), a different membership composition was needed. To this end, the TTC membership was proposed as the six local jurisdictions, the two transportation management associations, one at-large member, the USFS, and a representative of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. Caltrans and NDOT would serve as non-voting representatives, and the TMPO has the ability to add other members as appropriate.

The TRPA and TMPO will be required to adopt a resolution creating the TTC. As part of the resolution the TTC will be provided with direction from the policy boards as to the type and extent of policy guidance being sought.

**Tahoe Transportation Technical Advisory Committee**

To provide technical support to these various policy bodies, the Tahoe Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) is proposed. In order to avoid duplication and to streamline as much as possible, the TTD Technical Advisory Committee is proposed as the starting point for refinement of the technical committee process. The TTD TAC has been meeting for many years, but the focus has been primarily on transit operational issues. An expanded role would include issues related to highway improvement projects, waterborne and aviation, as well as input into the plans and programs to be received by the TTC prior to approval by either the TRPA or the TMPO.

To support the TTAC, subcommittees have been identified that would serve the needs of this expanded role. A Social Service Transportation Subcommittee has been identified to replace the TRPA ad-hoc committee that was meeting infrequently. Other subcommittees include a Transit Operations Subcommittee, a Public Works Subcommittee, and an Air Quality Subcommittee. The Air Quality Subcommittee would provide the interagency conformity consultation process required as the TMPO. The role and membership of the TTAC and its subcommittees will continue to evolve over the coming year.

**TRPA Transportation and Air Quality Staff Unit**

The TRPA staff will serve as staff to each of these organizations or bodies. This provides for a single point of contact for transportation issues, reduces administrative overhead, and avoids philosophical conflicts at the staff level. The Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning OWP will serve as the universal document for staff direction and subsequent policy board evaluation as to whether the TRPA staff are fulfilling the needs of the TMPO and the TTD.
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RESULTS OF THE 1998-1999 PLANNING PROGRAM

The following discussion highlights transportation planning results for FY 1998-1999.

As referenced previously, the TMPO was created and implemented. The TMPO is the result of significant coordination at the state and federal levels, as well as the input of numerous private and public entities at the local and regional levels as well.

The administration of the TTD was transferred to the TRPA, resulting in significant progress in the TTD's budgeting and grants management functions. With the concurrent TMPO discussions, the TTD began to informally address non-transit issues that would not have been relevant to them in the past. In particular, the TTD debated programming issues related to non-FTA funding sources such as the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program.

The CTS project continued to develop. Most notably, TRPA and the South Shore TMA selected a System Integrator to put together the System Requirements Document that will direct the overall hardware and software needs of the CTS. Negotiations between the TRPA, SSTMA and the selected contractor did not get resolved as quickly as had been hoped, but these have been resolved and the fourteen month project is expected to begin in earnest during FY 1999-2000.

As part of the TMPO implementation, the TRPA Air Quality program became much more pro-active. Air quality planning meetings identified numerous and significant inconsistencies in the air quality designations and classifications around the basin. Progress is being made to coordinate the three local, one regional and two state agencies with air quality jurisdiction in the Basin. In addition, air quality interagency consultation procedures have been developed, staff are participating in a major effort to monitor and evaluate controlled burns and wildfires, and are working on an airshed model that more accurately evaluates air pollution than does the existing traffic model.

As a result of the Lake Tahoe Clean Cities Program initiation, the inaugural Lake Tahoe Basin compressed natural gas fueling station was installed during FY 1998-1999. This station, a portable unit that will be relocated to the North Shore once a permanent station is built, is the result of considerable coordination between TRPA, TTD, the California Energy Commission, the Nevada State Energy Office and a host of other public and private sector participants involved in the alternative fuels industry. To support the development of the CNG infrastructure, the City of South Lake Tahoe ordered a CNG equipped bus, and other stakeholders have identified future CNG opportunities. Proposals for construction of the permanent facility on the South Shore have been received and evaluated, and construction is expected to begin in FY 1999-2000.

Efforts to gain the participation of the United States Postal Service (USPS) in development of a Master Plan gained momentum during the year, as the USPS and TRPA teamed up to provide funding to prepare the Master Plan and develop a consultant scope of work. The USPS made a presentation to the TMPO and sought input from the TTD.

This carryover project, the Phase II Marketing Project, resulted in two significant transit marketing tools. One is a website for transit in the Basin, found at Laketahoetransit.com on the Internet, and the other tool is a single "bus book" that lists all transit routes and schedules in one place. These two tools will be updated as necessary now that their frameworks have been developed.
Based on funding provided in the Tahoe Transportation Improvement Program, Caltrans and others have been engaged in several project development activities over the past year. Notably, Caltrans staff have initiated the environmental documentation necessary for both Phases I and II of the US 50 Highway Improvements Project between Ski Run Boulevard and the South Y. In addition, the Tahoe City Public Utility District completed a draft Project Study Report (PSR) for Fanny Bridge Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements. TPRA and Caltrans coordinated for the programming of future advance planning activities by Caltrans.

TRPA, acting as the RTPA for the Lake Tahoe Region, amended the Tahoe Transportation Improvement Program to account for an augmentation of funds provided through California as a result of TEA 21. Additional transit vehicles were programmed for acquisition, meaning that by late FY 1999-2000 all vehicles in both the STAGE and TART fleets will be less than one year old.

Trying to close the critical gap between project need and available funding, several environmental documents were initiated, including one for construction of parking facilities on SR 28, and construction of the Tahoe City 64 Intermodal Center. Once final, these documents will lead to construction activities during FY 1999-2000.

TRPA staff worked closely with transportation stakeholders to develop project selection criteria for future programming opportunities. This need will become more acute in FY 1999-2000 as the next TTIP is due and the regional intent is to advance funds in the California Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. The selection criteria will continue to develop next fiscal year.

To support the emerging changes brought about by the assumption of TTD functions and to support the newly created TMPO, TRPA reorganized its transportation planning staff. Formerly under the Long Range Planning Division Manager, transportation is now a separate unit within TRPA with the Transportation Programs Manager reporting directly to the TRPA Executive Director. Staff positions have been increased from three full-time and one part-time to seven full-time and one part-time. This increase of positions continues to require reassessment of the position duties and performance expectations.

TRPA completed a Performance Audit as required by the California Transportation Development Act. The Audit, done once every three years, identified several areas for improvement by TRPA staff, including improving the role and functions of the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, submitting of audit schedules on time, researching STA fund allocations, and timely processing of claims. TRPA staff will monitor and improve on these concerns over the next fiscal year.
TEA 21 PLANNING AND STRATEGY AREAS

The following seven planning and strategy areas described in TEA 21 are to be considered in development of the Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning OWP. Each planning area is listed with its relationship to this FY 1999-2000 OWP.

1. Support Economic Vitality and Enable Global Competitiveness
   Addressed in Work Elements 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111

2. Safety and Security for Motorized and Non-Motorized Users
   Addressed in Work Elements 102, 104, 107, 108

3. Accessibility and Mobility Options for People and Freight
   Addressed in Work Elements 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 108, 110

4. Protect and Enhance the Environment, Promote Energy Conservation, and Improve the Quality of Life
   Addressed in Work Elements 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108

5. Enhance Integration and Connectivity of the Systems Across or Between Modes for People and Freight
   Addressed in Work Elements 103, 104, 107, 108, 109

6. Promote Efficient System Management and Operation
   Addressed in Work Elements 101, 102, 103, 104, 108

7. Preservation of the Existing System (Maintenance)
   Addressed in Work Elements 103, 104, 107, 108
FTA/FHWA REGION IX PLANNING EMPHASIS AREAS

Annually, the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration provide planning emphasis areas that are to be considered during the development of the OWP. The planning emphasis areas identified for FY 1999-2000 include the following areas.

1. System Management and Operation
   Addressed in Work Elements 101, 102, 103, 104, 108

2. Financial Planning
   Addressed in Work Elements 101, 102, 103, 104, 111

3. Environmental and Community Impacts
   Addressed in Work Elements 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108

4. Environmental Justice and Title VI
   Addressed in Work Elements 101, 102, 105, 106
ASSUMPTIONS

1. Program budget is based in part on funds that have not yet been committed. An application for $193,750 was submitted to Caltrans in May 1999 for FY 1999-2000 Section 202, Public Lands Highways – Discretionary (PLH-D) funds. As of this submittal, this application has not yet been approved. Staff are coordinating with FHWA, USFS, Caltrans and NDOT to gain support for this application, as well as establish improved coordination for future year funding from the Section 202 program.

2. The FY 99-00 OWP is based on the premise that there will be a total of 8 positions filled within the Transportation Unit. Currently there are only 5 staff positions that are filled, and 3 positions that are vacant. The 5 filled positions are not dependent upon the receipt of the PLH-D funds, however, the ability to accomplish the milestones listed for each of the Work Elements will be seriously compromised if additional funding is not obtained.

3. A Cost Allocation Plan has not been submitted for approval to a cognizant federal agency. The OWP budget assumes the Executive Director, Deputy Director, Finance Director and 3 other staff are part of the Agency Overhead and are not included in the staff salary costs. A preliminary draft of the Cost Allocation Plan indicates that the Overhead Rate is nearly 45 percent, and it is this rate that is used for purpose of the FY 99-00 OWP.

4. As proposed early on in the implementation of the TMPO, TRPA is not allocating any Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for planning activities. These funds, which totaled approximately $29,000 in FY 98-99, will be available for allocation to Placer County, El Dorado County and the City of South Lake Tahoe for transit operations instead. The portion reserved for TDA administrative functions has been reduced from 3% to 2%. PL, RTIP and grant funds are not eligible for TDA activities.

5. Pursuant to the vote of the Tahoe Transportation District Board of Directors in April 1999, there are no Federal Transit Administration (FTA) PL funds programmed in the OWP.

6. There are significant research needs in terms of air quality thresholds. Three areas in particular need to be addressed, including the establishment of an LOS standard for use with the Air Quality Threshold, implementation of the Airshed model under development, and updating information on Basin travel behavior. This program does not attempt to provide resources to address these research needs.

7. This does not include 1998-1999 Carryover of FHWA PL Funds in the amount of $255,367 (CA) and $32,609 (NV). These funds will be programmed during FY 99/00.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>BUDGET/AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA)</td>
<td>$ 20,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway &quot;PL&quot; (CA)</td>
<td>255,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway &quot;PL&quot; (NV)</td>
<td>32,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands Highway-Forest Highway (NV)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands Highway-Forest Highway (CA)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands Highway-Discretionary (CA)</td>
<td>193,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Lands Highway-Discretionary (NV)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Car Mitigation</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA CA Grant</td>
<td>4,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System Strategic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment Plan</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Assistance Program</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning &amp; Research</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA General Fund</td>
<td>107,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodel Planning Group Conference</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,199,101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE CATEGORY</th>
<th>TRPA BUDGET/AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits, Overhead</td>
<td>465,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Administration Services</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Audits</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Lease</td>
<td>3,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal/Publications</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>5,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS/TMA</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT/TMA</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 89 PSR</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Monitor</td>
<td>107,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS SDP</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Admin</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS Planner</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRB Conference</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Revenue Study</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodel Planning Group Conference</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,199,101</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories/Work Elements</td>
<td>FHWA PL (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - Program Administration</td>
<td>98,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 - TTD Program</td>
<td>24,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 - Transportation Program</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 - Transit Program</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 - AQ Program</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 - Clean Cities Program</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 - Bicycle Program</td>
<td>21,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 - ITS Strategic Plan</td>
<td>4,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 - No. CA Aviation System Plan</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 - USFS Program</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 - Reg. Revenue Study</td>
<td>32,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Totals</td>
<td>255,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenues by Work Element

TRPA OWP FY 1999-2000 Revenue Summary by Work Element
## EXPENDITURES BY WORK ELEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Elements</th>
<th>TRPA</th>
<th>Other/Contract</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 – ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>61,842</td>
<td>119,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 – TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT PROGRAM</td>
<td>56,790</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>71,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 – TRANSPORTATION PLANNING</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 – TRANSIT PLANNING</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 – AIR QUALITY PROGRAM</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>107,450</td>
<td>175,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 – CLEAN CITIES PROGRAM</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 – BICYCLE PLANNING</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS STRATEGIC DEPLOYMENT PLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 – NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AVIATION SYSTEM PLAN</td>
<td>4,219</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 – UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE TRANS. PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 – REGIONAL REVENUE STUDY</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>465,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>734,092</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,199,101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 1999-2000 TTD OPERATING BUDGET
## Tahoe Transportation District
### Statement of Revenues and Expenditures
**Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2000**

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>USFS Parking Fees</th>
<th>BUDGET TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants (assume CA 45,000 and NV 30,000)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants - Match</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS Parking Fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

**100: Salaries, Benefits, & Overhead**

**200: Administrative Outlay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201: Consulting/Contract services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202: Bookkeeping services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203: Legal services</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204: Audits</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205: Reproduction and printing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206: Office Supplies/Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207: Director/Officer Insurance</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208: Postage expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209: Telephone service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210: Vehicle Insurance</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211: Tax payments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212: Legal notices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213: Miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funded through TRPA

Subtotal Services and Supplies: 7,150 1,800 11,250 20,200 0

**300: Capital Outlay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310: Buses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315: CNG Buses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320: Trolleys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325: CNG Trolleys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330: Vans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335: CNG Vans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340: Passenger Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360: Deferred Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Capital Outlay: 0

**400: Operations Outlay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>410: Operating Contracts and Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411: Douglas County</td>
<td>113,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412: CTS</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413: STAGE</td>
<td>25,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415: El Dorado Bus Plus</td>
<td>39,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416: TART</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417: No. Trolley</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418: So Trolley</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419: SR 28 (summer 2000)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>420: Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421: Vehicle Maintenance Services</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422: Vehicle Storage/Transport</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423: Parks and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424: Deferred Revenue for Mnce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425: Temporary CNG Station</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Operations Outlay: 97,850 113,200 63,750 15,000 299,850 0

**500: Deferred Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENTS
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
1999-2000 WORK PROGRAM

WORK ELEMENT 101 – PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

PURPOSE
To support on-going federal and state transportation and air quality planning administrative requirements such as development of the OWP and administration of the TDA program; to apply for and administer federal and state grants; to provide support to the TRPA Governing Board, the TMPO and TTC Board of Directors, and the TTD Board of Directors.

DISCUSSION
The administration of the Tahoe Basin transportation and air quality planning process involves a variety of activities, including administrative functions to comply with provisions of the TDA. TDA functions include preparation and distribution of fiscal audits, performance audits, annual financial transaction reports and audit schedules; conducting unmet transit needs hearings; and distributing and monitoring the use of LTF and STA funds by TDA claimants.

This Work Element includes activities associated with staff support for the TRPA and Governing Board such as development of staff recommendations, preparation of staff summaries based on those recommendations, attendance at meetings to present the staff recommendations, and follow-up of Governing Board actions. Other administrative duties include development of the draft and final Overall Work Program, and administration of the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Exchange program. All administrative functions are provided on an on-going basis.

PREVIOUS WORK
The work activities listed above continue on a regular, ongoing basis.

TASKS
- Provide Board Support for TRPA, TTD, TMPO, TTC and TTAC
- Submit Federal and State Grant Applications
- Submit Federal and State Grant Status and Financial Reports
- Allocate TDA Funds Based On Revenue Ratios
- Participate on Boards, Committees and Working Groups
- Support General Administration for TRPA and TTD

COMPLETION DATE
- Monthly
- FEB 00
- Quarterly
- Post Claim
- Monthly
- Monthly

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
- Complete TDA Audits (LTF, STA) and TRPA agency fiscal audit (RTPA) Jan 00
- Submit TDA Schedule of Performance Audits (RTPA) Aug 99
- Conduct Unmet Transit Needs Hearing (RTPA) Aug 99
- Adopt FY 2000-2001 Overall Work Program (TRPA, TMPO, TTD) April 00
- Execute RSTP Exchange Fund Agreements (RTPA) Dec 99
- Host IPG Conference Nov 99

REVENUES
- FHWA PL 76,726
- TDA 20,706
- Total: 97,432

EXPENDITURES
- TRPA Staff: 61,526
- Other/Contract: 35,906
- Total: 97,432
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TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
1999-2000 WORK PROGRAM

WORK ELEMENT 102 – TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT PROGRAM

PURPOSE
To provide administrative, technical and financial support for the operations and program objectives of the Tahoe Transportation District.

DISCUSSION
To support the realignment of agencies in response to the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, TRPA is providing all staff services to the TTD, including board support, program implementation and financial management. The program identified below reflects the objectives of the Board of Directors of the TTD, in coordination with TRPA and TMPO activities.

PREVIOUS WORK
TRPA has provided support to the TTD in the past, but not directly as staff under an Interagency Agreement.

TASKS
• Coordinate with N. Tahoe Transportation Authority Implementation
• Coordinate SR 28 Parking EA and Parking Implementation
• Coordinate Potential Parking Facilities for TTD Fee Management
• Administer Lease and Service Agreements

COMPLETION DATE
As Necessary
Monthly
Monthly

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
• Adopt FY 2000-2001 Operating Budget (TTD) June 00
• Conduct Strategic Planning Retreat (TTD) Aug. 99
• Execute Vehicle Lease/Management and Transit Service Agreements (TTD) April 00
• Execute CTS Subrecipient Agreement with TRPA (TTD, TRPA) Nov 99
• Execute Parking Fee Demo Agreement with USFS for SR 28 (TTD) July 99
• Execute Sunnyside Parking Management Agreements Nov 99
• Execute Legal and Audit Services Contracts (TTD) July 99
• Adopt TTD Financial Audit (TTD) Dec 99

REVENUES
FHWA PL (CA) $27,391
FHWA PL (NV) 32,609
Rental Car Mit. 15,000
Total: $75,000

EXPENDITURES
TRPA Staff: $60,000
Other/ Contract 15,000
Total: $75,000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
1999-2000 WORK PROGRAM

WORK ELEMENT 103 - TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

PURPOSE
The purpose of this work element is to support the development and implementation of the TRPA Regional Plan, including the Regional Transportation Plan – Air Quality Plan, and the Environmental Improvement Program. This work element also includes those activities and products to satisfy federal metropolitan planning organization requirements.

DISCUSSION
Responsibility for transportation planning in the Tahoe Region is given to TRPA by virtue of the Compact, and as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) in California. As such, TRPA must conduct planning studies in-house, contract for planning services by consultants, prepare grant proposals, conduct public hearings, agendaize meetings on specific issues with affected public agencies, the general public or interest groups, and recommend to the Governing Board transportation components or mitigation measures for all project applications.

PREVIOUS WORK
Staff are regularly involved in coordination with state and federal agencies, as well as local private and public transportation interest groups. Staff have completed several studies, including the Ph. I and II Marketing Studies, SR 89 Recreational Traffic Management Study, Fallen Leaf and Emerald Bay Transportation Study, SR 28 Corridor Management Plan, CTS Parking Management Study, So. Y Traffic Study, SR 89 Transitway Feasibility Study, 64 Acre Intermodal Center EA and other transit and transportation studies.

TASKS
- Coordinate Public Information Outreach Program
- Prepare ITIP Request to CalTrans
- Prepare CMAQ Project Lists and Applications
- Prepare TEA Project Lists and Applications
- Promote/Monitor US 50 Highway Project Implementation
- Promote/Monitor Fanny Bridge Project Implementation
- Promote/Monitor Echo Summit Project Implementation
- Promote/Monitor SR 28 Corridor Mgt. Plan Implementation
- Promote/Monitor Kings Beach Sidewalk Project Initiation
- Coordinate Westshore Transportation Master Plan
- Support Tahoe Airport Commercial Service Initiation
- Promote/Monitor 267/89 Corridor Studies with Placer/Nevada Co's
- Promote/Monitor Improvements Related to Construction Delays
- Support Project Review for Major TRPA Project Applications
- Coordinate Fallen Leaf Lake Planning (TRPA)
- Update Transportation Model (TRPA)

COMPLETION DATE
- Monthly
- Jan. 00
- Sept 99
- Oct 99
- Monthly
- Monthly
- Monthly
- As Necessary
- Monthly
- As Necessary
- As Necessary
- Monthly
- May 99
- April 00
**PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)**

- Adopt 1999 Tahoe Trans. Improvement Program (TRPA, TMPO) Dec 99
- Update/Amend Tahoe Transportation Plan (TRPA, TMPO) June 00
- Amend/Update EIP – Transportation Projects (TRPA) March 00
- Adopt USPS Master Plan (TRPA) Nov 99
- Complete SR 89 Realignment Project Study – Envir. Only (TRPA) May 00
- Complete US 50/SR 89 Intersection Project Study Report (TRPA) June 00
- Update/Amend Transportation Model (TRPA) April 00
- Conduct Vehicle Turning/Traffic Counts (TRPA) Aug 99
- Secure Fallen Leaf Lake Plan Funding (TRPA) MAY 99
- Completion of Remaining TMPO Implementation Work Tasks(TMPO) Sept. 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>REVENUES</strong></th>
<th><strong>Expenditures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLH-D</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIP</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHL (FH)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRPA Staff</strong></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract/Other</strong></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
1999-2000 WORK PROGRAM

WORK ELEMENT 104 – TRANSIT PLANNING

PURPOSE
To provide a focused effort on transit planning activities in Lake Tahoe.

DESCRIPTION
Transit is a key solution to the traffic congestion and air quality problems that are experienced in the Basin. The TRPA compact requires that planning activities be designed to reduce dependence on the automobile.

PREVIOUS WORK
Most recently have been involved with the development and administration of the Coordinated Transit System project for the South Shore. In addition, assist with the Incline Village TART service reorganization, the SR 28 summer transit service, and Camp Richardson circulation system evaluation.

TASKS
• Coordinate 64 Acre Tract Intermodal Center EIS and Implementation
• Preparation for TRB Rural and Intercity Bus Conference
• Coordinate CTS MCO Implementation
• Coordinate CTS Project Implementation
• Promote/Monitor Camp Richardson Transit Circulator Service
• Promote/Monitor Reno Airport/North Shore Transit Improvements
• Support Waterborne Transit Service Initiation
• Promote/Monitor Ski Train Evaluation with Placer/Nevada Counties

COMPLETION DATE
Nov 99
Monthly
Monthly
Monthly
March 00
March 00
As Necessary
June 00

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
• SR 28 Transit Service Plan (TTD)
• 5 Year Transit Vehicle CIP (TTD)
• Social Service Transportation Adv. Subcommittee Meetings (TRPA, TTD)
• Acquisition of Transit Vehicles Pursuant to TTIP (TRPA, TTD)

REVENUES
PLH-D 50,000
RTIP 20,000
FTA-TRB 45,000
PLH-FH 10,000
Total: $125,000

EXPENDITURES
TRPA Staff 80,000
Other/Contract 45,000
Total: $125,000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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WORK ELEMENT 105 – AIR QUALITY PROGRAM

PURPOSE
To develop and maintain transportation and air quality modeling capabilities and to enhance the modeling capabilities with simulation capabilities.

DISCUSSION
Historically this work element involved data input and analysis using the TRANPLAN transportation software. The model was then used to determine VMT, air quality and other transportation trends and impacts. The database used in TRPA's model was often distributed for use with project related applications. Given that the use of the VMT indicator has certain characteristics that limit its applicability in evaluating air quality, TRPA proposes to begin evaluation of the VMT as an indicator. This will involve communicating issues with our partners through technical review and literature search, and providing documentation of the results.

PREVIOUS WORK
Previous efforts have involved participation in the Lake Tahoe Research Symposiums that have been held to evaluate research programs and needs regarding TRPA's environmental thresholds, including air quality. Staff monitor air quality sampling stations, review project applications for air quality impacts, coordinate with state and federal air quality agencies.

TASKS
- Seasonal Visibility Evaluation
- Conduct AQ Monitoring
- Conduct Interagency Conformity Consultation Process
- Promote/Monitor Data Collection of Airborne Phosphorus
- Distribution of AQ Mitigation Fees to Local Jurisdictions
- Airshed Model Administration and Coordination (TRPA)

COMPLETION DATE
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- June 00
- As Necessary
- June 00

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
- Complete TTP Conformity Determination (TMPO) – May 00
- Complete TTIP Conformity Determination (TMPO) – May 00
- Procedures for Conformity Determinations – Aug 99
- Revised Visibility Based on Evaluation of Seasonal Visibility Threshold Standards (TRPA) – June 00
- Draft Monitoring Procedures for Prescribed Burns (TRPA) – Feb. 00
- Amend Code to Delete Oxygenated Fuel Requirements (TRPA) – Feb. 00
- Amend/Update Tahoe Basin Air Quality Plan (TRPA, TMPO) – June 00
- Draft UMT Evaluation as AQ Standard – June 00
- Draft LOS Evaluation as AQ Standard – June 00
- Smoke Management Plan – March 00
- Amend/Update EIP – AQ Projects – March 00

REVENUES
- FHWA-PL 75,000
- TRPA GEN. 107,450
- Total: $182,450

EXPENDITURES
- TRPA Staff 75,000
- Contract/Other 107,450
- Total: $182,450
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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WORK ELEMENT 106 – CLEAN CITIES PROGRAM

PURPOSE
To plan for and implement air quality improvement projects related to both mobile and stationary source pollution and to monitor air quality to determine progress in meeting TRPA thresholds; to construct CNG infrastructure for fueling and fuel storage and to convert transit vehicles, utility fleets and rental cars to CNG; to explore use of other alternative fuels such as electricity.

DISCUSSION
As part of the Tahoe Basin Regional Plan, TRPA adopted Air Quality thresholds, using a number of indicators to determine relative air quality. TRPA standards, in addition to state and federal standards, must be attained and maintained for each indicator. Project development in the Basin is dependent upon TRPA making the findings that air quality will not be impacted beyond these standards. This work element includes work tasks or projects that contribute to improving air quality. Work to be completed via this work element includes implementing a Clean Cities Program for the Tahoe Region, implementing the federal conformity regulations, hosting advisory committee meetings to address air quality issues, working with local, state and federal air quality agencies to implement a comprehensive air quality monitoring program, and maintaining TRPA’s air quality monitoring program.

PREVIOUS WORK
Staff have completed an air quality analysis for 1998 RTP-AQP, established a Clean Cities program of stakeholders and have submitted an enabling application to the Dept. of Energy. In addition, have organized a presentation on CNG transit engine performance and have submitted a grant application to U.S. DOE to pay incremental cost of transit vehicle conversion.

TASKS
- Coordinate fleet conversions and CNG Vehicle Acquisitions
- Grant applications to DOE
- Conduct Clean Cities Stakeholders Meetings
- Develop Long-Term Market Development Program

COMPLETION DATE
- As Necessary
- As Necessary
- Monthly
- Monthly

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
- Install Permanent CNG Fuelling Station in CSLT (TTD) Oct 99
- Install Satellite CNG Station on North Shore (TTD) June 00

REVENUES
- FHWA-PL 50,000
- RTIP 10,000
- Total: $60,000

EXPENDITURES
- TRPA Staff 60,000
- Contract/Other
- Total: $60,000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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WORK ELEMENT 107 – BICYCLE PLANNING

PURPOSE
To provide the planning necessary to support the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin in order to reduce congestion and improve air quality.

DISCUSSION
Bicycle facilities in the Lake Tahoe Basin have been proven to reduce commuter as well as recreational traffic. These facilities are needed to provide alternatives to driving. Unfortunately, many areas of the Basin are not well suited for bicycle facilities, most notably along the East Shore and near Emerald Bay. In other locations the exiting facilities are not connected to other facilities nor do they connect to transit. The development of the bicycle facility system in the Basin can provide a significant economic benefit to the areas recreational economy.

PREVIOUS WORK
Planning for the Lakeside Bicycle Trail have been ongoing, as have efforts to secure access along SR 28 between Sand Harbor and the Whittel Estate. Other planning efforts have focused on the Dollar Hill Bicycle Trail, the 15th Street segment and others.

TASKS
- Promote/Monitor Linear Park Implementation
- Promote/Monitor Tahoe City Lakeside Bike Trail Implementation
- Promote/Monitor Park Avenue Bike Trail Implementation
- Promote/Monitor Harrison Avenue Bike Trail Implementation
- Support for Bicycle Symposium

COMPLETION DATE
- Aug 99
- June 00
- June 00
- Dec 99
- Oct 99

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
- Approval for 15th Street Bike Trail Implementation (TRPA)
- Approval for Meeks Bay Bike Trail Implementation (TRPA)
- Update/Amendment of Bicycle Plan for Lake Tahoe Reg. (TRPA)
- Production of Bicycle Route Maps (TRPA)

COMPLETION DATE
- Oct 99
- Feb 00
- April 00
- April 00

REVENUES
FHWA-PL 26,250
PLH-D 3,750
TOTAL: $30,000

EXPENDITURES
TRPA Staff 30,000
TOTAL $30,000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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WORK ELEMENT 108 – INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS – STRATEGIC DEPLOYMENT PLAN

PURPOSE
The Strategic Deployment Plan is intended to provide the Lake Tahoe Basin with the planning document necessary to coordinate future ITS implementation. An ITS Strategic Deployment Plan is a blueprint for obtaining discretionary federal funds in the future for ITS initiatives.

DISCUSSION
The Coordinated Transit System and the North Lake Tahoe Traffic Management Program are two excellent examples of ITS at work. These are only two examples, however, of the multitude of projects that could be considered for ITS application in the Basin. Regional traffic management programs, transit and traffic signal coordination, information at ski lodges alerting visitors of traffic and weather conditions are just some of the potential applications. The Strategic Deployment Plan is an opportunity to identify all the various alternatives and evaluate the equipment, institutional relationships and operations that would be required to make ITS succeed at Lake Tahoe. In addition, the West Slope counties are initiating a ITS SDP of their own, and the coordination between the two plans would be ideal given the extent of travel originating from Sacramento and San Francisco.

PREVIOUS WORK
Coordination with the North Lake Tahoe Traffic Management Program (summer and winter), and development of the Coordinated Transit System on the South Shore. In addition, stakeholders have been involved with the Tahoe Frequent Passenger study as a part of TransCal, National System Architecture Training, and the Roadway Weather Information System.

TASKS
- Coordinate with Caltrans and NDOT for the SDP Initiation

COMPLETION DATE
- Monthly

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(S)
- Issue RFP and Hire ITS contractor (TRPA)
- Hire ITS Contract Employee (TRPA)

REVENUES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS-EDP</td>
<td>TRPA Staff:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>Total:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Local match, should it be required, has not been identified in this section.
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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WORK ELEMENT 109 – NO. CALIFORNIA AVIATION SYSTEMS PLAN

PURPOSE
To prepare first year products for the Tahoe Region’s portion of the Interregional Aviation System Plan.

DISCUSSION
Caltrans, Aeronautics Program is coordinating the development of the Interregional Aviation System Plan. To assist Caltrans in this process, TRPA, along with twenty-six counties in California, has been given the responsibility to coordinate and develop their respective element to this plan. The two-year project will be divided into two phases. Phase I products will be provided by Caltrans, and reviewed and updated by TRPA working with the region’s airport managers. Phase II products will include a System Requirements Element, and Action Plan and a Capital Improvement plan produced by the RTPAs and the airports. Results from Phases I and II will be incorporated into the Aviation element of the Regional Transportation Plan for the year 2000 and into an Interregional Aviation System Plan produced by Caltrans.

PREVIOUS WORK
Coordination with the airport staff and fixed base operator regarding initiation of commercial service. TRPA and others completed the Airport Settlement Agreement and Airport Master Plan in 1993.

TASKS
- Attend Technical Advisory Committee meetings.
- Coordinate work products and planning activities with Caltrans, appropriate local agencies, airport managers, and interest groups
- Review and update inventory of existing facilities (from Caltrans).
- Review and refine Airport Functional Classification System.
- Review and update financial element provided by Caltrans.
- Develop financial analysis and table of Airport User Fees.
- Compare Federal and State forecasts provided by Caltrans
- Begin development of system requirements element.

COMPLETION DATE
Ongoing
June 00
June 00
June 00
June 00
June 00

PRODUCTS
- Inventory, Financial Element, Forecast Element, and Initiation of System Requirements Element for incorporation into RTP-AQP. JUNE 00

REVENUES
| FAA: | 4,219 |
| Total: | $4,219 |

EXPENDITURES
| TRPA Staff | $4,219 |
| Total: | $4,219 |
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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WORK ELEMENT 110: UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

PURPOSE
To support the USFS transportation planning efforts in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and to help the USFS support the Basin transportation planning.

DISCUSSION
Clearly the intent of provisions in TEA 21 was to include the USFS in the transportation planning efforts in the Basin. This was evident in the inclusion of the USFS on the TMPO, and with the ability of the TMPO to use Section 202 funds for planning purposes. Many of the issues facing transportation are related to recreational access and travel, recreation provided by or on USFS lands. This new Work Element provides the USFS and the TMPO with the ability to more effectively coordinate on transportation issues.

PREVIOUS WORK
The USFS has participated in numerous planning activities in the past, including SR 28 parking and transit development, the 64 Acre Intermodal Center, planning for circulation improvements to Camp Richardson, and planning for access to and from Fallen Leaf Lake.

TASKS
- Hire USFS transportation planner
- Coordinate completion of 64 Acre Intermodal Center
- Coordinate planning for Camp Richardson
- Coordinate Fallen Leaf Lake traffic planning
- Participate on Westshore Master Plan

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
- EA for the SR 28 parking facilities expansion.
- OMP Actin Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLH-D</td>
<td>TRPA Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $60,000

Total: $60,000
TAHOE BASIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
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WORK ELEMENT 111: REGIONAL REVENUE STUDY

PURPOSE
To prepare a report that will evaluate potential regional revenue sources for specific impacts on the transportation patterns of local residents and visitors and for overall impacts on the economy of the Lake Tahoe Region. The regional revenue sources are intended to generate funds for capital and ongoing maintenance and operations costs of the regional community's portion of the Environmental Improvement Program. The Phase II report will also include a detailed implementation plan addressing legal and institutional issues.

PREVIOUS WORK

TASKS
Regional Revenue Source Study
- Cost of contract administration, RFP development, consultant selection, and establishment of and participation in an ad-hoc advisory committee will be covered by TRPA Staff through Work Element #100 (Administration).
- Evaluate funding alternatives selected from the list developed in Phase I of this project.
- Develop implementation plan, including legal and institutional barriers/opportunities.
- Develop Draft report to include detailed economic analysis and implementation plan.
- Hold at least two public hearings to present findings of draft report.
- Develop Final Report that will incorporate input received via public hearing process. Report will include final community based approved plan for pursuing new regional revenue.
- Present final report to TRPA Governing Board for review and approval.

Strategic Finance Plan
- Meetings with public and agencies to compile data on state and federal sources
- Develop databases of funding authorities and sources
- Draft plan identify funding source and mix by project type
- Consulting meetings with public and agency to discuss findings and proposals
- Develop final report and submit

PRODUCTS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCY(s)
- Draft Report; economic analysis and implementation plan (TRPA)
- Final Report, incorporating public comments
- Draft Strategic Finance Report (TRPA)
- Final Report Post Consultations (TRPA)

COMPLETION DATE
- Draft Report: Dec 99
- Final Report: April 00
- Draft Strategic Finance Report: Oct 99
- Final Report Post Consultations: June 00

REVENUES
State of California (SP&R): $95,000
Total: $95,000

EXPENDITURES
Contract: $95,000
Total: $95,000
BACKGROUND

Each year the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency develops an agency-wide program similar to the transportation program submitted for transportation purposes. The TRPA program, however, addresses twenty-eight different work elements associated with the mission of TRPA. Each Work Element has milestones, responsible staff and related Work Elements are identified. The program also includes a work load model that provides an estimate of the number of hours each staff person is anticipated to spend on a particular work element. The actual time spent by an employee is then recorded on the timesheet and the amount of staff time is then tracked internally.

Within the TRPA program are Work Elements 16 and 17 for the Air Quality and Transportation programs, respectively. These two Work Elements are included here to provide consistent comparisons between the two work program documents. Because of the different formats used, and to a certain extent due to the purpose of the two documents, there is not a one-to-one correlation between the Transportation OWP's Tasks and Products and the TRPA's Milestones. Every attempt has been made, however, to make these match as closely as possible.
## Milestone Totals

### Air Quality Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 194

### Adopt Interagency Conformity Consultation Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 48

### Air Quality Real Time Monitoring Program: Draft monitoring procedures for prescribed burns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJ</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 280

### Air Quality Real Time Monitoring Program: Maintain monitoring at TRPA Air Quality sampling site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRH</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 360

### Airshed Model Development: Administer contracts and follow-up to Airshed Scoping document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 50

### Airshed Model Development: Advance atmospheric deposition research for airshed model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 130

### Airshed Model Development: Evaluate the VMT standard as a threshold for air quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: CNG Long Term Market Development Program</th>
<th>NH 200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: Complete Permanent South Lake CNG fueling site</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: Hold Clean Cities meetings</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: Placement of a temporary CNG facility on North Shore</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete conformity determination for Tahoe Transportation Plan (RTP/AQP)</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete conformity determination for the Tahoe Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Smoke Management Plan (SMP) for the Tahoe Basin</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJ 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate if seasonal visibility standards are advised</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and finalize FY 00/01 Air Quality Work Program</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare EPA grant status reports and reimbursement requests</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove oxygenated fuel requirements from TRPA Code</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWB 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise numerical standards of regional/sub-regional visibility thresholds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update air quality element in the EIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update and Amend AQP portion of RTP/AQP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Milestone Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Milestone Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 K at Meeks Bay</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt 00/01 Overall Work Program</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and develop reports of transportation data collected by tech</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report of Financial Transactions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve and Allocate TDA Funds</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend CA Aviation system plan TAC meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete CA Aviation System Plan inventory, forecasts, financial analysis and systems requirement elements</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete SR 28 EA for parking</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete SR 89 Realignment Project Study Report</td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct and complete summer traffic and turning counts</td>
<td>ATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Social Service Advisory Subcommittee Meetings</td>
<td>STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct unmet transit needs hearing</td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate 64 Acre Tract Transit Center EIS and implementation</td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of individual outreach program</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft LOS Evaluation as AO Standard</td>
<td>ATP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Milestone Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire ITS EDP Contract Employee</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host for IPG annual conference</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement action plan elements for SR 28 CMP</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate as TRPA coordinator for bikeway planning</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in CTS MCO</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in local, regional, state, and ad hoc committees</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in monthly CTS project implementation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform overall support for TRPA, TMPO, TTD, TTAC</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| BC     | 8     |
| JWB    | 60    |
| NH     | 8     |
| RAW    | 15    |
| JWB    | 30    |
| RAW    | 20    |
| BC     | 60    |
| STP    | 20    |
| RAW    | 10    |
| ATP    | 90    |
| NH     | 160   |
| BC     | 20    |
| STP    | 80    |
| RAW    | 40    |
| JA     | 20    |
| NH     | 20    |
| STP    | 80    |
| RAW    | 120   |
| ATP    | 80    |
| STP    | 80    |
| RAW    | 20    |
| JWB    | 700   |
| BC     | 20    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>ATP</th>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>Total Milestone Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and Adopt 1999 TTIP</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and Adopt USPS Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare ITS EDP request for proposal</td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare SR 28 Summer Service Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare TRB Rural Transit Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote/Monitor Project Implementation (US 50, Fanny Bridge, Echo Summit, KB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of TDA Performance Audits</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit State and Federal Applications</td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit State and Federal Grant Status/Financial Reports</td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>Total Milestone Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support aviation and waterborne planning activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Adopt FY 00/01 Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Execute and Administer CTS Subrecipient Agreement with TRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Execute and Administer Lease, Management, and Service Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Execute and Administer Parking Fee Agreement with USFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Execute and Administer Sunnyside Parking Management Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTD Hold Annual Retreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update and Amend EIP Transportation/AQ Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Milestone Hours</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Update and Amend Tehoe Transportation Plan (Regional Transportation Plan)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPK</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 1934

**Update and amend the Bicycle Master Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Milestone Hours** 90

**Grand Total** 8090
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July 1, 1999
Work Element No. 1  General Administration

**APPROACH**

Every member of the management team and other staff will carry out the general administrative functions of TRPA. These include: review and approval of Governing Board and APC packets; transcribing Governing Board and APC minutes; review and approval of general correspondence; supervision and oversight of staff; personnel matters; time sheet preparation; general contract review/administration; administration of the human resources, medical insurance, safety, training, wellness, employee assistance, employee orientation and retirement programs; procurement; fleet maintenance; physical plant and office space administration; telephone reception; copying, mailing and word processing; and other related functions. As required, staff members will attend and participate in APC and Governing Board hearings, attend training and wellness seminars, workshops and meetings as assigned, and attend miscellaneous staff meetings, i.e., insurance, retirement, management team, etc. This work element also includes storing and managing TRPA records, documents, and archives. Staff will continue to actively pursue funding for a microfilm or other record storage system. Amendment of the Rules of Procedure, as required, is also included in this work element.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.**  EXECUTIVE

**LEAD STAFF**  JW  JDF

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

Administer Agency Human Resource Program (Personnel, benefits, training, wellness and employee orientation)

- Daily

Carryout general administration duties

- Daily

Implement new records management program

- 9/30/99
Work Element No. 2  

**Strategic Plan/Program of Work**

**APPROACH**
The management team and program managers will jointly develop an annual program of work consistent with the Agency's 3-year Strategic Plan. The program of work will take into consideration budget and resource constraints as well as requirements established by the Compact and the Regional Plan. The program of work shall consist of written goals and objectives to be accomplished in FY 99/00. Also included in this work element are monitoring and reporting to the Governing Board on the progress being made on the program of work, updating the 3-year Strategic Plan, and developing the annual work program for FY 00/01. The program of work shall include a description of the approach, completion schedule for each work task, and required resources. Objectives will be reviewed throughout the fiscal year to monitor work progress in accordance with adopted completion schedules.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.**

**EXECUTIVE**

**LEAD STAFF**

JW

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hold Management Team/MAT workshop to update Strategic Plan and prepare FY 2000-2001 work program and budget

Monitor FY 99-00 work program

Present Strategic Plan and FY 2000-2001 work program to Governing Board for approval

Report to Governing Board on work program progress
**Work Element No. 3**  
**Legislation**

**APPROACH**  
The California legislature will be in session during the 1st, 3rd, and 4th quarters of FY 99-00. TRPA's approach during FY 99-00 will be to initiate legislative action, such as authorization of local enforcement of MWC ordinances, to monitor activities of the California legislature which may affect the Tahoe Region, to report on those activities to the Governing Board, and to testify with regard to pending legislation, as appropriate. The Nevada Legislature will not be in session in FY 99-00. The Nevada Legislative Interim Committee to Review TRPA will meet in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarters. Staff will assist in setting the agenda for those meetings. Staff will also monitor and participate in activities relative to the Federal Legislative Agenda.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.**  
EXECUTIVE

**LEAD STAFF**  
JB  
PD

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

- Assist LCB in setting Interim Committee Agenda  
- Complete FY 01 federal legislative packet  
- Complete up to four FY 01 legislative packet advocacy trips to Washington, D.C.  
- Determine feasibility of CA 2000 bill and NV Interim Committee recommendation on regional revenue source  
- Meet with CA Boating & Waterways  
- Support introduction of MWC enforcement bill  
- Work with partners on CA EIP funding plan (like A.B. 285) and on Tahoe Bond legislation (CA)  

**Due Date / Frequency**

- 9/15/99
- 11/30/99
- 6/30/00
- 11/30/99
- 10/15/99
- 1/15/99
- 7/1/99  
Ongoing
**Work Element No. 4  Litigation**

**APPROACH**  Respond to all lawsuits filed or threatened to be brought against the Agency. Decide which cases to refer to outside counsel, oversee actions of outside counsel and file lawsuits for TRPA Code violations. Conduct necessary discovery, prepare motions and conduct trials. Maintain outside legal costs within budget.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.**  LEGAL

**LEAD STAFF**  JM  ATY

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Outside Counsel</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>LEGAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

Leonardi v. TRPA: defend litigation

Monitor and enforce settlements

Prepare Legal Division budget estimate/justification for FY 99/01

Sultum v. TRPA: perform settlement obligations  

Support for miscellaneous legal matters

TRPA v. Barbier: support outside counsel

TRPA v. Tonnemacher: prosecute litigation

TSPC v. TRPA

Unknown defensive litigation

Unknown enforcement litigation

**Due Date / Frequency**

Ongoing

Ongoing

Annually

7/15/99

Ongoing

Ongoing

Ongoing

Ongoing

Ongoing
Work Element No. 5  Budget/Financial Administration

APPROACH  This task will involve preparation of a budget request to the state of California (FY 00/01). During June and July 1999, a draft budget will be prepared and reviewed by TRPA staff and Governing Board for submission. During the second and third quarter TRPA staff will be involved in supporting the request to the California administration. During the fourth quarter a draft operating budget will be prepared reflecting the recommendation of the states. Revisions to the FY 99/00 budget will be prepared, as necessary, on a quarterly basis. This work element also involves preparation and administration of annual operating budgets, maintenance of TRPA financial statements, accounts payable, and receivable. Monthly records will be maintained for payroll, expenses, revenues, special project funds and trust funds. Financial records will be maintained for retirement, insurance and other benefits package elements. Fixed asset records will be maintained. Audit analyses and supporting schedules will be prepared. All accounting will be performed with the use of the automated accounting system.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  FINANCE
LEAD STAFF  PB  AJ
RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Computer and Furniture</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>TRPA Audit</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Description</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st FY 99/00 Budget Adjustment to Governing Board</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd FY 99/00 Budget Adjustment to Governing Board</td>
<td>2/28/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd FY 99/00 Budget Adjustment to Governing Board</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Monthly Finance Committee Meetings</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Reconciliation</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Admin/Personnel</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Adoption of Accounting P &amp; P Manual</td>
<td>1/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Receipts</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile Grant Billing Information</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete FY 98/99 TRPA/STA/LTF Audits and Transaction Report</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Mitigation Fund/Project Tracking System</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing, Phone, and General Administration</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 00/01 Budget to Governing Board</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant and Accounts Receivable Tracking</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate LTF and STA Funds Into General Ledger</td>
<td>8/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice and Follow up with Counties for Local Support</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Work Element No. 5  
Budget/Financial Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoice California for 99/00 Support</td>
<td>8/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoice Nevada for 99/00 Support</td>
<td>7/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Entries</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Check Registers for Governing Board</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Trial Balance</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Payroll Setup for Bi-Weekly Payroll and New Timesheets</td>
<td>7/12/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Bi-Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and Submit 1099's and W-2's</td>
<td>1/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Closing Entries, Financial Statements, and Supporting Schedules for 98/99 Audit</td>
<td>8/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Retirement Account for Yearly Report</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconcile Non-Cash Securities per Audit Recommendation</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation of Retirement Account</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Make Necessary Adjustments to Financial Records</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing Expenditures and Check Signing</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects (as they occur)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit FY 00/01 Budget Request to California</td>
<td>8/15/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Fixed Asset Listing</td>
<td>8/31/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 6  Security Administration Program

**APPROACH**
Receipt, file, track, and, if appropriate, release approximately $11 million dollars in non-cash project securities posted with TRPA. Staff will maintain a secure filing system for non-cash securities. Staff will renew certificates of deposit, letters of credit and bonds with the appropriate banking institutions. Staff will answer permitting questions, receive security return inspection requests, and update security procedures as necessary. Authorization will be forwarded to the Finance Department for issuance of checks for return of cash securities. TRPA will administer the abandoned securities program in accordance with the Code. Staff will also maintain an inventory of all securities and continue to implement an aggressive program to close out all completed project files and return the related securities, as appropriate. Staff will mail out 1099s and process information for IRS W9 Forms for interest paid on securities. Securities posted with the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will be identified and staff will attempt to release them and locate the appropriate owners.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.** ENVIRONMENTAL

**LEAD STAFF** LA SC

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

- Abandon Securities
  - Due Date / Frequency: Bi-annually
- Administer Securities
  - Ongoing
- Administer securities when Banks Change Names
  - Ongoing
- Assist Counties (delegation MOUs) for acceptable security information
  - Ongoing
- Meet with all new employees to insure knowledge of security process
  - Ongoing
- Report to Governing Board on Security Holdings
  - Annually
- Research Information for Counties (delegation MOUs)
  - Ongoing
- Security data Base Update
  - On-going
- Update Securities at Banks
  - On-going
Work Element No. 7  Public Information/Education Program

APPROACH
TRPA staff will enhance the existing ongoing public education and information program. Those activities include: developing program outreach plans (with assistance from program managers), regular contact with media to relay information; preparation of press releases and newspaper columns; preparation of semi-annual newsletters, and other pieces of literature as needed; regular contacts with the community to establish TRPA as a community resource; conducting public workshops; regular contact with other public agencies; Implementation of multi-agency public education projects, including expansion of the Tahoe Landscape project and BMP outreach program; and conducting the annual building and erosion control awards program.

Also included in this work element are lead roles for special community outreach projects. Examples of these include the California License Plate Program, the Question 12 program, the Nevada License Plate Program, the alternative revenue feasibility study, and others.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  EXECUTIVE

LEAD STAFF  PD

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Website design software</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Radio Advertising</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>MOTORIZED WATERCRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>MOTORIZED WATERCRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>MOTORIZED WATERCRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Printing, film, production</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Awards Program</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Regional Revenue, Phase III</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>EIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

- Complete 1999 Awards Program
  Due Date / Frequency: 9/22/99
- Conduct EIP/Regional Revenue Campaign
  Ongoing
- Conduct MWC media outreach
  Ongoing
- Coordinate Communications Working Group
  Ongoing
- Coordinate Phase II Regional Revenue Feasibility Analysis
  Due Date: 10/15/99
- Develop and disseminate website protocol
  Due Date: 7/31/99
- Front Counter Assistance
  Ongoing
- Interview and hire PIA
  Due Date: 8/15/99
- Maintain website for certain information (streamlining, current events, other general public information)
  Ongoing
- Plan/coordinate production of MWC radio ad campaign
  Due Date: 5/1/00
- Prepare bi-annual report
  Due Date: 10/1/99  (Bi-annually)
### Work Element No. 7

**Public Information/Education Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Regional Revenue Phase III Action Plan</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare/Implement Program Outreach Plans</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce EIP brochure</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearing at GB on Phase II report</td>
<td>10/27/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign agency web site</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to media inquiries</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to public inquiries</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update brochures</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update/reproduce MWC brochure</td>
<td>5/1/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 8  Streamlining Program

APPROACH
Streamlining all TRPA operations, from permit application processing to daily operations, is an ongoing TRPA priority. The purpose of streamlining is to increase efficiency and effectiveness, while maintaining high environmental standards. In recognition of decreasing resources and the need to shift available resources to implementation of the EIP, it is important to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of all TRPA operations.

Through Implementation of the Permit Integration Program Action Plan, TRPA will work with local, federal and state agencies to better integrate and improve the multi-layered permit process. TRPA will diligently pursue the goal of regulatory conformity throughout the Region. This work element is dynamic and will be updated as new ideas and actions are formulated.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  PROJECT REVIEW
RA

LEAD STAFF

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Web Improvements/Public Info Kiosks</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Web Programming/Public Info Kiosk Programming</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amend MOU - California Dept of Transportation</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend MOU - California Tahoe Conservancy</td>
<td>6/23/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend MOU - Nevada Dept of Transportation</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend MOU - Placer County: Transfers, Minor Grading, Scenic Residential</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend MOU - United States Forest Service</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend MOU - Washoe County: Transfers, Minor Grading, Scenic Residential,</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Tank Removal/Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Phase I Public Informational Kiosks with Print Capability</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop TRPA Action Plan Re: Disaster Response Plan for the Tahoe Region</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General clerical related to streamlining</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public Relations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement telephone/customer service training program</td>
<td>6/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue Adoption of PAS by Douglas County</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 9  Local Assistance Program

APPROACH
In order to increase the Agency's efficiency and effectiveness, TRPA staff will actively promote the use of MOUs with local governmental agencies to exempt certain activities, e.g., residential review, routine maintenance and repair activities, and other minor activities, from TRPA review and approval. This work element includes MOU development, administration and support, development of an automated permit tracking system, MOU-related land capability verifications, resolution of violations forwarded by local government, training and auditing for MOU compliance. This work element also includes administration of the residential allocation program.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.
PROJECT REVIEW

LEAD STAFF
PN

RESOURCES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES
Administer the Allocation Performance Review Committee and the overall residential allocation program

Due Date / Frequency

- Adopt MOU with NV Division of State Lands for SEZ mitigation banking/restoration 3/30/00 Annually
- Conduct annual below the IPES line allocation drawing Annually
- Continue training of local government staff regarding MOU administration. Ongoing
- Hold annual meeting with CDF and NDF on MOU 5/30/99
- Institute quarterly coordination meetings with Lahontan WQCB staff Quarterly
- Institute quarterly training sessions with local jurisdiction staff Quarterly
- Maintain and update established procedures and criteria for auditing Ongoing
- Monitor Lahontan MOU and report to GB and Lahontan staff annually Annually
- Monitor MOU compliance and conduct performance audits (semi-annually) Bi-annually
- Provide access to TRPA GIS and database to all jurisdictions 6/30/00 Annually
- Provide Code enforcement training to local officials and Interested professionals Annually
- Report MOU audit results to GB Ongoing
- Resolve violations returned by local government re: MOU activities Ongoing
- Revise delegation MOUs to clarify responsibilities for Code enforcement Ongoing
- Train affected agencies on MOU Provisions Ongoing
Work Element No. 10  Environmental Improvement Program

APPROACH  TRPA will continue to develop a program to integrate all threshold-related plans and programs. The intent of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness in the use of staff and public resources for the attainment of threshold goals. This is accomplished by incorporating the various plans into one summary document, improving coordination of activities through electronic means, and utilizing TRPA’s Geographic Information System (GIS) to track, record, and graphically communicate threshold needs and progress. An initial document that lists threshold project, program, and study needs has been prepared. Items such as the NDOT Master Plan, Nevada Bond Act TAC, and integration of 5 year CIP List/208 Plan Update/EIP fall under this work element.

There are three main priority areas related to EIP implementation this fiscal year. They are the creation of the computerized databases and geographic information system (GIS) spatial layers related to EIP project, study, and program needs; the development of interagency organizational structure and processes necessary to implement the EIP; and the finance plan needed to capitalize the EIP. TRPA will begin full development of the computerized system described above. Complete implementation of the system is likely to take several years (also see W.E. 25). There will also be continuing update and operation of the system upon completion to keep it a viable tool. The construction of this system will provide the data framework for the Real Time Monitoring Program (see W.E. 11) related to threshold evaluation and update of the EIP. Program managers will work with the EIP unit to construct the computerized system and its corresponding information. The system will be used by program managers to keep lists of project, program, and study priorities relative to their respective threshold up-to-date. The master list is to be updated during the fiscal year.

Primary emphasis is expected to be on fine-tuning and fleshing out the computerized system and the interagency organizational structure modifications. In the realm of organizational structure, the primary focus will be on expanding TRPA staff’s focus on project and organizational facilitation. This is based on the assumption that the finance plan has been successfully capitalized and staff time can be spent on managing the program rather than seeking operation and project capital. Refinements to the strategy and milestones in these years will be made during the annual work program planning process.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

LEAD STAFF  CH  EIPP

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Legislative packet advocacy travel</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>EIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Printing of updated EIP</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>EIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

Administer mitigation fund relative to EIP projects

Caltrans 10 yr./Master Plan; NDOT MP; Nevada TBA: coordination and liaison duties

Complete EIP finance plan - work with consultant to complete plan and databases 9/30/99

Coordinate with stakeholders such as the transportation and water quality coalition, resort associations, chambers, etc. relative to EIP activities Ongoing

Create EIP databases to make electronic EIP 10/30/99

Draft EIP update - revise, add, delete the list of projects, program, and study needs. 12/20/99

Final EIP update - approval 3/31/00

Finance plan mgmt: update and program funding for EIP listings, serve as resource for program managers and EIP coordinator relative to EIP financing Monthly
Work Element No. 10  Environmental Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interagency integration coordination on EIP activities: meet on work plans and duties, execution thereof</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal coordination on EIP activities: meet with staff to ensure the execution of agency goals and policies</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize research community relative to EIP resource and policy research needs</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide grant coordination with staff and EIP finance plan</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve GIS Map Requests and Data Processing with Data Team Interaction</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working group mobilization. Various threshold related working group meetings working to advance threshold projects, policy, and action. Typically more technically oriented groups, not policy stakeholders</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 11  Threshold Monitoring and Evaluation Program

APPROACH  This work element addresses the functions, responsibilities and needs of the Real Time Management Program and related monitoring activities of each threshold program. It integrates the special studies and monitoring needs of each program manager and is closely related to work elements 10 and 25. TRPA will continue to pursue funding and resources to develop and sustain a continuous real time monitoring program that integrates program needs and adapts the current air and water quality monitoring programs to include all threshold categories and develop new indicator units as needed. The term "real time" means that all threshold managers will have the tools to allow for at least annual evaluation of the status of each threshold. Research, baseline data collection, and special studies will be incorporated into threshold programs that currently do not have this information. The evaluation system is dependent upon the use of TEGIS databases and GIS. Database and equipment to perform these tasks need to be constructed accordingly.

There are five main priority areas related to Real Time Management implementation for FY 99-00. These priorities focus on the completion of the conceptual prototype model, the implementation of the annual reporting format for each threshold, the development of GIS layers and associated databases, the development of interagency structure and processes necessary to implement and coordinate the threshold monitoring and evaluation program, and identification of additional funding sources to assure that this program is sustainable in future years. Primary emphasis will be placed on applying the program manager's identified monitoring and reporting needs and formalizing the interagency structure needed to integrate monitoring and evaluation efforts. A priority is to implement and expand the prototype model applications to all thresholds and refine the current threshold reporting system to ensure full utilization of the real time monitoring process for the upcoming threshold evaluation.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

LEAD STAFF  KH  GWB

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>USGS-Tributary/GW Monitoring</td>
<td>$236,000.00</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Tahoe Research Group</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>DRI-Land Use Decision Model</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>EPA - REAL TIME MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Impervious Coverage Update</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>ARS</td>
<td>$107,450.00</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Consultant - Recreation Survey - carry over</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Working group communication</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>EPA - REAL TIME MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>RTM Equipment</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>EPA - REAL TIME MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>USGS-Menlo Park</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>EPA - REAL TIME MONITORING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIS Data Management Plan: Conduct ARCVIEW training for affected staff</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Data Management Plan: Develop base maps by threshold</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Data Management Plan: Identify GIS limitations/potentials</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Data Management Plan: Identify software/hardware to track data</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Work Element No. 11

**Threshold Monitoring and Evaluation Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIS Data Management Plan: Meet w/ Program Managers to decide GIS tasks</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Management Plan: Develop an action plan with roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Management Plan: Distribute request for proposals</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Management Plan: Draft design to manage threshold information</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Management Plan: Refine framework and make operational</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIMP Data Interpretation: Attend LTIMP Data Team Meetings</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIMP Data Interpretation: Progress Report on USGS/TRG efforts</td>
<td>7/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Demonstration Model: Identify links to other thresholds</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Demonstration Model: Incorporate threshold information into model</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Demonstration Model: Presentation of demonstration model</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Integration: Conduct monthly meeting w/program managers</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Integration: Coordinate with Watershed Assessment, Clarity Model, Symposiums</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Monitoring Databases: Collect Threshold Data for Program Managers</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Monitoring Databases: Create schedule for integrating/relating existing databases and develop new databases if necessary</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Monitoring Databases: Distinguish GIS and non-GIS mapping needs</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Monitoring Databases: Document existing database, maps, and their formats</td>
<td>2/28/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Monitoring Databases: Formalize and implement format for new and existing databases</td>
<td>5/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Monitoring Databases: Set priorities on data essential for threshold report</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Program Administration: CBEP Grant: Distribute Request for proposals</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Program Administration: CBEP Workplan: Meet with Parn to finalize work program</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Program Administration: Draft job description and advertise for RTMP position</td>
<td>7/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM Program Administration: Hire RTMP position</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Report: Create Critical Path for completion of 2001 and 2007 Regional Plan updates</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Report: Create schedule for developing or acquiring data</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Report: Evaluate organizational, staffing, and support needs</td>
<td>2/28/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Report: Identify special study needs</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 12  Community/Master Planning Program

APPROACH  Prepare community plans, ski area and marina master plans and associated environmental documents, which are generally applicant-initiated, for submittal to the AFC and Governing Board for adoption. Process amendments to each adopted plan upon request. As required by Chapters 14 and 16 of the Code, these plans have interagency steering committees, specific work programs and schedules for completion attached to them. TRPA staff will serve as master plan and community plan steering committee members. TRPA staff will participate in the Placer Legacy program, a Placer County program to develop open space policies that will be incorporated into the county general plan. TRPA staff will monitor master plan and community plans for compliance with plan requirements.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  CS  JH

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Richardson/Anchorage Marina Master Plan Organizational meeting</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Richardson/Anchorage Marina Master Plan Work Prog. And Schedule</td>
<td>1/30/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan Draft Doc. For South &quot;Y&quot; Industrial</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan Draft Doc. For West Shore</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan Work Prog. For South &quot;Y&quot; Industrial</td>
<td>6/30/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan Work Program for South &quot;Y&quot; commercial</td>
<td>5/30/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan Work Program for West Shore</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Doc. Review</td>
<td>4/30/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan RFP for Environmental Doc.</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Steering Committee Meetings</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Mountain Resort Ski Area Master Plan Work Prog. And Schedule</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Keys Marina Master Plan Administrative Draft Review</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Keys Marina Master Plan DEIS Circulation</td>
<td>2/28/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Keys Marina Master Plan Final EIS and Certification</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Keys Marina Master Plan Steering Com Meetings</td>
<td>7/30/99</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 13  Regional Plan Program

APPROACH
TRPA has the responsibility to maintain the Regional Plan Package. TRPA will amend the Regional Plan and other related plans in response to the 1996 Threshold Evaluation recommendations, the streamlining program, and other requests.

Amendments specific to a work element's topic (such as thresholds, transportation, and EIP) are listed under that work element. Community Plan and Master Plan Amendments are listed in WE 12. Regional Plan, Code and PAS amendments are listed below.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING
LEAD STAFF  GWB

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

Regional Plan Administration: Develop filing system  9/1/99
Regional Plan Document Update: General Updates of Code, PAS, etc.:  Monthly
Regional Plan Document Update: Convert CP documents (CSLT) to Word and PDF  12/31/99
Regional Plan Document Update: Convert CP documents (Placer & Douglas Cos) to Word and PDF  9/1/99
Regional Plan Document Update: Convert CP documents (Washoe) to Word and PDF  11/1/99
Regional Plan, Code, PAS, etc. amendments to GB  Ongoing
Shorezone BMPs to Governing Board  11/30/99
Shorezone Ordinance Amendments to Governing Board  11/30/99
**Work Element No. 14  Water Quality Program**

**APPROACH**
Approach: This work element addresses the planning and implementation aspects of the water quality program. The Water Quality Management Plan will be updated in the next two years. A process framework will be reviewed and further developed by a stakeholder group. It is anticipated that an environmental document (an EA or EIS) will be prepared as part of the update. Completion of the Water Quality Working Group's Charter Objectives will be coordinated by a Steering Team which will focus the work of subgroups such as the Research and Monitoring subcommittee. The WQ Working Group will coordinate with other working groups, and shape policy decisions towards the coordination of all basin water quality programs, and maintenance and attainment of the water quality thresholds.

TRPA will continue to pursue grants to finance the water quality monitoring program, implementation of the water quality elements of the EIP, implementation of the SEZ restoration program, and implementation of water quality presidential deliverables such as Source Water Assessment and Protection Program, Phase II. The Water Quality Element of EIP will be updated. TRPA staff will take a strong advocacy role in implementing projects, programs, and studies aimed at water quality threshold attainment through a partnership approach.

TRPA will also continue to develop and implement the focused watershed approach with the Upper Truckee and Trout Creek watersheds. This effort will be addressed in the Watershed Plan being prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers with guidance from the Upper Truckee River Focused Watershed Group.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.**
LONG RANGE PLANNING

**LEAD STAFF**
JPK RW

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>USGS/MARINAS Watercraft</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>WQ - Shorezone Erosion</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Boat Mooring</td>
<td>$1,774.00</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>USGS/TRPA Watercraft</td>
<td>$41,000.00</td>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

- **208 Update: Begin Draft Plan Amendments.**
  - **Due Date / Frequency:** 9/1/99

   **208 Update: Begin EIS preparation, scope alternative projects.** (See Work Program FY 00-01 for additional 208 Update Milestones.)
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 3/1/00

   **208 Update: Convene TAC and PACs. Schedule at least 4 meetings each.**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 7/31/99

   **208 Update: Convert existing document to Word**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 3/31/00

   **208 Update: Draft Critical Task Path.**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 8/1/99

   **208 Update: Identify Update Process and Final Update Short List: meet with program managers and EPA to complete.**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 7/1/99

   **208 Update: Hold Stakeholder Scoping Meeting(s), final scope of project.**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 7/31/99

   **Complete Stormwater Runoff Program: Completion of, and development of mitigation plan for inclusion in EIP: Identify program funding source.**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 7/31/99

   **Maintain an updated 5-Year list of projects aimed at WQ threshold attainment, and meeting PRC criteria: Final updated list.**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** 10/15/99

   **NDOT Hwy 50 Master Plan Partnering Process: Attend Partnering Meetings.**
   - **Due Date / Frequency:** Monthly
Work Element No. 14  Water Quality Program

PRC WQ Maintenance Criteria Follow-up: Meet with local Public Works personnel to evaluate Maintenance Efficiency Plans.  10/15/99

Prepare Annual Water Quality Report: Draft report.  4/15/00

Prepare Annual Water Quality Report: Obtain water year data.  3/15/00

Prepare Annual Water Quality Report: Present report findings to APC.  5/10/00

Prepare Annual Water Quality Report: Present report findings to GB.  5/24/99

Shorezone EIS Response to Comments, WQ chapters: Complete responses.  7/31/99

Stormwater Runoff Program: Draft and Manage program outside contract. (See FY 00/01 Work Program for additional program Milestones.)  8/30/99

SWAPP: Complete Coordination Plan and Present Plan to APC for approval.  8/11/99

SWAPP: Complete Coordination Plan and Present Plan to GB for approval.  8/25/99

SWAPP: Complete Inventory GIS Layer.  7/31/99

SWAPP: Draft Project Report.  7/19/99

SWAPP: Submit quarterly progress reports.  7/31/99  Quarterly

SWAPP: Draft contract to develop phase II website, including TRPA website update.  7/15/99

Tahoe Basin Interagency Roadways Maintenance and Operations Committee: Attend meetings, complete follow-up tasks. Runoff Subcommittee.  Monthly

Tahoe Basin Interagency Roadways Maintenance and Operations Committee: Submit TIRS meeting minutes to WE 28 Program Manager.  Monthly

TCEAN: Administer grant contract on interim basis.  7/31/99

TCEAN: Attend monthly meetings.  Monthly

Upper Truckee Focused Watershed Group: Attend monthly meetings.  Monthly

Upper Truckee Focused Watershed Group: Comment on Watershed PSP.  7/31/99

Water Quality Mitigation Fee Administration: Allocate funds to qualified agencies.  12/31/99

Water Quality Monitoring: Research and Monitoring Subcommittee attendance and tasks.  Monthly

Water Quality Monitoring: Watercraft Study Group, Ambient Monitoring and PAH research in-kind services.  7/7/99  Quarterly

Water Quality Monitoring: Collect BMP Effectiveness Data.  9/30/99

Water Quality Monitoring: Complete littoral turbidity monitoring.  8/1/99  Quarterly


Water Quality Monitoring: Evaluate/Redesign BMP Effectiveness Survey.  8/15/99

Water Quality Monitoring: ID permittees required to submit Fertilizer Management Plans, ID property owners to require submittal.  12/31/99

Water Quality Monitoring: Phase review of Fertilizer Mgmt Plans to WE 28.  2/30/00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Outside Contract Administration.</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Special Fund Coordination: Identify grants available for WQ program</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Special Fund Coordination: Make grant requests for WQ program</td>
<td>3/15/00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Working Group: Attend semi-monthly Steering Team meetings.</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Working Group: Participate in completion of Working Group Milestones.</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 15  Soil Conservation/SEZ Program

APPROACH
Continue implementation of the land capability and IPES program at a high level of accuracy, while increasing efforts to implement SEZ restoration and land coverage removal projects. Evaluate parcels for initial IPES scores and appeals, update scores for water quality improvements, complete coverage determinations for parcels greater than 1/3 acre and parcel re-evaluations, as requested; prepare staff summaries for IPES appeals to be resolved by TRPA Governing Board; maintain an updated IPES database; conduct IPES TAC meetings; and complete IPES line movement analysis and recommendation to Governing Board. Develop work plan to identify IPES below the line parcels to determine if parcels can be removed from the inventory. Continue review of IPES database for use in considering movement of IPES line for California jurisdictions, to assist acquisition agencies in the implementation of their acquisition programs. Update IPES water quality scores for areas with completed erosion control projects. Conduct field inspections of parcels for land capability verifications, including determinations of backshore boundaries, and soils investigations for land capability and backshore boundary challenges during summer field season in a timely manner. Complete groundwater investigations for the soils/hydrology review process. Coordinate remediation of contaminated groundwater sites with Lahontan and assist in review with NDEP. Prepare SEZ maps for Governing Board adoption. Amend and implement a tracking system for existing land coverage to monitor land coverage threshold attainment progress.

Provide technical and other assistance, and training to IVGID, NRCS, Washoe County Public Works, Nevada Division of State Lands and private landowners on a coordinated SEZ Restoration Plan for Third and Incline Creek, Glenbrook Creek, and Burke Creek SEZ restoration projects. Work with Upper Truckee Focus Watershed Group on conducting Bioassessment monitoring in the watershed and developing a grazing management plan for the High Meadows portion of the watershed. Coordinate SEZ restoration with plans for new grazing management in the SEZs based on amending grazing ordinances. The SEZ Classification (EPA Wetlands Grant) for SEZ Restoration Needs and Prioritization falls under this work element.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  JP  TS

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>IPES Analysis Report</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>EPA-SEZ Grant</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
<td>SEZ GRANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Misc. Field Equipment</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Contract Technical Assistance</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual IPES data base Update</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist with NRCS Soil Survey Update</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Hyatt-Incline Creek Parking Lot Removal and SEZ Restoration Project</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete IPES Initial Field Work, RVALs, and Appeal Field Work &amp; Staff Summaries for GB (During field season)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete IPES line movement analysis and make recommendation to GB</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Soils/Hydro Reports &amp; Field (During Field Season) and input into TEGIS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with landowners and NRCS in High Meadows grazing pasture to expedite development of grazing management plan.</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Element No. 15  Soil Conservation/SEZ Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop work plan to amend existing &amp; implement new land coverage tracking system</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Soil/ Plant/Groundwater Conditions on Publicly Acquired SEZ Parcels</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand grazing-related BMP monitoring (Bioassessment) (B-list)</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land capability and backshore boundary challenges completed (During field season)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land capability verifications and Backshore Delineation’s completed (During field season)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Chapter 73 Grazing Amendments for Livestock Containment Facilities to APC &amp; GB</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present final SEZ maps to GB for adoption</td>
<td>7/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present IPES status report.</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Soil/SEZ Related Public Information Requests</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review IPES Program Code Provisions, develop plan for reviewing the IPES below the parcels to identify parcels that can be removed from the inventory, and assemble water quality analysis data needed to evaluate impact of possible changes to IPES Program.</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEZ Grant: Grant Administration &amp; Reporting</td>
<td>10/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEZ Grant: Grant Administration Final Reports, After end of Grant</td>
<td>1/31/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEZ Grant: Integration of Storm Water and Water Clarity Models with SEZ Planning</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEZ Grant: QA/QC for Sampling</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEZ Grant: SEZ EIP Project Evaluation and Update</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEZ Grant: SEZ Plans/Reports Reproduction for SEZ Watershed Level Evaluation, Meadow Classification, and Runoff Treatment Elements</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit IPES/Land Capability status report to GB</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Implementation of USFS land coverage removal &amp; restoration on 29 miles of roads under Travel Management Plan Deliverable</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update IPES Water Quality Scores</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 16  Air Quality Program

APPROACH  TRPA staff will develop and take the necessary steps to adopt a Regional Transportation Plan/Air Quality Plan that fulfills federal conformity requirements and supports TRPA Air Quality Thresholds. Through the Clean Cities program, TRPA staff will continue to lead the Basinwide effort to shift public and quasi-public fleets toward Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) use. This includes the infrastructure necessary and increasing the demand for CNG. TRPA staff will continue to work with University researchers who are developing an airshed model for Lake Tahoe that may suggest modifications to existing air quality thresholds. This may require data collection. TRPA staff will continue to perform data collection at the TRPA monitoring locations. The monitoring data will be discussed by the Visibility TAC as will the visibility thresholds. TRPA will provide support to the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) and administer the AQ Mitigation Funds, EPA planning grants, and any grants for the AQ program. TRPA staff will interact with AQ agencies and attend and organize meetings regarding Prescribed Burning within the Tahoe Basin. TRPA staff will interact with various air quality related technical advisory groups for development, feedback, and direction on air quality standards and thresholds.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  JA  NH

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>O&amp;D Airshed</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administer AQ Mitigation Fee</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Interagency Conformity Consultation Procedures</td>
<td>7/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Real Time Monitoring Program: Draft monitoring procedures for prescribed burns</td>
<td>4/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Real Time Monitoring Program: Maintain monitoring at TRPA Air Quality sampling site</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airshed Model Development: Administer contracts and follow-up to Airshed Scoping document</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airshed Model Development: Advance atmospheric deposition research for airshed model</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airshed Model Development: Evaluate the VMT standard as a threshold for air quality</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: CNG Long Term Market Development Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: Complete Permanent South Lake CNG fuelling site</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: Hold Clean Cities meetings</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel and Clean Cities Program: Placement of a temporary CNG facility on North Shore</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete AQP for final adoption by APC and GB</td>
<td>6/15/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete conformity determination for Tahoe Transportation Plan (RTP/AQP)</td>
<td>4/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete conformity determination for the Tahoe Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)</td>
<td>1/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Smoke Management Plan (SMP) for the Tahoe Basin</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate if seasonal visibility standards are advised</td>
<td>2/28/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and finalize FY 00/01 Air Quality Work Program</td>
<td>5/18/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare EPA grant status reports and reimbursement requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose removal of the oxygenated fuel requirements from TRPA Code to APC and GB</td>
<td>7/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise numerical standards of regional/sub-regional visibility thresholds</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update and Amend AQP portion of RTP/AQP</td>
<td>3/15/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quarterly
Work Element No. 17  Transportation Program

APPROACH Because Lake Tahoe was designated a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the Transportation Program is expanding over previous years to include more staff and responsibilities. With expanded staff, a large portion of the duties will involve administration and bringing the MPO up to speed. Along with the MPO responsibilities, a host of meetings and sub-committee meetings of various entities will be required to maintain all elements of the transportation program. Implementation of transit projects will continue to be a major focus. The Coordinated Transit System (CTS) will move closer to full implementation. The environmental documentation for the 64 Acre Transit Terminal will be completed so that implementation may proceed. Along SR 28, transit solutions will be advanced that help respond to parking and resource conflicts. Tahoe will be the location of several national transportation conferences. As funded through grants for hosting entities, TRPA staff will be coordinating and developing certain aspects of the conferences. The Tahoe Transportation Plan (previously the Regional Transportation Plan) will be developed and submitted for adoption. The TTP will be developed with the focus of the MPO responsibilities as well as those of TRPA thresholds. Other programs will include the development and implementation of bicycle projects and plans, US Postal Service Master Plans, and Project Study Reports for highway improvements. TRPA staff will also be responsible for administering the Tahoe Transportation District work program, contracts, agreements, and required meetings.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT. TRANSPORTATION

LEAD STAFF RAW STP

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>TDA Audit</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>TRB Conference</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>$260,000.00</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Regional Revenue Study</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>SR 89 Project Study Report</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>TMAs</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt 00/01 Overall Work Program</td>
<td>4/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Tahoe Transportation Plan</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and develop reports of transportation data</td>
<td>10/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve and Allocate TDA Funds</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend CA Aviation system plan TAC meetings</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete CA Aviation System Plan inventory, forecasts, financial analysis and systems requirement elements</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete ITS EDP Consultant Contract</td>
<td>1/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete SR 28 EA for parking</td>
<td>5/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete SR 89 Realignment Project Study Report</td>
<td>2/28/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 17  Transportation Program

Conduct and complete summer traffic and turning counts  9/30/99
Conduct Social Service Advisory Subcommittee Meetings  As necessary
Conduct unmet transit needs hearing  8/30/99
Coordinate 64 Acre Tract Transit Center EIS and Implementation  Monthly
Development of individual outreach program  Monthly
Draft LOS Evaluation as AQ Standard  4/30/00
Hire ITS EDP Contract Employee  8/30/99
Host for IPG annual conference  Monthly
Implement action plan elements for SR 28 CMP  Monthly
Implement plan for 1.5 K of bicycle trail at Meeks Bay to the terminus of the West Shore Bicycle Trail  Monthly
Participate as TRPA coordinator for bikeway planning  Monthly
Participate in CTS MCO  Monthly
Participate in local, regional, state, and ad hoc committees  Monthly
Participate in monthly CTS project implementation  Monthly
Perform overall support for TRPA, TMPO, TTD, TTAC  Daily
Prepare and Adopt 1999 TTIP  12/30/99
Prepare and Adopt USPS Master Plan  5/30/00
Prepare ITS EDP request for proposal  10/30/99
Prepare SR 28 Summer Service Plan  5/30/00
Prepare TRB Rural Transit Conference  Monthly
Promote/Monitor Project Implementation (US 50, Fanny Bridge, Echo Summit, KB)  Monthly
Schedule of TDA Performance Audits  9/30/99
Submit State and Federal Applications  3/30/00
Submit State and Federal Grant Status/Financial Reports  Monthly
Support aviation and waterborne planning activities  Monthly
TTD Adopt FY 00/01 Budget  6/30/00
TTD Execute and Administer CTS Subrecipient Agreement with TRPA  8/30/99
TTD Execute and Administer Lease, Management, and Service Agreements  Monthly
TTD Execute and Administer Parking Fee Agreement with USFS  7/30/99
Work Element No. 17  Transportation Program

- TTD Execute and Administer Sunnyside Parking Management Agreement  3/30/00
- TTD Hold Annual Retreat  8/30/99
- Update and Amend Tahoe Transportation Plan (Regional Transportation Plan)  3/30/00
- Update and amend the Bicycle Master Plan  6/30/00
Work Element No. 18  Recreation Program

APPROACH  TRPA staff will assist with EIP recreation project development, funding and implementation. TRPA staff will coordinate recreation user surveys with other public agencies, conduct primary research in recreation threshold data categories, and act as a Region-wide clearinghouse for survey data. TRPA staff will participate as a core member of TEAM Tahoe and TCORP. A work program and funding strategy for the Regional Recreation Plan will be developed.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  LUP  CS

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Consultant - Recreation Plan Assistance</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96 EVALUATION: B List Recreation Access Code and G&amp;P Amendments</td>
<td>10/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA NEEDS: Gather Recreation User Data from Other Regional Surveys</td>
<td>7/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTER PLANS: Prepare work program and develop funding/staffing strategy for the Recreation Master Plan</td>
<td>1/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present CTC Regional Recreation Access Signage Guidelines to APC &amp; GB</td>
<td>6/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION PLANNING ASSISTANCE: TRPA and TCORP will conduct a coordinated needs assessment of recreation users to determine use needs of recreation users and providers</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY: Compile and Publish Results</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY: Conduct Recreation User Survey</td>
<td>8/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY: Develop Recreation User Survey Instrument</td>
<td>7/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY: Select Survey Contractor and Execute Contract</td>
<td>7/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCORP - Develop 2001 Evaluation Work Program and Schedule</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCORP - Establish a subcommittee to assist TRPA as a technical committee with the Recreation Threshold for the 2001 Evaluation. Conduct Bi-monthly meetings.</td>
<td>8/30/99  Bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCORP: Participate as a member of this Recreation Working Group</td>
<td>7/30/99  Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 19  Scenic Program

APPROACH  TRPA staff will take an advocacy role in implementing EIP projects aimed at scenic threshold restoration and enhancement working with others in a partnership approach. The Scenic Quality Improvement Program will be amended in accordance with the '96 Evaluation recommendations. Provisions of the Regional Plan package regarding scenic and community design thresholds will be enhanced, including development and implementation of the Shorezone EIS mitigation measures. Annual monitoring of scenic resources will be initiated. Technical assistance will be provided to the Project Review and Environmental Compliance divisions.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  JH

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>NT Workstation/ARC View</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>TEGIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

- CODE: Amend Chapter 20, relative to coverage requirements for long driveways to preserve scenic quality  
  Due Date: 11/30/99
- CODE: Amend Chapter 22, Height, relative to allowable maximum height.  
  Due Date: 11/30/99
- CODE: Amend Chapter 26 for SLT  
  Due Date: 9/30/99
- CODE: Amend Chapter 26, Signs  
  Due Date: 12/30/99
- CODE: Amend Chapter 30, Design Standards  
  Due Date: 12/30/99
- Draft Highway Scenic Guidelines  
  Due Date: 9/30/99
- MONITORING: Conduct Annual Scenic Shoreline and Roadway Unit Inventories  
  Due Date: 10/30/99
- MONITORING: Establish Annual Photographic Monitoring Protocol and Viewpoints  
  Due Date: 9/30/99
- RECREATION: Develop Visual Inventories for Additions to Public Recreation Area Thresholds and Present to APC & GB  
  Due Date: 10/30/99
- SHOREZONE: Complete Shorezone Scenic Mitigation Program  
  Due Date: 9/30/99
- SQIP: Present Draft SQIP Update to APC/GB for adoption  
  Due Date: 11/30/99
Work Element No. 20  Vegetation Program

APPROACH  TRPA will continue its leadership role in fostering partnerships to implement forest ecosystem restoration. The Staff to continue to develop progressive forest health enhancement guidelines for substantial tree removal and urban interface lots and will be actively involved in biomass projects and prescribed burning. Interim regulatory language for late successional/old growth threshold shall be revisited in conjunction with adaptive management techniques. Staff will initiate research into forest ecosystem restoration utilizing computer models, geographic information systems, global positioning systems (GPS), remote sensing and real-time monitoring. Staff will begin work in conjunction with the Forest Health Consensus Group (FHCG) to rewrite and update the current vegetation thresholds for greater compatibility with real time monitoring (RTM). Vegetation team will review all forestry projects and issue permits for substantial tree removal and will monitor ongoing timber related projects and enforce all regulations relative to Qualified Exempt Activities, MOU projects, and permitted tree removals. Staff will initiate enforcement action on violations associated with illegal tree cutting activities on federal, state, and private lands. Staff will work with EPA, University of Nevada, Reno, and USGS to map deep water plants using side scanning sonar. Staff will assist California State Lands, California Tahoe Conservancy, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Nevada Natural Heritage Program, and California Department of Fish and Game to implement a stewardship of Tahoe yellow cress (TYC) and develop a Management Plan. Chapter 71 of the Code will be further modified to reflect an ecosystem/forest health approach to resource management and staff will continue to provide leadership to the Tahoe Re-Green, Forest Health Consensus Group, and Lake Tahoe Unified Steering Group programs.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

LEAD STAFF  KJ  SC

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Forest Ecologist</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

Amend Chapter 72 to require compliance with newer ordinances revised by LRPD for visibility and particulate matter.

Attend Lake Tahoe Unified Steering Group Meetings

Attend Project Regreen Meetings

Complete deep water plant mapping project. Contract with UNR, EPA to evaluate potential habitat sites.

Conduct Annual survey for sensitive plant species (other than TYC) at mapped and otherwise known sites.

Conduct annual survey for Tahoe yellow cress occurrences

Coordinate with USFS to update and incorporate GIS data on LSOG, pre-European conditions, fire regimes, regreen lots

Develop and implement a late successional/old growth forest enhancement program.

Develop a Tahoe Region model for potential natural vegetation and prepare a plan for achieving the desired future condition

Develop burn plan criteria to more closely reflect air quality monitoring program.

Direct Forest Health Consensus Group Meetings

Direct liaison committee on forest health to Watershed Assessment

Due Date / Frequency

Ongoing

10/1/99

10/30/99

Annually

Ongoing

Ongoing

6/30/00

1/30/00

Monthly

Ongoing
Establish prescribed burning technical advisory committee.  12/30/99
Hire Forest Ecologist to assist with GIS implementation and field GPS. Assist with threshold monitoring and changes using GIS integration with current map layers. Ongoing
Implement and Monitor Biomass Projects Ongoing
Initiate vegetation monitoring program. Ongoing
Integrate ecosystem management into Vegetation section of the Goals and Policies Ongoing
Involvement in "presidential deliverables" and reaffirmation of partnerships. Ongoing
Maintain and update 5-year list aimed at vegetation threshold attainment.  6/15/00
Monitor and permitting of LSOG removals Ongoing
Monitor and Update Vegetation Management EIP Ongoing
Monitor CDF/NDF MOU Ongoing
Monitor forest health, East Shore Ecosystem project. Ongoing
Monitor forest health, North Shore Ecosystem Project. Ongoing
Monitor Forest Service Deliverables Ongoing
Monitor ongoing forest health enhancement projects. Ongoing
Provide input on forestry, timber harvesting and natural resource management. Ongoing
Provide input on vegetation issues to Legislative Agenda Ongoing
Provide public information regarding tree removal and urban forestry questions. Ongoing
Pursue funding for LSOG Enhancement Studies Ongoing
Request grants for program implementation Ongoing
Review forest health enhancement projects. Includes all harvests, substantial tree removal, QE activity, 20 acre exemptions. Ongoing
Rewrite vegetation thresholds to reflect real time monitoring.  8/30/00
Staff involvement in public outreach and involvement in community forestry projects.  8/30/99
Training for Biomass, burning and all other forestry related meetings. Ongoing
Update maps and data base Ongoing
Update Tahoe yellow cress data base and maps  11/30/99
Utilizing the ecological unit inventory, spatially portray historic LSOG conditions.  5/30/00
Work Element No. 21  Fisheries Program

APPROACH  Staff will take a leadership role in requesting and obtaining grants for the fisheries program implementation. TRPA staff will take a strong advocacy role in implementing projects aimed at fisheries threshold attainment through a partnership approach. The lead staff will participate in the BI-state fisheries meetings and will coordinate with the other appropriate resource agencies on all fish habitat restoration projects. Staff will update the fish habitat maps (inlake/instream) periodically to reflect restoration work accomplished. These maps will be added to the GIS. Staff will also monitor the instream flow standard, once adopted. In addition, the lead staff for this work element is responsible for providing fisheries technical support and information to other staff members, agencies, and the public. The fisheries program manager is responsible for the review of all fish habitat restoration projects and activities. To assist in the facilitation of EIP projects, the fisheries program manager will provide pre-application site analysis and recommendations for restoration work in coordination with other program managers when appropriate. The fisheries program manager is responsible for bringing together and facilitating a subcommittee of the Biological Advisory Group to focus on the Fisheries Environmental Thresholds. This subcommittee will assist TRPA develop its Needs Assessment, Work Program and Schedule for the 2001 Threshold Evaluation as it pertains to the Fisheries Threshold Standards.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  CS  SR

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Develop In-stream Minimum Flow Standard</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>THRESHOLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Summer Technician/ Fish Hab. Survey</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertise, Interview and Hire Summer Fisheries Technician</td>
<td>4/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Advisory Group Meetings - Participate in the monthly BAG meetings</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate RFP for In-Stream Flow Study Contract</td>
<td>7/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Interviews and Select Consultant for In-Stream Flow Study</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop work program for summer fisheries technician</td>
<td>5/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Subcommittee of the Biological Advisory Group to start work on 2001 Threshold Evaluation</td>
<td>8/30/99  Bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Subcommittee to Develop 2001 Threshold Evaluation Needs</td>
<td>8/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries subcommittee to develop 2001 Threshold Evaluation Work Program</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-stream flow consultant contract signed and work begins</td>
<td>9/15/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of In-stream and In-Lake Fish Habitat Conditions. (This milestone task shall begin June 1 and continue through the field season. The final product, the inventory, will not be completed until mid September 2000.)</td>
<td>6/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage In-Stream Flow Contract Through Completion</td>
<td>6/30/00  Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 22  Wildlife Program

APPROACH
Staff will take a leadership role in requesting and obtaining grants for program implementation. TRPA staff will take a strong advocacy role in implementing projects and programs aimed at wildlife threshold attainment through a partnership approach. Staff will facilitate annual bird counts and will assist the USFS and CSP with bald eagle and osprey surveys. Staff will also update the special interest species maps and maintain a current listing of species of interest designated by state and federal agencies. Other activities will include providing assistance to Project Review and Compliance staff in the review of projects involving potential wildlife impacts. The wildlife program lead staff is responsible for the technical support and review of all habitat enhancement and/or restoration elements of a project. The wildlife program lead staff is responsible for the facilitation of the Tahoe Region's Biological Advisory Group (a technical advisory group that meets once a month consisting of public agency biologists and ecologists whose role as a working group is to review and make comment on current management practices and policies, improve coordination of public agency biological management activities, and to share information regarding current research activities).

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  SR CS

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Wildlife Technician for surveys</td>
<td>$7,800.00</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>ARCView Spatial Analyst Software</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
<td>TEGIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

Acquire old-growth habitat (LSOG) layers from USFS and assimilate into TRPA's GIS. Attribute LSGO layer with wildlife species associated with Sierra old growth coniferous forest.

Conduct Golden Eagle and Peregrine Falcon surveys at all threshold site and at other selected areas that may support nesting habitat.

Conduct osprey reproductive success surveys

Conduct Water-Associated bird surveys at all threshold locations.

Conduct wildlife surveys at locations identified as restoration or BMP sites to establish baseline of wildlife information.

Conduct wildlife surveys for summer 2000 (May - August). Note hours for wildlife technician (WT) are inclusive of entire summer season (May - August), year 2000.

Create a subcommittee of biologists (from BAG) for the 2001 threshold evaluation. Hold quarterly meetings starting in July 1999. Subcommittee will develop threshold needs and work program to accomplish needs.

Evaluate (in cooperation with the USFS) current control of OHV's in the Lake Tahoe basin. Determine potential OHV impacts on wildlife from a GIS perspective.

Finalize participation in the Lake Tahoe Watershed Assessment - Biological Diversity chapters.

Hire wildlife technician for threshold species surveys, summer 2000.

Map known deer migration routes and potential habitat. Finished product will be a hard copy map that displays these themes; also will be available on TRPA's GIS.

Participate and help coordinate in the Annual Lake Tahoe Ecological Forum.

Due Date / Frequency

1/30/00
9/30/99
9/30/99
9/30/99
6/30/00
9/30/99  Quarterly
5/30/00
8/30/99
5/30/00
2/28/00
4/30/00
Work Element No. 22   Wildlife Program

Participate in a bald eagle management plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. 9/30/99 Quarterly

Prepare BAG agendas and participate in meetings. 9/30/99 Monthly

Present revised regulations on snag/woody debris retention based on wildlife requirements. Create a sub-committee in the BAG to review scientific literature and provide rationale. Present findings to FHCG, APC and GB for approval. 9/30/99

Review and glean goshawk habitat variables and management recommendations from John Keane Ph.D. dissertation on goshawk habitat use in the Lake Tahoe Basin. 10/30/99

Special interest species map and database updates. Utilize survey information collected by the USFS and other agencies to update TRPA's data base and GIS. 12/30/99

Summarize results of wildlife surveys at restoration and BMP sites in a report. 11/30/99

Update USFS sensitive species list, NDOW and Cal. Fish and Game, and USFWS threatened, endangered, and species of concern list. Product will be a list available for review by all staff members. 4/30/00

Using the variables gleaned from John Keane's goshawk dissertation, create a predictive spatial model that identifies areas of potential goshawk habitat for the basin. Product will be a map that identifies areas most likely of supporting nesting goshawks. 3/30/00

Write up results of Golden Eagle and Peregrine Falcon surveys in a report. 11/30/99

Write up results of osprey surveys in a report. 12/30/99

Write up results of water-associated bird surveys in a report. 11/30/99
Work Element No. 23  Noise Program

APPROACH  Staff will review project applications, noise compliance plans, and environmental documentation for compliance with the noise thresholds. Compliance with the threshold standards for existing development will be enforced by the Environmental Compliance Division. When required, staff will monitor noise for compliance with the thresholds. TRPA Compliance Division staff will enforce the 600 foot no-wake zone. TRPA will develop a real time noise monitoring program, focusing on thresholds and major noise areas such as ski areas, shorezone, airport, and highways.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING

LEAD STAFF  GWB  JA

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

Assign Noise Program Manager  7/31/99


Enforce the 600 ft No-wake zone (see Work Element 27 for duplicate milestone regarding enforcement of Motorized Watercraft regulations)  Daily

Hold Noise working group meeting to review monitoring program  8/30/99

Implement Noise RTM Program  1/30/00

Monitor Airport Noise for Compliance with Master Plan (see Work Element 27 for duplicate milestone)  Quarterly
Work Element No. 24  Special Studies

APPROACH
Special studies will be conducted as required by the Regional Plan such as the studies required by the 1996 and 2001 Evaluations, RTP/AQP, SQIP, Watershed Assessment, Shorezone EIS, and the Water Quality Management Plan. Many of the studies are needed in preparation of the 2007 Regional Plan Update. TRPA staff will identify issues with affected agencies, complete background research and site visits, review proposals with responsible divisions and present proposals to the APC and Governing Board for action.

Studies related to specific thresholds are listed in the threshold work element or are listed in WE 11, Threshold Monitoring.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  LONG RANGE PLANNING
LEAD STAFF  GWB

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 motorized watercraft work program for MWTAG review</td>
<td>1/1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop work program for shorezone structure scenic inventory</td>
<td>9/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Shorezone EIS to GB</td>
<td>10/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present results of MWTAG 1999 summer studies to GB</td>
<td>12/1/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENIC: Complete shorezone structure scenic inventory</td>
<td>3/1/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update special studies needs list for 2001 and 2007 evaluations</td>
<td>3/1/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 25  GIS/Database

**APPROACH**

This work element addresses the functions and responsibilities of the Information Management Team (IMT). This unit provides a service to the agency and greater public in several forms. Central services include computer system operations, management, and support. This function has also begun to include other forms of technology and software including phone systems, copiers, and internet or external communications. Service demands exceed the capability of a staff of two, therefore priority has been given to core system functions that fulfill daily agency operation needs. This limitation is slowing implementation of several strategic directions namely EIP (W.E. 10), RTM (W.E. 11), and Streamlining (W.E. 8). In response, the Agency is working to build its information staffing capacity as well as system user capacity. These efforts are described below.

There are five primary areas of concentrated staff time to be made this fiscal year. First, is core system daily operations. These activities include monitoring TRPA’s computer system, including performing daily backups, allocating and monitoring disk and memory usage, printer management, system security, troubleshooting and resolving system problems. Administration of the system for these operations is very time consuming. System administration alternatives will be explored and pursued in order to acquire an additional staff person. Second, is continuing the upgrade of the computer system begun last fiscal year. This will include the installation of ARC/CAM software and Internet E-mail capability (increasing system user capacity). Software training will be provided via a federal grant from EPA. The third area involves the maintenance and streamlining of existing data entry programs in order to populate existing databases per Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinances. The fourth area involves the servicing of data requests for GIS and database information. This task also requires large amounts of staff time. A lower priority will be placed on many of these requests in order to free time for the fifth area of concentration.

The fifth and final area of concentration is related to the strategic directions upon which the agency has embarked, namely EIP, RTM, and Streamlining. In response, the requirements of Chapter 38 will be reviewed and evaluated in context to building a real time monitoring/evaluation system (RTM) and EIP update. Revisions to Chapter 38 may need to be made. The building of databases and GIS spatial layers for these efforts will be a priority (see W.E. 10 and 11). A secondary priority will be system changes relative to streamlining. Time will also be spent on evaluating data staff needs relative to the maintenance and operation of the constructed information system. An emphasis will be placed on the regional aspects of data use and analysis to be shared by multiple land management agencies.

It is expected that with the addition of a system administrator and the development of the strategic data and GIS system, more time can be spent on the implementation and maintenance of a regional system. The intent of a regional system is for use by the collaborative land management organization described in W.E. 10. It is believed to be the most cost-effective way of leveraging human and financial resources relative to data, analysis, and management decision making. During these fiscal years additional data staff will be sought to maintain and update data needs. It is assumed that with the additional staff, more time will be available to service data requests including those of the general public.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.**

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**LEAD STAFF**

CH DA

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Slide Scanner/APS Camera</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>TEGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Information Mgmt System</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>TEGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>System Upgrades</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>TEGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>TEGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>TEGIS Service Contracts</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>TEGIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

Administer computer system: backups, operations, troubleshooting, etc.

**Due Date / Frequency**

Daily
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element No. 25</th>
<th>GIS/Database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect individual kiosks to WEB with access to TRPA database</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to electronically post all Code amendments</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop WEB interactive Public Info Kiosks</td>
<td>6/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a TRPA server in addition to information posted on CERES</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS system administration: complete deeds</td>
<td>4/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS system administration: converting data to UTM zone 10</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS system administration: fulfill GIS requests</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS system administration: update assessor's data</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS system upgrade: software</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS system upgrade: training</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement an electronic permit tracking system accessible on the WEB and on public kiosks with WEB access</td>
<td>6/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPES Book Update</td>
<td>1/30/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Management: Electronic Conversion</td>
<td>12/30/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade computer system hardware and software</td>
<td>3/30/00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 26  Project Review

APPROACH  The Project Review Division will review and process all applications received. Review and processing will include receipt and review of applications for completeness; preparation of file folders; project data entry into the database; site inspections; review of plans for conformance with development standards; review of proposed water quality improvements; process transfer of development rights; review of plan revisions; verification and banking of development rights; review of commercial floor area allocations; preparation, management and review of environmental documents, including notice, circulation and consultant contract management; responding to public inquiries; writing and presenting staff summaries; issuing and finalizing permits; collecting mitigation fees; performing site assessments; and verification of land capability. All project applications will be reviewed for completeness within 30 days of receipt and all applicants will be notified if additional information is needed. Upon a determination of completeness, all project applications will be reviewed for compliance with the Code, adopted community plans, master plans, redevelopment plans, area-wide design standards, the Regional Plan, the Scenic Quality Improvement Program, 208 plan, and all other applicable regulations within 120 days from the date that the application is determined to be complete. The Division will also conduct the Shorezone Project Review Committee involving all responsible agencies with jurisdiction in a consolidated review of project proposals. In addition, the Division will process all appeals of actions on permit applications. This will include the scheduling of items to be heard, preparation of agendas and recordation of meeting minutes. The Division will also administer the residential allocation program, including distributing and tracking allocations to the local jurisdictions and notice and conduct the annual drawing for parcels below the IFES line (see work element 9). The Division will also administer the Commercial and Tourist Special Project Allocation system. The Division will be responsible for administration and implementation of the Hearings Officer program. The Division will also operate the front counter and be responsible for the creation and revision of application forms and application information packets.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  PROJECT REVIEW

LEAD STAFF

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Small project contracts</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Equipment replacements/upgrades</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

Administer contract for small projects.  Ongoing
Administer Special Allocation Programs.  As necessary
Annual report to Governing Board on performance statistics of the Division  7/23/99
Coordinate with State Historic Preservation Officers to develop an Improved prehistoric and historic project review program, update data base and Regional Historic Maps.  As necessary
Develop permissible use matrix for public use at the future self-help station.  9/15/99
Hold bi-monthly Hearings Officer Public Meetings  As necessary
Hold Joint Hearings Officer/Zoning Administrator/City Council Hearings  As necessary
Hold monthly Interagency Shorezone Committee Meetings  Monthly
Issue annual residential allocations.  Annually
Project Review Div. Intern Program  Annually
Work Element No. 26  Project Review

Review & write permit for West Upper Truckee SEZ Restoration Project 4/30/00  Ongoing
Review project applications.  Ongoing
Review qualified exempt applications for compliance with Agency requirements.  Ongoing
Track 30/120 day deadlines and report to Governing Board.  Monthly
Track commercial and residential allocations.  Ongoing
Train and implement Douglas County/TRPA joint planner agreement.  Ongoing
Update public information packets  Ongoing
Work Element No. 27  Environmental Compliance

**APPROACH**  
The Compliance Division will conduct pre-grade or pre-construction inspections for all approved projects to ensure compliance with all permit conditions. Staff will conduct intermediate inspections of public service, erosion control, redevelopment, and commercial projects during construction to identify and resolve problems. Final inspections will be conducted to determine if the project has been constructed as approved and to release the project security. The division will also complete the analysis for the compliance criteria for the IPES line movement. Staff will perform field review for determination of "emergency" for issuance of emergency permits, and process all requests for exceptions to the seasonal grading limitations. The Environmental Compliance Division will resolve major violations in accordance with the applicable TRPA regulations, utilizing informal contacts, correction notices, cease and desist orders, notices of violation, settlements, show cause hearings before the Governing Board and/or litigation. Work with the Nevada and California Departments of Transportation in the development of assigned sections of the Tahoe Basin Roadway Design Guidelines and Operations and Maintenance Procedures. Receive reports of hazardous materials discharges. Staff will assist state water quality agencies with sewage spill investigations and remediation, and remediation of soil or groundwater contamination sites in accordance with MOUs. Staff will log reports and track reported sewage discharges, toxic material releases, and known soil or groundwater contamination sites. Staff will mark hazardous trees and issue hazard tree removal permits as needed. Staff will monitor implementation of airport and ski area master plans, and redevelopment project special conditions.

Marine Program: Staff will enforce the provisions of the motorized watercraft regulations. As the program is implemented, TRPA will seek legislation in California to allow local jurisdictions to enforce the regulations.
Marine Team staff will enforce all regulations relative to the shorezone areas of the Region.

**RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.**  
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

**LEAD STAFF**  
MS  SC

**RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Boat Mooring</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
<td>MOTORIZED WATERCRAFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MILESTONES**

- Complete field inspections and tracking for final conformance with conditions of approval and return of security within 30 days of date requested (estimated 440)  
  - Due Date / Frequency: Ongoing
- Complete intermediate and winterization field inspections and tracking for all active construction projects (estimate 440)  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 11/15/99
- Complete security return inspections for 10% of the backlog of older securities (posted 3 or more years ago) - approximately 160 inspections  
  - Due Date / Frequency: Ongoing
- Coordinate with Cal. DMV and NV NDOW for up to date registered boat owners names and addresses  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 7/30/99
- Develop "Green" Service Stations Awards Program  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 3/15/00
- Develop and implement public education program  
  - Due Date / Frequency: Ongoing
- Develop data base for California and Nevada registered boat owners  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 7/30/99
- Develop Marine procedures manual  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 8/1/99
- Develop program for upgrading marine sewage pumpout systems  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 6/30/99
- Develop streamlined fining procedure for civil citations  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 8/30/99
- Hire staff for Motorized Watercraft program  
  - Due Date / Frequency: 7/30/99
Work Element No. 27  Environmental Compliance

Implement No Wake Zone  Ongoing
Implement tributary restrictions  Ongoing
Implement two cycle engine restrictions.  Ongoing
Inspect and permit removal of hazardous trees on residential properties  As necessary

Inventory existing TRPA shorezone permits and verify implementation of mitigations. Where needed, bring projects into conformance with approvals.  6/30/00
Inventory marine sewage pumpout systems in the Region  10/30/99
Inventory private and commercial buoys on Lakes in the Region  6/30/99
Inventory watercraft Concessionaires for compliance  Ongoing
Investigate and resolve shorezone violations  Ongoing
Investigate complaints alleging immediate and significant threat to environment or threshold attainment  Daily
Issue seasonal grading exceptions  As necessary

Maintain patrol vessels  Ongoing

Monitor and track compliance inspection and follow-up requirements for billing for inspection fees for Implementation of Stateline Erosion Control Project  Quarterly
Monitor compliance with CSLT airport master plan and as required by TRPA permit  10/27/99

Prepare report for compliance criteria element of IPES line movement report  11/30/99
Prepare spreadsheet for tracking and compliance of units of use transfers and allocations for CSLT Redevelopment Project 1  8/30/99

Process warnings and citations  Ongoing

Report to Governing Board on highway deicing activities  1/26/00

Resolve major violations through notice of violation, negotiated settlement agreements, or judicial remedies pursuant to Article IX of the Rules of Procedures  Ongoing
Respond to and coordinate mitigation efforts on hazardous or toxic substance releases  As necessary

Schedule and complete pre-grade/pre-construction field inspections and tracking for approximately 660 project approvals  Ongoing

Tahoe Basin Interagency Roadways Winter Operations technical advisory committee meeting and coordination  Quarterly

Track sewer spills and coordinate with NDEP and LRWQCB on mitigation and remedies  As necessary
Work Element No. 28  Long Term Project Operations & Maintenance

APPROACH
TRPA will develop a long term project maintenance program. The program will consist of planning and implementation phases. The planning phase entails developing a framework to create, track, and implement maintenance programs for all types of activities and projects. This includes everything from coordinated transit to sediment basin cleaning. The planning phase also involves identification of long-term funding sources to support the Long Term maintenance program. Emphasis will be on developing a program to monitor and maintain BMP effectiveness for all projects, with a focus on water quality. The planning phase will be coordinated with the BMP retrofit program to track and monitor the non-point discharges related to erosion control, SEZ restoration, BMP retrofits, and other water quality-related projects and activities.

The implementation phases will involve coordination, monitoring and tracking of the maintenance and functionality of the projects and activities. At the onset, efforts will focus on the BMP retrofit, erosion control, SEZ restoration, water quality, soil conservation, and NPDES-related activities and projects. TRPA staff will continue to coordinate efforts of the Basin's sewer agencies in evaluating their infrastructure and seeking financial assistance for a regional sewer line rehabilitation to prevent discharges.

TRPA will continue implementation of the BMP retrofit program for small dischargers and provide public outreach information, field assessments, certificate letters, and tracking of compliance procedures. This program requires augmented grant funding to properly implement and substantial assistance from the local governments, the Resource Conservation Districts, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Lahontan, and the Environmental Protection Agency. TRPA will continue to seek grant funding under Section 319(h) of the Federal Clean Water Program to support the BMP Retrofit Program.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION/DEPT.  ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

LEAD STAFF  DS  BMP3

RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Laptop for Field BMP Permits</td>
<td>$5,050.00</td>
<td>319 CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MILESTONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMP Retrofit Program: Administer 319(h) grants, quarterly reports, invoicing, budgets, scheduling of staff</th>
<th>Due Date / Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Administer Contract with RCDs and Supervise RCD program; also, coordinate related work with other cooperating Agencies</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Conduct Community BMP Presentations</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Conduct Private Parcel BMP Evaluations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Coordinate, Issue &amp; Track Permitting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Develop framework for BMP Media Campaign</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Establish and Publish BMP information packets.</td>
<td>10/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Establish Field Permitting Procedures</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Inspect and Issue Certificates of Completion for BMP Retrofits</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Integrate BMP Data with TEGIS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Spatially Analyze BMP Data with GIS</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Retrofit Program: Update BMP Display Board</td>
<td>12/31/99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Element No. 28  Long Term Project Operations & Maintenance

BMP Retrofit Program: Write Final 319(h) report to Lahontan for grant in FY 98-99 12/31/99

Long Term Project O & M Program: Conduct Stakeholders' Meetings to coordinate work program elements and ensure non-duplicative efforts Quarterly

Long Term Project O & M Program: Coordinate O & M aspects of upcoming WQ/BMP/Erosion Control activities Ongoing

Long Term Project O & M Program: Coordinate with Lahontan and NDEP on Contaminated Groundwater remediation activities Ongoing

Long Term Project O & M Program: Develop Priority Lists for BMP/WQ Projects and Activities 3/30/00

Long Term Project O & M Program: Develop System to track maintenance and monitoring requirements of BMP Effectiveness on New and Retrofit projects 12/31/99

Long Term Project O & M Program: Draft and Manage EPA 104(b)(3) contract 12/31/99

Long Term Project O & M Program: Identify Action Plan with Stakeholders Meeting 10/31/99

Long Term Project O & M Program: Identify Responsible Parties to Review and Revise Standard and Special Conditions of Approval as appropriate 12/31/99

Long Term Project O & M Program: Identify Stakeholders necessary to participate in quarterly meetings for coordination and development of the O & M work program 9/30/99

Long Term Project O & M Program: Maintain Copies of Tahoe Basin Interagency (TBI) Subcommittee meeting minutes 12/31/99

Long Term Project O & M Program: Review and Track required BMP/WQ monitoring records to ensure BMP Effectiveness for permitted activities Ongoing

Long Term Project O & M Program: Review Standard Attachments for conformance with applicable provisions and ordinances 2/28/00

Long Term Project O & M Program: Revise Standard Attachments and Draft Special Permit Conditions as appropriate 4/30/00

Long Term Project O & M Program: Update, Review and Maintain records of contaminated groundwater investigations and remediation activities Ongoing

Regional Sewerline Rehabilitation: Coordinate sewer agency meetings and incorporate assessment study with EPA and US Army Corps of Engineers Quarterly
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

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

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

B. RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL PLAN

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

II. MISSION AND VALUE STATEMENTS

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

The TRPA Governing Board has adopted the following mission statement:

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

In addition, the TRPA Governing Board adopted a core policy statement which sets out the Agency's guiding principles, consistent with the Compact (see Figure 1).

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

TRPA is a leading partner for plans and actions to preserve the environment of the Tahoe Region, including the Regional Plan and the Environmental Improvement Program. TRPA advocates action; acts as a regional resource center; uses innovative planning techniques and approaches; and networks with local, regional, state, and national groups to facilitate a cooperative approach in implementing these plans and programs.

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

TRPA is primarily an environmental agency, but recognizes the interdependence of environmental, economic, and social values in the Tahoe Region.
Statement of Mission

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

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 purposes.

Source: TRPA Goals and Policies, 1996
TRPA exists to serve the public. Given the unique values of the Tahoe Region, TRPA's constituency extends beyond our geographic boundaries. TRPA can't please everyone, but can make every effort to be reasonable and responsive.

TRPA believes in streamlining the Regional Plan and Agency operations, focusing on the highest priority tasks, concentrating on results, and improving effectiveness and efficiency. TRPA is also committed to finding ways to more effectively interact with and serve those agencies and institutions with which we have cooperative agreements.

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

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

III. ORGANIZATION

To carry out its mission, TRPA is organized into the following nine functional areas: Long Range Planning, Project Review, Environmental Compliance, Environmental Improvement, Transportation, Management Support, Finance, Environmental Education, and Legal. The Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director supervises the staff and are responsible for all decision-making delegated to the staff by the Governing Board. Agency Counsel advises both the staff and the Governing Board. The Advisory Planning Commission reviews planning matters and makes recommendations to the Governing Board.

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

- MPO Conformity Task Force
- Transportation/Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee
- Water Quality Monitoring Committee
- Visibility Monitoring Committee
- Forest Health Consensus Group
- Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) working group
- Stream Environment Zone Restoration Committee
- Shorezone Partnership Consensus Committee
- Lake Tahoe Regional Biological Advisory Group

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

- Bi-State Fisheries Committee
- California Stormwater Management Task Force
- Erosion Control Task Force
- Highway Deicing Steering Group
- Lake Tahoe Unified Steering Group for Forest Assessment and Protection
- Nevada Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee
- Nevada Statewide Transit Advisory Committee
Shorezone Project Review Committee (PRC)
South Lake Tahoe ADA Advisory Committee
South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce
Tahoe Coalition of Recreation Providers (TCORP)
Tahoe-Douglas Chamber of Commerce
Tahoe East Area Management Team (TEAM Tahoe)
Tahoe Landscape
Tahoe Transportation District and Technical Advisory Committee
Tahoe-Truckee Regional Economic Coalition (TTREC)
Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association (TNT-TMA)
South Shore Transportation Management Association (SS-TMA)
Waste Not (Incline Village)
Environmental Improvement Program Implementation Committee (EIPIC)
Coordinated Transit System (CTS)
California Transportation Commission Rural Counties Task Force
Tahoe Water Quality/Transportation Coalition
Gold Country Transportation Alliance
Lake Tahoe Watershed Assessment Group
Water Quality Working Group

IV. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

A. SETTING

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

Located between the Carson Range on the east and the Sierra Nevada on the west, the Tahoe Region straddles the California-Nevada state line (see Figure 2). About two-thirds of the Region is in California. The total land area is over 207,000 acres, with about 85 percent in public ownership.

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

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

During the gold and silver boom and the western migration of European settlers in the 1800s, almost the entire Region was logged to obtain timber and fuel for the Comstock mines. Today, the forests of the Region are extremely unhealthy, partly because of the clear-cutting of that era and the fir-dominated forest that came back after the logging.
For many years after the turn of the century, the Tahoe Region served a small number of residents and tourists; access was difficult. Most development and urbanization of the Region occurred after the Squaw Valley winter Olympics in 1960. Since that time, the population of the Region has increased over five times, with about 80 percent of the population residing in California.

Today, the year-round resident population is about 54,550. Peak summer day population, including day-use visitors, is about 300,000. There are about 20 developed towns and communities. The City of South Lake Tahoe is the only incorporated city. The Region is home to approximately 29,500 single-family homes; 16,000 multi-family units; 12,000 tourist accommodation units; 2,115 campground units; and about 6.2 million square feet of commercial floor area. Casino gaming areas are located at the north and south stateline areas, and in Incline Village. Approximately 85 percent of the Region is publicly owned. Outdoor recreation use of the Region is extensive.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL TRENDS

Long-term environmental trend data provide insight into both the challenges facing the Tahoe Region and the effectiveness of environmental control programs. As of 1996, only two of the seven environmental thresholds are considered to be “in attainment.” The remaining five water quality thresholds monitored are in “non-attainment.” Trends towards or away from attainment are mixed (see Table 1). The following paragraphs discuss some of the most critical trend information:

Since 1968, algal productivity has increased over 300 percent, and water clarity has decreased 30 percent, with over one foot per year of transparency lost. In 1968, downward visibility through Lake Tahoe’s water extended over 100 feet. Today, on average, one’s ability to see through the water extends only 70 feet.

Algal productivity and water clarity are two of seven water quality environmental thresholds monitored by TRPA to measure trends in the conditions of water quality over time. Waters of the shallow areas of the Lake show increasing rates of algal productivity, especially near developed areas. Disturbed tributaries, and stormwater runoff typically do not attain state discharge standards for total nitrogen, total phosphorus, and total iron. Groundwater monitoring data is currently limited. Existing data shows that groundwater nutrient concentrations exceed that of Lake Tahoe water. Since groundwater nutrients generally originate from land-surface sources with only minor contributions from aquifers, trends in groundwater quality somewhat parallel tributary and runoff trends. Water quality of other lakes in California generally meet state standards. Spooner Lake meets Nevada standards, however, Marlette Lake exceeds some Nevada standards. Under undisturbed conditions, Lake Tahoe’s ecological system would be in balance and relatively stable. In the past, changes in water quality occurred very gradually and were imperceptible by man. Currently, more nutrients, primarily nitrogen and phosphorus, flow into Lake Tahoe, then exit the Lake. The nutrient budget of the Lake is unbalanced.

Lake Tahoe is experiencing a phenomenon known as cultural eutrophication, which is the Lake’s response to accelerated inputs of nutrients to the Lake due to development of the Tahoe Region. Impervious land coverage, land disturbance, and atmospheric deposition are typical products of development which have impacted the Lake’s nutrient budget. Correcting the Lake’s imbalanced nutrient budget is a difficult task since Lake
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. AIR QUALITY</td>
<td>AQ-1 CO</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-2 O_</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-3 Particulate</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-4 Visibility</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-5 U.S. 50 Traffic Volume</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-6 Wood Smoke</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-7 VMT</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AQ-8 Atmospheric Nutrient Loading</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. WATER QUALITY/SOIL CONSERVATION</td>
<td>WQ-1 Turbidity (Shallow)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WQ-2 Clarity, Winter</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WQ-3 Phytoplankton PFr</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WQ-4 Tributary Water Quality</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WQ-5 Runoff Water Quality</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WQ-6 Groundwater</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WQ-7 Other Lakes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC-1 Impervious Coverage</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC-2 Naturally-Functioning SEZ</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. VEGETATION</td>
<td>V-1 Relative Abundance and Pattern</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-2 Uncommon Plant Communities</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-3 Sensitive Vegetation</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. FISHERIES</td>
<td>F-1 Lake Habitat</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-2 Stream Habitat</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-3 In-Stream Flows</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. WILDLIFE</td>
<td>W-1 Special Interest Species</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W-2 Habitats of Special Significance</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. SCENIC RESOURCES</td>
<td>SR-1 Travel Route Ratings</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-2 Scenic Quality Ratings</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-3 Public Recreation Area Scenic Quality Ratings</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-4 Community Design</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. NOISE</td>
<td>N-1 Single Event (Aircraft)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-2 Single Event (Other)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-3 Community Noise</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. RECREATION</td>
<td>R-1 High Quality Recreational Experience</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-2 Capacity Available to the General Public</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tahoe does not benefit from the flushing action of runoff that benefits other water bodies such as Fallen Leaf Lake. A drop of water resides in Fallen Leaf Lake approximately 8 years. Described as "residence time," the entire volume of water in Fallen Leaf Lake exchanges, or is completely flushed, approximately every 8 years. In contrast, Lake Tahoe has a remarkable residence time of 700 years. As a result, the Lake behaves like a sink without a drain. Removal of additional inputs such as nutrients is nearly impossible. Therefore, controlling the sources of nutrients is paramount to reversing trends towards degradation of Lake Tahoe’s water quality. In addition to a nutrient budget imbalance, water clarity may be greatly impacted by the accumulation of colloid size particulate matter (mineral suspensoids) in Lake waters. These particles efficiently scatter light, resulting in clarity loss.

Researchers at the University of California, Davis, have indicated that the Lake’s water quality imbalances must be corrected within the next 8 years, if current negative trends are to be reversed. In order to accomplish this, it is imperative that the existing condition of the Region be more accurately assessed, that systems be developed to more quickly measure responses to management actions designed to protect water quality, and that approaches be developed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of management actions proposed to improve the Region’s environmental conditions.

Previously, a portion of the Tahoe Region was designated as a federal non-attainment area for carbon monoxide (CO). A "hot spot" near the Stateline, California monitoring station exists, and in the past often showed periods of non-attainment for the Federal 8-hour CO standard (9.0 parts per million). In recent years, this trend has been improving, and current data shows attainment with the federal standards. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) applied for redesignation of the Tahoe area to attainment status, because three years of data (1993-1995) showed no exceedences of the federal standard. U.S. EPA has approved the redesignation plan, so the Tahoe Region is now considered in attainment of the Threshold. In addition to meeting the federal CO standard, CO data for 1995 indicated only one 8-hour concentration exceeding the TRPA and California 6.0 ppm standard, which is considered attainment of the Threshold.

1996 data showed no exceedences of the 6.0 ppm standard. The federal standard has not been exceeded since 1992, and the state and TRPA standards have not been exceeded since 1994. The improvement in CO concentrations is due primarily to a cleaner vehicle fleet, as well as the use of oxygenated fuels within the Tahoe Region, and throughout California.

The Region does not regularly attain state and TRPA ozone standards. There has been no apparent trend in ozone concentrations at the three monitoring sites in the Region since 1980. 1996 data showed no exceedences of any of the standards, however, the first and second high were at the 0.08 ppm TRPA standard. 1995 data showed a high of 0.09 ppm, which exceeds the TRPA standard. Peak ozone concentrations have hovered at or just above TRPA’s 1-hour standard. Scientific evidence indicates long-range transport of ozone into the Region may be occurring.

CARB and the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP) have air quality monitoring stations throughout the Tahoe Region. TRPA relies on data from many of these stations for pollutants such as carbon monoxide, ozone, oxides of nitrogen, and particulate matter (PM10).
Data for particulate matter (PM 10) indicates that the California 24-hour standard is being exceeded. The first and second highs for PM 10 for 1995 and 1996 exceed the 50 micrograms per cubic meter California standard. All of the federal standards are being met, as well as the California geometric mean standard.

TRPA administers a monitoring program for particulates, visibility and atmospheric deposition. There are two main monitoring sites maintained by TRPA within the Tahoe Region. Data from these sites is showing that visibility has stayed fairly constant over the past six years, but may not be meeting the Threshold. The fine particulate samplers at these sites reveal that the main causative factors in degradation of visual range are wood smoke and airborne dust.

In 1982, TRPA adopted an air quality and water quality threshold standard calling for a reduction in vehicle-miles-of-travel (VMT) of 10 percent from the 1981 peak summer day value. TRPA estimates that VMT has increased 5 percent in the Region, from 1.65 million miles in 1981 to 1.74 million miles in 1995. The current estimate for 2016 is 2.25 million miles per day. Surveys reveal that a large proportion of visitors and residents consider traffic congestion to be one of Tahoe’s biggest problems, yet traffic volumes are increasing. Population growth outside the Tahoe Region, with attendant increases in day-use traffic within the Region, is an important factor influencing VMT.

As stated elsewhere in this Strategic Plan, TRPA recognizes a relationship between environmental conditions and economic conditions. As the drafters of the bi-state compact recognized, the quality of the environment is the Region’s biggest economic asset. In addition, unstable or declining economic conditions make environmental protection and enhancement more difficult than they already are.

The 1996 Threshold Evaluation concluded that the Region’s economic base is still not well understood. Additional study should be devoted to understanding the economic needs of both visitors and residents. The current business mix in the Tahoe Region has never been adequately assessed to determine if the Region is optimizing services for both residents and visitors. Total economic activity in the Region has not been estimated and the economic multiplier associated with visitation has not been adequately determined.

The Tahoe Region is in the stability phase of market growth in a destination resort. Future economic expansions will require a better Tahoe “product.” Dampeners on visitation include a lack of high quality visitor accommodations, strip development, sprawl, uncoordinated recreation opportunities, and traffic congestion. The redevelopment projects on the South Shore represent an important step in redefining the Tahoe Region visitor experience.

C. TRPA HISTORY

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

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

Extensive amendments to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact in 1980 (P.L. 96-551) rectified the problem created by the voting procedures and directed TRPA to adopt environmental threshold carrying capacities ("environmental thresholds" or "thresholds") to protect the values of the Region, and to amend the Regional Plan to attain and maintain the thresholds. TRPA adopted a comprehensive set of thresholds on August 26, 1982. In 1984, TRPA amended the Regional Plan, but was immediately sued by the people of the state of California and the League to Save Lake Tahoe, on the grounds that the plan was incomplete, the EIS was flawed, and the plan did not comply with the Compact. After a two-day hearing, a federal district judge enjoined TRPA from implementing the 1984 plan, and TRPA initiated efforts to settle the litigation.

When initial settlement negotiations failed in 1985, TRPA convened the Consensus Building Workshop to attempt to find a consensus set of policies which would have broad support throughout the Region. The Consensus Building Workshop was a success—resulting in settlement of the litigation—and TRPA adopted amended Regional Plan Goals and Policies, a land use plan, and a code of ordinances in 1986 and 1987. This Regional Plan package, with amendments, is in place today.

In 1992 and 1996, TRPA completed its first and second comprehensive five-year evaluations of the thresholds and the Regional Plan and made amendments to the Plan in response to the evaluations.

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

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

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

- **1990**  
  Defense of Regional Plan package in Kelly v. TRPA

- **1991**  
  Five-Year Threshold Evaluation Report issued

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

- **1993**  
  Meyers and Douglas County Community Plans adopted  
  Lowering of IPES line in Douglas and Washoe counties
1994 Tahoe City and Stateline-Ski Run Community Plans adopted Nevada legislature conducts interim study of TRPA Kelly. TRPA litigation resolved

1995 Delegation agreements for residential project review were implemented in all local jurisdictions in California

1996 Placer and Washoe County Northshore Community Plans adopted Bijou-Al Tahoe Community Plan adopted

1997 Five-Year Threshold Evaluation Report issued Presidential Forum on Lake Tahoe Environmental Issues held

1998 Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) adopted Coordinated Transit System agreement signed

1999 Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) created Suitum v. TRPA and NMMA v. TRPA litigation resolved

From the point of view of administration and management, TRPA has changed significantly in recent years. After the settlement of litigation in 1987, TRPA experienced a period of high project backlogs, heavy overall workload, large commitments of overtime, and complex policies and procedures. Today, after significant streamlining, clarification of procedures, and office automation, the backlog of applications is much smaller, and overtime balances are dramatically lower. TRPA has an internal system of strategic planning, work programming, and control, which contributes to improved focus and accountability. Nevertheless, insufficient funding for TRPA’s baseline operations as a result of previous budget cuts in California and Nevada have constrained production.

TRPA has stressed the development of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with other units of government and entities such as utility districts to identify exempt activities and delegate project application review to willing units of local government. TRPA has now entered into four residential review delegation MOUs and 24 exempt activity MOUs. Because of these agreements, the number of applications received by TRPA has been reduced in recent years. However, TRPA has seen an increase in the scale and complexity of the average application submitted. Recent project applications include several major redevelopment projects and large scale master plans and associated environmental documents. In addition, the need to monitor, train and assist the local jurisdictions in the implementation of the MOUs has been time consuming. TRPA has reorganized its staff to provide a local assistance unit within the Project Review Division to meet this need.

The results of the 1996 Threshold Evaluation has caused a change in TRPA’s strategic approach in achieving threshold goals by placing a greater emphasis on remedial environmental improvement programs, while at the same time maintaining and improving the current regulatory structure. Given that the current regulatory structure has reached a level of maturity, the Agency is now in a position to place an increased emphasis on implementing environmental improvement projects aimed at threshold attainment. This change in approach has been an evolutionary progression that stems from both the maturity of the public process and debate which has shaped policy in the Lake Tahoe Region over the last twenty-eight years, and the public funding situation.
which has impacted all levels of government functions over the last five years. The Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), which is being developed in response to this shift in approach includes capital improvement projects, programs, special studies, and regulations designed to collectively attain the environmental thresholds. This proactive approach requires a continuation of regional and local partnership efforts, the creation of efficient and effective management systems, the creation of long-term funding sources, and updating of the current regional policy evaluation and communication framework. Fortunately, many aspects of the EIP are underway, including the partnerships. TRPA has also stressed environmental education, working to reach out to the public for their participation in and cooperation with TRPA's mission. Through participation in the Tahoe-Truckee Regional Economic Coalition (TTREC), TRPA has promoted the concept of environmental-economic synergism. That is, the idea that a healthy environment and a vital economy can do more than co-exist, and can actually enhance each other.

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

In recent years, several significant legal cases have been resolved by judicial action in TRPA's favor or by settlement, including litigation involving constitutional challenges to the Regional Plan. In order to maintain legal expenses within budget, additional funding from California and Nevada will be necessary. TRPA's compliance program focuses on major violations of the Compact and the Regional Plan.

The TRPA operating budget in FY 1992-93 was $3.5 million, and about $3.3 million in FY 1993-94. In FY 1994-95 the TRPA budget decreased to $3.1 million, and in FY 1995-96 the budget increased to $3.4 million due to the receipt of additional grant funding. The budget for FY 1996-97 remained at approximately $3.4 million, while the FY 97-98 budget increased to approximately $4.3 million due to the receipt of special state and federal grant funding. The budget for FY 98-99 increased to approximately 4.7 million; again due to special grant funding. Although TRPA's budget has increased overall in recent years due to special grant funding, this funding is for special projects only, and does not provide the additional funding that is necessary for the Agency's baseline operations. TRPA has experienced reductions in State funding for baseline operations in previous years due primarily to budget constraints in California. The continuation of these baseline funding reductions have caused problems in service delivery, and deferral of certain planning and environmental improvement activities. In order to rectify this problem, TRPA has requested restoration of adequate baseline funding from the two states in the FY 1999-00 budget request cycle, as well as pursued increases in project application fees and other service fees in an attempt to fully recover the Agency's cost for providing these services. Based on our request to the two states, it is anticipated that the Agency budget for FY 1999-00 will be approximately $5.3 million.

In prior years the prolonged drought caused alteration of many of TRPA's activities and required a significant diversion of resources to forest health issues. The local economy was also affected by the drought and the economic recession in California. TRPA has undertaken a significant effort to work with local government officials and business leaders to reposition the Regional economy to compete in the destination resort tourism
business. The sluggish local economy has tended to reduce the pressure for additional commercial and tourist development. Recent upturns in the California economy have renewed interest in commercial development in the Region and has strengthened economic-environmental interaction and cooperation.

V. PROBLEM ASSESSMENT:

A. What's Going Well With TRPA?

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

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

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

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

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

In FY 95-96, the Nevada Legislative Committee to Continue Review of the TRPA made over 20 recommendations that resulted in numerous legislative bills and resolutions targeted at assisting TRPA in attaining the environmental thresholds. Included in this legislation was a $20 million bond for erosion control, which was approved by the Nevada voters in FY 96-97.

In the area of streamlining and delegation, TRPA has successfully reduced its project-review backlog and increased its efficiency. In addition, in accordance with the recommendations contained in the performance audit conducted by the California State Auditor in FY 96-97, TRPA has adopted a 120-day project permit turnaround requirement for all complete project applications. As a part of TRPA's streamlining program, a consultant contract is underway to review all of the regulatory programs in the Region (local, state and federal), and to make recommendations on conforming the
various regulations and to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the current multi-agency project review process. TRPA has continued to develop agreements with other public agencies, bringing the total number of residential review delegation MOUs to four, and the total number of exempt activity MOUs to 24. TRPA continues to carry out its extensive project review and compliance functions, issuing over 1100 permits and inspecting over 2700 active projects in a typical year.

In FY 96-97 the California State Auditor’s office conducted a performance audit of TRPA’s permitting and regulatory operations. The audit concluded that the Agency’s current approach to regulatory streamlining and its emphasis on the Environmental Improvement Program is appropriate to the Agency’s mission and is consistent with the overall audit recommendations. In addition, TRPA was successful in developing, implementing and obtaining funding for a Coordinated Transit System (CTS) through a partnership approach to provide improved transit facilities and operations in South Lake Tahoe. Also, through the assistance of its many partners, TRPA was successful in arranging for a Presidential Forum for the purpose of addressing the environmental and economic issues at Lake Tahoe. Both President Clinton and Vice President Gore, as well as several Cabinet members were present at the Forum held in July 1997 at Lake Tahoe.

In FY 97-98 TRPA adopted the Environmental Improvement Program, which identifies all of the known required capital improvement projects, regulatory adjustments and special studies that are necessary to achieve and maintain the environmental thresholds. The program operates like a traditional capital improvement program, and will be updated on a regular basis.

TRPA annually updates its Strategic Plan and Program of Work, and follows up regularly on the Program of Work to ensure that important deadlines are met and milestones are reached.

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

At current baseline funding levels, TRPA is unable to accomplish the workload and fully carryout TRPA’s mission without cutbacks in service delivery, and without environmental impacts from delays in key planning efforts and enforcement of regional plan violations. Funding for TRPA’s baseline operations has not kept pace with inflation and has actually been reduced in previous budget years. In addition, due to recent legal challenges to the Regional Plan, legal defense costs have exceeded the funding levels appropriated by the two states. The funding level for TRPA legal expenses has not been increased since 1984. The budget requests to the two states for FY 99-00, however, include a significant increase in funding for general operations and legal expenses. It has been requested that this increased funding be considered as our baseline budget for next year.

The Regional Plan package, particularly the Code, could be further simplified, to take into account day-to-day experience with implementation. Many persons feel that the Plan is too detail-oriented, lacks flexibility, is too complex, and contains conflicting policies and rules. Together, these concerns create a shift in TRPA’s focus away from truly regional issues. TRPA must also revise the Plan on an ongoing basis to take into account changing conditions in the Region.
TRPA's physical plant lacks adequate storage, particularly for project records, which are voluminous and would benefit from the application of CD ROM or similar records management technology. In addition, the amount of office space, the number of computer workstations, and telephone capabilities are not adequate to fully meet the Agency's needs. In FY 99-00 TRPA will be expanding its leased office space to allow for added personnel and other space needs under the terms of the existing lease. The current lease expires in April 2003. TRPA will need to reassess its long-term office space needs during the next few years, including the possibility of purchasing its own building.

Despite improvements, image problems still exist for TRPA, making TRPA's already challenging job more difficult. Items which contribute to image problems are: the complexity of the Regional Plan and the Code; and residual resentment in the local community over past debates and decisions. Also, since TRPA is often on the cutting edge of planning and regulatory developments, it is sometimes difficult to "sell" the public on new plans, programs, and regulations. TRPA must strengthen its public affairs function in order to adequately inform and receive feedback from the public regarding a wide variety of issues. Several issue areas require comprehensive, ongoing public outreach efforts to increase and maintain public awareness and understanding. These issues include: regulatory streamlining and conformity; creation of strong partnerships to facilitate EIP funding mechanisms; new regulatory requirements, such as the 1999 phase-out of carburetted two-stroke watercraft engines; and other issues as they arise.

Although the EIP moves us much closer, TRPA still needs to more clearly communicate its vision of the future in areas such as recreation, transportation, SEZ restoration, and scenic quality improvements.

Finally, many persons have been dissatisfied with the pace of implementation of erosion control projects, SEZ restoration, IPES, and mass transit improvements. Water quality in Lake Tahoe continues to deteriorate, despite the efforts of all the agencies involved in its protection.

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

On the positive side of the ledger, there is a growing personal, local, regional, state, and national awareness of the need for environmental protection and preservation. As a result, voluntary coalitions and partnerships have emerged within the Tahoe Region to create positive environmental change. To some degree, this change is reflected in improved legislative perceptions of TRPA and in the interest of the federal, California and Nevada congressional delegations in the environment of the Tahoe Region.

Legislative actions external to the Tahoe Region, such as the federal transportation act, the federal clean air and clean water acts, creation of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, and the California statutes creating the California Tahoe Conservancy also have a positive impact on TRPA. The development of a common federal legislative agenda with other involved agencies and organizations in the Tahoe Basin has proven to be most effective in promoting increased federal funding for environmental improvement programs. TRPA has had over 10 years of experience with the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES). In FY 96-97, TRPA moved the IPES line, consistent with the Regional Plan, in Douglas and Washoe Counties for the fourth consecutive year. TRPA did not move the
IPES line in FY 97-98, since all of the required findings could not be made. In FY 98-99 the IPES line was moved again in Douglas and Washoe Counties. However, the line has not yet moved in El Dorado or Placer Counties, generally due to the inability to meet the parcel retirement findings. There is a need to accelerate the parcel acquisition programs, particularly in California.

TRPA’s twenty year Regional Plan is due for a major update by 2007. To accomplish this, TRPA will need to address threshold non-attainment, new scientific data, maintenance and implementation of environmental improvements, and changing socio-economic conditions. In preparation for this update, TRPA is currently developing real time monitoring programs for all thresholds and developing analysis models to evaluate the monitoring data. TRPA’s focus will be on building a scientific data base to evaluate the Regional Plan, to further refine the EIP, and to develop the collaborative process that will provide the basis for a supportable comprehensive plan for 2007 and beyond. TRPA plans to make needed threshold, plan and program revisions beginning in 2001 to assure threshold attainment beyond 2007.

The local, state and federal support resulting from the Presidential Forum, the national economic recovery coupled with local interest in revitalization and redevelopment, and an emerging transportation plan, are also positive factors.

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

VI. STRATEGIC PLAN DIRECTION

TRPA’s overall goal, established in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, is to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds and applicable state, federal, and local air and water quality standards. In support of this goal, TRPA has established the strategic plan direction outlined below.

The Program of Work for FY 99-00 is a separate document from this strategic plan. It includes detailed descriptions of 28 separate work elements, covering approaches, specific objectives (milestones), and resources aimed at achieving the following goals:

- Implement the Regional Plan and carry out all other Agency responsibilities as required by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and other state and federal mandates

  - Implementing the Regional Plan and carrying out the responsibilities required by the Compact and other state and federal mandates will continue to be a high priority for the Agency.

  - A Real Time Management Program will be implemented to provide program development, direction, coordination, and assistance to guide the threshold evaluation process. Programs will be more responsive, eliminating the need for a major budget request for the 2001 threshold evaluation.
• A great deal of time and funding has been invested in evaluating the environmental impacts related to motorized watercraft. The Agency will develop public education and enforcement strategies and pursue all necessary funding and legislation that may be required to fully enforce the new standards.

• Regional Plan updates for the 208 Water Quality Plan, Recreation Plan, Community Plans, and the Scenic Quality Improvement Program will be completed prior to the 2001 Threshold Evaluation. The Regional Plan will also be amended to include new Shorezone regulations through the Shorezone EIS process. These planning actions will be a precursor to a major update of the Environmental Thresholds and the Regional Plan, which is scheduled for 2002-2007.

• TRPA’s transportation and air quality planning efforts, as required by the Compact, will be integrated with the operational authority of the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and the planning and programming requirements of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). The primary objective will be the implementation of transportation and air quality projects through the preparation and adoption of plans and programs such as the RTP-AQP and the RTIP.

☐ Achieve additional physical improvements in the built and natural environments through restoration, rehabilitation, and redevelopment, in an effort to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds

• On the ground implementation of Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects is vitally important to attaining and maintaining the environmental thresholds. EIP implementation needs will be supported throughout the Agency.

• The EIP is a dynamic program and is a top priority of the Agency. It is the focus and summary of implementation measures for threshold attainment. Actions of TRPA relating to the EIP will have a direct or indirect positive effect on the ground. A clear definition of EIP project objectives, measures of success, and a project selection process will be developed.

• The development and implementation of a long-term EIP project maintenance and operations plan will be a top priority for TRPA.

☐ Establish and implement a coordinated program through public and private partnerships to prioritize and secure funding requests for environmental improvements, program implementation, and agency operations.

• The Agency will actively pursue increased baseline funding to support the Agency’s base operations and responsibilities, to maintain staff salaries and benefits at a level comparable to those of other local and state agencies in the Region, and to adequately respond to legal challenges to the Regional Plan.
- All Agency staff must be educated to ensure understanding and support of the EIP as our approach to meeting threshold attainment. As such, all program managers will be evaluated based on their effectiveness in pursuing implementation of the EIP relative to their threshold responsibilities. An appropriate evaluation mechanism will be developed. All staff will use a collaborative approach in implementing the EIP and in resolving potential conflicts between thresholds.

- The resource needs for EIP and threshold planning and implementation will be supported and developed consistent with the Agency's budget and work program requirements, including consideration of administrative support and public outreach needs. The EIP Coordinator and threshold program managers will work together to pursue funding for each threshold program.

- A finance plan coordinator position will be pursued to develop and coordinate the Agency's financial strategies and plans.

Streamline the Regional Plan and Agency operations in an effort to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

- The Agency will continue to delegate or pursue alternative permit review strategies for residential, small commercial and other activities considered appropriate for local jurisdiction responsibility. Careful consideration will be given to the level of threshold-related environmental risks resulting from this process. TRPA will maintain and support a Local Assistance Unit (LAU) within the Agency to serve as a resource to local government in the delegation of project review activities.

- A Permit Integration Program (PiP) action plan to achieve regional regulatory conformity has been developed. The long-term implementation of the PiP will be a high priority of the entire Agency and sufficient staff resources will be dedicated to insure the success of the program.

- The Agency will continue to make adjustments and modifications in its activities and operations in order to improve overall efficiency and effectiveness. The Agency will develop and implement an action plan to specifically address the following priority issues: 1) provide consistency and fairness in the implementation of personnel procedures and policies, i.e., provide human resource position, 2) develop a work program that balances workload demands with the available staff and budget resources in order to ensure quality products and accomplishment of priority objectives, 3) provide adequate accountability systems for all staff relative to job performance, 4) provide a comparable staff salary and benefit package as compared to other agencies in the Region, and 5) develop systems to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Management Team.

- The 30/120 day requirement for reviewing all applications submitted to the Agency is a top priority for the entire Agency.
• There is an ongoing need to aggressively continue upgrading the Agency's computer system and support technology, including staff resources and training, in order to meet the threshold goals and to maximize the Agency's efficiency and effectiveness. The Agency will continue to actively pursue funding to support this need.

□ Build public understanding and support for the TRPA mission.

• The Agency's public outreach and education strategy shall focus on building public understanding and support for the TRPA mission, shall be responsive to the public, and shall be actively implemented and supported by all staff.

• All Agency programs, activities and grants shall incorporate public outreach and education functions and funding as appropriate and when consistent with the Agency's public outreach and education strategy.