Regional Plan Update Chapters

The following chapters are intended to replace existing materials in your RPUC Binder:

- Land Use – dated 02/29/2012. Replace pages II-2 to II-27
- Community Design – dated 02/22/2012. Replace pages II-40 and II-41
- Noise – dated 02/29/2012. Replace pages II-42 to II-45
- Air Quality – dated 02/22/2102. Replace pages II-50 and II-51
- Transportation – dated 02/29/2012. Replace pages III-5 and III-6
- Scenic – dated 02/29/2012. Replace pages IV-25 to IV-27
- SEZ – dated 02/29/2012. Replace pages IV-29 to IV-32
- Implementation – dated 02/29/2012. Insert after the Implementation tab in your RPUC binder.
CHAPTER II
LAND USE ELEMENT

Article V(c)(1) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact calls for a "land use plan for the integrated arrangement and general location and extent of, and the criteria and standards for, the uses of land, water, air, space and other natural resources within the Region, including but not limited to indication or allocation of maximum densities and permitted uses."

In general, the Land Use Element sets forth the fundamental land use philosophies of the Regional Plan, including: the direction of development to the most suitable locations within the Region; maintenance of the environmental, economic, social, and physical, and economic well-being of the Region; and coordination of the Regional Plan with local, state, and federal requirements.

The Land Use Element includes the following Subelements: Land Use, Housing, Community Design, Noise, Natural Hazards, Air Quality, and Water Quality, and community design.
LAND USE

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact calls for development of a Regional Plan that establishes a balance, or equilibrium, between the natural environment and the manmade environment. The TRPA has established environmental threshold carrying capacities that define the capacity of the natural environment and set specific environmental performance standards related to land use. The thresholds, however, do not define the maximum buildout populations, densities, permitted uses, or other land use criteria for the manmade environment; this is the function of the Regional Plan.

It is the intent of this subelement to establish land use goals and policies that will ensure the desired equilibrium and attain and maintain the environmental thresholds within a specific time schedule.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (7-0) supported Goal LU-1 and Policies LU-1.1 through LU-1.3 on November 2, 2011.

GOAL LU-1

RESTORE, MAINTAIN, AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE LAKE TAHOE REGION FOR THE VISITORS AND RESIDENTS OF THE REGION.

Lake Tahoe is a unique natural resource in a spectacular natural setting. It is truly one of the natural treasures of the United States. The long-term economic and natural health of the Region depends on the maintenance of this unusual quality. While previous land use planning efforts have concentrated on regulating the quantity of permitted development, this Plan emphasizes an improvement in the quality of development in the Region and in the quality of the natural environment.

POLICIES

LU-1.1. THE PRIMARY FUNCTION OF THE REGION SHALL BE AS A MOUNTAIN RECREATION AREA WITH OUTSTANDING SCENIC AND NATURAL VALUES.

The economic health of the Region depends on a viable tourist and recreation-oriented environment. It is not the intent of this Regional Plan, among other things, to encourage other economic development that enhances these values, such as industry or non-service commercial facilities, at the expense of outdoor recreation in the Tahoe Region.

LU-1.2. THE REGIONAL PLAN GIVES A HIGH PRIORITY TO CORRECTING PAST DEFICIENCIES IN LAND USE. THE PLAN SHALL ENCOURAGE A REDIRECTION STRATEGY FOR SUBSTANTIALLY AND ADVERSELY ALTERED AREAS, WHEREVER FEASIBLE REDEVELOPING EXISTING TOWN CENTERS IS A HIGH PRIORITY.

Many of the Region's environmental problems can be traced to past and existing development which often occurred without recognition of the sensitivity of the area's natural resources.

A redirection strategy provides for to correct this environmentally beneficial redevelopment programs as well as for and rehabilitation of identified Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District is a priority developed areas in need of improvement.
LU-1.3. THE PLAN SHALL SEEK TO MAINTAIN A BALANCE BETWEEN ECONOMIC/SOCIAL HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Goal LU-2 on November 16, 2011.

GOAL LU-2

DIRECT THE AMOUNT AND LOCATION OF NEW LAND USES IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES AND THE OTHER GOALS OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT.

Based on the findings of the Compact, evidence included in the environmental impact statement prepared for this Plan, and public testimony, the Tahoe Region is experiencing resource use problems and deficient environmental controls.

POLICIES

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported the deletion of Policy LU-2.1 on November 16, 2011.

LU-2.1. THE TOTAL POPULATION PERMITTED IN THE REGION AT ONE TIME SHALL BE A FUNCTION OF THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES.

Population growth in the Region will be guided by the limitations on land use set forth in the Plan. This Plan identifies land-use, densities, traffic volumes, urban boundaries, and other factors that indirectly determine the population at any given time. All of these factors have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds.

*Note: Relocated and amended from LU Goal #2, Policy 5 and unanimously (6-0) supported by the RPU Committee on November 16, 2011:

LU-2.2 THE REGIONAL PLAN AREA STATEMENTS, COMMUNITY PLANS, OR OTHER SPECIFIC PLANS—ADOPTED BY THE AGENCY SHALL SPECIFY THE TOTAL ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT WHICH MAY BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE REGION, NOT TO EXCEED THE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH BELOW, IN A, B, C, AND D, BELOW. RECONSTRUCTION AND RELOCATION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT ARE NOT CONSIDERED ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT. (SEE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES SUBELEMENT FOR GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS.)

The Environmental Impact Statement prepared for this Plan analyzed impacts based on defined development parameters which are integrated into this Plan. It is the intent of this Policy to insure that these parameters are incorporated, both individually and cumulatively, into the Land Use Element. These limitations shall be expressed in appropriate land use regulations, such as zoning, use limitations, floor area limitations, allocation limits and other such regulations. For the purposes of this Plan, the development—regulated development is categorized as residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, recreation, public service, and resource management.

Residential: Each undeveloped legal parcel existing on August 17, 1986 at the time of the adoption of this plan (estimated at approximately 16,000), unless otherwise restricted, has a development right of one residential unit, except where additional development rights are acquired pursuant to Goal #2, of the development and Implementation Element, priorities, or acquired pursuant to Goal #3, of the development
The total number of multi-residential additional units permitted shall not exceed 1400 additional units. (See Goals #2 and #3 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement for more detail.)

The status of development rights that existed on August 17, 1986 is outlined in the table below (as of November 30, 2011):

**Note:** Statistics will be updated upon adoption of the 2012 Regional Plan Update.

### Development Rights Inventory (as of November 30, 2011)

| Residences Developed before 1987 | 37,701 |
| Total Development Rights in 1987 | 18,688 |
| Development Rights Retired 1987-2011 | 8,512 |
| Development Rights Developed or Allocated to Jurisdictions 1987-2011 | 6,085 |
| **Total Development Rights Remaining** | **4,091** |
| Remaining on Buildable Parcels | 2,791 |
| Remaining on Marginal Parcels | 765 |
| Remaining on Unbuildable Parcels | 535 |

**Tourist Accommodation:** There is a limited need for additional tourist accommodation units. Based on demonstrated need, projects may be permitted additional units as specified within a community plan or an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan and as provided for in Goal #3 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement. The total number of additional tourist accommodation units shall not exceed 400 units. (See Goals #2 and #3 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement for more detail.)

**Commercial:** The amount of additional commercial development is based on the estimated needs of the region. Commercial development may be permitted as specified in plan area statements, community plans, or other specific plans, or an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan. The total additional gross commercial floor area permitted shall not exceed 800,000 sq. ft., excluding minor expansion, for the first 20 years of this plan. (See Goal #2 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement for more detail.)

**Recreation:** Additional recreation uses may be permitted only as specified within plan area statements, community plans, or other specific plans, or an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan. The total capacity of additional outdoor recreational facilities for the region shall not exceed 6,114 persons at one time (PAOTs) for overnight facilities, 6,761 PAOTs for summer day use facilities, and 12,400 PAOTs for winter day use facilities. (See Recreation Element for more detail.)
Public Service: Additional public service development shall be limited to those projects needed to serve the other development permitted by this plan. (See Public Service Element)

Resource Management: Resource Management activities pertaining to the utilization, management, or conservation of natural resources shall be limited to those activities that are consistent with policies of this plan and of other adopted plans.

2. SPECIFIC LAND USE POLICIES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE USE OF PLANNING AREA STATEMENTS FOR EACH OF THE PLANNING AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE MAP INCLUDED IN THIS PLAN (LOCATED INSIDE BACK COVER). AREAS OF SIMILAR USE AND CHARACTER HAVE BEEN MAPPED AND CATEGORIZED WITHIN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS: CONSERVATION, RECREATION, RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE, AND TOURIST. THESE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS SHALL DICTATE ALLOWABLE LAND USES. MORE DETAILED PLANS, CALLED COMMUNITY PLANS, MAY BE DEVELOPED FOR DESIGNATED COMMERCIAL AREAS. OTHER DETAILED PLANS, SUCH AS THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, SKI AREA MASTER PLANS, AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANS, MAY ALSO BE DEVELOPED. THESE DETAILED PLANS MAY COMBINE TWO OR MORE OF THE FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS.

Since the development permitted under this Plan is generally limited to the existing urban boundaries in which uses have already been established, the concept of this land use plan is directed toward regulating in fill and redirection. The intent of this system is to provide flexibility when dealing with existing uses, continuation of acceptable land use patterns, and redirection of unacceptable land use patterns. Implementation ordinances set forth the detailed management criteria and allowed uses for each land use classification.

Conservation areas are non-urban areas with value as primitive or natural areas, with strong environmental limitations on use, and with a potential for dispersed recreation or low-intensity resource management. Conservation areas include: (1) public lands already set aside for this purpose, (2) high-hazard lands, stream environment zones, and other fragile areas, without substantial existing improvements, (3) isolated areas which do not contain the necessary infrastructure for development, (4) areas capable of sustaining only passive recreation or non-intensive agriculture, and (5) areas suitable for low-to-moderate resource management.

Recreation areas are non-urban areas with good potential for developed outdoor recreation, park use, or concentrated recreation. Lands which this Plan identifies as recreation areas include: (1) areas of existing private and public recreation use, (2) designated local, state, and federal recreation areas, (3) areas without overriding environmental constraints on resource management or recreational purposes, and (4) areas with unique recreational resources which may service public needs, such as beaches and ski areas.

Residential areas are urban areas having potential to provide housing for the residents of the Region. In addition, the purpose of this classification is to identify density patterns related to both the physical and manmade characteristics of the land and to allow accessory and non-residential uses that complement the residential neighborhood. These lands include: (1) areas now developed for residential purposes; (2) areas of moderate-to-good land capability; (3) areas within urban boundaries and serviced by utilities; and (4) areas of centralized location in close proximity to commercial services and public facilities.
Commercial and Public Service areas are urban areas that have been designated to provide commercial and public services to the Region or have the potential to provide future commercial and public services. The purpose of this classification is to concentrate such services for public convenience, separate incompatible uses, and allow other noncommercial uses if they are compatible with the purpose of this classification and other goals of this Plan. These lands include: (1) areas now developed for commercial or public service uses; (2) in the case of public services, lands designated for, or in, public ownership; (3) areas suitable to encourage the concentration of compatible services; (4) areas of good-to-moderate land capability; and (5) areas with adequate public services and transportation linkages.

Tourist areas are urban areas that have the potential to provide intensive tourist accommodations and services or intensive recreation. This land use classification also includes areas recognized by the Compact as suitable for gaming. These lands include: (1) areas now developed with high concentrations of visitor accommodations and related uses; (2) lands on which gaming is a permitted and recognized use; (3) lands of good-to-moderate land capability; and (4) areas with adequate public services and transportation linkages.

*Note: Replaced by policies in Goal LU-4. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported the deletion of former Policy 3 and 4 on December 6, 2011:*

3. THE PLANNING AREA STATEMENTS SHALL ALSO IDENTIFY THE MANAGEMENT THEME FOR EACH PLANNING AREA BY DESIGNATING EACH AREA FOR (1) MAXIMUM REGULATION, (2) DEVELOPMENT WITH MITIGATION, OR (3) REDIRECTION OF DEVELOPMENT. THESE DESIGNATIONS SHALL PROVIDE ADDITIONAL POLICY DIRECTION FOR REGULATING LAND USE.

The maximum regulation designation applies primarily to conservation areas. Areas with this designation shall be strictly regulated to ensure preservation and enhancement of the existing environment, with little or no additional development of residential, commercial, tourist, recreation, or public service uses.

The development with mitigation designation is the predominant management theme. Most areas of existing residential or recreational use carry this designation. Areas with this designation can accommodate additional development if the impacts are fully mitigated and the land is capable of withstanding the use. Both on-site and off-site mitigation of environmental impacts from development shall be required.

The redirection of development designation is designed primarily to improve environmental quality and community character by changing the direction of development or density through relocation of facilities, rehabilitation or restoration of existing structures and uses, and limited new development. The purpose of this designation is to reduce impervious coverage, restore natural environments, improve the efficiency of transportation systems, improve scenic quality, and provide high-quality facilities for residents and visitors alike. Local government participation in redevelopment of appropriate areas shall be encouraged.

4. THE PLANNING AREA STATEMENTS SET FORTH SPECIAL POLICY DIRECTION TO RESPOND TO THE PARTICULAR NEEDS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF A SPECIFIC AREA. EACH PLANNING AREA STATEMENT MAY VARY IN DETAIL OR SPECIFICITY DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF THE AREA AND THE DETAIL OR SPECIFICITY OF RELATED LOCAL JURISDICTION PLANS.

This policy allows the Regional Plan to respond to the individual needs of a particular neighborhood, undeveloped area, or other area. Each planning area statement describes...
the area, its existing uses and environment, its special problems, its minimum and maximum intensity of uses, density of land use permitted, and policies for allowed, prohibited, non-conforming, and special uses.

The foregoing requirements shall be depicted on Plan Area Statement Maps, which shall designate areas available for development according to the various land use classifications. Areas depicted on these maps shall reflect a reasonable projection of the amount of land available for the specific uses allowed in that area for the life of the Plan. The Plan Area Statement Maps shall be coordinated with other TRPA maps to permit ready determination of the constraints on development and the location of other relevant information including:

- Stream Environment Zones (SEZs)
- SEZ Restoration Programs
- Capital Improvement Programs
- Stream Habitat Quality
- Historical Sites
- Public Facilities Development Programs
- Wildlife Habitat
- Special, Sensitive, and Uncommon Plants
- Fish Habitat
- Transportation Corridors
- Special Interest Species Areas
- Land Capability
- Sending and Receiving Areas for Transfer of Development Rights

*Note: Relocated and amended to Policy LU-2.2. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported the relocation and modification of former Policy 5 language on December 6, 2011:

5. ALL PLAN AREA STATEMENTS, COMMUNITY PLANS, OR OTHER SPECIFIC PLANS ADOPTED BY THE AGENCY SHALL SPECIFY THE TOTAL ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT WHICH MAY BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE REGION, NOT TO EXCEED THE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN A, B, C, D, AND E, BELOW. RECONSTRUCTION AND RELOCATION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT ARE NOT CONSIDERED ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT. (SEE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES SUBELEMENT FOR GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS.)

The Environmental Impact Statement prepared for this Plan analyzed impacts based on defined development parameters which are integrated into this Plan. It is the intent of this Policy to insure that these parameters are incorporated, both individually and cumulatively, into the Land Use Element. These limitations shall be expressed in appropriate land use regulations, such as zoning, use limitations, floor area limitations, allocation limits and other such regulations. For the purposes of this Plan, the development regulated is categorized as residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, recreation, public service, and resource management.

Residential: Each undeveloped legal parcel existing at the time of the adoption of this plan (estimated at approximately 16,000), unless otherwise restricted, has a development right of one residential unit, except where additional development rights are acquired pursuant to Goal #2, of the development and implementation priorities, or...
acquired pursuant to Goal #3, of the development and implementation priorities subelement. The total number of multi-residential additional units permitted shall not exceed 1400 additional units.\footnote{Amended 10/25/06} \footnote{Amended 4/24/02}\cite{goals2a} (See Goals #2 and #3 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement for more detail.)

Tourist Accommodation: There is a limited need for additional tourist accommodation units. Based on demonstrated need, projects may be permitted additional units as specified within a community plan and as provided for in Goal #3, of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement. The total number of additional tourist accommodation units shall not exceed 400 units.\footnote{Amended 10/25/06} \footnote{Amended 4/24/02}\cite{goals2a} (See Goals #2 and #3 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement for more detail.)

Commercial: The amount of additional commercial development is based on the estimated needs of the region. Commercial development may be permitted as specified in plan area statements, community plans, or other specific plans. The total additional gross commercial floor area permitted shall not exceed 800,000 sq. ft., \textit{excluding} minor expansion, for the first 20 years of this plan. \cite{goals2} (See Goal #2 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement for more detail.)

Recreation: Additional recreation uses may be permitted only as specified within plan area statements, community plans or other specific plans. The total capacity of additional outdoor recreational facilities for the region shall not exceed 6,114 persons at one time (PAOTs) for overnight facilities, 6,761 PAOTs for summer day use facilities, and 12,400 PAOTs for winter day use facilities. \cite{goals2} (See Recreation Element for more detail.)

Public Service: Additional public service development shall be limited to those projects needed to serve the other development permitted by this plan. \cite{goals2} (See Public Service Element.)

\textit{*Note: Replaced by policies in Goal LU-4. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported the deletion of former Policy 6 on December 6, 2011:}

6. \textit{IN ORDER TO BE RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES OF VARIOUS AREAS WITHIN THE REGION, SPECIFIC COMMUNITY PLANS (CPs) MAY BE DEVELOPED FOR DESIGNATED COMMERCIAL AREAS. COMMUNITY PLANS SHALL GUIDE DEVELOPMENT IN SPECIFIED AREAS FOR AT LEAST THE FIRST TEN YEARS OF THE PLAN AND SHALL BE KEPT CURRENT BY PERIODIC REVIEW. THE TRPA SHALL ACTIVELY ENCOURAGE PROMPT DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANS FOR ALL DESIGNATED AREAS, WITH A GOAL OF COMPLETING THE COMMUNITY PLANS BY DECEMBER 1, 1989. THE AREAS DESIGNATED SHALL BE THOSE WHERE COMMERCIAL USE IS CONCENTRATED OR SHOULD BE CONCENTRATED, THEY SHALL BE AREAS SERVED, OR EASILY SERVED, BY TRANSIT SYSTEMS, WHICH HAVE ADEQUATE HIGHWAY ACCESS, WHICH HAVE, OR CAN HAVE, HOUSING IN THE VICINITY AVAILABLE FOR EMPLOYEES WORKING IN THE AREA, AND WHICH OTHERWISE QUALIFY AS AREAS SUITABLE FOR CONTINUED OR INCREASED LEVELS OF COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY. SOME AREAS, BECAUSE OF THEIR EXISTING AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS, MAY INCORPORATE MORE THAN COMMERCIAL USE CLASSIFICATIONS.}

A. Areas eligible for community plans are shown on the map located inside the back
B. Plan Area Statement Maps shall show preliminary boundaries for the community plans, as well as the hydrologic boundaries within which certain land coverage transfer programs can occur.

C. Ordinances shall establish standards that apply to community plans. Some standards may be replaced by specific provisions of adopted community plans if such specific provisions are more appropriate to the situation and provide equal or superior measures to satisfy the environmental thresholds. If none are set in community plans, the regional standards shall apply.

Standards which may be replaced include:
1. parking requirements;
2. sign rules;
3. snow storage provisions;
4. landscaping requirements, other than erosion control requirements;
5. scenic design standards; and
6. density rules.

Standards not subject to replacement by community plans include:
1. land coverage; and

D. Ordinances shall establish other requirements to be met by community plans such as:

1. fair share of public recreation facilities;
2. provisions for reducing vehicle miles traveled;
3. targets for reducing existing coverage;
4. Provisions for the allocation of development; and
5. Assurance for the implementation of CP environmental improvement projects.

E. Components of a community plan shall include:

1. assessment of needs, opportunities, limitations, and existing features;
2. statement of goals and objectives for the area;
3. maps, showing final boundaries, land uses permitted on specific parcels, and other relevant information; and
4. an integrated plan addressing land use, transportation, traffic circulation, parking, public service, housing (including affordable), recreation, allocation procedures, commitments for environmental improvement projects, special features or standards, CP implementation, consistency with the applicable plan area statements, coordination with monitoring, and other requirements of the Regional Plan.

F. Community plans shall set forth a schedule showing how development is to be
coordinated with public projects, including water quality improvements, transportation improvements, and other remedial projects, so that attainment of the applicable goals and standards is achieved.

G. The process for developing community plans shall follow the methods outlined below:

1. In consultation with local governments and the community, the Agency shall set the priorities for development of the community plans.

2. The process for each CP shall begin as a result of a local government request, or by Agency initiative in recognition of local interest.

3. In partnership with one another, TRPA, local government, and the community shall assess the feasibility of undertaking the CP process. If the process is found to be feasible, recommendations shall be made concerning plan boundaries, time schedules, applicable standards required to be met, fair share of public recreation facilities, provisions for reducing vehicle miles traveled, targets for reducing existing coverage, preliminary estimates of commercial floor area needs, and environmental documentation requirements.

4. The Agency shall review and approve, at its discretion, the community planning process proposed pursuant to (3) above. Also, based on the above recommendations, a preliminary allocation for additional commercial floor area from the amount allocated by TRPA to that jurisdiction shall be made. (See Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement Goal #2, Policy 4.)

5. A planning team, representing TRPA, local government, and the community, shall develop each community plan according to the following process:
   a) assessment of environmental opportunities and limitations;
   b) inventory and needs assessment;
   c) identification of applicable standards and constraints;
   d) development of draft alternative plans;
   e) environmental analysis and documentation (see (9) below); and
   f) selection of recommended alternative.

To the extent possible, consistent with available resources and community initiative, TRPA shall take a primary, active role in assisting development of community plans. To help ensure that proposed CPs meet all applicable local, state, and TRPA requirements, TRPA shall seek review and comment from all responsible public agencies at appropriate points in the CP planning process. It is the Agency’s goal that each proposed community plan, when presented to TRPA for approval, will have addressed the needs and concerns of the community and will be consistent with all applicable local, state, and regional requirements.

6. Following completion of the above steps, the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission shall review the recommendations from the planning team and make a recommendation to the Governing Board.
7. TRPA must approve a community plan before it can take effect. Prior to such approval, TRPA shall determine compliance with: required standards, allocations of development limitations, and phasing of development with associated programs, such as remedial programs.

As part of the approval, TRPA shall establish the allocation of additional commercial floor area for the period ending December 31, 1996. TRPA shall make the initial allocation of additional commercial floor area taking into consideration such factors as demonstrated need, the expected ability to achieve or maintain environmental thresholds, the reasonableness of projected time schedules, the degree of certainty for obtaining the needed funds for implementation, compatibility with other CPs and plans, and other relevant factors. The amount initially allocated shall be from the 75 percent portion designated for local jurisdictions for planning purposes. (See Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Goal #2, Policy 4.)

8. As soon as TRPA has reviewed a sufficient number of proposed community plans, to adequately assess the cumulative impacts of development and proposed mitigation, TRPA shall distribute the remainder of the 25 percent of the additional commercial floor area. This distribution shall reward those CPs which best demonstrate the ability to achieve and maintain environmental thresholds, and have a clearly demonstrated need for the additional allocation. TRPA shall retain a sufficient reserve to adequately address the needs of CPs not yet presented for review. However, it is the Agency’s goal, acting in partnership with local interests, to achieve completion of CPs by December 31, 1989 in all areas where sufficient local interest and initiative exists to do such planning. Accordingly, TRPA anticipates the allocation of the remaining unallocated floor area by that date, so long as the allocation is supported by local needs assessments.

9. Before a community plan may be approved, TRPA must certify an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the community plan, except as noted in (10) below. (In California, where the CP is to be adopted as a general plan amendment or a specific plan, a joint EIS/EIR may be utilized.) The EIS may be useful for meeting subsequent environmental documentation requirements for more specific projects consistent with the community plan.

10. Simpler and more streamlined procedures for CPs with insignificant impacts may be provided for in the implementing ordinances. These procedures may allow preparation of appropriate environmental analysis and documentation other than an EIS. §

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-2.3 and 2.4 on December 6, 2011.

LU-2.37. NO NEW DIVISIONS OF LAND SHALL BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE REGION WHICH WOULD CREATE NEW DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL INCONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THIS PLAN.

This policy does not consider the following divisions of land to be inconsistent when the
result does not increase the development potential permitted by this Plan:

A. Division of land for the purposes of conveying a portion thereof to a governmental agency, public entity, or public utility.

B. Division of land for the purposes of creating cemetery lots.

C. Division of land ordered by a federal or state court of competent jurisdiction as a result of bona fide, adversary legal proceedings to which the Agency is a party. Any such division of land or approval of any other project or action resulting from such legal proceedings, shall be pursuant to an evaluation of the effect of such division or approval upon the Regional Plan, the environmental thresholds, and other requirements of the Compact. Based on the above evaluation, appropriate adjustments to the Regional Plan shall be made.

D. A modification to an existing subdivision or a lot line adjustment or lot consolidation, which does not result in any increase in development potential, or in present or potential land coverage or density, and shall not have an adverse impact upon the health, safety, general welfare or environment of the Region.

E. Conversion of an existing structure, to a stock cooperative, community apartment, condominium, or any other form of divided interest; which conversion does not result in any increase in development potential, or in present or potential land coverage or density, and will not have an adverse impact upon the health, safety, general welfare or environment of the Region.

F. Redivision, adjustment, or consolidation, of parcels within an existing urban area, as part of a TRPA approved redevelopment plan that does not increase development potential basin-wide.

G. Division of land through condominiums, community apartments, or stock cooperatives within an existing urban area in conjunction with the approval of a project associated with an approved transfer of development, or otherwise in accordance with the provisions of this Plan. In order to subdivide a project under this provision, the project itself shall be approved prior to the approval of the division and in no case shall the division result in a greater amount, a different location, or a greater rate of development than otherwise permitted by this Plan.

LU-2.48. BUILDINGS, WHETHER CONFORMING OR NONCONFORMING, WHICH ARE DAMAGED OR DESTROYED BY FIRE OR OTHER SIMILAR CALAMITY, MAY BE REPAIRED OR REBUILT WITH NO REQUIREMENT FOR REDUCTION IN COVERAGE OR HEIGHT BY WAY OF FEE OR OTHERWISE. THIS POLICY APPLIES ONLY IF THE BUILDING IS RECONSTRUCTED IN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE WITH THE ORIGINAL STRUCTURE AND, WITH NO INCREASE IN FLOOR AREA, LAND COVERAGE, HEIGHT, OR VOLUME. OTHER PROVISIONS GENERALLY APPLICABLE TO REHABILITATION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS SHALL APPLY. THIS POLICY IS SUBJECT TO THE NATURAL HAZARDS SUBELEMENT, GOAL #1, POLICY 1. SPECIAL PROVISIONS SHALL APPLY TO BUILDINGS IN THE SHOREZONE, LAKEWARD OF THE HIGHWATER LINE.

Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to support Land Use Policy LU-2.6 on December 13, 2011.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to LU-2.5 and LU-2.6 on February 1, 2012.

LU-2.59. STRUCTURES, LEGALLY EXISTING AS OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS PLAN, BUT
WHICH, BY VIRTUE OF THEIR DESIGN OR LOCATION, ARE PROHIBITED, ARE CONSIDERED NONCONFORMING AND SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING POLICIES:

A. Nonconforming structures may be maintained or repaired. Maintenance and repair shall be defined in implementing ordinances.

B. Nonconforming structures may not be enlarged, replaced, or rebuilt without the approval of TRPA. Such approval shall occur through direct TRPA review, through the conformance review process for Area Plans, or through Memoranda of Understanding with applicable governments and shall be based on criteria set forth in implementing ordinances to ensure that:

i. the activity shall not increase the extent of nonconformity; and

ii. if the structure is subject to a specific program of removal or modification by TRPA, the activity shall not conflict with that program.

LU-2.6 USES, LEGALLY EXISTING AS OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE THIS PLAN, BUT WHICH ARE NOW PROHIBITED, ARE CONSIDERED NONCONFORMING AND SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING POLICIES:

A. Nonconforming uses may continue as they exist except where specifically subject to a program of removal or modification.

B. Nonconforming uses may not be modified, expanded, or intensified, nor resumed following a significant interruption without the approval of TRPA. Such approval shall occur through direct TRPA review, through the conformance review process for Area Plans, or through Memoranda of Understanding with applicable governments and shall be based on criteria set forth in ordinances to ensure that:

i. the activity shall not increase the extent of nonconformity.

ii. the activity shall not make it more difficult to attain and maintain environmental threshold carrying capacities.

iii. the use is otherwise consistent with applicable Plan Area Statements and Community Plans.

C. Additional rules regarding excess land coverage are set forth in this land use subelement Goal #3, Policy 3.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-2.7 and 2.8 on December 6, 2011.

LU-2.7 USES OF THE BODIES OF WATER WITHIN THE REGION SHALL BE LIMITED TO OUTDOOR WATER-DEPENDENT USES REQUIRED TO SATISFY THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THIS PLAN.

This policy is intended to promote the use of waters of the Region for water-dependent outdoor recreation and to protect the scenic and natural qualities of such waters. Plan area statements shall detail the specific policies.

LU-2.8 RESTORATION AND REHABILITATION SHALL BE A HIGH PRIORITY FOR IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER OF AREAS DESIGNATED FOR REDIRECTION BUT NOT INCLUDED IN A REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.

The Regional Plan calls for improvement of environmental quality and community character in redirection areas by the private sector through restoration and rehabilitation. Implementation of rehabilitation and restoration strategies shall be by ordinance.
Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to support the deletion of Land Use policies LU-2.9 and LU-2.16 and to add modified language to LU-2 Implementation Measures on December 13, 2011.

**LU-2.013** REDEVELOPMENT SHALL BE ENCOURAGED IN AREAS DESIGNATED FOR RELOCATION AND REDEVELOPMENT TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER.

The Regional Plan calls for improvement of environmental quality and community character through relocation and redevelopment of existing structures and uses in blighted areas. Existing predominantly urbanized areas with high levels of impervious coverage and disturbance may be designated for redevelopment. The purpose of redevelopment is to make more efficient use of existing development, improve environmental quality, improve the efficiency of transportation systems, provide high quality facilities to residents and visitors, improve the economy, and improve the general safety, health and welfare of the people of the Region.

Local government and private sector participation in redevelopment pursuant to applicable state law shall be encouraged through incentives. While each redevelopment plan may be different, the incentives may include such things as additional height. Such incentives may be achieved by providing expanded scenic corridors, reductions of coverage greater than otherwise required, larger buffers, more open space or landscaped areas, larger reductions in traffic than otherwise required, and similar benefits. To obtain these incentives, a redevelopment plan must be submitted in both conceptual and final form to, and approved by, the TRPA Governing Board. Public agency redevelopment plans shall include all applicable contents required by state law. Redevelopment plans shall demonstrate why incentives are necessary to make the plan economically feasible. Redevelopment plans shall demonstrate progress towards meeting environmental thresholds and achieving the goals of the Regional Plan, and shall result in a net benefit to the social and economic well-being of the Region. Rules for redevelopment plans shall be consistent with the Regional Plan and relevant plan area statements and community plans. Specific criteria for redevelopment plans shall be included in implementing ordinances. This policy should be considered an interim policy subject to revisions based on the findings of the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Study Team.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-2.10 on December 6, 2011.

**LU-2.1014** THE PROVISIONS SET FORTH IN ARTICLE VI (d) THROUGH VI (i) OF THE COMPACT APPLY TO TRPA REGULATION OF STRUCTURES HOUSING GAMING.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-2.11 and 2.12 on December 6, 2011.

**GOAL #3**

**LU-2.11** ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT SHALL CONFORM TO THE COEFFICIENTS OF ALLOWABLE LAND COVERAGE IN THE TAHOE REGION SHALL BE AS SET FORTH IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION METHODOLOGY AND DISTRICT BASED LAND COVERAGE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN “THE LAND CAPABILITY CLASSIFICATION OF THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA, A GUIDE FOR PLANNING, BAILEY, 1974.”
This policy goal calls for policies which limit allowable impervious land coverage associated with new development. These policies set allowable land coverage by applying the recommended Bailey land coverage coefficients to specifically defined and related areas. In some instances, provisions are made to allow additional coverage by transfer. The transfer programs shall operate by a direct offset method. In addition, land capability is one of the basic factors in determining the suitability of lands for development and appropriateness of land uses.

**POLICIES**

**LU-2.12** ALLOWED BASE LAND COVERAGE FOR ALL NEW PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES SHALL BE CALCULATED BY APPLYING THE BAILEY COEFFICIENTS, AS SHOWN BELOW, TO THE APPLICABLE AREA WITHIN THE PARCEL BOUNDARY, OR AS OTHERWISE SET FORTH IN A, B, AND C OF THIS POLICY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICT</th>
<th>MAXIMUM ALLOWED LAND COVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. In the case of subdivisions approved by TRPA in conformance with the coefficients coverages assigned to individual lots shall be the allowed base coverage for those lots. A list of such TRPA-approved subdivisions appears in Attachment D.

B. In the case of existing planned unit developments (PUDs) not in conformance with the coefficients, the coefficients shall apply to the entire project area minus public rights-of-way, and the allowed base coverage shall be apportioned to the individual lots or building sites, and common area facilities. A list of such PUDs appears in Attachment E.

C. After December 31, 1988, for vacant residential parcels evaluated under the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES), the allowable base land coverage shall be a function of a parcel’s combined score under the IPES criteria for relative erosion hazard and runoff potential as correlated with the above coefficients and applied to the designated evaluation area. (See Goal #1, Policy 1 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement.)

The method of calculation of allowed land coverages shall be detailed in the implementing ordinances consistent with the above policy.

**Note:** The RPU Committee voted (4-1) to support language for combined Land Use Policy LU-13 and LU-14 on December 13, 2011.

**LU-2.13** THE ALLOWED COVERAGE IN POLICY 1 LU-2.12 MAY BE INCREASED BY TRANSFER OF LAND COVERAGE WITHIN HYDROLOGICALLY RELATED AREAS UP TO THE LIMITS AS
SET FORTH IN A, B, C, D, AND F OF THIS POLICY:

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR ADDITIONAL COVERAGE, SUCH AS EXCEPTIONALLY LONG
DRIVEWAYS, PERVIOUS COVERAGE AND HANDICAPPED ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED,
MAY ALSO BE ALLOWED. ORDINANCES SHALL SPECIFICALLY LIMIT AND DEFINE
THESE PROGRAMS.

LU-2.14 LAND COVERAGE MAY BE TRANSFERRED THROUGH PROGRAMS THAT ARE FURTHER
DESCRIBED IN THE GOAL #3 OF THE (DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION
PRIORITIES) SUBELEMENT.

The intent of the land coverage transfer programs is to allow greater flexibility in the placement
of land coverage within hydrologically related areas. Such programs include the use of land
banks, lot consolidation, land coverage restoration programs, and transfer programs based on
the calculation of land coverage on non-contiguous parcels located in hydrologically related
areas. The coverage transfer programs allow for coverage over base coverage to be permitted
and still be consistent with the soils threshold and Goal #3 LU-2 of this Subelement.

A. Single Family Residential: The maximum land coverage allowed (Base + Transfer) on
a parcel through a transfer program shall be as set forth below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size (Square Feet)</th>
<th>Land Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0  -   4,000</td>
<td>Base Land Coverage as Set Forth in Policy LU-2.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001  -   9,000</td>
<td>1,800 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001  -  14,000</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,001  -  16,000</td>
<td>2,900 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,001  -  20,000</td>
<td>3,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001  -  25,000</td>
<td>3,100 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001  -  30,000</td>
<td>3,200 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001  -  40,000</td>
<td>3,300 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001  -  50,000</td>
<td>3,400 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001  -  70,000</td>
<td>3,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,001  -  90,000</td>
<td>3,600 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,001  - 120,000</td>
<td>3,700 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,001 - 150,000</td>
<td>3,800 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,001 - 200,000</td>
<td>3,900 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001 - 400,000</td>
<td>4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For lots in planned unit developments, the maximum coverage allowed (Base +
Transfer) shall be up to 100 percent of the proposed building envelope but shall
not exceed 2,500 square feet. Lots in subdivisions with TRPA-approved transfer
programs may be permitted the coverage specified by that approval.

B. Commercial Facilities in a Community Plan, Town Center, Regional Center or
the High Density Tourist District (Other than Facilities listed in Subsection C-E
below): The maximum coverage allowed (Base + Transfer) on an existing
undeveloped a parcel through a transfer program, shall be 70 percent of the land
in capability districts 4 - 7, provided the parcel is within an approved community plan, or a Town Center, Regional Center or the High Density Tourist District of a conforming Area Plan. For existing developed parcels, the maximum land coverage allowed is 50 percent coverage. Transfers to increase coverage from the base coverage up to 50 percent the maximum coverage allowed, shall be at a ratio of 1:1 for Coverage transfers of coverage from sensitive lands. For transfers of coverage from non-sensitive lands, coverage shall be transferred to increase coverage above 50 percent, shall be at a gradually increasing ratios from 1:1 to 2:1, as further specified in code, with the transfer ratio for all the coverage over 50 percent determined as indicated on the following graph:

```
      2:1
      1.6:1
      1:1

50% - 60% - 70%
```

C. **Tourist Accommodation Facilities, Multi-Residential Facilities of 5 Units or More, Public Service Facilities, and Recreational Facilities in a Community Plan, Town Center, Regional Center or the High Density Tourist District:** The maximum coverage (Base + Transfer) allowed on a parcel through a transfer program shall be **50-70 percent** of the land in capability districts 4 - 7, provided such parcel is within an approved Community Plan or a Town Center, Regional Center or the High Density Tourist District of a conforming Area Plan. The coverage transfer ration to increase coverage from the base coverage to 50-70 percent shall be at a ration of 1:1.

D. **Other Multi-Residential Facilities:** The maximum coverage (Base + Transfer) allowed on a parcel through a transfer of coverage programs shall be the amounts set forth in Policy A, above.

E. **Linear Public Facilities and Public Health and Safety Facilities:** Such public facilities defined by ordinance and whose nature requires special consideration, are limited to transferring the minimum coverage needed to achieve their public purpose.

F. **Public Service Facilities Outside a Community Plan, Town Center, Regional Center or the High Density Tourist District:** The maximum coverage (Base + Transfer) allowed on a parcel through a transfer program shall be 50 percent land coverage provided TRPA determines there is a demonstrated need and requirement to locate such a facility outside a Community Plan, Town Center, Regional Center or the High Density Tourist District area and there is no feasible alternative which would reduce land coverage.

G. **Other Facilities Outside of Community Plans, Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District, and Facilities Within Community Plans Before the Community Plan is Approved, and facilities outside a Community Plan but within a Town Center, Regional Center, or the High Density Tourist District before Local Government Plans are approved and found in conformance with the Regional Plan:** Other than the exceptions in Subsections A, D, E, and F, the
maximum land coverage allowed shall be the base land coverage as set forth in Policy LU-2.12.

H. Notwithstanding subsections A-G above, when existing development is relocated to Town Centers, Regional Centers or the High Density Tourist District and the prior site is restored to a natural condition and retired, non-conforming coverage may be maintained with the relocation as long as the new site is developed in accordance with all other TRPA Policies and Ordinances, including, but not limited to, the installation of BMPs.

I. Conforming Area Plans may include a comprehensive coverage management system as an alternative to the parcel level coverage requirements outlined in subsection A-H above. In order to be found in conformance with the Regional Plan, the comprehensive coverage management system shall reduce coverage overall and reduce coverage in land capability districts 1 and 2 compared to the parcel level limitations in the Regional Plan and Code.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported language for Land Use Policy LU-2.15 on December 15, 2011.

LU-32.15. REHABILITATION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND UPGRADING OF THE EXISTING INVENTORY OF STRUCTURES, OR OTHER FORMS OF COVERAGE IN THE TAHOE REGION, ARE HIGH PRIORITIES OF THE REGIONAL PLAN. TO ENCOURAGE REHABILITATION AND UPGRADING OF STRUCTURES, THE FOLLOWING POLICIES SHALL APPLY:

A. Repair or reconstruction of buildings damaged or destroyed by fire or other calamity subject to Goal #2, Policy 8 of this subelement is exempt from this policy.

B. Reconstruction, rehabilitation, modification, relocation, or major repair of structures or coverage other than as specified in A above may be allowed, provided such use is allowed under the land use subelement Goal #2, Policies 8, 9 and 10. For parcels with existing coverage in excess of the Bailey Coefficients, a land coverage mitigation program shall be set by ordinance, which shall provide for the reduction of coverage in an amount proportional to the cost of the repair, reconstruction, relocation, rehabilitation, or modification, and to the extent of excess coverage. To accomplish these reductions, property owners shall have at least the following options:
   i. reducing coverage on-site;
   ii. reducing coverage off-site in a hydrologically-related area;
   iii. paying a rehabilitation fee in lieu of on-site or off-site coverage reduction in an amount established by Agency ordinance to help fund a land bank program established to accomplish coverage reductions;
   iv. lot consolidation with a contiguous parcel or lot line adjustment to reduce the percentage of excess coverage on the resulting parcels; or
   v. any combination of the foregoing options.

C. Existing development in Town Centers, Regional Centers or the High Density Tourist District with excess coverage may earn multi-residential bonus units, tourist accommodation bonus unit and bonus commercial floor area for removing
and retiring excess coverage onsite.

**CD.** Existing coverage may be relocated within a parcel provided it is relocated to areas of equal or superior environmental capability consistent with B above.

**DE.** TRPA shall maintain a rehabilitation fee schedule that is adequate to carry out an effective land coverage banking program, equitably divides the costs to the public and private sectors, and has the minimum possible deterrent effect on the Regional Plan goal of encouraging rehabilitation, reconstruction, and upgrading of the existing inventory of structures. The rehabilitation fee schedule shall be updated annually. In establishing the rehabilitation fee schedule(s) provided for in (3.B.iii), above, the following procedures shall be followed:

i. A special task force shall be convened to analyze and report on the actual costs and mechanisms involved in establishing and implementing an effective land coverage banking program. The report shall take into account the costs of obtaining and retiring coverage, and shall also consider alternative funding sources or programs to provide supplemental funding for such land coverage banking programs.

ii. After considering the report in (i), above, the special task force shall recommend, for adoption by TRPA, a rehabilitation fee schedule which will (1) provide a reasonable level of funding for the proposed land banking program taking into account identified alternative sources of funding, (2) not unduly restrict or deter property owners from undertaking projects involving the rehabilitation, reconstruction, major modification, or repair of existing structures, and (3) carries out an effective land coverage reduction program. The recommendation of the task force shall take into account the cost of BMP requirements and the other mitigation fees described in the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Goal #4, Policies 1 and 2. The task force also shall recommend a schedule of activities comprising routine maintenance and repair which should be exempt from rehabilitation fees.

iii. After considering the recommendations of the special task force, TRPA shall adopt a rehabilitation fee schedule that is adequate to carry out an effective land coverage banking program, equitably divides the costs to the public and private sectors, and has the minimum possible deterrent effect on the Regional Plan goal of encouraging rehabilitation, reconstruction, and upgrading of the existing inventory of structures.

iv. TRPA may set an interim fee, if necessary, while the task force prepares its recommendations.

**EF.** In approving repair, reconstruction, rehabilitation, modification, or relocation of structures or other coverage, the Agency shall also apply other relevant standards, including installation of Best Management Practices or compliance with the design review guidelines.

Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to support the deletion of Land Use policies LU-2.9 and LU-2.16 and to add modified language to LU-2 Implementation Measures on December 13, 2011.
LU-42.16 LAND COVERAGE ALLOWED PURSUANT TO REDEVELOPMENT PLANS SHALL BE EMBE ESTABLISHED BY TRPA-APPROVED REDEVELOPMENT PLANS. HOWEVER, IN NO CASE SHALL THERE BE A NET INCREASE IN LAND COVERAGE IN THE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported language for LU-2 Implementation Measures bullets 1, 2, and 4 on December 15, 2011.

LU-2 Implementation Measures for Coverage

- Amend the Code of Ordinances to reflect modifications to coverage requirements within Goal LU-2 and associated policies.

- Amend excess coverage mitigation program to allow the use of in-lieu mitigation fees across Hydrologically Related Area Boundaries if the fees are targeted for removal of coverage from land capability districts 1 and 2.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (4-0) supported language for LU-2 Implementation Measures for Land Capability Verification on January 10, 2012.

- Amend the Code of Ordinances to waive the requirement for site-specific land capability mapping through actual field verification when the following criterion area met:
  - The entire parcel is located in land capability districts 4-7;
  - A parcel exhibits generally uniform slope;
  - There is no record or evidence of high ground water on the parcel;
  - Land Capability Verifications have been conducted and on the record of other parcels within the geographic vicinity; and
  - The 1987 mapped land capability district and the land capability district on updated maps are identical;

- By December 31, 2013, TRPA will prepare a map depicting properties that will not require field verification. The map should include parcels meeting the criteria listed above and any other parcels where the land capability is not in question. Before taking effect, the map shall be approved by the TRPA governing Board.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported language for LU-2 Implementation Measures bullets 1, 2, and 4 on December 15, 2011.

- Amend the Code of Ordinances to remove ineffective and burdensome regulations and provide incentives for redevelopment and non-motorized transportation options, including:
  - Allow legally existing and verified soft coverage to be transferred from Stream Environment Zones (land capability district 1b) to Community Plans, Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District.
  - Exempt “re-locatable coverage” (coverage that is temporary and does not have a permanent foundation) that is 120 square feet or less on high capability lands (districts 4-7) and that does not require a grading permit under the code.
  - Allow a 25% credit for pervious coverage on high capability lands (districts 4-7), subject to design and maintenance requirements to minimize and mitigate impacts.
  - On high capability lands (districts 4-7), allow a 100 percent credit for new pervious
decks up to 500 square feet, and a sliding scale of credits from 100 percent to zero percent for new pervious decks between 501 and 1,000 square feet subject to requirements to prohibit existing decks from qualifying for the coverage credit through coverage banking or other mechanisms and subject to design and maintenance requirements to minimize and mitigate impacts.

- Allow a 100% credit for non-motorized public trails, subject to siting and design requirements that minimize and mitigate the impact of additional coverage.

**Note:** The RPU Committee voted (4-1) (Nay: Shute (CA)) to support language for LU-2 Implementation Measures for Allocations on January 10, 2012.

**LU-2 Implementation Measures for Allocations**

- Update the Implementation Section of the Regional Plan and the Code of Ordinances to reflect remaining allocations from the 1987 plan and the release of new allocations with the 2012 Regional Plan. Changes should reflect the following considerations:

  - New residential allocations, residential bonus units (RBU), tourist bonus units (TBU) and commercial floor area (CFA) should be evaluated by the Draft EIS in accordance with the table below. Changes to the Alternative numbers should be considered in the Final EIS based on information from the Draft EIS and modifications to the system of managing development commodities, as described below:

  - The system for release of allocations, bonus units and CFA should be modified in coordination with Local Governments and in accordance with the following principles:

    - A maximum yearly release of residential allocations and CFA should be made to each Local Government through the performance system and staff should coordinate with Local Governments to establish an equitable system for distribution of CFA.

    - The amount of bonus units and CFA held by TRPA and Local Governments should be evaluated annually and modified if necessary by the Governing Board to maintain adequate commodities for anticipated redevelopment activities in the region.

    - All allocations and CFA that have been distributed to Local Governments should be retained by Local Governments. In the future, Local Governments should be able to retain all allocations and CFA and that are distributed to them for use that year or at a later date.

    - All past awards of bonus units should be honored until development approvals expire. In the future, all awards of bonus units should also be honored until development approvals expire.

    - All past awards of bonus units to Plan Areas should be honored regardless of whether or not development approvals within those Plan Areas have expired.

    - No additional Residential Development Rights may be created. Approximately 4,091 Residential Development Rights remain.

    - Residential Bonus Units and Tourist Bonus Units that have not been awarded should...
The performance system shall be evaluated at least every four years as part of each Regional Plan review and should be modified if necessary to implement the Regional Plan.

ALLOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS ACCOUNTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOCATIONS/DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS</th>
<th>USED FROM 1987-2011*</th>
<th>REMAINING FROM 1987 PLAN</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL PROPOSED IN THE REGIONAL PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALT. 1</td>
<td>ALT. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Allocations</td>
<td>6475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Bonus Units</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Bonus Units</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Floor Area (Total)</td>
<td>575,237</td>
<td>224,763</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>128,623</td>
<td>72,609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>87,906</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>45,300</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>15,250</td>
<td>36,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>77,042</td>
<td>52,986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA Pool</td>
<td>221,116</td>
<td>24,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 158,816 sq. ft. of Commercial Floor Area, 245 Residential Bonus Units and 90 Tourist Bonus Units have been reserved or allocated to projects (e.g., Community Enhancement Projects) that have not been permitted or permitted but the projects have not been acknowledged.

Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to support the deletion of Land Use policies LU-2.9 and LU-2.16 and to add modified language to LU-2 Implementation Measures on December 13, 2011.

- Delete Chapter 15 of Code (Redevelopment Plans) and amend Code to include Redevelopment Plan allowances within Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District, along with opportunities for priority processing and/or fee reductions in conjunction with restoration activities.

*Note: Relocated from LU Goal #4. The Committee unanimously (5-0) supported language for Land Use Goal LU-3 and Land Use Policies LU-3.1 through LU-3.5 on December 15, 2011:

GOAL LU-3

PROVIDE TO THE GREATEST POSSIBLE EXTENT, WITHIN THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES, A DISTRIBUTION OF LAND USE THAT ENSURES THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL, AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE REGION.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and extensive public testimony call for TRPA, along
with other governmental and private entities, to safeguard the well-being of those who live in, work in, or visit the Region.

POLICIES

LU-3.1. ALL PERSONS SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO UTILIZE AND ENJOY THE REGION’S NATURAL RESOURCES AND AMENITIES.

LU-3.2. NO PERSON OR PERSONS SHALL DEVELOP PROPERTY SO AS TO ENDANGER THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE.

Persons who develop property in the Region must ensure that their development conforms to the Goals and Policies Plan, all TRPA regulations and all applicable local, state, and federal laws pertaining to public health, safety and welfare.

LU-3.3 PROACTIVELY DIRECT DEVELOPMENT AWAY FROM SENSITIVE LANDS AND AREAS THAT ARE FURTHEST FROM NON-RESIDENTIAL SUPPORT SERVICES AND TOWARDS DESIGNATED TOWN CENTERS, REGIONAL CENTERS AND THE HIGH DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT, WHILE MAINTAINING THE CHARACTER OF DEVELOPMENT IN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

LU-3.4 DEVELOPMENT IS PREFERRED IN AND DIRECTED TOWARDS TOWN CENTERS, REGIONAL CENTERS AND THE HIGH DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT, AS IDENTIFIED ON THE REGIONAL LAND USE MAP. TOWN CENTERS, REGIONAL CENTERS AND THE HIGH DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT SHALL HAVE THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS:

1) A CONCENTRATION OF NON-RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT A HIGHER INTENSITY THAN EXISTS IN OTHER AREAS OF THE REGION.

2) EXISTING OR PLANNED TRANSIT SERVICE.

3) HIGHWAY ACCESS.

4) INFILL AND REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

5) CAPACITY FOR RECEIVING TRANSFERS OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS AND RELOCATIONS OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT.

6) EXISTING OR PLANNED HOUSING IN THE VICINITY.

7) EXISTING OR PLANNED STREET DESIGNS WITH CONTINUOUS SIDEWALKS, PATHS AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE THAT PROMOTES WALKING, BICYCLING AND TRANSIT USE SO AS TO ENCOURAGE MOBILITY WITHOUT USE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES.

LU-3.5 EXISTING DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS OUTSIDE OF TOWN CENTERS, REGIONAL CENTERS AND THE HIGH DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT AND ENVIRONMENTALLY-SENSITIVE LANDS SHOULD BE MAINTAINED WITH NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported Land Use Policies LU-3.6 through LU-3.8 on December 15, 2011.

LU-3.6 DEVELOPMENT IS DISCOURAGED IN AND DIRECTED AWAY FROM ENVIRONMENTALLY
SENSITIVE LANDS AND AREAS FURTHEST FROM NON-RESIDENTIAL SUPPORT SERVICES. THESE AREAS ARE FURTHER DEFINED IN OTHER PLAN POLICIES.

LU-3.7 TRPA SHALL MAINTAIN A POOL OF DEVELOPMENT ALLOCATIONS AND RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS TO PROMOTE THE TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FROM SENSITIVE LANDS TO TOWN CENTERS, REGIONAL CENTERS, AND THE HIGH DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT.

LU-3.8 TRPA SHALL MAINTAIN A POOL OF DEVELOPMENT ALLOCATIONS AND RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS TO PROMOTE THE TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FROM OUTLYING RESIDENTIAL AREAS TO TOWN CENTERS, REGIONAL CENTERS AND THE HIGH DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported LU-3 Implementation Measures bullet #1 and transfer table on December 15, 2011.

LU-3 Implementation Measures

• Amend Chapter 13, Plan Area Statements and the Land Use Map to designate certain areas as Town Centers and Regional Centers and designate the four existing casino towers in Stateline as the High Density Tourist District.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported LU-3 Implementation Measures for subdivisions on January 26, 2012.

• Amend the Section 31.5.2.B of the Code of Ordinances (Maximum Density for Mixed-Use Categories) as follows:

4. Category D

In Category D, the maximum residential density is one unit per project area, provided that residential units are allowed by the plan area statement or community plan; except for a mixed-use project proposing to subdivide multi-family residential units, which is subject to Category E below.

5. Category E

In Category E, the maximum density of a multi-family dwelling, multi-person dwelling, or other tourism accommodation use shall be the maximum density for the given residential or tourist accommodation uses, as determined by Table 31.3.2-1, multiplied by the ratio of the floor area of that use to the total floor area in the project area (see Examples 1 and 2), subject to the exceptions below.

Note: The RPU Committee voted (4-1) (Nay: Shute (CA)) to support LU-3 Implementation Measure for Development in the Recreation District on January 10, 2012.

• Amend the Code of Ordinances to allow the development and subdivision
Amend the Code of Ordinances to create bonus allocations and increased transfer ratio matches to encourage the transfer development from sensitive lands and outlying areas to Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District pursuant to the following table. Also allow conforming Area Plans to establish alternative transfer ratios based on unique conditions in each jurisdiction as long as the alternative transfer ratios are determined to generate equal or greater environmental gain compared to TRPA transfer ratios.

Transfer Existing Development (ERU, CFA, TAU) to Town Centers, Regional Centers and/or the High Density Tourist District and restore and retire parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEZ</th>
<th>1:3</th>
<th>1:1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Lands (1a, 1c, 2 and 3)</td>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>1:1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sensitive Lands (4, 5, 6 and 7)</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance from Town Centers, Regional Centers, the High Density Tourist District and Primary Transit Routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Non-residential support services and transit (only for transfers of Residential Development Rights and Existing Residential Units into Town Centers, Regional Centers and/or the High Density Tourist District)</th>
<th>Additional transfer ratio based on distance from non-residential support services and transit (only for transfers of Residential Development Rights and Existing Residential Units into Town Centers, Regional Centers and/or the High Density Tourist District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than ¼ Mile or on the Lake-ward side of primary transit routes</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ Mile to ½ Mile</td>
<td>1:1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ Mile to 1 Mile</td>
<td>1:1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile to 1½ Mile</td>
<td>1:1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1½ Mile</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The RPU Committee voted (4-1) (Nay: Shute (CA)) to support LU-3 Implementation Measure for TAU Transfers on January 10, 2012.
a bedroom with or without cooking facilities, primarily designed to be rented by the day or week and occupied on a temporary basis."

- Amend the Code to define a sending TAU to equal 1,200 square feet receiving unit or 1,800 square feet/3-bedroom receiving unit if the units make up less than 20 percent of a project.

*Note: Relocated to Goal LU-3:

GOAL #4

PROVIDE TO THE GREATEST POSSIBLE EXTENT, WITHIN THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES, A DISTRIBUTION OF LAND USE THAT ENSURES THE SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE REGION.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and extensive public testimony call for TRPA, along with other governmental and private entities, to safeguard the well-being of those who live in, work in, or visit the Region.

POLICIES

1. ALL PERSONS SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO UTILIZE AND ENJOY THE REGION'S NATURAL RESOURCES AND AMENITIES.

2. NO PERSON OR PERSONS SHALL DEVELOP PROPERTY SO AS TO ENDANGER THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE.

Persons who develop property in the Region must ensure that their development conforms to the Goals and Policies Plan, all TRPA regulations and all applicable local, state, and federal laws pertaining to public health, safety and welfare.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (7-0) supported Goal LU-4 on November 2, 2011.

GOAL LU-4

REGIONAL PLAN GOALS, POLICIES, AND ORDINANCES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED USING AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANNING.

POLICIES

*Note: Relocated and amended from LU Goal #2, Policy 2. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.1 with modifications on December 6, 2011.

LU-4.1 THE REGIONAL PLAN LAND USE MAP IDENTIFIES GROUPINGS OF GENERALIZED LAND USES AND PRIORITY REDEVELOPMENT AREAS IN THE REGION. SPECIFIC LAND USE POLICIES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE USE OF PLANNING AREA STATEMENTS FOR EACH OF THE PLANNING AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE MAP INCLUDED IN THIS PLAN (LOCATED INSIDE BACK COVER). AREAS OF SIMILAR USE AND CHARACTER HAVE BEEN MAPPED AND CATEGORIZED WITHIN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE SEVEN LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS: WILDERNESS, BACKCOUNTRY, CONSERVATION, RECREATION, RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC
SERVICEmixed-use, and Tourist. These land use classifications shall dictate allowable land uses. Existing urbanized areas are identified as town centers, regional centers and the high density tourist district. Town centers, regional centers and the high density tourist district are the areas where sustainable redevelopment is encouraged. More detailed plans, called community plans, may be developed for designated commercial areas. Other detailed plans, such as the airport master plan, ski area master plans, and redevelopment plans, may also be developed. These detailed plans may combine two or more of the five land use classifications.

Since the development permitted under this Plan is generally limited to the existing urban boundaries in which uses have already been established, the concept of this land use plan is directed toward encouraging regulating infill and redirection. The intent of this system is to provide flexibility when dealing with existing uses, continuation of acceptable land use patterns, and redirection of unacceptable land use patterns. Implementation ordinances set forth the detailed management criteria and allowed uses for each land use classification.

Wilderness
Wilderness Districts are designated and defined by the U.S. Congress as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. These lands offer outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive, unconfined recreation experiences, and they contain ecological, geological, and other features of scientific, educational, scenic and historic value. The wilderness designation is intended to protect and preserve such areas for present and future generations. These lands are managed to prevent the degradation of wilderness character. Natural ecological processes and functions are preserved, and restored where necessary. Permanent improvements and mechanized uses are prohibited. Wilderness District lands within the Tahoe Region include portions of the Desolation, Granite Chief and Mount Rose Wilderness Areas.

Backcountry
Backcountry Districts are designated and defined by the U.S. Forest Service as part of their Resource Management Plans. These lands are roadless areas including Dardanelles/Meiss, Freel Peak and Lincoln Creek. On these lands, natural ecological processes are primarily free from human influences. Backcountry areas offer a recreation experience similar to Wilderness, with places for people seeking natural scenery and solitude. Primitive and semi-primitive recreation opportunities include hiking, camping, wildlife viewing, and cross-country skiing, in addition to more developed or mechanized activities not allowed in Wilderness areas (e.g., mountain biking, snowmobiling). Management activities that support administrative and dispersed recreation activities are minimal, but may have a limited influence. Limited roads may be present in some backcountry areas; road reconstruction may be permitted on Backcountry lands where additional restrictions do not apply. Backcountry areas contribute to ecosystem and species diversity and sustainability, serve as habitat for fauna and flora, and offer wildlife corridors. These areas provide a diversity of terrestrial and aquatic habitats, and support species dependent on large, undisturbed areas of land. Backcountry areas are managed to preserve and restore healthy watersheds with clean water and air, and healthy soils. Watershed processes operate in harmony with their setting, providing high quality aquatic habitats.

Conservation
Conservation areas are non-urban areas with value as primitive or natural areas, with strong environmental limitations on use, and with a potential for dispersed recreation or low intensity resource management. Conservation areas include (1) public lands already set aside for this purpose, (2) high-hazard lands, stream environment zones, and other fragile areas, without substantial existing improvements, (3) isolated areas which do not contain the necessary infrastructure for development, (4) areas capable of sustaining only passive recreation or non-intensive agriculture, and (5) areas suitable for low-to-moderate resource management.
Recreation

Recreation areas are non-urban areas with good potential for developed outdoor recreation, park use, or concentrated recreation. Lands which this Plan identifies as recreation areas include (1) areas of existing private and public recreation use, (2) designated local, state, and federal recreation areas, (3) areas without overriding environmental constraints on resource management or recreational purposes, and (4) areas with unique recreational resources which may service public needs, such as beaches and ski areas.

Residential

Residential areas are urban areas having potential to provide housing for the residents of the Region. In addition, the purpose of this classification is to identify density patterns related to both the physical and manmade characteristics of the land and to allow accessory and non-residential uses that complement the residential neighborhood. These lands include: (1) Areas now developed for residential purposes; (2) areas of moderate-to-good land capability; (3) areas within urban boundaries and serviced by utilities; and (4) areas of centralized location in close proximity to commercial services and public facilities.

Note: The RPU Committee directed staff to modify Mixed-Use definition to include light industrial and office on January 4, 2012.

Mixed-Use

Mixed-use Commercial and Public Service areas are urban areas that have been designated to provide a mix of commercial, and public services, light industrial, office, and residential uses to the Region or have the potential to provide future commercial, and public services, light industrial, office, and residential uses. The purpose of this classification is to concentrate such services, higher intensity land uses for public convenience, and enhanced sustainability, separate incompatible uses, and allow other noncommercial uses if they are compatible with the purpose of this classification and other goals of this Plan. These lands include: (1) areas now developed for commercial or public service uses; (2) in the case of public services, lands designated for, or in, public ownership; (3) areas suitable to encourage the concentration of compatible services; (4) areas of good- to-moderate land capability; and (5) areas with adequate public services and transportation linkages.

Tourist

Tourist areas are urban areas that have the potential to provide intensive tourist accommodations and services or intensive recreation. This land use classification also includes areas recognized by the Compact as suitable for gaming. These lands include areas that are: (1) areas now developed with high concentrations of visitor accommodations and related uses; (2) lands on which gaming is a permitted and recognized use; (3) lands of good-to-moderate land capability; and (4) areas with adequate public services and transportation linkages.

1) already developed with high concentrations of visitor services, visitor accommodations, and related uses;
2) of good to moderate land capability (land capability districts 4-7);
3) with existing excess land coverage; and
4) located near commercial services, employment centers, public services and facilities, transit facilities, pedestrian paths, and bicycle connections.

Town Center Overlay

Town Centers contain most of the region's non-residential services and have been identified as a significant source of sediments and other contaminants that continue to enter Lake Tahoe. Town Centers are targeted for redevelopment in a manner that improves environmental conditions, creates a more sustainable and less auto-dependent development pattern and provides economic opportunities in the region.
**Note:** The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported to add Regional Center Overlay language to Policy LU-4.1 on November 16, 2011.

**Regional Center Overlay**
The Regional Center area includes a variety of land uses in the core of South Lake Tahoe, including the Gondola and base lodge facilities for Heavenly Ski Area. Development patterns in the Regional Center have been and should continue to be more intensive that Town Centers and less intensive that the High Density Tourist District. Older development within the Regional Center is a significant source of sediment and other water contaminants. The Regional Center is targeted for redevelopment in a manner that improves environmental conditions, creates a more sustainable and less auto-dependent development pattern and provides economic opportunities in the region.

**High Density Tourist District Overlay**
The High Density Tourist District contains a concentration of hotel/casino towers and is targeted for redevelopment in a manner that improves environmental conditions, creates a more sustainable and less auto-dependent development pattern and provides economic opportunities for local residents. The High Density Tourist District is the appropriate location for the region’s highest intensity development.

**Note:** The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported the Stream Restoration Plan Area definition on January 24, 2012.

**Stream Restoration Plan Area**
Stream Restoration Plan Areas are Stream Environment Zones along major waterways that have been substantially degraded by prior or existing development. Individual Restoration Plans should be developed for each Stream Restoration Plan Area in coordination with the applicable Local Government and property owners in the Plan area. Restoration Plans may be developed as a component of an Area Plan or as a separate document and should identify feasible opportunities for environmental restoration.

**Note:** The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported Policy LU-4.2 on November 15, 2011.

**LU-4.2 DETAILED PLAN AREA STATEMENTS HAVE BEEN APPROVED FOR ALL PROPERTIES IN THE REGION. THESE PLAN AREA STATEMENTS WERE ADOPTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 1987 REGIONAL PLAN AND SHALL REMAIN IN EFFECT UNTIL SUPERSEDED BY AREA PLANS THAT ARE DEVELOPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AND FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THIS REGIONAL PLAN. IF ANY PLAN AREA STATEMENT CONTAINS PROVISIONS THAT CONTRADICT NEWER PROVISIONS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT CODE, THE NEWER PROVISIONS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT CODE SHALL PREVAIL, BUT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT SPECIFIC PROVISIONS CONFLICT.

**Note:** The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported Policy LU-4.3 on November 15, 2011.

**LU-4.3 COMMUNITY PLANS HAVE BEEN APPROVED FOR SOME PROPERTIES IN THE REGION TO REFINE AND SUPERSEDE THE PLAN AREA STATEMENTS. THESE COMMUNITY PLANS WERE ADOPTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 1987 REGIONAL PLAN AND SHALL REMAIN IN EFFECT UNTIL SUPERSEDED BY AREA PLANS THAT ARE DEVELOPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AND FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THIS REGIONAL PLAN. IF ANY COMMUNITY PLAN CONTAINS PROVISIONS THAT CONTRADICT NEWER PROVISIONS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT CODE, THE NEWER PROVISIONS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT CODE SHALL PREVAIL, BUT
**Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported Policy LU-4.4 on November 15, 2011.**

**Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.5 on December 6, 2011. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to LU-4.5 on February 1, 2012.**

**Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.6 on November 15, 2011. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to LU-4.6 on February 1, 2012.**

**Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.7 on November 15, 2011. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to LU-4.7 on February 1, 2012.**

**LU-4.4 OTHER DETAILED PLANS, SUCH AS THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, SKI AREA MASTER PLANS, AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANS HAVE ALSO BEEN APPROVED FOR SOME PROPERTIES IN THE REGION TO FURTHER REFINE AND SUPERSEDE THE PLAN AREA STATEMENTS. THESE PLANS WERE ADOPTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 1987 REGIONAL PLAN AND SHALL REMAIN IN EFFECT UNTIL SUPERSEDED BY AREA PLANS THAT ARE DEVELOPED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AND FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THIS REGIONAL PLAN. IF ANY OF THESE PLANS CONTAIN PROVISIONS THAT CONTRADICT NEWER PROVISIONS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT CODE, THE NEWER PROVISIONS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT CODE SHALL PREVAIL, BUT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT SPECIFIC PROVISIONS CONFLICT.**

**LU-4.5 TRPA SHALL REQUEST THAT ALL LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS IN THE REGION PROVIDE WRITTEN STATEMENTS INDICATING THEIR INTENT TO PREPARE AREA PLANS AND THEIR ANTICIPATED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF AREA PLANS FOR AREAS WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTION. STATEMENTS OF INTENT SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO TRPA NO LATER THAN DECEMBER 31, 2013. THE TRPA GOVERNING BOARD SHALL EVALUATE THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT STATEMENTS OF INTENT AND DEVELOP AN ACTION PLAN BY APRIL 30, 2014. THE ACTION PLAN MAY INCLUDE UPDATES AND CONSOLIDATIONS OF PLAN AREA STATEMENTS, COMMUNITY PLANS AND OTHER PLANS FOR AREAS THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED IN AREA PLANS. ANY PLANS THAT ARE UPDATED BY TRPA MAY UTILIZE THE PROVISIONS THAT APPLY TO AREA PLANS.**

**LU-4.6 IN ORDER TO BE RESPONSIVE TO THE UNIQUE NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES OF COMMUNITIES OF THE REGION, LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO PREPARE CONFORMING AREA PLANS THAT SUPERSEDE EXISTING PLAN AREA STATEMENTS AND COMMUNITY PLANS OR OTHER TRPA REGULATIONS FOR AREAS WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTION. AREA PLANS SHALL BE PREPARED IN COORDINATION WITH LOCAL RESIDENTS, OTHER STAKEHOLDERS AND TRPA STAFF, AND SHALL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN.**

**LU-4.7 AFTER APPROVAL BY LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL OR TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS, AREA PLANS SHALL BE REVIEWED BY THE TRPA GOVERNING BOARD AT A PUBLIC HEARING. IN ORDER TO TAKE EFFECT, THE TRPA GOVERNING BOARD SHALL MAKE A FINDING**
THAT THE AREA PLAN, AND ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODES WITHIN THE PLAN, ARE CONSISTENT WITH AND FURTHER THE GOALS AND POLICIES OF THE REGIONAL PLAN. THIS FINDING SHALL BE REFERRED TO AS A FINDING OF CONFORMANCE AND SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE SAME VOTING REQUIREMENTS AS APPROVAL OF A REGIONAL PLAN AMENDMENT.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.8 on November 15, 2011.

**LU-4.8** IN ORDER TO BE FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN, ALL AREA PLANS SHALL INCLUDE POLICIES, ORDINANCES AND OTHER IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES TO:

1. Identify zoning designations, allowed land uses and development standards throughout the plan area.
2. Be consistent with all applicable Regional Plan Policies, including but not limited to the Regional growth management system, development allocations and coverage requirements.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.8 bullet 3 on January 24, 2012.

3. Either be consistent with the Regional Land Use Map or recommend and adopt amendments to the Regional Land Use Map as part of an integrated plan to comply with Regional Plan Policies and provide Threshold gain.
4. Recognize and support planned, new, or enhanced Environmental Improvement Projects. Area Plans may also recommend enhancements to planned, new, or enhanced Environmental Improvement Projects as part of an integrated plan to comply with Regional Plan Policies and provide Threshold gain.
5. Promote environmentally beneficial redevelopment and revitalization within Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District.
6. Preserve the character of established residential areas outside of Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District, while seeking opportunities for environmental improvements within residential areas.
7. Protect and direct development away from Stream Environment Zones and other sensitive areas, while seeking opportunities for environmental improvements within sensitive areas. Development may be allowed in Disturbed Stream Environment zones within Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District only if allowed development reduces coverage and enhances natural systems within the Stream Environment Zone.
8. Identify facilities and implementation measures to enhance pedestrian, bicycling and transit opportunities along with other opportunities to reduce automobile dependency.

*Note: The RPU Committee (5-1) supported Policy LU-4.9 on November 15, 2011 and unanimously (6-0) supported to add Regional Center Overlay language on November 16, 2011.

**LU-4.9** IN ORDER TO BE FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN, ALL AREA PLANS THAT INCLUDE TOWN CENTERS OR REGIONAL CENTERS SHALL INCLUDE POLICIES, ORDINANCES AND OTHER IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES TO:

1. Address all requirements of Policy LU-4.8
2. Include building and site design standards that reflect the unique character of each area, respond to local design issues and consider ridgeline and viewsheild protection.

3. Promote walking, bicycling, transit use and shared parking in Town Centers and Regional Centers, which at a minimum shall include continuous sidewalks or other pedestrian paths and bicycle facilities along both sides of all highways within Town Centers and Regional Centers, and to other major activity centers.

4. Use standards within Town Centers and Regional Centers addressing the form of development and requiring that projects promote pedestrian activity and transit use.

5. Ensure adequate capacity for redevelopment and transfers of development rights into Town Centers and Regional Centers.

6. Identify an integrated community strategy for coverage reduction and enhanced stormwater management.

7. Demonstrate that all development activity within Town Centers and Regional Centers will provide Threshold gain, including but not limited to measurable improvements in water quality.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.10 on November 15, 2011.

LU-4.10 IN ORDER TO BE FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN, AREA PLANS THAT INCLUDE THE HIGH DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT SHALL INCLUDE POLICIES, ORDINANCES AND OTHER IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES TO:

1. Address all requirements of Policies LU-4.8 and LU-4.9.

2. Include building and site design standards that substantially enhance the appearance of existing buildings in the High Density Tourist District.

3. Provide pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities connecting the High Density Tourist District with other regional attractions.

4. Demonstrate that all development activity within the High Density Tourist District will provide Threshold gain, including but not limited to measurable improvements in water quality. If necessary to achieve Threshold gain, off-site improvements may be additionally required.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.11 on November 15, 2011.

The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to LU-4.11 on February 1, 2012

LU-4.11 LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS MAY ADOPT DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCES THAT SUPERSEDE TRPA ORDINANCES IF THE AREA PLAN AND ASSOCIATED ORDINANCES ARE FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN, AND MEET THE INTENT OF TRPA ORDINANCES.

*Note: The RPU Committee deferred action on Policy LU-4.12 and directed staff to work through modified language with the Local Government Committee and return with a recommendation for the RPU Committee. The RPU Committee (4-1) supported Policy LU-4.12 on December 15, 2011. The RPU Committee supported (5-1) modifications to LU-4.12 on February 1, 2012

LU-4.12 ONCE AN AREA PLAN, AND ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODES WITHIN THE PLAN, HAVE BEEN FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN, LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS MAY ASSUME DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
AUTHORITY BY MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING WITH TRPA, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING LIMITATIONS:

1. The TRPA Governing Board shall annually review a sample of permits issued within each Area Plan, and shall certify that the Area Plans are being implemented in Conformance with the Regional Plan. If the TRPA Governing Board finds that development that has been permitted within an Area Plan does not comply with the conforming Area Plan, TRPA may retract delegation of certain permitting authority and implement the conforming Area Plan.

2. Approval of projects within Area Plans shall require TRPA review and approval if the project includes any of the following criteria:
   a. All development within the High Density Tourist District;
   b. All development within the Shorezone of Lake Tahoe;
   c. All development within the Conservation District;
   d. All development meeting criteria on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Center</th>
<th>Town Center</th>
<th>Not in Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>200,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>100,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>50,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>100,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>50,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>25,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. All of the local governments ongoing TRPA development monitoring and reporting requirements are met.

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported Policy LU-4.13 on November 15 and 16, 2011. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) support modified language for LU-4.13 on December 6, 2011. The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to LU-4.13 on February 1, 2012

LU-4.13 TRPA SHALL TAKE AN ACTIVE ROLE IN ASSISTING WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONFORMING AREA PLANS TO HELP ENSURE THAT AREA PLANS ARE IN CONFORMANCE WITH TRPA REQUIREMENTS. LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS SHALL ALSO SEEK REVIEW AND COMMENT FROM ALL PUBLIC AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY AT APPROPRIATE POINTS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS TO ENSURE THAT REQUIREMENTS OF OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES ARE ADDRESSED. THIS POLICY IS INTENDED TO ENSURE THAT EACH AREA PLAN, AND ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODES WITHIN THE PLAN, WHEN PRESENTED TO TRPA FOR CONFORMANCE REVIEW AND APPROVAL, WILL HAVE ADDRESSED THE NEEDS AND CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITY AND WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL APPLICABLE LOCAL, STATE, AND REGIONAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS.

LU-4 Implementation Measures

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported LU-4 Implementation Measures 1-4 on November 16, 2011.

- Amend Chapter 12, 13, 14, the Plan Area Statements and the Land Use Map to incorporate the following seven major land use classifications (Wilderness,
Backcountry, Conservation, Recreation, Residential, Mixed-Use and Tourist) and three overlay districts (Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District).

- Amend the Development Code to reflect the Area Planning process outlined in Goal LU-4.
- Amend the appropriate Plan Area Statement to recognize Tribal ownership of parcels located on the East Shore of Lake Tahoe.
- Amend the Code to state that the Code, Plan Area Statements, and other adopted plans as amended by the Regional Plan update will remain in effect until superseded by local government area plans.

*Note: The RPU Committee directed staff on November 16, 2011 to work on LU-4 Implementation Measure 5 (sub-items 1-3) with the Local Government Committee, then bring recommendations back to the RPU Committee. The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported remaining LU-4 Implementation Measures on December 15, 2011.*

- Amend the Development Code to establish monitoring, reviewing, and reporting standards for Area Plans as follows:
  - Monitor – Local governments transfer basic information as part of building permit process
  - Review – TRPA staff check a sample of development projects approved by local governments using similar process to that used for existing MOU. The sample will be determined in each MOU.
  - Report – TRPA staff prepare an annual report on monitoring and review results

- Require that Area Plans include development standards that are consistent with criteria in the attached table.

---

**Note:** The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported language for the Land Use

---
### Land Use Classifications and Designations Table on January 04, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Parameters</th>
<th>Wilderness</th>
<th>Backcountry</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Mixed-Use</th>
<th>Town Center</th>
<th>Regional Center</th>
<th>Tourist</th>
<th>High Density Tourist District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing for each use type</td>
<td>Up to 4 stories (56 ft) max with adoption of an Area Plan</td>
<td>Up to 6 stories (95 ft) max with adoption of an Area Plan</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Up to 197’ max with adoption of an Area Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density SFD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing (1 unit per parcel unless greater than 1 acre)</td>
<td>Residential up to 25 units/ac</td>
<td>Tourist up to 40 units/ac with adoption of an Area Plan</td>
<td>Residential up to 25 units/ac</td>
<td>Tourist up to 40 units/ac with adoption of an Area Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density MBD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Plan for sidewalks, trails, and other pedestrian amenities providing safe and convenient non-motorized circulation within the Town Center and incorporating the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>Plan for sidewalks, trails, and other pedestrian amenities providing safe and convenient non-motorized circulation within the Regional Center and incorporating the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>Plan for sidewalks, trails, and other pedestrian amenities providing safe and convenient non-motorized circulation within the High Density Tourist District and incorporating the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Coverage</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Maximum of 70%</td>
<td>Maximum of 70%</td>
<td>Maximum of 70%</td>
<td>Maximum of 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported Goal LU-5 and Policy LU-5.1 on*
GOAL LU-5

COORDINATE THE REGULATION OF LAND USES WITHIN THE REGION WITH THE LAND USES SURROUNDING THE REGION.

To minimize the impacts on one another, the Tahoe Region and its surrounding communities should attempt to coordinate land use planning decisions. This goal is especially pertinent with respect to major land use decisions immediately adjacent to the Region which may have significant impacts on the Region and affect the ability of TRPA to attain environmental thresholds.

POLICIES

LU-5.1 THE REGIONAL PLAN SHALL ATTEMPT TO MITIGATE ADVERSE IMPACTS GENERATED BY THE PLAN WITHIN THE REGION, AND NOT EXPORT THE IMPACTS TO SURROUNDING AREAS.

Where project approvals or other proposed actions by TRPA would adversely impact surrounding areas, TRPA shall consult with the affected jurisdictions. While the Agency will attempt to ensure that adverse impacts are mitigated within the Region, there may be situations where the adverse impacts on surrounding areas are outweighed by the environmental harm that would result from absorbing all impacts within the Region. In that regard, state laws in California and Nevada require the export of virtually all wastewaters and solid wastes from the Region.

*Note: The RPU Committee directed staff on November 15, 2011 to modify Policy LU-5.2 to more accurately reflect the Compact and require Board direction initiating cooperative planning efforts. Modifications are reflected in proposed text. The RPU Committee unanimously supported Policy LU-5.2 on December 6, 2011.

LU-5.2 WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE REALIZATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN, THE AGENCY MAY ENGAGE IN COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTIONS LOCATED OUTSIDE THE REGION, BUT CONTIGUOUS TO ITS BOUNDARIES. THE TRPA GOVERNING BOARD SHALL INITIATE ALL COLLABORATIVE PLANNING EFFORTS THAT ARE AUTHORIZED BY THIS POLICY.

THE AGENCY SHALL DEVELOP JOINT REVIEW AGREEMENTS WITH PUBLIC ENTITIES ADJOINING THE REGION TO CONSIDER ACTS OF DEVELOPMENT OR IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT THAT CROSS JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES.

As authorized in the Compact, TRPA will develop such joint agreements with Placer County, El Dorado County, Washoe County, City and County of Carson City, Douglas County, and appropriate state and federal agencies to ensure that land use decisions of those entities that have a significant impact on the Tahoe Region are reviewed by the Agency.
COMMUNITY DESIGN

The purpose of this Subelement is to implement the TRPA regional design criteria as they apply to the built environment. The Governing Board policy applicable to community design is derived from environmental threshold carrying capacities for scenic resources:

POLICY STATEMENT

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, to insure the height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signing and other design elements of new, remodeled and redeveloped buildings be compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreational values of the Region.

This Subelement sets forth policies for new developments or existing developments in need of remodeling or redevelopment. Some aspects of development can be brought to total conformance within a certain period of time, such as a five year program to bring all signs into conformance with adopted standards. Others may require more time or extensive redevelopment or rehabilitation to correct past deficiencies.

GOAL CD-1

INSURE PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATURAL FEATURES AND QUALITIES OF THE REGION, PROVIDE PUBLIC ACCESS TO SCENIC VIEWS, AND ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT.

Based on findings in the Compact and evidence presented in the environmental threshold carrying capacity study, both the natural scenic qualities of the Region and the man-made environment have suffered degradation in the past decades. It is important that both the natural environment and the built environment be brought into compliance with the established thresholds, including the thresholds and policies found in the Scenic Subelement.

POLICIES

CD-1.1. THE SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS ESTABLISHED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS SHALL BE MAINTAINED OR IMPROVED.

Implementation of regional design review requirements will be required to ensure compliance with this policy.

CD-1.2 RESTORATION PROGRAMS BASED ON INCENTIVES WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THOSE AREAS DESIGNATED IN NEED OF SCENIC RESTORATION TO ACHIEVE THE RECOMMENDED RATING.

GOAL CD-2

REGIONAL BUILDING AND COMMUNITY DESIGN CRITERIA SHALL BE
ESTABLISHED TO ENSURE ATTAINMENT OF THE SCENIC THRESHOLDS, MAINTENANCE OF DESIRED COMMUNITY CHARACTER, COMPATIBILITY OF LAND USES, AND COORDINATED PROJECT REVIEW.

The intent of the criteria is that they be regional in nature yet specific enough to ensure that the Agency meets the mandate of specific thresholds and other policy requirements of this Plan as they relate to site planning. The concept is that a design review document is the focal point for implementing many other Plan policies relating to transportation, noise, water quality, air quality, scenic and aesthetic considerations, etc.

POLICIES

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously supported modifications to CD-2.1 on February 1, 2012

CD-2.11 TO BE FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN, AREA PLANS SHALL REQUIRE THAT ALL PROJECTS COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING DESIGN REQUIREMENTS. AREA PLANS MAY ALSO INCLUDE REGIONAL DESIGN REVIEW SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING TO BE USED IN EVALUATING PROJECTS THROUGHOUT THE REGION. THIS REVIEW MAY ENTAIL ADDITIONAL OR SUBSTITUTE REQUIREMENTS OR SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS NOT LISTED BELOW THAT PROMOTE THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT.

A. Site Design: All new development shall consider site design which includes, at a minimum:

1) Existing natural features to be retained and incorporated into the site design.

2) Building placement and design to be compatible with adjacent properties and consideration of solar exposure, climate, noise, safety, fire protection, and privacy.

3) Site planning to include a drainage, infiltration, and grading plan meeting BMP water quality standards.

4) Access, parking, and circulation to be logical, safe, and meet the requirements of the transportation element.

B. Building Design: Height, Bulk and Scale: Standards shall be adopted to ensure attractive and compatible development. The following shall be considered:

1) Outside Town Centers, building height shall be limited to two stories (32 feet). Within Town Centers, building height may be allowed up to four stories (56 feet) as part of an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan. Within Regional Centers, building height may be allowed up to six stories (95 feet) as part of an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the
Regional Plan. Within the High Density Tourist District, building height may be allowed up to 197 feet as part of an Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan, except that provisions for additional height requirements may be provided for unique situations such as lighting towers, ski towers, buildings within Ski Area Master Plans, steep sites, redevelopment projects and tourist accommodation facilities, affordable housing, and essential public safety facilities.

2) Building height limits shall be established to ensure that buildings do not project above the forest canopy, ridge lines, or otherwise detract from the viewshed.

3) Buffer requirements shall be established for noise, snow removal, aesthetic, and environmental purposes.

4) The scale of structures should be consistent with existing and planned Land Uses in the area.

5) Viewshed should be considered in all new construction. Emphasis should be placed on lake views from major transportation corridors.

6) Area Plans that allow buildings over two stories in height shall include provisions for transitional height limits or other buffer areas adjacent to areas not allowing buildings over two stories in height.

7) Area Plans shall include design standards for building design and form. Within Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District, building design and form standards shall promote pedestrian activity.

C. Landscaping: The following should be considered with respect to this design component of a project:

1) Native vegetation should be utilized whenever possible, consistent with Fire Defensible Space Requirements.

2) Vegetation should be used to screen parking, and to alleviate long strips of parking space and accommodate stormwater runoff where feasible.

3) Plants should be used to give privacy, reduce glare and heat, deflect wind, muffles noise, prevent erosion, and soften the line of architecture where feasible.

D. Lighting: Lighting increases the operational efficiency of a site. In determining the lighting for a project, the following should be considered:

1) Exterior lighting should be minimized to protect dark sky views, yet adequate to provide for public safety with an emphasis on safety and should be consistent with the architectural design.

2) Exterior lighting should utilize cutoff shields that extend below the lighting element to minimize light pollution and stray light.

3) Overall levels should be compatible with the neighborhood light level. Emphasis should be placed on a few, well placed, low intensity lights.

4) Lights should not blink, flash, or change intensity except for temporary public safety signs.
Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to support language for Community Design Policy CD-2.1 E. on February 21, 2012

E. **Signing:**

Area Plans may include alternative sign standards. For Area Plans to be found in conformance with the Regional Plan, the Area Plan must demonstrate that the sign standards will minimize and mitigate significant scenic impacts and move toward attainment or achieve the adopted scenic thresholds for the Lake Tahoe Region.

In the absence of a conforming Area Plan that addresses sign standards, the following policies apply, along with implementing ordinances:

1) Off premise signs are generally prohibited; way-finding and directional signage may be considered where scenic impacts are minimized and mitigated.

2) Signs should be incorporated into building design

3) When possible, signs should be consolidated into clusters to avoid clutter

4) Signage should be attached to buildings when possible

5) Standards for number, size, height, lighting, square footage, and similar characteristics for on premise signs shall be formulated and shall be consistent with the land uses permitted in each district.

Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (6-0) to support language for Community Design CD-2 Implementation Measures on January 4, 2012.

**CD-2 Implementation Measures:**

- Amend TRPA Code to reflect changes in the Community Design Subelement.
- Amend Chapter 22 to redefine how height is measured on steep slopes to promote the stair-stepping of structures.
- Develop a definition of essential public safety facilities in coordination with local public safety agencies.

---

*Note: Topic addressed under Goal LU-4

Local jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt design guidelines consistent with the Regional Plan. The Agency will consider local design review guidelines when preparing the regional design review guidelines. Also, the Agency will encourage local governments to adopt design guidelines consistent with the Agency guidelines.*
High noise levels can reduce the public’s enjoyment of the natural environment, impact quality of life for residents, and disturb native wildlife. The TRPA Compact recognizes noise as an Environmental Threshold and requires that TRPA establish carrying capacity standards for noise. The Noise Subelement establishes Goals and Policies to achieve and maintain TRPA’s noise Thresholds. The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact requires that environmental threshold carrying capacities be established for noise and that the Plan and its elements achieve and maintain all such environmental threshold carrying capacities. The following standards have been adopted for noise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Monitoring Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aircraft</strong></td>
<td>80 dB</td>
<td>6,500 m-start of takeoff roll&lt;br&gt;2,000 m-runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.4 dB</td>
<td>6,500 m-start of takeoff roll&lt;br&gt;2,000 m-runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watercraft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pass-By Test</td>
<td>82 L&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>50 ft.-engine at 3,000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shoreline Test</td>
<td>75 L&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Microphone 5 ft. above water, 2 ft. above curve of shore, 5 ft. above dock or platform. Watercraft in Lake, no minimum distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stationary Test</td>
<td>88 dB L&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt; for boats manufactured before January 1, 1993;</td>
<td>Microphone 3.3 feet from exhaust outlet - 5 feet above water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 dB L&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt; for boats manufactured after January 1, 1993;</td>
<td>Microphone 3.3 feet from exhaust outlet - 5 feet above water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motor Vehicles Less Than 6,000 GVW</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motor Vehicles Greater Than 6,000 GVW</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motorcycles</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-Road Vehicles</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Snowmobiles</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Noise Subelement on January 26, 2012.

1. The single event noise standard of 80 dB L<sub>max</sub> for aircraft departures at Lake Tahoe Airport shall be effective immediately. The single event noise standard of 80 dB L<sub>max</sub> for aircraft arrivals at Lake Tahoe Airport is not to be effective until ten years after the adoption of an airport master plan by TRPA. The schedule for phasing in the 80 dB arrival standard shall be based on a review.
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CUMULATIVE NOISE EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Average Noise Level Or CNEL range (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMERICAL STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential Areas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential Areas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel Areas</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Areas</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Areas</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Outdoor Recreation Areas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Outdoor Recreation Areas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness and Roadless Areas</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Wildlife Habitat Areas</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY STATEMENT:** It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in the development of the Regional Plan to define, locate, and establish CNEL levels for transportation corridors.

**TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS**

1. Highway 50
2. Highways 89, 207, 28, 267 and 431
3. South Lake Tahoe Airport

1. Recommended CNEL levels for transportation corridors.
2. This recommended threshold overrides the land use CNEL thresholds and is limited to an area within 300 feet from the edge of the road.
3. This recommended threshold applies to those areas impacted by the approved flight paths.

---

**GOAL #N-1**

**SINGLE EVENT NOISE STANDARDS SHALL BE ATTAINED AND MAINTAINED.**

People can be annoyed by a specific noise source. Thresholds were have been adopted that apply to aircraft, boats, motor vehicles, off-road vehicles, and snowmobiles to reduce impacts associated with single noise events.

**POLICIES**

*Note: The RPU Committee (5-1) (Nay: Shute (CA) in absentia) supported the Noise Policy N-1.1 on January 26, 2012.*

N-1.1. UNLESS SUPERSEDED BY AN UPDATE TO THE 1986 AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, AN ORDINANCE

---

Amended 05/28/97
AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM SHALL BE DEVELOPED TO PERMIT ONLY AIRCRAFT THAT MEET THE SINGLE EVENT NOISE THRESHOLDS TO USE THE AIRPORT.

The 77.1 dBA single-event threshold applies between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. The airport master plan shall provide for implementation and enforcement of the single event noise thresholds for aircraft. Review of the phasing schedule for the 80 dBA standard for aircraft arrivals shall be conducted at five year intervals, consistent with the airport master plan and the periodic threshold reviews. TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe (owner/operator of the airport) will continue to analyze the airport’s environmental impacts, the best available aircraft technologies, and the needs of the community to develop plans for threshold attainment with regard to airport operations.

N-1.2. BOATS WILL ONLY BE ALLOWED TO USE ON LAKE TAHOE IF THEY COMPLY IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE SINGLE-EVENT THRESHOLD.

Implementation of the single-event threshold for boats shall be shared by the public and private sectors. TRPA shall prepare a model ordinance, and encourage local government and the U. S. Coast Guard to adopt and enforce the model ordinance. TRPA shall also encourage marinas and other boat launching facilities to participate in implementation of the single-event threshold standard.

N-1.3. MOTOR VEHICLES AND MOTORCYCLES SHALL COMPLY WITH THE APPROPRIATE NOISE THRESHOLDS.

The local and state law enforcement agencies should will not allow motor vehicles and motorcycles to use the streets and highways in the Region Basin if they exceed the single-event thresholds for noise.

N-1.4. OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE IS PROHIBITED IN THE LAKE TAHOE REGION EXCEPT ON SPECIFIED ROADS, TRAILS, OR DESIGNATED AREAS WHERE THE IMPACTS CAN BE MITIGATED.

Off-road vehicles can be annoying if they produce excessive noise relative to the standards of the surrounding land uses. To reduce these noise impacts of off-road vehicles, as well as impacts on wildlife, vegetation and water quality by allowing their use, the Plan will allow them to be used only in designated areas.

N-1.5. THE USE OF SNOWMOBILES WILL BE RESTRICTED TO DESIGNATED AREAS.

Snowmobiles can also be annoying if they produce excessive noise or are incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Snowmobiles can interfere with other winter outdoor activities and affect wildlife. To resolve these problems, snowmobile use should be restricted to specified areas where potential conflicts with other winter outdoor activities and wildlife can be minimized. Exceptions will be allowed pursuant to Policy N-1.4, above. (See Dispersed Recreation Subelement, Goal #2, Policy 2.)

Note: The RPU Committee (5-1) (Nay: Shute (CA) in absentia) supported the Noise Policy N-1.6 on January 26, 2012.

N-1.6. THE PLAN WILL PERMIT USES ONLY IF THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE NOISE STANDARDS.

Noise mitigation measures soundproofing practices may be required on all structures containing uses that would otherwise adversely impact the prescribed noise levels.

Ordinances shall be adopted to allow the Agency or local governments to review and resolve any existing and future problems of nuisances associated with a specific source of noise. These ordinances shall allow the Agency or local governments to require that the impacts
be mitigated either through voluntary compliance or through conditions of project approval.
GOAL #N-2
COMMUNITY NOISE EQUIVALENT LEVELS SHALL BE ATTAINED AND MAINTAINED.

CNEL thresholds were adopted to reduce the annoyance associated with cumulative noise events on people and wildlife. In the Region Basin, the main sources of noise are attributed to the major transportation corridors and the Airport (refer to Figure 43). Therefore, these policies are directed towards reducing the transmission of noise from those sources. The CNEL thresholds will be attained upon implementation of the following policies.

POLICIES

N-2.1. TRANSMISSION OF NOISE FROM THE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS SHALL BE REDUCED.

The noise associated with the transportation corridors can be decreased by reducing the number of trips and by installing mitigation measures. Trip reduction will be accomplished by the transit improvements identified in the Transportation Element. Ordinances will establish specific site design criteria for projects to help reduce the transmission of noise from the transportation corridors. The design criteria will also be incorporated into the water quality and transportation improvement programs. The mitigation measures may include set-backs, earth berms, and barriers.

N-2.2. REDUCE NOISE-RELATED IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE AIRPORT SHOULD BE AT AN ACCEPTABLE LEVELS.

A master plan and accompanying EIS must be completed to evaluate the noise impacts from aircraft flights into and from the Lake Tahoe Airport. The Airport Master Plan should include specific recommendations on aircraft type and the number of flights per day per aircraft type necessary to attain the environmental thresholds. The master plan should also include implementation provisions for attaining the noise thresholds.

N-2.3. IN CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES, TRPA WILL FURTHER DEFINE CNELs FOR WILDERNESS AND ROADLESS AREAS AND FOR CRITICAL WILDLIFE HABITAT AREAS.

The 25 CNEL standard for the above areas needs further evaluation as to location of monitoring and conditions of monitoring. The Agency will further evaluate the proper application of the standard.
Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported the Air Quality Introduction and Goals, Policies and Implementation Measures AQ-1 on February 1, 2012.

AIR QUALITY

Poor air quality poses a risk to human health and reduces the public's enjoyment of the natural environment. Air pollution also degrades ecosystem integrity and impairs water quality. Maintaining and improving air quality will protect the quality of life for residents and visitors, maintain the region's tourism economy, and attain multiple thresholds.

The TRPA Compact recognizes air as a natural resource and requires that TRPA establish environmental threshold carrying capacity standards for air quality. The Compact directs TRPA to develop a land use plan that considers air resources, as well as a transportation plan that reduces air pollution from motor vehicles. TRPA is also required to attain federal, state, and local air quality standards for the portions of the Region in which they apply. The Air Quality Subelement, along with the Transportation Element, establishes Goals and Policies to achieve and maintain TRPA’s Air Quality Thresholds and all applicable federal, state, and local standards for air quality.

GOAL AQ-1

ATTAIN AND MAINTAIN AIR QUALITY IN THE REGION AT LEVELS THAT ARE HEALTHY FOR HUMANS AND THE ECOSYSTEM, ACHIEVE AND MAINTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS AND DO NOT INTERFERE WITH RESIDENTS’ AND VISITORS’ VISUAL EXPERIENCE.

It is intended that implementation of the control measures contained in the Air Quality Subelement and other TRPA programs will lead to attainment of the TRPA threshold standards and will also lead to attainment and maintenance of federal and state air quality standards.

POLICIES

AQ-1.1 COORDINATE WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND JURISDICTIONS TO REDUCE EMISSIONS, EXPOSURES, AND HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS WHEN DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS, PLANS, AND PROJECTS.

The Regional Plan will facilitate cooperative efforts that efficiently attain and maintain Air Quality threshold standards, and federal and state air quality standards, while at the same time achieving other threshold standards.

AQ-1.2 REDUCE OR LIMIT SOURCES OF POLLUTANTS THAT DEGRADE VISIBILITY.

Some air pollutants, such as fugitive dust and wood smoke, degrade visibility as well as harm human or ecosystem health. The Regional Plan will control those pollutants to minimize their impact on visibility, as well as their impact on human or ecosystem health.

AQ-1.3A ENCOURAGE THE REDUCTION OF EMISSIONS FROM MOTOR VEHICLES AND OTHER MOTORIZED MACHINERY IN THE REGION.
Significant emissions of air pollutants including greenhouse gases (GHGs) are produced by automobiles, motor vehicles and other gas powered machinery in the Region. The Land Use Subelement and the Transportation Element contain Goals and Policies to reduce the amount of air pollution generated from motor vehicles in the Region. Additionally, TRPA shall pursue other feasible and cost effective opportunities to reduce emissions from motor vehicles and other gas powered machinery in the Region.

AQ-1.3B ENCOURAGE THE REDUCTION OF EMISSIONS FROM GAS APPLIANCES.
Additional emissions of air pollutants are produced by building appliances. TRPA shall seek feasible and cost effective opportunities to reduce emissions from gas appliances in the Region.

AQ-1.3C ENCOURAGE THE REDUCTION OF EMISSIONS THROUGH BUILDING EFFICIENCY.
Construction of energy efficient buildings, replacement of energy inefficient buildings, and improvements to the efficiency of existing buildings can significantly reduce air pollutant emissions in the Region. TRPA shall seek feasible opportunities to promote energy efficient buildings in the Region.

AQ-1.4 REDUCE EMISSIONS FROM WOOD BURNING STOVES IN THE REGION, AND REQUIRE WOOD STOVES TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT EPA EMISSIONS STANDARDS WITH A TARGET COMPLIANCE DATE OF 2020.
Older, less efficient wood burning appliances emit more air pollutants than newer, more efficient appliances. A faster rate of replacement of old inefficient wood burning appliances with newer cleaner burning technology will benefit attainment of the Air Quality Threshold standards.

AQ-1.5 PROMOTE THE REDUCTION OF AIR QUALITY IMPACTS FROM CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES IN THE REGION.

AQ-1.6 PROMOTE TECHNOLOGIES THAT REDUCE THE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF PRESCRIBED BURNING, OR NON-BURNING METHODS OF REDUCING HAZARDOUS FOREST FUELS, WHERE PRACTICAL.

AQ-1 Implementation Measures
• Develop an incentive program to encourage the replacement of non-compliant wood stoves and conversion of fireplaces by 2015.
• Provide exemptions to current wood stove disclosure requirements for transfer instruments such as Trusts and Limited Liability Corporations and where wood stoves were replaced in conformance with the Wood Heater Retrofit Program adopted by TRPA in the 1987 Regional Plan (which became effective January 1, 1993).

GOAL AQ-2
MAINTAIN AN EFFECTIVE AIR QUALITY MITIGATION PROGRAM FOR THE REGION.
Administrator a program that effectively mitigates significant air quality impacts resulting
from new projects or changes in use. Under the mitigation program, impact fees and mitigation measures are among the strategies to address significant impacts.

POLICIES

AQ-2.1 IN ADDITION TO OTHER POLICIES AND REGULATIONS INTENDED TO MINIMIZE AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT, COLLECT AND EXPEND AIR QUALITY MITIGATION FEES TO OFFSET AIR POLLUTION IN COORDINATION WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (EIP). A PORTION OF MITIGATION FUNDS SHALL BE EXPENDED IN THE LOCAL JURISDICTION WHERE THE FUNDS ARE GENERATED AND A PORTION OF THE FUNDS MAY BE USED ON THE MOST COST EFFECTIVE AND ENVIRONMENTALLY BENEFICIAL PROJECTS IN THE REGION.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Air Quality AQ-2 Implementation Measures on February 21, 2012.

AQ-2 Implementation Measures

- Amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances to allow distribution of a portion of air quality mitigation funds across jurisdictional boundaries to support projects of Regional priority established as part of a regional capital improvement program developed in cooperation with local jurisdictions such as the Five Year Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) Priority Project List.

AIR QUALITY PLAN ELEMENT

A. Introduction

The Air Quality Plan Element of the integrated Regional Transportation Plan—Air Quality Plan focuses on the need for air quality control strategies required to meet the air quality related goals for the Tahoe Region. The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Compact) states that the goal of transportation planning shall be to reduce to the extent feasible air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles. The purpose of the integrated Regional Transportation Plan-Air Quality Plan is to attain and maintain the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (thresholds) established by TRPA in 1982, and all applicable federal, state, and local standards established for transportation and air quality.

The Air Quality Plan portion of the integrated plan document contains all feasible control measures considered to be effective in the Tahoe Region. This is consistent with the California Clean Air Act requirements, and California Air Resources Board guidance developed pursuant to the California Clean Air Act.

TRPA thresholds, Federal National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and state standards establish 23 separate air quality standards for 14 air quality parameters, including carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, particulate matter less than 10 microns in size (PM10), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), sulfur dioxide (SO2), visibility, lead, hydrocarbons, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, oxides of nitrogen (NOx), wood smoke, suspended soil particles and NOx transport. Volume II of the Regional Transportation Plan—Air Quality Plan discussed these standards.

Air Quality Standards—Status

The status of the various threshold, federal and state standards is as follows:
Air Quality - Attainment
- Carbon Monoxide 1 hour standard - all standards
- Ozone 1 hour standard - NAAQS
- Nitrogen Dioxide 24-hour and annual average - all standards
- Total Suspended Particulate (24-hour and Annual Geometric Mean) - all standards
- Particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM10) (24-hour) - NAAQS
- PM10 (Annual Geometric Mean) - all standards

Air Quality - Non-attainment
- Carbon Monoxide 8-hour standard - NAAQS, CA, and TRPA standards
- Ozone 1-hour standard - TRPA standard
- PM10 24-hour standard - CA standard

Air Quality - Non-attainment Transitional
- Ozone 1-hour standard - CA standard

Visibility - Attainment
- Regional visibility - TRPA standard
- Subregional visibility - TRPA standard

Nitrate Deposition
The interim target for NOx emissions is currently being met. Vehicle NOx emissions are estimated to have been reduced overall by up to 15.6 percent between 1982 and 1987. The impact of transport NOx to the Tahoe Air Basin has not been fully quantified at this time.

Management standard for a 10 percent VMT reduction has not been met.

Air Quality Standards - Forecasts
Air quality forecasts are limited to the pollutants for which the Region is not in attainment. The forecasts all assume worst-case growth in traffic volumes.

Carbon Monoxide
Carbon monoxide concentrations were modeled for the South Stateline area both with and without the completion of the redevelopment-related Loop Road project. Without the completion of the loop roads, attainment of the 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for CO is modeled at the California South Stateline monitoring site by 1997. The NAAQS for CO at the Nevada South Stateline monitoring site is modeled as remaining in attainment. The NAAQS for CO is also modeled as being in attainment at all other locations in the Region.

With the completion of the Loop Road system in the South Stateline area, the California, Nevada, and TRPA threshold standards for CO (6 ppm, 8-hour average) are modeled...
as being in attainment at both South Stateline monitoring sites. Construction of the Loop Road system will commence in FY 1993-94, with completion of the project anticipated in FY 1996-97.

The TRPA CO threshold standard and the California and Nevada CO standards for the Tahoe Region are also shown as being in attainment at all but one location within the Region by 1997. Without the implementation of any transportation control measures, violations of the 6 ppm CO standard through 2007 are forecast at Kingsbury Grade (Nevada 207) and U.S. 50. Monitoring of this location will be necessary to determine the actual concentrations and to determine attainment of the 6 ppm standard.

Forecast concentrations do not take into account the impact of the transportation and air quality control measures contained in the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan Control Program - Action Element.

Ozone
The California standard for ozone (.09 ppm) was exceeded on two days during 1989, being measured at .10 ppm. Data for 1990 and 1991 indicates that the California ozone standard was met with a high reading of .09 pm at the Lake Tahoe Boulevard monitoring site.

The trend in ozone concentrations as measured at the Lake Tahoe Boulevard site on the South Shore indicates that ozone concentrations are relatively stable. It is assumed that this trend will continue, and may decline as ozone precursor control measures are implemented upwind of the Region. Implementation of transportation and air quality control measures in the Tahoe Region should contribute to a decline in ozone concentrations, although the portion of the decline attributed to local sources would be minimal.

Particulate Matter Less Than 10 Microns – PM10 (24-Hour)
The trend in PM10 24-hour measurements has fluctuated significantly since measurements were first taken in 1985. However, the overall trend has been downward, increasing from 116 µg/m³ in 1985 to a high of 177 µg/m³ in 1987, and then decreasing to 95 µg/m³ in 1988, and 84 µg/m³ in 1990. It is assumed this downward trend will continue as best management practices continue to be applied and stricter controls on combustion devices are implemented in the Tahoe Region.

B. Air Quality Control Measures
TRPA has the authority under the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (PL 95-551) to adopt and implement the ordinances necessary to attain and maintain air quality standards in the Tahoe Region. In 1987, TRPA adopted Chapter 91 (Air Quality Control) and Chapter 93 (Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The purpose of Chapter 91 is to implement the Air Quality Subelement, Land Use Element, of the Goals and Policies. Chapter 91 regulates and sets emission standards for combustion appliances including gas heaters and wood heaters. Chapter 91 also sets emission standards for new or modified stationary sources. TRPA's stationary source review rule meets or exceeds the requirements of the California Clean Air Act. It requires an environmental assessment and provides for best available control.
technology and best available retrofit control technology for new or modified stationary sources. Chapter 91 also restricts extended vehicle idling and prohibits the construction of new drive-up windows.

The purpose of Chapter 93 is to implement TRPA’s 1982 Air Quality Plan and the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Implementation Element of the Goals and Policies. Chapter 93 establishes fees and other procedures to offset impacts from indirect sources of air pollution. Chapter 93 requires a traffic analysis to be completed for new, additional, or transferred development. Chapter 93 requires that potential traffic and air quality impacts be analyzed and requires that regional and cumulative impacts be offset or mitigated. The traffic and air quality mitigation fees collected under Chapter 93 must be expended on projects which will offset or reduce emissions.

Implementation of the control measures contained in the Air Quality Plan should lead to attainment of the TRPA threshold standards and should also lead to attainment and maintenance of federal and state air quality standards.

The Air Quality Plan contains the following elements:
- Vehicle Emission Control Technologies
- Alternative Fuels
- Transportation Control Measures (TCM)
- Indirect South Control Measures
- Best Management Practices
- Combustion Heaters
- Stationary Source Controls

**Vehicle Emission Control Technologies**

On-board vehicle emission controls have had a significant effect on vehicle emissions. Improvements in regional air quality can be attributed primarily to the cleaner vehicle fleet that has resulted from the improved control technology. Since 1980, the composite emission factors developed for the Tahoe Region indicate an overall average decrease in vehicle carbon monoxide emissions of 51.6 percent, and in oxides of nitrogen emissions of 31.3 percent.

Eight-hour CO concentrations monitored at the South Stateline, California site show an overall improvement of 46.8 percent from 1980 to 1990. Also, the number of days the NAAQS eight-hour CO standard was exceeded has decreased from 27 days in 1980 to 7 days in 1990 (74.1 percent reduction).

Vehicle NOx emissions (based on composite emission factors) decreased by 31.3 percent from 1980 to 1987. By applying the composite emission factors to vehicle miles of travel modeled for the Region, an estimated decrease in NOx emissions of up to 15.6 percent, from 1981 to 1987, can be calculated.

The forecast emission inventories prepared by the California Air Resources Board for the Tahoe Air Basin indicate that bulk emissions from motor vehicles are expected to
continue to decrease from 1987 to 2010. Carbon monoxide emissions are expected to decrease by 21.1 percent, and NOx emissions are expected to decrease by 42.6 percent. Additional improvements in vehicle control technology are expected to result from the recently passed federal Clean Air Act of 1990. The federal Clean Air Act includes requirements to reduce vehicle emissions of NOx and CO even further than the requirements of the 1977 Clean Air Act Amendments.

**Alternative Fuels**

Vehicles designed to use alternative fuels, including methanol, ethanol, compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) and electricity, and reformulated conventional fuels, can produce significant reductions in motor vehicle emissions. However, as reported in the study Alternative Motor Vehicle Fuels to Improve Air Quality (California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance, January 1990) each fuel requires appropriate engine design and emission control systems. The study report also states that vehicle emissions are the net result of fuel properties, engine design and emission control technology.

Use of methanol as a motor vehicle fuel can have emission reduction benefits. However, there are other impacts associated with the use of methanol that are not as positive. Low-level blends of methanol and gasoline can reduce carbon monoxide emissions in older cars, but it also can increase nitrogen oxide emissions. Higher concentrations of methanol can reduce NOx emissions, but does so at the expense of higher CO emissions. Introduction and widespread use of methanol may have health, safety, and other environmental impacts. Strategies to substitute methanol for gasoline are not relatively cost-effective. Methanol is highly corrosive to engine and fuel system components and would require a significant investment in converting these components to more compatible materials.

CNG has a number of advantages as a motor fuel, however, its compression and storage space requirements present obstacles to its widespread use to fuel passenger vehicles. CNG is well suited to powering diesel engines in trucks and buses. CNG fuel cost savings are offset by current costs of vehicle conversion, and the cost of fueling stations.

LPG is a mixture of petroleum and natural gases. LPG is widely used in residential, commercial, industrial, and other applications. LPG has been widely used as a motor vehicle fuel for many years, and the LPG fuel storage and distribution system is already established. LPG emissions testing indicates that it can provide air quality benefits similar to methanol. Vehicle emissions are comparable to gasoline with the exception of carbon monoxide, which is substantially reduced. On-board fuel storage requires a large tank, and the fuel system needs to be converted for LPG. LPG conversion costs are significant, and because of cost considerations, LPG may have better application in fleet vehicle use.

Emissions from electrically powered vehicles are generally non-existent. Use of electrical powered vehicles is limited by range and recharge time. The best application of electrical powered technology may be in urban delivery vehicles.

Oxygenated fuels are gasolines that are blended with additives that contain oxygen. The increased oxygen in the fuel enables the fuel to burn more completely, reducing the amount of carbon monoxide produced by the vehicle. Oxygenated fuels are generally...
available in two forms: gasoline blended with ethanol, or gasoline blended with methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE).

Ethanol is an ethyl alcohol produced from agricultural products. It increases the octane of fuel. Ethanol can reduce carbon monoxide emissions, primarily in older model cars. Nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions are somewhat higher for ethanol than gasoline. Ethanol production for use as a fuel is highly dependent on tax subsidies.

MTBE is a petroleum-based oxygenate produced at refineries and petrochemical plants. It is commonly used to produce high octane or premium grade gasolines. Low levels of MTBE blends appear to have a varying effect on NOx emissions.

Washoe County, Nevada, implemented a 2.5 percent oxygenated fuel mixture program in 1989, resulting in an 11 percent reduction in carbon monoxide emissions. To comply with the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments, Washoe County will require a 2.7 percent oxygen content in gasoline during the winter months of 1991-92. This mixture should result in a 15 percent reduction in CO emissions.

The Federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1991 require oxygenated fuels be sold in moderate CO non-attainment areas by 1992. In order to ensure that NOx emissions do not increase, the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) requires a lower oxygen content mixture (2.0 percent) than the federal standard. The California portion of the Region would, therefore, use a different oxygen content fuel than the Nevada portion which complies with the federal oxygen mixture regulation. Provided that fuel distribution is not problematic, two oxygenated mixtures can be implemented in the Tahoe Region. However, it is also recognized by TRPA that uniformity in oxygen content regulations would be desirable to fuel suppliers.

Extensive research is underway by both regulatory agencies and industry to evaluate the opportunities for, and costs of, alternative fuel properties so as to reduce emissions. Reformulated fuel technology is showing that emissions in older vehicles can be reduced by 20 to 30 percent. Emission reduction estimates from reformulated fuels in new vehicles range up to 15 percent.

**Transportation Control Measures**

The California Clean Air Act defines transportation control measures as "any strategy to reduce vehicle trips, vehicle use, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling, or traffic congestion for the purpose of reducing vehicle emissions."

Transportation control measures can include both regulatory measures and transportation system measures. Regulatory measures are implemented through regulations or ordinances which are used to affect individual travel choices or traffic flow. Regulatory measures can include employer-based trip reduction programs and parking management programs.

Transportation system measures are measures which are implemented by transportation providers to influence travel behavior to reduce vehicle use. Transportation system measures can include TSM improvements, transit system improvements, and land use changes that support trip reductions.
The Regional Transportation Plan includes transportation control measures which reduce vehicle emissions through vehicle trip reduction programs and air quality benefits due to congestion improvements. Chapter 91 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances limits the allowable amount of time of vehicle idling in the Region. TRPA also has an ongoing program to reduce unnecessary trips and to provide for shorter trips through land use planning measures. Community plans are to address vehicle trip reduction targets and threshold related air quality standards. Community plans shall contain programs to reduce the dependency on the automobile and trip reduction measures which will reduce congestion, lead to air quality and visibility improvements, and reduce VMT.

**Indirect Source Control Measures**

An indirect source of pollutant emissions is defined as, "A facility, building, structure, installation, real property, road or highway which generates or may generate mobile sources of air pollution or serves as a trip end. Indirect sources include, but are not limited to parking facilities, airports, and retail facilities." An indirect source control measure is a rule or ordinance established to reduce mobile source emissions associated with specific activity centers. Indirect source control measures can be divided into two categories: measures to reduce emissions from existing sources and measures to reduce or mitigate emissions from new or modified sources.

The Regional Transportation Plan contains transportation demand management measures which will reduce vehicle trip demand and VMT. Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires new or modified indirect sources to mitigate air quality impacts to less than significant levels. Cumulative impacts of new development will be addressed in revisions to Chapter 93.

**Best Management Practices**

The Tahoe Region is in compliance with the California PM10 standard as measured by the annual geometric mean. However, the Region does not achieve the California standard as measured over 24 hours. TRPA has a program to reduce sources of PM10 through the application of best management practices and controls on combustion appliances.

Chapter 25 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Best Management Practice Requirements) implements best management practice (BMP) requirements for the Region. Best management practices are alternative structural and nonstructural practices proven effective in erosion control and management of surface runoff in the Region. BMPs include both temporary and permanent activities. BMPs include: construction site activities, sediment barriers, soil stabilization (non-vegetative), slope runoff controls, grade stabilization, sediment retention, slope stabilization, infiltration systems, vegetative soil stabilization (including revegetation) and other practices such as street sweeping. These BMPs can significantly reduce erosion and stabilize slopes, and reduce the amount of wind-blown soils and re-entrained dust in the Region.

Chapters 61 through 64 of the Code of Ordinances also contain requirements for erosion control, slope stabilization, and site disturbances related to grading and construction activities. Chapter 64 of the Code requires dust control measures for any grading activity. Chapter 91 regulates the amount of PM10 emissions allowed from new or modified stationary sources.
Combustion Heaters

TRPA regulates combustion heaters through Chapter 91 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The TRPA threshold management standards for regional and subregional visibility call for a 15 percent reduction in wood smoke emissions from 1981 base year. In order to achieve this threshold standard, it is necessary to amend the existing Code of Ordinances to ensure that wood burning stoves and fireplaces are replaced in a more timely fashion by newer technology wood burning appliances.

TRPA recommends Chapter 91 of the Code of Ordinances be amended as follows:

1. Upon sale of a residential dwelling unit or any other structure which is equipped with a wood burning appliance that does not meet current emission standards, the wood burning appliance is to be replaced with an appliance that meets TRPA emission standards as contained in the Code, or shall be rendered inoperable.

2. It shall be illegal to sell, or offer for sale, in the Tahoe Region, a wood burning appliance that does not meet the emission standards contained in the Code. It shall also be illegal to purchase, or acquire by other means, a wood burning appliance for use in the Tahoe Region which does not meet TRPA Code emission standards.

3. It shall be illegal for anyone to install a wood burning appliance in the Tahoe Region that does not meet TRPA Code emission standards.

4. It shall be illegal to sell, or offer for sale, in the Tahoe Region coal for residential heating. It shall also be illegal to burn coal as a home heating fuel in the Tahoe Region.

5. The stricter of TRPA, local, state, or federal standards regulating wood heating appliances or fuel for residential heating shall apply.

TRPA will enter into the necessary agreements with local or state jurisdictions to enforce wood burning appliance regulations. The City of South Lake Tahoe, Douglas County, El Dorado County, Placer County, and Washoe County should enter into a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) to implement a program to regulate wood burning appliances and combustion heaters. This program shall include permit approvals for installation or retrofit of wood burning appliances, and an inspection program under the jurisdiction of the local counties and City.

Stationary Source Controls

TRPA regulates new or modified stationary sources through Chapter 91 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Chapter 91 requires an environmental assessment be prepared for new or modified stationary sources that exceed minimum emission limits for NOx, PM10, VOC, SO2, and CO. Offsets are permitted, provided the existing stationary source is permanently retired. Chapter 91 requires best available control technology (BACT) for all new stationary sources. At a minimum, BACT measures shall meet or exceed applicable state or federal requirements.

C. Implementation Schedule

Implementation of the transportation and air quality control measures needed to assure attainment or maintenance of the Region’s air quality standards is scheduled over the next five years (1992-1997). Volume IV of the integrated Regional Transportation Plan -
Air Quality Plan (Capital Improvement Program) contains a recommended schedule (Table 5) for implementation of these control measures in the Region.

The recommended implementation schedule for transportation and air quality control measures is summarized as follows:

- Vehicle Emissions Control Technology (Federal) 1994
- Oxygenated Fuels (Federal) 1992
- Transportation Control Measures (States, Local) 1992-1997
- Indirect Source Measures (TRPA) Adopted (Chapter 91)
- Combustition Heaters Control Program (TRPA, Local) Adopted (Chapter 93)
- Stationary Source Controls (TRPA) Adopted (Chapter 91)
- Air Quality Monitoring Program (TRPA, CARB, NDEP) Ongoing

D. Attainment Projections

TRPA used the CALINE4 air quality model to determine the effect of the implementation of the transportation and air quality control measures on reducing carbon monoxide concentrations in the South Tahoe non-attainment area. Inputs to the CALINE4 model were selected which allowed the model to be calibrated to existing conditions. A complete discussion of the air quality modeling process and the use of the CALINE4 model can be found in Volume VI (Technical Appendix B).

Following model calibration, CO concentrations were modeled for seven “hot spot” locations within the Tahoe Region, including Park Avenue at U.S. 50, Ski Run Boulevard at U.S. 50, Al Tahoe Boulevard at U.S. 50, the South Tahoe Wye, Kingsbury Grade at U.S. 50, Nevada 28 in Incline Village, and California/Nevada 28 at North Stateline. CO concentrations were modeled at these locations for four forecast years: 1992, 1997, 2002, and 2007.

Air quality forecasts were analyzed to determine the impact of implementing the transportation and air quality control measures, including the following:

- Vehicle Emission Control Technologies
- Oxygenated Fuels Program
- Transportation Control Measures
- Indirect Source Control Measures
- Combustion Heater Controls
- Stationary Source Controls

Vehicle emission control technologies are anticipated to improve vehicle emissions by up to 21.1 percent for CO and 42.6 percent for NOx. Additional benefits will be realized from improved vehicle control technologies mandated by the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA).

A Region-wide oxygenated fuel program, which is mandated by the FCAA for implementation in 1992, is estimated to reduce CO emissions by 11.0 percent.
The transportation control measures to be implemented in the South Lake Tahoe area by 1997 will reduce traffic volumes by one percent by 1992, 7.2 percent by 1997, 9.2 percent by 2002, and 14.6 percent by 2007. Average daily vehicle miles of travel are modeled to be reduced by 78,500 VMT (4.3 percent) by 1997, by 113,000 VMT (5.0 percent) by 2002, and by 201,200 VMT (8.2 percent) by 2007.

These reductions in traffic volumes and VMTs are estimated to reduce CO bulk emissions by similar amounts. However, reductions in bulk CO emissions do not ensure that measured CO concentrations will be reduced correspondingly. CO concentrations are not directly related to reductions in bulk emissions. CO concentrations are subject to many other variables including meteorological conditions, vehicle speeds and traffic congestion, and the vehicle fleet mix.

With the completion of the construction of the South Stateline loop roads, attainment of the federal eight-hour CO standard (9 ppm) is projected at the Stateline, California monitoring site and at all other locations in the Region. The Stateline, Nevada monitor is projected to remain in attainment. The completion of the Loop Road project is anticipated by the end of the 1995-96 fiscal year.

With implementation of the transportation and air quality control measures contained in the Regional Transportation Plan – Air Quality Plan Control Program – Action Element, attainment of the California, Nevada and TRPA Eight-hour CO standard (6 ppm) is projected at the Stateline, California monitoring site by 1997. Attainment of the 6 ppm standard is also projected at all other locations in the Region by 1997.

These projections assume the timely completion of the Loop Road project in the Stateline, California area, the implementation of an oxygenated fuels program Region-wide by FY 1992, and the implementation of the first phase of the transportation and air quality control measures contained in the integrated Regional Transportation Plan – Air Quality Plan by 1997.

E. Emissions Accounting

A baseline emissions inventory for carbon monoxide was prepared by CARB for the El Dorado County portion of the Tahoe Air Basin. The emissions inventory is to be used as a baseline to compare progress in attaining the CO standards for the Region. An emissions accounting is required to assure that a five percent per year (averaged over three years) reduction is achieved until the CO standard is attained as mandated by the California Clean Air Act. The five percent per year reduction in bulk CO emissions target requires that emissions be reduced by 35.0 percent between the years 1987 and 1994.

The CARB CO emissions inventory indicates that bulk CO emissions will be reduced by 8.9 percent from 1987 to 1994, by an additional 6.0 percent from 1994 to 1997, by 5.1 percent from 1997 to 2000, and by 3.0 percent from 2000 to 2010. The bulk emissions inventory assumes that vehicle emissions will be reduced through improved vehicle emissions control technology and new gasoline specifications including clean fuels.

TRPA has calculated a 23.5 percent reduction in CO bulk emissions between 1987 and 1994 based on modeled Regional VMT and CO emission factors developed for the Tahoe Region.
Modeling of the emission reductions due to the implementation of transportation control measures indicates additional reductions in bulk emissions resulting from reduced vehicle miles of travel in the Region and reduced congestion on the South Shore highway system. Transportation control measures to be implemented in South Lake Tahoe by 1997 will reduce vehicle trips by 7.2 per cent. Average daily vehicle miles of travel are modeled to be reduced by 4.3 percent by 1997.

Reductions in traffic volumes and VMTs are estimated to reduce CO bulk emissions by similar amounts. However, reductions in bulk CO emissions do not ensure that measured CO concentrations will be reduced correspondingly. CO concentrations are not directly related to reductions in bulk emissions. CO concentrations are subject to many other variables including meteorological conditions, vehicle speeds and traffic congestion, and the vehicle fleet mix.

Additional reductions in CO emissions will also result from the implementation of an oxygenated fuels program in the Tahoe Region in 1992. Assuming similar reductions as experienced by Washoe County, an 11.0 percent reduction in emissions may be realized. A 15.0 percent reduction in emissions may be realized if higher concentrations of oxygenates are utilized.

Implementation of the transportation and air quality control measures should result in bulk CO emission reductions by 1994 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CARB</th>
<th>TRPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO Emission Reductions</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Control</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuels Program</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reductions</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target - 1987 to 1994</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferee</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>+6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peak carbon monoxide concentrations measured at the California South Stateline monitoring site have been reduced by approximately 22.3 percent between 1987 and 1990, an average of 5.6 percent reduction in concentrations per year. This is largely attributable to improved vehicle emission technology, but it also reflects the influence of the other parameters which affect CO concentrations.

Although the five percent per year average reduction in CO bulk emissions cannot be demonstrated utilizing the CARB emission reduction estimate, air quality modeling of CO concentrations in the Stateline, California area projects attainment of the federal and state CO standards upon construction of the Loop Road project which is anticipated to be completed by 1996, the implementation of the other transportation control measures, and the implementation of the oxygenated fuels program in 1992. The loop roads will divert approximately 53.0 percent of the traffic from the existing U.S. 50 to the new Loop Road system. Although traffic volumes will remain generally the same, CO concentrations and bulk emissions will be reduced significantly.

F. Cost Effectiveness

An assessment of the cost effectiveness of the transportation and air quality control
measures contained in the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan Control Program - Action Element was developed by identifying control measures to be implemented, estimating project and program costs, calculating emission reductions for each control program, and determining the relative cost effectiveness of each strategy. Because cost estimates were not calculated for the federally mandated vehicle emissions control technology and oxygenated fuels programs, or existing TRPA programs for indirect source controls, stationary source controls, and combustion heater controls, the cost effectiveness of these measures could not be determined.

Although the relative cost effectiveness of these control measures may be low due to the high cost of some of the transportation control measures and the relatively low reductions in emissions, implementation of the transportation control measures is considered a high priority for TRPA in achieving its transportation goals for the Region.

Traffic modeling indicates that the estimated average daily VMT savings following the implementation of the control measures programmed for the first five-year phase ending in 1997 is 78,500 VMT, a 4.3 percent reduction. It is assumed that a like percentage reduction in bulk CO emissions will also result. The CARB emissions inventory indicates a total of 54.36 tons per day of carbon monoxide from on-road mobile sources. A reduction of 4.3 percent would result in a reduction of 2.34 tons per day of bulk CO emissions. The cost of implementing the transportation control measures which would have an impact on CO emissions in the South Lake Tahoe area during the first phase of the integrated Plan is estimated at $78,490,000. This results in a cost of $335,427 per ton reduction of bulk CO emissions.

The cost-effectiveness of the transportation and air quality control measures is summarized, in priority order, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Measure</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Emissions Control Technology (Federal)</td>
<td>Not Calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygenated Fuels (Federal)</td>
<td>Not Calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Control Measures (States, Local)</td>
<td>$335,400/ton/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation and Waterborne Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Highways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Source Measures (TRPA)</td>
<td>Not Calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion Heaters Control Program (TRPA, Local)</td>
<td>Not Calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Source Controls (TRPA)</td>
<td>Not Calculated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Air Quality Monitoring Program

TRPA currently operates two air quality and visibility monitoring stations in the Tahoe Region. The California Air Resources Board monitors air quality at its monitoring site located adjacent to the TRPA's monitoring site on Lake Tahoe Boulevard. Visibility is also monitored in the Desolation Wilderness by the U.S. Forest Service. TRPA will continue to monitor air quality and visibility and, based on the monitoring data, will propose amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan to assure compliance with TRPA threshold standards and federal, state, and local standards for air quality and visibility.
Note: The entire Transportation Element is modified and reorganized. Existing text that is recommended to be deleted is noted after recommended Goals and Policies.

Note: The Transportation Element Introduction was supported unanimously (5-0) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.

The Compact calls for the development of an integrated transportation plan addressing all modes of travel to “…reduce dependency on the automobile”, “…reduce air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles”, and provide “public transportation and public programs and projects related to transportation.”

Although it is not a threshold category, Tahoe’s transportation system relates to multiple threshold areas, particularly air and water quality. To fulfill the Compact’s mandate and work towards attainment of thresholds, the Regional Plan Transportation Element seeks to establish a safe, efficient, and integrated transportation system that provides quality mobility options for all sectors of the population, supports the Region’s economic base, enhances quality of life to its residents, and maximizes opportunities for environmental benefits. This Element includes transportation goals, policies and implementation measures that address multiple aspects of transportation planning and interact to create a successful multi-modal transportation system.

TRPA is designated as the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) for state and federal transportation planning. In addition to fulfilling the Compact’s directives, as the TMPO, TRPA must develop a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) consistent with federal transportation laws. The RTP must also meet statutory requirements in California through the adoption of a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” (SCS). The SCS lays out a plan for reducing passenger vehicle related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in California. The Goals and Policies of the RTP are identical to those in the Regional Plan Transportation Element. In addition to goals and policies, the RTP also includes a detailed transportation improvement strategy, predicated on received or forecasted funding.

Note: Transportation Element T-1 and T-2 Goals and Policies were supported unanimously (5-0) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.

GOAL T-1

§ Amended 10/27/04
PROMOTE WALKABLE MIXED-USE CENTERS, TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS THAT INCREASE THE VIABILITY OF TRANSIT SYSTEMS.

POLICIES

T-1.1 Support mixed-use that encourages walking, bicycling and easy access to existing and planned transit stops in Town Centers, Regional Centers and High Density Tourist Districts.

T-1.2 Mitigate the Regional and cumulative traffic impacts of new, expanded, or revised developments or land uses.

T-1.3 Consider non-automobile travel modes when mitigating traffic-related project impacts.

T-1.4 Develop and implement a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) to meet TRPA thresholds and other statutory requirements.

GOAL T-2

ENCOURAGE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN USAGE AS VIABLE AND SIGNIFICANT MODES OF TRANSPORTATION AT LAKE TAHOE.

POLICIES

T-2.1 Develop and maintain a Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan) as a component of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and maintain a list of existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities and strategies for implementation within the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

T-2.2 Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities consistent with the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

T-2.3 Prioritize constructing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in urbanized areas of the Region, facilities that increase connectivity of the pedestrian and bicycle network, and facilities that can be constructed concurrently with other projects.

T-2.4 Design and site intersections and driveways where feasible to minimize impacts on public transportation, adjacent roadways and intersections, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

T-2.5 Preserve the condition of sidewalks and bicycle facilities and where feasible, maintain their year-round use.

T-2.6 Promote the incorporation of programs and policies of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan into Regional and local land use plans and regulatory processes.

T-2.7 Implement safety awareness signage, road markings, educational programs, and programs that encourage bicycling and walking.
T-2 Implementation Measures

**Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (6-0) to support T-2 Implementation Measures bullet #1 on 01/24/2012**

- Amend the TRPA Development Code to require commercial, tourist, mixed-use, multi-family, public service and recreation projects (including the construction, alteration or improvement of roadways) to incorporate segments of the bicycle and pedestrian network consistent with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Implementation of facilities which are adjacent to, or within the project parcel boundaries will be through construction, easements, or in-lieu fees as appropriate to the development. Wherever feasible bicycle and pedestrian facilities shall be located in public rights-of-way. Where it is not feasible to locate facilities within public rights-of-way, alignment of facilities should minimize impacts on private parcels to the extent feasible and neither the land coverage nor the site area required for the bicycle or pedestrian improvement shall reduce the total land coverage or development potential otherwise allowable for the project area. The code shall include provisions that provide relief or waivers for properties that may be excessively impacted.

**Note: The RPU Committee voted unanimously (5-0) to support T-2 Implementation Measures bullet #2 on 01/10/2012**

- Amend TRPA Development Code to require a maintenance plan including a funding strategy for the life of bike and pedestrian facility projects that must be approved before permit issuance or funding disbursement for any proposed public bicycle and pedestrian facility.

**Note: Transportation Element T-3, T-4 and T-5 Goals and Policies were supported unanimously (5-0) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.**

**GOAL T-3**

IMPLEMENT NEW TECHNOLOGY TO INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK AND PROMOTE USAGE OF ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODES.

**POLICIES**

**T-3.1** Implement electronic and automated payment systems for transit systems and paid parking areas, where appropriate.

**T-3.2** Implement measures consistent with the Federal Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Program and the Tahoe Basin ITS Strategic Plan, including Traffic Management, Traveler Information Services, and Emergency Management Techniques.

**GOAL T-4**

ENCOURAGE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE EXPANSION OF PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATION AND USE IN THE LAKE TAHOE REGION.

**POLICIES**
T-4.1 Improve existing transit systems through increased frequency, preferential signal controls, expanded service area, and extended service hours.

T-4.2 Provide transit facilities that encourage transit, bicycle, and pedestrian usage.

T-4.3 Provide transit service to major summer and winter recreational areas.

T-4.4 Use alternative fuels to the maximum extent feasible in public transit fleets.

T-4.5 Actively support Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) in the Tahoe Region.

T-4.6 Consider waterborne transportation systems in coordination with other public and private transportation systems, including the pedestrian bicycle network, using best available technology to minimize air and water quality impacts as an alternative to automobile travel within the Region.

GOAL T-5
STRENGTHEN TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS INTO AND OUT OF THE LAKE TAHOE REGION.

POLICIES

T-5.1 Participate in state and local transportation planning efforts to ensure coordination and consistency amongst various planning agencies in the Region.

T-5.2 Seek cooperation from neighboring jurisdictions to expand non-automobile transportation to cities, towns, and recreational areas outside of the Tahoe Region.

T-5.3 Work with appropriate public entities, tribal governments, and private interest groups to ensure coordination and consistency.

Note: Transportation Element T-6, and T-7 Goals and Policies were supported unanimously (5-0) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.

GOAL T-6
SUPPORT THE ECONOMIC VITALITY OF THE LAKE TAHOE REGION BY PRESERVING AND ENABLING AN EFFICIENT SYSTEM TO MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS.

POLICIES

T-6.1 Develop and track measures of economic vitality related to transportation (i.e., traffic and pedestrian counts, employment, hotel-motel occupancies, and other visitation trends) as part of the adaptive management system.

T-6.2 Enhance the economic vitality of the Region by efficiently connecting people to jobs, goods, services, and other communities.

T-6.3 Support public-private partnerships and business improvement districts
GOAL T-7
DEVELOP EFFECTIVE INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES WHERE THREE OR MORE MAJOR MODES OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM INTERSECT AND/OR TERMINATE (E.G., INTERSECTION OF AUTO, BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN TRAILS, TRANSIT AND/OR WATERBORNE MODES).

POLICIES
Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to T-7.1 on February 1, 2012.

T-7.1 Require that Area Plans identify intermodal transportation facilities to serve each Town Center, Regional Center, the High Density Tourist District and other major activity centers. Intermodal transportation facilities should incorporate planned regional transportation facilities, parking, connections between them (e.g., sidewalks, enclosed walkways, etc.) and should accommodate increased use of transit and non-motorized travel modes. Local agencies may need to coordinate with state Departments of Transportation when identifying intermodal facilities.

T-7.2 Require major commercial interests providing gaming, recreational activities, or excursion services to provide or participate in joint shuttle services or provide transit use incentives to their guests or patrons; and require connections with intermodal transportation facilities.

Note: Transportation Element T-8 Goals, Policies and Implementation Measures were supported unanimously (5-0) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.

GOAL T-8
ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION.

POLICIES

T-8.1 Encourage shared and other parking management strategies.

T-8.2 Encourage parking management programs that provide incentives to fund improvements benefiting transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

T-8.3 Encourage parking management strategies that are tailored to the needs of each specific location and promote pedestrian and transit use.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (6-0) supported modifications to T-8 Implementation Measures on February 1, 2012.

T-8 Implementation Measures

- Amend the TRPA Development Code to encourage and permit area-wide parking strategies as a component of Area Plans and other plans for specific geographic areas. Strategies could include:
  - Reduction or relaxation of minimum parking standards
  - Creation of maximum parking standards
-Shared parking
-In-lieu payment to meet parking requirements
-On-street parking
-Parking along major regional travel routes
-Creation of bicycle parking standards
-Free or discounted transit
-Deeply discounted transit passes for community residents
-Paid Parking Management

Note: Transportation Element T-9 Goals and Policies were supported unanimously (5-0) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.

GOAL T-9
IMPLEMENT TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) MEASURES TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF VEHICLE TRIPS ON THE REGION’S HIGHWAYS.

POLICIES

T-9.1 Require major employers to implement vehicle trip reduction programs. Such programs could include: carpool and vanpool matching programs, employee shuttles, on-site secure bicycle storage and shower facilities, flexible work hours, parking and transit use incentives.

T-9.2 Require the development of traffic management plans for major temporary activities that account for the coordination and timing of simultaneously occurring activities.

T-9.3 Encourage rental car providers to offer vehicles that are low- or zero-emission within the Tahoe Region.

T-9.4 Require new and encourage existing condominiums, timeshares, hotels and motels to participate in public transit and/or private shuttle programs, and provide transit information and incentives to their guests and residents.

Note: Transportation Element T-9 Implementation Measures were supported unanimously (5-1)(Nay: Shute (CA)) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.

T-9 Implementation Measures

- Update the Transportation Monitoring Report to include a measure of total traveler delay at congestion hotspots.

- Amend the TRPA Development Code to include the following level of service (LOS) criteria for the highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods:
  - Convert existing LOS Policies to Code standards, with an exception for development in areas where adequate multi-modal amenities exist. Standards shall reflect that LOS criteria shall be at or better than: “C” on rural recreational/scenic roads; “D” on rural developed area roads; “D” on urban developed area roads; “D” for signalized intersections. LOS “E” may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, not to exceed four hours per day. These vehicle LOS standards may be exceeded
when provisions for multi-modal amenities and/or services (such as transit, bicycling, and walking facilities) are adequate to provide mobility for users.

Note: Transportation Element T-10 and T-11 Goals and Policies were supported unanimously (5-0) by the RPU Committee on 01/12/2012.

GOAL T-10

UPGRADE REGIONAL ROADWAYS AS NECESSARY TO IMPROVE SAFETY AND PROVIDE FOR A MORE EFFICIENT, INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

POLICIES

T-10.1 Incorporate transit stops and bicycle and pedestrian facilities in roadway improvement projects.

T-10.2 Use Transportation system management (TSM) measures to improve the existing transportation system, while maintaining provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. TSM measures could include: dedicated turn lanes, intersection improvements, bicycle-activated signals, and roundabouts. Additionally, work with State Departments of Transportation (DOT) and local transportation departments to improve signal synchronization.

T-10.3 Preserve existing view turn-outs along scenic highways to maintain traffic flow and safety.

T-10.4 Reduce traffic conflicts by limiting or controlling turning movements from multiple parking lot access points onto major Regional travel routes and major local roadways; by designing and siting driveways to minimize impacts to Regional traffic flow, and by utilizing shared access points and shared driveways where feasible.

T-10.5 Consider quality of service for transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists in addition to motor vehicles when analyzing development impacts on the transportation system.

T-10.6 Prohibit the construction of roadways to freeway design standards in the Tahoe Region.

GOAL T-11

IMPROVE THE MOBILITY OF THE ELDERLY, DISABLED, TRADITIONALLY UNDER-REPRESENTED AND UNDER-SERVED POPULATIONS AND OTHER TRANSIT-DEPENDENT GROUPS.

POLICIES

T-11.1 Provide specialized public transportation services with subsidized fare programs for transit, taxi, demand response, and accessible van services.

T-11.2 Ensure that transit and pedestrian facilities are ADA compliant and consistent with the TMPO Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan.
GOAL T-12
MAINTAIN AND SUPPORT AIR SERVICE TO THE EXTENT THAT IT INCREASES MOBILITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE LAW AND ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS.

POLICIES
T-12.1 Update and Maintain an Airport Master Plan.
T-12.2 Limit aviation facilities within the Tahoe Region to existing facilities.

GOAL T-13
DEVELOP ON-GOING SOURCES OF REGIONAL REVENUE TO FUND THE LOCAL SHARE OF TRANSIT, BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND OTHER NON-AUTO-TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE.

POLICIES
T-13.1 Research and pursue sources of local and Regional revenue to support the investments, vision and goals outlined in this plan.

GOAL T-14
IMPLEMENT TRANSPORTATION POLICIES AND IMPROVEMENTS THROUGH PRIVATE, LOCAL, STATE, REGIONAL, AND FEDERAL EFFORTS. ENGAGE IN COLLABORATIVE AND COOPERATIVE PLANNING EFFORTS, LEVERAGING RESOURCES, AND EXECUTING TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS. ENCOURAGE DEDICATED PROGRAMS RELATED TO TAHOE NEEDS.

Note: The entire Transportation Element is modified and reorganized. Existing text that is recommended to be deleted is noted below:

A. INTRODUCTION

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is an Element of the Regional Transportation Plan - Air Quality Plan, which focuses on transportation improvements needed to meet transportation related goals for the Tahoe Region. The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact says that the goal of transportation planning shall be to reduce dependency on
the automobile, and to give preference to providing increases in capacity on the Region’s transportation system through public transportation projects and programs. The Compact also requires a transportation plan for the Region which provides for the integrated development of a regional system of transportation. This system is to include parkways, highways, public transportation facilities, bicycle facilities, and appurtenant terminals and facilities for the movement of people and goods within the Region.

The RTP addresses the requirements of the Compact. The RTP also addresses the need to provide an integrated transportation system for the Region which will meet the basic transportation needs of residents and visitors by providing adequate local circulation and access to goods and services.

Congestion within the Region interferes with the ability to provide adequate circulation and access to basic goods and services. During periods of peak traffic demand, congestion on the Region's highway system creates lengthy delays and affects the accessibility of health care and emergency facilities, and other basic services for residents and visitors to the Region.

The Regional Transportation Plan discusses standards and the status of compliance with these standards. Level of service (LOS) standards are contained in the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Goals and Policies (TRPA, 1986, as amended). The Goals and Policies establishes level of service criteria for various types of highways and an operational level of service for signalized intersections.

LOS criteria established by the Regional Plan Goals and Policies are not being met at some locations along U.S. 50, including the intersections at Park Avenue, Pioneer Trail, Ski Run Boulevard, and Tahoe Keys Boulevard. Although LOS criteria were not established for unsignalized intersections, the unsignalized intersections at California 28 and Grove Street and Jack Pine operate at a poor level of service during weekends and holiday periods.

Reduction in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) is a requirement of the threshold management standards for subregional visibility and nitrate deposition. These management standards require a ten percent reduction in VMT from the 1981 base year. Vehicle miles of travel in the Tahoe Region, from 1981 to 1987, increased by 10.0 percent.

The Regional Transportation Plan contains the following sections:
- Lake Tahoe Basin Transportation Overview
- Lake Tahoe Basin Transportation Planning Framework
- Lake Tahoe Basin Transportation System
- Goals, Policies and Objectives
- Action Plan
- Financial Element
- Air Quality Conformity Determination

The Goals, Policies and Objectives state the ends toward which efforts are to be directed, provide policy guidance for courses of action, and identify objectives which can
be obtained or measured. Section 3 - Action Plan and Appendix A – Project List of the RTP identifies programs and capital improvements and projects needed to implement the goals, policies and objectives of the RTP.

B. GOALS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

The formulation of regional transportation goals and policies is a fundamental step in the transportation planning process. The goals and policies reflect the consideration of environmental, social, and economic factors in making transportation related decisions.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION GOALS

1. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to fulfill the requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

2. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to attain and maintain the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and federal, state, and local transportation standards.

3. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to establish a safe, efficient, and integrated transportation system which reduces reliance on the private automobile, provides for alternative modes of transportation, and serves the basic transportation needs of the citizens of the Tahoe Region, supports the economic base of the Region in the movement of goods and people, and minimizes adverse impacts on man and the environment.

4. The organizational structures and process relevant to transportation and transit operations and governance shall be designed to facilitate the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan and the goals of the Compact.

5. It is the goal of the Regional Transportation Plan to research potential funding sources as referenced in the RTP Financial Element.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

1. Participate in state and local transportation planning efforts to ensure coordination and consistency in the transportation system.
   A. TRPA shall work with appropriate public entities and private interest groups in the Region to ensure coordination and consistency in transportation planning efforts within multijurisdictional transportation corridors.
   B. TRPA shall work with federal, state and local agencies to develop a rail system which will provide access from northern California and Nevada population centers.
   C. TRPA shall participate in the Community Plan process to provide consistency between Community Plans and the RTP.
   D. TRPA will work with organizations that facilitate public-private transportation partnerships and coordination for the benefit of improved transportation in the Lake Tahoe Region.
2. Plan for and promote land use changes and development patterns which will encourage the use of alternative transportation modes and minimize impacts on the existing transportation system.

   A. Community Plans shall promote land use development patterns and designs which will increase the ability to use public transportation, waterborne, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

   B. Community Plans shall promote the development of neighborhood commercial areas which will reduce travel distances.

   C. Development patterns shall provide for the in-fill of existing areas, making use of existing transportation facilities and promoting the use of alternative transportation modes.

   D. New, expanded or revised developments and land uses shall fully mitigate their regional and cumulative traffic impacts.

   E. Parking for residential usage shall meet TRPA standards and shall be provided on-site.

   F. Parking for non-residential uses shall be the minimum/maximum required to meet the demand for parking generated by the use, except as may be offset by reducing parking demand through parking management and trip reduction programs.

   G. Driveways shall be designed and sited to minimize impacts on public transportation, adjacent roadways and intersections, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

   H. Public land management agencies shall develop transit services that manage access.

3. Actively pursue programs that promote the use of mass transit as an alternative to the automobile.

   A. Expansion of transit services shall be provided to residential areas of the Region with the system being appropriate for the area to be served, and shall be consistent with the Action element of the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan.

   B. Public or private transit services shall be given preference in mitigating traffic and transportation related impacts due to new, expanded or revised development or land use activities.

   C. Transit facilities shall be provided which encourage the use of public transit services, with new or revised developments incorporating transit facilities into their designs or plans.

   D. Transit service shall be expanded to cities, towns, and recreational areas outside of the Tahoe Region, and be coordinated with other transportation modes.

   E. Bus lanes with preferential signal controls should be implemented along U.S. 50, California 89 and California/Nevada 28.

   F. Alternative transit modes including fixed guideway systems should be implemented.
G. Multi-modal transfer facilities shall be located in activity centers in both the North and South Shore areas.
H. Transit shelters shall be provided at major transit stops.
I. Transit services shall be provided to connect the North and South Shore areas of the Tahoe Region.
J. Transit services shall be provided to beaches, campgrounds and other summer-time recreational areas.
K. Transit excursion services should be provided in the Region.

4. Develop and encourage the use of pedestrian and bicycle facilities as a safe and viable alternative to automobile use.
A. There shall be a high priority on constructing pedestrian and bicycle facilities in urbanized areas of the Region and where reductions in congestion will result.
B. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be constructed, or upgraded, and maintained along major travel routes.
C. Where it is not feasible to construct or maintain Class I bicycle paths along the Region's major travel routes, Class II bicycle lanes should be provided on roadway shoulders.
D. Bicycle racks or storage facilities shall be provided at non-residential developments, transit stops, and on transit vehicles.
E. Bicycle and pedestrian linkages shall be provided between residential and non-residential areas.
F. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities in urbanized areas and along transportation routes used for commuting should be maintained to allow year-around use of the facilities.
G. The unconstructed Route 50 right-of-way remains an integral component of the overall transportation system in the South Shore by providing commuting and recreational bicycle options which will maximize the function of the highway network.
H. The RTP shall contain bicycle and pedestrian policies for the development of any new bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the Lake Tahoe Region.

5. Implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce the number of vehicle trips on the Region's highways.
A. Transit fare reductions, including free fares, should be used to encourage transit use.
B. Employers shall implement vehicle trip reduction programs, including carpool and vanpool matching programs, employee shuttles, flexible work hours, and transit use incentives.
C. Public and private employers shall develop parking management programs including preferential parking and reduced parking rates for carpools and vanpools, parking charges for employee parking and paid...
D. Condominiums, timeshares, hotels and motels shall participate in public transit and private shuttle programs, and provide transit information and incentives to their guests and residents.

E. Commercial interests providing gaming, recreational activities, or excursion services shall provide or participate in joint shuttle services or provide transit use incentives to their guests or patrons.

F. Park-and-Ride facilities shall be provided by local jurisdictions to encourage ridesharing.

G. Automobile rentals should be discouraged within the Tahoe Region, and alternative fuel vehicle technology should be used if feasible. Air quality and traffic mitigation fees shall be assessed on vehicles rented in the Region.

H. Ski areas and other recreational activity areas shall control the rate of departure of patrons from parking areas to minimize the impact on congested transportation facilities.

6. Transportation System Management (TSM) measures shall be used to improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system:

A. High occupancy and reversible vehicle lanes should be considered in high traffic demand areas, provided existing roadway capacities can be maintained.

B. Traffic conflicts should be reduced by limiting or controlling access to major regional travel routes and major local roadways.

C. Intersection improvements required to upgrade existing levels of service including lane restriping, turn lanes, channelization and traffic signals should be implemented when warranted.

D. Roadway designs shall accommodate bicycle lanes and transit stops and reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicycle and pedestrians.

E. New on-street parking shall be prohibited along major regional travel routes and existing parking should be discouraged along major regional travel routes and local roads.

F. View turn-outs should be provided along scenic highways.

G. Left-turn lanes and right-turn lanes shall be provided to reduce turning conflicts along major travel routes.

H. Utilization of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology shall be implemented consistent with the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) Tahoe Basin ITS Strategic Plan.

7. Limit improvements to the regional highway system to those necessary to meet the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan.
A. The construction of roadways to freeway design standards is inappropriate in the Tahoe Region. However, grade separations may be appropriate at locations where traffic volumes exceed the capability of intersection improvements and local trip reduction measures to meet LOS criteria.

B. Highway design criteria shall be developed for the Tahoe Region which minimizes the environmental impact of highway projects while providing for the needs of the traveling public.

C. New roadways or projects which expand the capacity of existing roadways shall be consistent with traffic and circulation elements of TRPA adopted redevelopment plans or community plans.

D. Local roadways connecting residential areas, and connecting residential areas with non-residential areas, may be constructed provided these roadways are designed to improve local circulation and will not induce through traffic.

E. Roadway projects designed to correct hazardous roadway conditions shall be encouraged provided these projects are limited to needed safety improvements.

F. Level of service (LOS) criteria for the Region’s highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods shall be:
   - Level of service "C" on rural recreational/scenic roads.
   - Level of service "D" on rural developed area roads.
   - Level of service "D" on urban developed area roads.
   - Level of service "D" for signalized intersections.
   - Level of service "E" may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, not to exceed four hours per day.

G. TRPA will work with roadway maintenance agencies that manage roadway runoff and erosion.

8. Encourage air service as a viable alternative for travel to the Tahoe Region, provided all impacts can be mitigated.

A. The location of aviation facilities within the Tahoe Region shall be limited to existing facilities.

B. Expansion of aviation facilities shall be limited to service levels identified in a TRPA-approved Airport Master Plan.

C. Public and private mass transportation systems shall be given preference in serving air service passengers.

D. Multi-modal transit links are to be provided to the Lake Tahoe Basin from primary commercial air services in Reno and Sacramento.

E. All operations for the Lake Tahoe Airport are subject to the terms of the Lake Tahoe Airport Settlement Agreement/Master Plan.

F. The Airport Master Plan/Settlement Agreement shall be updated. This update shall be predicated on a study evaluating: (1) the potential for both aviation and non-aviation uses of the site; (2) the role of the proposed uses in Tahoe’s transit system; and (3) the appropriate scale of facilities related thereto. Any update that includes regional commercial service
shall additionally require a comprehensive feasibility study of the viability of regional commercial air service.

9. Encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the Region.
   A. Waterborne point-to-point services are encouraged.
   B. Waterborne excursion services are encouraged.
   C. Waterborne services shall coordinate with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.

10. Improve the mobility of the elderly, handicapped and other transit-dependent groups.
    A. Provide specialized public transportation services with subsidized fare programs for transit, taxi, demand responsive, and accessible van services.
    B. Ensure access to the public transportation system by providing and maintaining sidewalks with curb cuts and ramps.
    C. Provide and maintain accessible transit stops and shelters with ramps and paved areas.
    D. Provide and maintain accessible transportation vehicles with adequate lifts and ramps and wheelchair tiedowns.

11. Postal Carrier service shall be provided Region wide, with the U.S. Postal Service Tahoe Regional Master Plan identifying priority areas and a timeframe for implementation. The following Regional Goals establish the objectives of the U.S. Postal Service, and the TRPA concerning mail service.
    A. The U.S. Postal Service shall provide mail service for areas not currently served in the Tahoe Region that encourages residents to drive fewer miles for the service. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations shall maximize reductions in vehicle miles traveled by postal customers to the extent practicable.
    B. In fulfillment of its national environmental values, the U.S. Postal Service will develop future facilities and implement future operations in ways that meet its desire to protect and preserve the environment.
    C. Locating new or expanded U.S. Postal Service facilities near population and commercial concentrations is a priority for both the U.S. Postal Service and the TRPA.
    D. Many existing U.S. Postal Service facilities require replacement and/or renovation to meet minimum health, safety, operational, environmental, and business requirements. Many elements of the Tahoe Regional Master Plan, such as new services, cannot be realized without improvements in facilities.
    E. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations that can meet multiple goals require a partnership between the USPS, TRPA, local and regional agencies, and individual and community groups. These groups should work in partnership to conduct collaborative planning, to identify the appropriate organization to undertake the leadership role on specific issues, and to facilitate project
To maximize benefit from available financial resources, new facilities and operations shall be prioritized in large measure based on their contribution to overall Master Plan goals.

G. U.S. Postal Service facilities and operations that implement TRPA RTP/AQP control strategies (including carrier service) shall receive credit for impact fees equal to the financial contribution. Future consideration may be given to provision of alternative fuel fleet vehicles.

H. The U.S. Postal Service and TRPA will diligently pursue Master Plan implementation within the constraints of future available resources.

12. Increase the use of alternative fuel vehicles within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

A. Future public transit vehicles purchased for operations in the Lake Tahoe Basin shall be alternative fuel powered.

B. When considering new or replacement vehicles for public and private fleets alternative fuel vehicles should be purchased.

C. TRPA shall phase in alternative fuel vehicle requirements for public and private fleet purchases above 15 vehicles in size.

13. The Regional Transportation Plan shall include an Action Plan and Project List containing transportation capital improvement projects, plans and programs needed to achieve transportation goals, carry out transportation policies, and implement transportation objectives.
SCENIC

Scenic quality is perhaps the most often identified natural resource of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Basin affords views of a magnificent lake setting within a forested mountainous environment. The unique combination of visual elements provides for exceptionally high aesthetic values. The maintenance of the Basin's scenic quality largely depends on careful regulation of the type, location, and intensity of land uses. The Compact declares “Maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic … values provided by the Lake Tahoe Basin.” The Scenic Subelement establishes Goals and Policies intended to preserve and enhance the Region's unique scenic resources by advancing the scenic threshold standards.

Environmental thresholds provide the basis for selecting appropriate strategies for maintaining scenic quality. Scenic resource thresholds are listed below:

Roadway and Shoreline Units

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each unit, including the scenic quality rating of the individual resources within each unit, as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory and shown in Tables 13-3, 13-5, 13-8 and 13-9 of the Draft Study Report.

Maintain the 1982 ratings for all roadway and shoreline units as shown in Tables 13-6 and 13-7 of the Draft Study Report.

Restore scenic quality in roadway units rated 15 or below and shoreline units rated 7 or below.

Other Areas

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned to each identified scenic resource, including individual subcomponent numerical ratings, for views from bike paths and other recreation areas open to the general public as recorded in the 1993 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation.

The following goals and policies directly address the issue of maintaining or restoring the natural scenic quality of the Lake Tahoe Basin. Attainment of the scenic thresholds is expected to be a long-term goal and achieved incrementally over the next 20 years.

**Note:** The RPU Committee supported (5-1) (Nay: Shute (CA) in absentia) Scenic Goal SR-1 on January 26, 2012.

**GOAL #1 SR-1**

**MAINTAIN AND RESTORE THE SCENIC QUALITIES OF THE NATURAL APPEARING LANDSCAPE.**

As with many of the Region's natural resources, the scenic qualities of the Region are vulnerable to change. Modifying the natural scenic features of the Basin is a by-product of development, but such impacts can be minimized and mitigated need not be devastating. A coordinated effort that incorporates architectural design and location considerations in plan development and the project review process is a useful means for promoting scenic and...
aesthetic values. Policies to achieve this goal are consistent with the adopted environmental thresholds.

POLICIES

SR-1.1. ALL PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SHALL EXAMINE IMPACTS TO THE IDENTIFIED LANDSCAPE VIEWS FROM ROADWAYS, BIKEPATHS, PUBLIC RECREATION AREAS, AND LAKE TAHOE.

The impact of development on the landscape views and scenic qualities of the Tahoe Region should be considered as part of the project review process. Conditions should be placed on project approval in a manner capable of mitigating any likely impacts. Impacts shall be evaluated against specific management directions provided for each identified landscape view. Management and remedial criteria for each roadway and shoreline unit shall be updated through appropriate studies so they are consistent with the format and detail of the 1983 scenic analysis of the recreation areas, in the Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation, 1983, Wagstaff and Brady. In addition, the Scenic Quality Improvement Program (SQIP, adopted September, 1989) and Design Review Guidelines for Scenic Quality (September, 1989) are to provide direction for the design, review, and implementation of projects reviewed from identified roadways, bikepaths, public recreation areas, and Lake Tahoe.

SR-1.2. ANY DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED IN AREAS TARGETED FOR SCENIC RESTORATION OR WITHIN A UNIT HIGHLY SENSITIVE TO CHANGE SHALL DEMONSTRATE THE EFFECT OF THE PROJECT ON THE 1982 TRAVEL ROUTE RATINGS OF THE SCENIC THRESHOLDS.

Projects proposed in areas sensitive to scenic degradation shall be closely scrutinized to ensure that the scenic quality of the area is maintained or improved or, at the very least, not further compromised by the action.

SR-1.3. THE FACTORS OR CONDITIONS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO SCENIC DEGRADATION IN IDENTIFIED AREAS, AS SPECIFIED IN THE SCENIC QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (SQIP), NEED TO BE RECOGNIZED AND APPROPRIATELY CONSIDERED IN RESTORATION PROGRAMS, PLAN DEVELOPMENT, AND DURING PROJECT REVIEW TO IMPROVE SCENIC QUALITY.

To the extent funding is available, the studies identified by Policy 1 above shall be completed. Areas in need of scenic restoration and appropriate remedial measures shall be identified within two years.

GOAL #2SR-2

IMPROVE THE ACCESSIBILITY OF LAKE TAHOE FOR PUBLIC VIEWING.

Lake Tahoe is the dominant landscape feature in the Region. Yet, opportunities and opportunities to view the Lake from roadways are often limited due to inadequate or unmarked pull-off facilities, traffic congestion, and manmade obstructions should be improved.

POLICIES

SR-2.1. ENHANCE THE OPPORTUNITIES TO VIEW LAKE TAHOE BY DESIGNING VIEW CORRIDORS FROM HIGHWAYS.

View corridors to the Lake should be incorporated into the design of urban areas as
strategy for preserving open space areas and improving the role of the views to the Lake as a visitor attraction.

**SR-2.2. SCENIC VIEWPOINTS FROM ROADWAYS SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED AND PULL-OFF FACILITIES PROVIDED ON PUBLIC PROPERTY, WHEREVER DESIRABLE.**

TRPA should work with Caltrans, Nevada Department of Transportation and Local Governments. This policy would to increase the opportunities for motorists to park and view Lake Tahoe and would in order to limit the tendency or need to pull-off onto unimproved shoulders of roadways.

**SR-2.3. SIGNS SHOULD BE PLACED ALONG THE ROADWAYS, AS APPROPRIATE, TO IDENTIFY PHOTO SITES AND SCENIC TURNOUTS.**

Signing of photo sites and scenic viewpoints adequately notifies travelers of opportunities to view Lake Tahoe. This information will help visitors plan for stops and also will help reduce traffic congestion associated with slow moving vehicles.

**SR-2.4. TIME LIMITS FOR PARKING AT ROADSIDE TURNOUTS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED.**

The length of stay at roadside turnouts should be limited depending upon the purpose of the turnout. For viewing and picture-taking purposes, parking should be short-term, as necessary, to minimize the number of parking spaces and provide for quick turnover.
Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Stream Environment Zone Subelement on January 26, 2012.

STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE

Stream environment zones (SEZs) and related hydrologic zones consist of the natural marsh and meadowlands, watercourses and drainageways, and floodplains which provide surface water conveyance from upland areas into Lake Tahoe and its tributaries. Stream environment zones are determined by the presence of riparian vegetation, alluvial soil, minimum buffer strips, water influence areas, and floodplains. The plant associations of stream environment zones constitute only a small portion of the Region’s Basin’s total land area, but are perhaps the single most valuable plant communities in terms of their role in providing for wildlife habitat, purification of water, and scenic enjoyment. Protection and restoration of stream environment zones are essential for improving and maintaining the environmental amenities of the Lake Tahoe RegionBasin and for achieving environmental thresholds for water quality, vegetation preservation, and soil conservation.

GOAL #SEZ-1

PROVIDE FOR THE LONG-TERM PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION OF STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES.

The preservation of SEZs is a means for achieving numerous environmental thresholds. Policies that promote their maintenance, protection, and restoration are listed below.

POLICIES

Note: The RPU Committee (5-1) (Nay: Shute (CA) in absentia) supported SEZ Policy SEZ-1.1 on January 26, 2012.

SEZ-1.1. RESTORE ALL DISTURBED STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONELANDS IN UNDEVELOPED, UNSUBDIVIDED LANDS, AND RESTORE 25 PERCENT OF THE SEZ LANDS THAT HAVE BEEN DISTURBED, DEVELOPED, OR SUBDIVIDED.

Many acres of SEZ lands have been modified or disturbed before adoption of the Regional Plan. Considerable progress has been made to restore disturbed SEZ lands. TRPA shall continue to monitor the status of SEZ lands and identify restoration priorities and activities through actions and programs including the Environmental Improvement Program. identify the number of acres to be restored and prepare a list of projects to achieve the environmental threshold carrying capacity for stream environment zones.

TRPA shall develop an implementation program to restore the necessary acreage, and establish an annual tracking program. The implementation program shall provide for restoration over a twenty-year period, with 90 percent of the acreage to be restored within the first fifteen years.

SEZ-1.2. SEZ LANDS SHALL BE PROTECTED AND MANAGED FOR THEIR NATURAL VALUES.

SEZ lands are scarce, as is associated riparian vegetation when compared to scarce in the Basin relative to other plant communities. Because SEZs provide many beneficial functions (especially pertaining to water quality) only forest management
practices, stream improvement programs, and habitat restoration projects and those special provisions provided for in Policy SEZ-1.5 below are permissible uses.

**SEZ-1.3. GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT IN SEZ LANDS SHALL BE DISCOURAGED WHEN SUCH DEVELOPMENT COULD POSSIBLY IMPACT ASSOCIATED PLANT COMMUNITIES OR INSTREAM FLOWS.**

Withdrawal of water from SEZ lands may lower surface and ground waters and, by so doing, alter plant composition of the riparian vegetation and reduce instream flows. Groundwater proposals in SEZs and riparian plant communities will be evaluated against those concerns.

**SEZ-1.4. GOLF COURSES IN STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES SHALL BE ENCOURAGED TO RETROFIT COURSE DESIGN IN COMBINATION WITH AND IMPLEMENT FERTILIZER APPLICATION STANDARDS MANAGEMENT PLANS (SEE WATER QUALITY SUBELEMENT, GOAL #1, POLICY 5) TO PREVENT RELEASE OF NUTRIENTS TO ADJOINING GROUND AND SURFACE WATERS.**

A combination of strategies to include fertilizer application standards and course redesign may be necessary to control off-site nutrient release from golf course fairways and greens.

*Note: The RPU Committee (5-1) (Nay: Shute (CA) in absentia) supported SEZ Policy SEZ-1.5 F on January 26, 2012.*

**SEZ-1.5. NO NEW LAND COVERAGE OR OTHER PERMANENT LAND DISTURBANCE SHALL BE PERMITTED IN STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES EXCEPT FOR THOSE USES AS NOTED IN A, B, C, D, E AND FE BELOW:**

A. Public outdoor recreation facilities not specified in subsection F below are permissible uses in stream environment zones if:

1. The project is a necessary part of a public agency’s long range plans for public outdoor recreation;
2. The project is consistent with the recreation element of the regional plan;
3. The project, by its very nature, must be sited in a stream environment zone;
4. There is no feasible alternative which would reduce the extent of encroachment in stream environment zones;
5. The impacts are fully mitigated;
6. Stream environment zone lands are restored in the amount of 1.5 times the area of stream environment zone which is disturbed or developed by the project.

To the fullest extent possible, recreation facilities must be sited outside of stream environment zones. Some recreation facilities, such as river access points or stream crossings for hiking trails, by their very nature require some encroachment of stream environment zones. However, the six-part test established by this policy allows encroachment into SEZs where such encroachment is essential for public outdoor recreation and precautions are
taken to ensure that stream environment zones are protected to the fullest extent possible. The restoration requirements of this policy can be accomplished on-site or off-site, and shall be in lieu of any coverage transfer or coverage mitigation provisions elsewhere in this Plan.

B. Public service facilities are permissible uses in stream environment zones if:

(1) The project is necessary for public health, safety, or environmental protection;

(2) There is no reasonable alternative, including spans, which avoids or reduces the extent of encroachment in stream environment zones;

(3) The impacts are fully mitigated; and

(4) Stream environment zone lands are restored in the amount of 1.5 times the area of stream environment zone which is disturbed or developed by the project.

Development within stream environment zones is not consistent with the goal of managing stream environment zones for their natural qualities and shall generally be prohibited except under extraordinary circumstances involving public works. Each circumstance shall be evaluated based on the conditions of this policy. The restoration requirements of this policy can be accomplished on-site or off-site, and shall be in lieu of any coverage transfer or coverage mitigation provisions elsewhere in this Plan.

C. Projects which require access across stream environment zones to otherwise buildable sites are permissible in SEZs if:

(1) There is no reasonable alternative, which avoids or reduces the extent of encroachment in the SEZ;

(2) The impacts are fully mitigated; and

(3) SEZ lands are restored in the amount of 1.5 times the area of stream environment zone which is disturbed or developed by the project.

The restoration requirements can be accomplished on-site or off-site, and shall be in lieu of any coverage transfer or coverage mitigation provisions elsewhere in this Plan.

D. New development may be permitted in man-modified stream environment zones where:

(1) The area no longer exhibits the characteristics of a stream environment zone;

(2) Further development will not exacerbate the problems caused by development in stream environment zones;

(3) Restoration is infeasible; and

(4) Mitigation is provided to at least partially offset the losses which were caused by modification of the stream environment zones.

E. Stream environment zone restoration projects and erosion control projects.

F. Non-Motorized Public trails are allowed in stream environment zones, subject to siting and design requirements that minimize and mitigate impacts, as specified.
REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING COVERAGE IN STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES MAY BE PERMITTED WHERE THE PROJECT WILL REDUCE IMPACTS ON STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONES AND WILL NOT IMPEDE RESTORATION EFFORTS.

Existing structures in stream environment zones may be repaired or rebuilt. Minor reconstruction may be permitted so long as drainage improvements, protection of the stream environment zone from disturbances, or other measures are carried out which provide a net benefit to the area's capacity to serve as a naturally-functioning stream environment zone. Major reconstruction or replacement may also be permitted if there is a net benefit to the stream environment zone and if the replacement or reconstruction is consistent with stream environment zone restoration programs (see Policy 1).

THE PROCEDURES FOR STREAM ENVIRONMENT ZONE IDENTIFICATION SHALL BE UPDATED.

The Handbook of Best Management Practices establishes a procedure for delineating stream environment and related hydrologic zones. This procedure shall be reviewed and revised pursuant to the recommendations of the Individual Parcel Evaluation technical team. These revisions shall become effective on January 1, 1989. This review and update of The Handbook of Best Management Practices shall include consideration of the procedures to be followed for artificial drainageways and man-modified stream environment zones.

WHERE FEASIBLE, ENCOURAGE AND INCENTIVIZE THE REMOVAL OR RETROFITTING OF EXISTING STREAM CORRIDOR IMPEDIMENTS TO HELP REESTABLISH NATURAL CONDITIONS AND ALLOW FOR THE EVOLUTION OF NATURAL FLUVIAL PROCESSES (SUCH AS STREAM MIGRATION) WITHIN SEZ LANDS.

ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT PUBLIC ACQUISITION OF SEZ LANDS BY LAND BANKS AND PUBLIC ENTITIES IN ORDER TO RESTORE, RETIRE COVERAGE ON, AND DEED RESTRICT SEZ LANDS FOR PROTECTION FROM FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND DISTURBANCE.
Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Implementation Element Introduction through Policy IAP-2 on February 21, 2012.

CHAPTER VII
IMPLEMENTATION ELEMENT

Implementation of the Regional Plan depends upon the success of multi-sector participants (federal, bi-state, local, and private) and a broad inter-agency partnership to support it. The Implementation Element provides for necessary commitment, and coordination of effort, and development of collaborative management and financial programs. The Element also, and incorporation of outlines a monitoring program to measure progress of Plan implementation. It is also a function of this Element to indicate a schedule for attaining environmental thresholds consistent with the programs, strategies, and costs specified by the goals and policies of this Plan. The Subelements are: 1) Institutional Inter-Agency Partnerships, 2) Development and Implementation Priorities, 3) Financing, and 4) Monitoring and Evaluation.
INTER-AGENCY PARTNERSHIPS

The institutional responsibilities of Plan development and implementation are shared among numerous agencies and individuals. This Subelement establishes a framework for the coordination, responsibilities, and commitments necessary to implement the goals and policies of the Plan. The partnerships needed to perform A consensus is sought as to who will conduct planning, design, contracting, cost sharing, and evaluation can shift over time with the needs of each Plan Element and each Program.

GOAL #IAP-1

COORDINATE ALL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ACTIVITIES WITH THE AFFECTED JURISDICTIONS AND AGENCIES.

Implementation of the Regional Plan follows two broad approaches. The approaches range from the TRPA establishing and enforcing regulatory standards of TRPA and other jurisdictions to TRPA establishing regional programs, regulations to be carried out by the affected jurisdictions and agencies, local governments. Successful implementation of the Plan requires coordination of all phases of planning and program implementation among between TRPA, the affected jurisdictions and the public.

POLICIES

Note: Policy IAP-1.1 is relocated and amended from Old Policy IAP-1.4

IAP-1.1 TRPA SHALL IDENTIFY THE PLANNING AND REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES OF LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS.

This policy is consistent with Article VI(a) of the Compact which states: “Whenever possible, without diminishing the effectiveness of the Regional Plan, TRPA ordinances, rules, regulations and policies shall be confined to matters which are general and regional in application, leaving to the jurisdiction of the respective states, counties, and cities the enactment of specific and local ordinances, rules, regulations, and policies which conform to the Regional Plan.” General planning and implementation responsibilities are shared among TRPA, and local, state, and federal agencies as set forth in the Compact, the Regional Plan, the Development Code or agreed to in a Memorandum of Understanding.

Note: Policy IAP-1.2 is relocated and amended from Old Policy IAP-1.3

IAP-1.2 THE AGENCY SHALL PRESCRIBE BY ORDINANCE THOSE ACTIVITIES WHICH HAVE NO SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT ON THE LAND, AIR, SPACE, OR ANY OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE REGION. SUCH IDENTIFIED ACTIVITIES WILL BE EXEMPT FROM TRPA REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

Ordinance 81-1, the TRPA ordinance implementing Article VI (a) which lists activities that are exempt from Agency review and approval, shall be reconsidered and possibly expanded.

IAP-1.3. THE AGENCY SHALL COORDINATE WITH LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL
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AGENCIES TO DEVELOP AREA PLANS AND CODES THAT CONFORM WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN. ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM TRPA REVIEW AND APPROVAL IF PROVISIONS IN THE AREA PLANS DEMONSTRATE THAT EXEMPTED ACTIVITIES WILL HAVE NO SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT ON THE LAND, AIR, SPACE, OR ANY OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE REGION.

IAP-1.44. ALL PROJECTS PROPOSED IN THE REGION [OTHER THAN THOSE TO BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED UNDER THE SPECIAL PROVISIONS OF THE COMPACT RELATING TO GAMING] SHALL OBTAIN THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENCY.

This policy is consistent with Article VI(b) of the Compact which states: "No project other then those to be reviewed and approved under the special provisions of subdivisions (d), (e), (f) and (g) may be developed in the Region without obtaining the review and approval of the agency and no project may be approved unless it is found to comply with the Regional Plan and with the ordinances, rules and regulations enacted pursuant to subdivision (a) to effectuate that Plan." A project is defined by the Compact as..."an activity undertaken by any person, including any public agency, if the activity may substantially affect the land, water, air, space or any other natural resources of the region." However, it is the intent of the TRPA within the limits of the Compact to coordinate project review functions with local, state, and federal agencies.

IAP-1.52. NO PROJECT MAY BE APPROVED UNLESS IT IS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN; AND WITH ANY ORDINANCES, RULES, AND REGULATIONS ENACTED TO EFFECTUATE THE REGIONAL PLAN; AND NOT EXCEED THRESHOLDS.

Articles V (g) and VI (b) of the Compact, require a set of findings to be adopted by ordinance, as set forth above, to ensure that projects under consideration will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan and will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Note: Old Policy 3 is relocated and amended in Policy IAP-1.2

3. THE AGENCY SHALL PRESCRIBE BY ORDINANCE THOSE ACTIVITIES WHICH HAVE NO SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT ON THE LAND, AIR, SPACE, OR ANY OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE REGION. SUCH IDENTIFIED ACTIVITIES WILL BE EXEMPT FROM TRPA REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

Ordinance 81.1, the TRPA ordinance implementing Article VI (a) which lists activities that are exempt from Agency review and approval, shall be reconsidered and possibly expanded.

Note: Old Policy 4 is relocated and amended in Policy IAP-1.1

4. TRPA SHALL IDENTIFY THE PLANNING AND REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES OF LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS.

Whenever possible, without diminishing the effectiveness of the Regional Plan, TRPA ordinances, rules, regulations and policies shall be confined to matters which are general and regional in application, leaving to the jurisdiction of the respective states, counties, and cities the enactment of specific and local ordinances, rules, regulations, and policies which conform to the Regional Plan. General planning and implementation responsibilities are shared among TRPA, and local, state, and federal agencies as set forth in the Compact or agreed to in
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IAP-1.56. TRPA, IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER AGENCIES OF JURISDICTION, SHALL DEVELOP AND ACTIVELY PURSUE AN EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE PLAN AND ORDINANCES OF THE AGENCY.

**GOAL #IAP-2**

LEAD THE REGIONAL MULTI-SECTOR PARTNERSHIP IDENTIFY AND SEEK COMMITMENTS FROM AGENCIES TO IMPLEMENT THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER REMEDIAL PROGRAMS IDENTIFIED IN THIS PLAN.

TRPA will collaborate with regional partners to seek consensus commitments among the individuals and agencies responsible for specific functions pertaining to capital improvements and remedial programs. Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) or other forms of agreements between TRPA and implementing agencies or partners will provide the coordination necessary to ensure efficient implementation of the Plan.

**POLICIES**

IAP-2.1. APPROPRIATE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF VARIOUS AGENCIES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN SHALL BE IDENTIFIED AND VERIFIED THROUGH PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT/ AGENCY AGREEMENTS.
Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement Goal DP-1 and associated Policies on February 21, 2012.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITIES

The Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement coordinates the implementation provisions and time schedules of each Plan Element to achieve and maintain adopted environmental thresholds to provide for effective management of the Region’s resources and attain environmental thresholds. Three factors must be considered and planned carefully. First, the feasible rate for correcting or mitigating existing resource utilization problems will determine how rapidly improvements in environmental quality will take place. Second, the rate and type of new development will absorb or negate some of the progress made toward environmental goals and standards. Third, uncertainty exists regarding the effectiveness of water quality BMPs and programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

As an illustration of these factors, reductions in fine sediments and nutrient loads to Lake Tahoe from remedial programs will improve water quality only if remedial measures keep pace with new loads from land coverage and disturbance permitted by the Plan. The timing and phasing of both new development, redevelopment and remedial measures must, therefore, be carefully linked to ensure steady progress toward the environmental thresholds. If BMPs and other water quality enhancement measures prove to be less effective than originally thought, further adjustments to development and remedial priorities will be required. The Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement provides for periodic monitoring of progress toward threshold standards and identifies study needs for determining the effectiveness of control strategies.

The Plan also must provide incentives for correcting existing problems within the Region. Properly structured incentives can provide for broader participation in meeting regional goals and expedite desired improvements.

GOAL #DP-1

DIRECT ALL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FIRST TO THOSE AREAS MOST SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS, SUCH AS INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY AND PROGRESS TOWARD ACCOMPLISHING WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS.

POLICIES

DP-1.1. UPON ADOPTION OF THIS PLAN, EVALUATION AND RANKING OF ALL VACANT RESIDENTIAL PARCELS UNDER AN INDIVIDUAL PARCEL EVALUATION SYSTEM (IPES) SHALL BE UNDERTAKEN AND COMPLETED BY DECEMBER 31, 1988. COMMENCING ON JANUARY 1, 1989, NEW SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE EVALUATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH IPES. THIS SYSTEM SHALL RANK ALL VACANT RESIDENTIAL PARCELS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR RELATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL SUITABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS UNDER IPES SHALL NOT COMMENCE UNTIL ALL PARCELS HAVE BEEN EVALUATED AND RANKED IN ACCORDANCE WITH IPES.
THE STANDARDS SET FORTH IN GOAL #1, POLICY 2, OF THIS SUBELEMENT SHALL APPLY UNTIL IMPLEMENTATION OF IPES. NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE ALLOCATION LIMITS SET FORTH IN GOAL #2, POLICY DP-2.2 OF THIS SUBELEMENT.

A. IPES is an objective and scientific system based on the report entitled Individual Parcel Evaluation System (1986), which evaluates relative environmental suitability for development. IPES shall evaluate each parcel with respect to the criteria listed below. Details of IPES, including a rating system, shall be included in implementing ordinances.

1) Relative erosion hazard (soil erodability, slope length and gradient, climatic conditions, surface roughness and mass wasting).
2) Runoff potential (depth to seasonal high water table, percolation rate, permeability and depth to very slowly permeable layer).
3) Degree of difficulty to access building site (amount of excavation and soil disturbance required to provide minimum driveway and parking area and degree of difficulty for excavation due to soil properties).
4) Water influence areas (proximity to and extent of disturbance in water influence areas).
5) Condition of watershed (extent to which watersheds and intervening drainage areas conform to land coverage allowances set forth in the land capability system, hydrologic characteristics and known sediment/nutrient production).
6) Ability to revegetate (climatic conditions and the available water holding capacity, fertility, texture, drainage and permeability of the soil).
7) Need for water quality improvements in vicinity of parcel (stable roadside drainage channels, storm drainage system and stable cut and fill slopes).

B. IPES shall include an element, separate from the criteria used for rating each parcel, to encourage physical mitigation of existing water quality problems by individual property owners. The rating of a parcel may be increased, to a limited and finite degree, by the property owner constructing off-site water quality improvements. The extra consideration for off-site work shall result in benefits that fully offset the difference in impacts between developing the subject parcel and developing a parcel with a rating equivalent to the subject parcel's rating without applying the bonus.

C. IPES shall be implemented by ordinance consistent with the following:

1) A team of experts shall evaluate each vacant residential parcel using a standardized approach in accordance with IPES.
   a) For parcels of 1/3 acre or less in size, the entire parcel shall be evaluated for purposes of establishing the IPES rating, except in cases where the parcel contains an SEZ. SEZs shall be excluded from the area evaluated. For...
parcels with less than 5,000 square feet outside an SEZ, the IPES rating shall be reduced by a factor equal to the ratio of land available for construction to 5,000 square feet (See Goal #1, Policy 2, SEZ Subelement).

b) For parcels greater than 1/3 acre but less than 5 acres in size, the evaluation team shall select and evaluate the 1/3 acre portion of the parcel that results in the highest rating. If the selected 1/3 acre portion contains an SEZ, the procedure set forth in (a) above shall be followed. If the property owner wishes to locate the residence outside the area evaluated, a reevaluation shall be required of the 1/3 acre portion of the parcel containing the desired building site.

c) For parcels of 5 acres or greater in size, the property owner shall be notified and asked to identify the desired building site. Once a building site has been identified, the evaluation team shall evaluate the best 1/3 acre portion of the parcel containing the identified building site. If this 1/3 acre contains an SEZ, the procedures set forth in (a) above shall be followed.

d) Installation of water quality improvements in the vicinity of a parcel, subsequent to the initial rating, may increase the rating of a parcel. The amount of increase shall depend on the weight given that factor in IPES and the degree of water quality improvement.

e) Changes in the condition of a watershed, subsequent to the initial rating, may change the rating of parcels located in that watershed. The amount of change in the rating shall depend on the weight given that factor in IPES. Such changes in the condition of a watershed may cause the initial rating to increase or decrease.

f) The rating of all parcels shall be based on the assumption that when developed, all required BMPs shall be installed and maintained.

g) Property owners may appeal parcel ratings to an independent body of qualified experts not involved in the original field evaluation of that particular parcel. These independent experts shall then apply the criteria established in IPES. The decision of the independent body shall be deemed the final action of the Agency unless the property owner appeals the decision to the Governing Board. The Governing Board may change the rating of a parcel only upon expressly finding, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the criteria established in the IPES were not applied correctly.

2) TRPA shall rate all vacant residential parcels numerically and then rank them from the most suitable to the least suitable by jurisdiction. TRPA may reconsider the rating upon request.
before the rankings are officially adopted except as otherwise provided in (d) and (e) above.

3) The Agency shall establish a level in the numerical ranking immediately above the most sensitive parcels, based on recommendations from a technical committee.

4) All vacant residential parcels may compete for building allocations. Those above the initial level, referred to in 3) above, and as may be adjusted in accordance with 5) below, shall comprise the top rank and, if receiving an allocation, may pursue a permit. Those below that level, if receiving an allocation, may exercise the options listed below:
   a) transfer the allocation in accordance with policies in Goal DIP-#3 of this Subelement.
   b) relinquish the allocation and wait for the level to drop to include the parcel within the top rank.
   c) transfer other development rights as permitted elsewhere in the Plan.

5) The numerical level defining the top rank for any jurisdiction shall be lowered on an annual basis by the number of allocations utilized in that jurisdiction during the previous year, provided that:
   a) all parcels included in the top rank are otherwise eligible for development under the applicable state water quality management plans for the Lake Tahoe Basin and other legal limitations;
   b) a monitoring program for that jurisdiction is in place in accordance with the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement;
   c) demonstrable progress is being made on capital improvement programs for water quality within that jurisdiction (see Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement);
   d) there is a satisfactory rate of reduction in the inventory of vacant sensitive parcels. The IPES line shall not move down in any jurisdiction unless the number of parcels below the IPES line in that jurisdiction compared to the number that were deemed sensitive on January 1, 1986, does not exceed the following percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>33 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>33 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   e) the level of compliance with conditions of project approvals within that jurisdiction is satisfactory;

6) Where an allocating authority does not use a random allocation system for IPES allocations after December 31, 1988, its allocations to parcels which are ranked below the line existing on
January 1, 1989 may not exceed the number of allocations which would otherwise occur if chosen by a random system.

7) Allowable land coverage for parcels evaluated under IPES shall be a function of the parcel's IPES rating as set forth in Goal #3, Policy 1.C. of the Land Use Subelement.

2. THRU DECEMBER 31, 1988, UNTIL THE INDIVIDUAL PARCEL EVALUATION SYSTEM IS IMPLEMENTED, AN INTERIM SYSTEM SHALL BE UTILIZED FOR REVIEW OF VACANT RESIDENTIAL PARCELS, SUBJECT TO THE ALLOCATION LIMITS SET FORTH IN GOAL #2, POLICY 2 OF THIS SUBELEMENT.

A. The following categories of projects shall be eligible to receive a residential permit, provided that, to be eligible under categories 1), 2) or 3), parcels shall, consistent with the Bailey coefficients, contain sufficient high-capability (land capability districts 4-7) land so that at least 1,200 square feet of impervious surface area can be created on the parcel; and shall be served by at least three of the services listed in Policy 3:

1) Parcels in California with 1983 allocations.
2) Parcels with Placer County permits which were extended by ordinance to August 1, 1986, have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits, and have not commenced construction.
3) Parcels with local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, and have not commenced construction.
4) Projects which received TRPA conditional approval prior to August 27, 1983, but which did not receive a TRPA permit prior to May 1, 1984, shall be permitted to proceed under the original conditions of approvals.

B. If not eligible to be processed under A. above, to be eligible to obtain a permit under the interim system, a parcel must meet the criteria set forth below as determined by Agency staff, based on field review:

1) The parcel contains sufficient land in Land Capability Districts 4, 6, 6 and 7, so that a single family dwelling and all related land coverage may be constructed in accordance with Agency development standards; and
2) The parcel is served by a paved road, water service utilities, sewer service utilities, and electrical utilities pursuant to Policy 3 below; and
3) The development of the parcel shall not require disturbance of land coverage in land capability districts 1a, 1b SEZ, 1c, 2, and 3, except as provided in Goal #1, Policy 5c, SEZ Subelement; and
4) The parcel shall otherwise be eligible for development under this Plan.
5) Ordinances shall set forth provisions for the waiver of the paved road criteria.
C. If a parcel receiving an allocation is determined to be ineligible for a permit under A. or B. above, the owner may, within applicable time limits set forth in implementing ordinances:

1) relinquish the allocation;
2) transfer the allocation to a parcel which is eligible for development in Land Capability Districts 4–7, provided the parcel from which the allocation is transferred is retired in accordance with Goal #3, Policy 4 of this Subelement;
3) combine one or more adjacent parcels in order to meet the criteria in B. above;
4) appeal to the TRPA Governing Board and demonstrate that the parcel meets the criteria in A. or B. above; or
5) transfer other development rights in accordance with Goal #3 of this Subelement.

D. FOR PARCELS LOCATED IN TYROLIAN VILLAGE UNITS #1-5, FOR WHICH COMPLETE APPLICATIONS WERE FILED AND ACCEPTED PURSUANT TO THE “AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TYROLIAN VILLAGE ASSOCIATION, INC. AND THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY REGARDING EROSION CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS AND RECLASSIFICATION OF UPPER TYROLIAN VILLAGE” DATED MAY 26, 1983, AN INTERIM SYSTEM SHALL BE DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED BY ORDINANCE.

DP-1.23. TO APPROVE A PROJECT ON A PARCEL RATED AND RANKED BY IPES THE PARCEL MUST BE SERVED BY A PAVED ROAD, WATER SERVICE, SEWER SERVICE AND AN ELECTRICAL SERVICE UTILITY. ORDINANCES SHALL SET FORTH PROVISIONS FOR THE WAIVER OF THE PAVED ROAD CRITERIA.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement Goal DP-2 and associated Policies on February 21, 2012.

GOAL #DP-2

MANAGE THE GROWTH OF DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT CONSISTENT WITH PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS.

POLICIES

DP2.1. IN 1992 AND EVERY FIVE YEARS THEREAFTER, TRPA SHALL CONDUCT AN IN DEPTH RE-EVALUATION OF THE THIS REGIONAL PLAN IN COMPARISON WITH PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES.

It is the intent of this Plan to comply with the directives of the Compact and to be responsive to new evidence and changing conditions. Therefore, periodic re-evaluation is required. If progress toward the environmental threshold
standards is not being made goals set forth in the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement is other than anticipated by this Plan, TRPA shall consider making adjustments in one or more of the following areas: (1) rate of growth; (2) types of development permitted; (3) development requirements limitations; (4) capital environmental improvement programs; (5) enforcement programs; (6) financial programs; and (7) any other appropriate element of the Plan. These reevaluations shall be conducted pursuant to established procedures and criteria set forth in this Plan and the implementing ordinances. This review shall ensure that the Regional Plan, and all of its associated parts, are proceeding in conformance with the directives of the Compact.

**Note:** Policy DP-2.2 is drafted with five alternatives for Residential Allocations, Commercial Floor Area, Tourist Accommodation Units and Bonus Units. The Allocation and Development Rights Accounting table was supported unanimously (4-0) by the RPU Committee as part of LU-2 Implementation Measures on January 10, 2012.

**DP-2.2 THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS, COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA, TOURIST BONUS UNITS AND RESIDENTIAL BONUS UNITS THAT MAY BE RELEASED BEFORE DECEMBER 31, 2032 IS OUTLINED IN THE TABLE BELOW.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLOCATIONS/DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS</th>
<th>USED FROM 1987-2011*</th>
<th>REMAINING FROM 1987 PLAN</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL PROPOSED IN THE REGIONAL PLAN</th>
<th>ALT. 1</th>
<th>ALT. 2</th>
<th>ALT. 3</th>
<th>ALT. 4</th>
<th>ALT. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Allocations</td>
<td>6475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2600 2600 4000 5200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Bonus Units</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>0 0 600 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Bonus Units</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0 0 0 200 400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Floor Area (Total)</td>
<td>575,237</td>
<td>224,763</td>
<td>200,000 200,000 400,000 600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>128,623</td>
<td>72,609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>87,906</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>45,300</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>15,250</td>
<td>36,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>77,042</td>
<td>52,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA Pool</td>
<td>221,116</td>
<td>24,768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 158,816 sq. ft. of Commercial Floor Area, 245 Residential Bonus Units and 90 Tourist Bonus Units have been reserved or allocated to projects (e.g., Community Enhancement Projects) that have not been permitted or permitted but the projects have not been acknowledged.

**DP-2.3 THE ANNUAL RELEASE RATE FOR RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS AND COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA SHALL BE IDENTIFIED IN THE CODE OF ORDINANCES AND SHALL UTILIZE A SYSTEM THAT MODIFIES THE RATE OF RELEASE BASED ON PERFORMANCE TOWARDS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS.**
2. A maximum of 2,000 additional residential units may be authorized to receive permits for construction during the first six years of the plan, except that this limitation shall not apply to affordable housing units as described in the housing subelement. Subject to the provisions below, any allocations which are not utilized may be reallocated by the local jurisdiction. The allocation of these permits shall be made as follows:

**FIGURE 6**

**ALLOCATION TABLE**

**ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNIT ALLOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Approvals (4-7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'83 Allocations</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'83 Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTSA Service Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Approvals (4-7)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103[22]</td>
<td>63[40]</td>
<td>63[40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'83 Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Reissued Alloc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Approvals (4-7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Reissued Alloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Approvals (4-7)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Reissued Alloc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. In the event South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) has the ability to serve new development in years 1989, 1990 and 1991, the amounts to be allocated to the STPUD service area during those years are shown with asterisks on Figure 6. In the event disposal capacity is lacking, a portion of the amount available shall be allocated to other jurisdictions, as shown in square brackets. The remaining portion of the El Dorado allocation may be allocated outside of the STPUD service area in the TTSA portion of El Dorado, or in other areas for which sewer capacity exists in El Dorado County. In addition, a program to recognize the imbalance in allocations to the STPUD service area shall be developed for the year.
1992 and beyond, if sewage capacity becomes available.

B. Local jurisdictions shall set their own priorities within the categories of residential units listed in the allocation table (Figure 6) except that in the category of New/Reissued Allocations, the reissued allocations shall have priority over the new allocations. Any allocations which are not utilized may be reallocated by the local jurisdiction.

C. The categories in the residential allocation table are defined as follows:

1. New Allocations - are allocations which are to be assigned to properties that currently do not have allocations and do not fall into the categories below.

2. 1983 Allocations - are allocations which shall be assigned to properties which received a 1983 single family building allocation from the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, or Placer County.

3. Reissued Allocations - are allocations that shall be assigned to properties which fall into the following special classes:
   (a) Parcels with Placer County permits which were extended by ordinance to August 1, 1986, have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits and have not commenced construction.
   (b) Parcels with a local county building permit which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, and have not commenced construction.

   The provision for reissued allocations ((a) and (b) above) shall expire December 31, 1989.

4. Case-By-Case Approvals - are allocations which shall be assigned to Nevada properties which received a conditional approval for a single-family residence under the case-by-case review procedure prior to August 27, 1983, but did not receive a TRPA permit prior to May 1, 1984.

5. Prior Approvals (4-7) - are allocations which shall be assigned to properties located in land capability districts 4-7 which received a TRPA conditional approval for a single-family residence prior to August 27, 1983, but which did not receive a TRPA permit before May 1, 1984.

D. California jurisdictions shall be authorized to issue all the 1983 allocations when notified by TRPA. As applications are processed and permits issued by TRPA, conditions shall be imposed so that no more than 50 percent of the allocations issued are authorized to start construction in those jurisdictions in either of the first two years.

E. Nevada jurisdictions shall be authorized to issue all the case-by-case allocations when notified by TRPA. As permits are issued by TRPA, conditions shall be imposed so that no more than one-third of the permits issued are to be authorized to start construction in those jurisdictions in either of the first two years.

F. A total of 1,400 additional multi-residential units shall be available for the
20 year life of this Plan as bonus units in conjunction with transfer of development rights or other Agency incentive programs designed to attain the goals and objectives of this Plan. Except for affordable housing as defined in the Housing Subelement, these multi-density residential units shall be included in the allocation limitations above (see Land Use Subelement, Goal #2, Policy 5).

G. Unused allocations may be added to a jurisdiction's successive years allocations, through 1991. A residential development policy beyond year 1991 shall be considered at an appropriate time in the future.

3. **A Maximum of 200 Additional Tourist Accommodation Bonus Units May Be Permitted.** (See Policy 9 for 200 Additional Tourist Accommodation Unit Allocations.) (See Goal #3, of the Development and Implementations Priorities Subelement.)

4. **A Maximum of 400,000 Square Feet of Additional Gross Commercial Floor Area May Be Permitted.** (See Policy 8 for Additional Commercial Floor Area Allocations.) Development of Additional Commercial Floor Area Shall Be Allocated As Follows:

Commercial development poses a particularly difficult problem in terms of demands on transportation systems. Controlling the rate of new commercial development will minimize these impacts and provide an opportunity for transportation systems to keep pace.

A. The amount of additional commercial floor area allowed within a community plan for the first ten years of the Regional Plan shall be 360,000 square feet. Seventy-five percent of that amount shall be distributed to local jurisdictions by ordinance based on recommendations of APC and the local jurisdictions, considering such factors as available water and sewage disposal service, the inventory of potentially developable properties, and anticipated needs. TRPA shall then further allocate those amounts to community plans as part of the community planning process. (See Goal #2, Policy 6, of the Land Use Subelement.)

Of the 360,000 square feet, 25 percent shall be retained by TRPA for later distribution to community plans. Of that 25 percent, 36,000 square feet may be allocated by TRPA to projects within CPs before the CP is adopted. Such projects shall be subject to the rules that apply outside CP areas. The remaining 15 percent shall be allocated by TRPA pursuant to the provisions governing the CP process. (See Goal #2, Policy 6, of the Land Use Subelement.)

The rate of development within a CP shall be set forth in a schedule in the adopted CP. The schedule shall be correlated with schedules for the accomplishment of other CP programs such as transportation improvements and watershed restoration work. If those are behind schedule, adjustments in CP growth rates shall be required.

B. The amount of additional commercial floor area allowed outside

---

§ Amended 04/24/02
§ Amended 10/25/06
community plans shall be no more than 40,000 square feet for the first
10 years of the Regional Plan and shall be allocated to individual
projects by TRPA. TRPA may, by ordinance, allow reassignment of this
commercial floor area to community plan areas in conjunction with
adoption or amendment of community plans.

The amount of commercial development outside CPs shall be checked at
two-year intervals to determine if the rate at which projects are being
approved exceeds the projected 4,000 square feet a year rate by more
than 25 percent.

C. The term “additional commercial floor area” shall not include tourist
accommodation area, or outdoor recreation floor area, or their accessory
uses, as defined by ordinance. Additional commercial floor area shall not
include area added in minor remodeling of existing commercial facilities
so long as no change in use occurs, there is no added traffic as a result,
the increase is no more than 500 square feet or five percent of the
existing facility, whichever is less, and the appropriate coverage rules
apply. The exception for minor remodeling is limited to one project for a
facility in a ten year period.

D. Structures housing gaming shall be considered separately under the
provisions set forth in the compact.

DP-2.45. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL USES
SHALL BE PURSUANT TO SHORT- AND LONG-RANGE PROGRAMS. CRITERIA
FOR INCLUSION IN THESE PROGRAMS SHALL BE IDENTIFIED IN THE CODE OF
ORDINANCES DEVELOPED BY ORDINANCE.

6. A MAXIMUM OF 1,500 ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS MAY BE AUTHORIZED TO
receive permits for construction during the years 1992 through
1996. This limitation shall not apply to affordable
housing units as described in the housing subelement. Unused
allocations may be reallocated by the local jurisdictions in
successive years through 1996. The allocation of these residential
units shall be made as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTSA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPUD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. A MAXIMUM OF 1,500 ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS MAY BE AUTHORIZED TO
receive permits for construction during the years 1997 through
2001. This limitation shall not apply to affordable housing units as
described in the housing subelement. Unused allocations from 1996
and prior years shall not be reassigned to the local jurisdictions.
The allocations assigned yearly to each jurisdiction shall be
Linked to the local jurisdiction’s performance on permit compliance, implementation of water quality improvements, and monitoring. Unused allocations from 1997 and later years shall be assigned to an allocation pool administered by TRPA. The allocation pool shall be used to reward a jurisdiction’s good performance and to allow property owners who retire sensitive parcels to receive an allocation. The allocation and distribution of allocations each year shall not exceed the following, except for assignment of allocations from the allocation pool administered by TRPA.

### JURISDICTION PER YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STPUD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Pool Loan</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. A maximum of 400,000 square feet of additional gross commercial floor area may be permitted after 1997. Development of additional commercial floor area shall be allocated as follows:

66 The commercial floor area allocations after 1997 shall focus on the implementation of projects listed in the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) and promotion of the transfer and rehabilitation of substandard development.

A. A maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial floor area may be permitted in adopted community plans. A portion of this allocation may also be permitted outside community plans when used to replace commercial allocations used in the first ten years for outside community plans and if it is linked to environmental improvements.

B. A maximum of 150,000 sq. ft. may be allocated to special projects in community plan areas or adopted master plan areas. These projects shall be evaluated on their implementation of environmental improvement projects.

C. A maximum of 150,000 square feet of commercial floor area may be allocated after 2002. 50,000 square feet may be allocated to projects within adopted community plans. A maximum of 100,000 square feet of commercial floor area allocation shall be allocated to Special Projects.
9. **§§** A **MAXIMUM OF 200 ADDITIONAL TOURIST ACCOMMODATION UNITS MAY BE PERMITTED AFTER 1997 FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS THAT RETIRE TOURIST UNITS FROM SENSITIVE LANDS.**

10. **§§** A MAXIMUM OF 1475 ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS MAY BE AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE PERMITS FOR CONSTRUCTION DURING THE YEARS 2002 THROUGH 2006. THIS LIMITATION SHALL NOT APPLY TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS AS DESCRIBED IN THE HOUSING SUBELEMENT. ALL UNUSED DISTRIBUTED ALLOCATIONS AS OF JANUARY 1 OF EACH YEAR SHALL BE ASSIGNED TO THE ALLOCATION POOL ADMINISTERED BY TRPA. ALL UNALLOCATED OR DEDUCTED ALLOCATIONS SHALL NOT BE PLACED INTO THE ALLOCATION POOL. THE ALLOCATIONS ASSIGNED YEARLY TO EACH JURISDICTION SHALL BE LINKED TO THE LOCAL JURISDICTION’S PERFORMANCE ON PERMIT COMPLIANCE, IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER QUALITY AND AIR QUALITY EIP IMPROVEMENTS, AND MONITORING AND INCREASED TRANSIT OPERATIONS. THE ALLOCATION POOL SHALL BE USED TO ALLOW PROPERTY OWNERS WHO RETIRE SENSITIVE PARCELS TO RECEIVE AN ALLOCATION. THE ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ALLOCATIONS EACH YEAR SHALL NOT EXCEED THE FOLLOWING, EXCEPT FOR ASSIGNMENT OF ALLOCATIONS FROM THE ALLOCATION POOL ADMINISTERED BY TRPA.**§

### MAXIMUM YEARLY ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL-Dorado County</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **§§** FROM JANUARY 1, 2007, THE MAXIMUM ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS THAT MAY BE AUTHORIZED IS EQUAL TO THE NUMBER OF UNITS IN THE ALLOCATION POOL CARRIED OVER FROM 2006 PLUS THE 236 UNUSED PRIOR TO 1996 ALLOCATIONS THAT SHALL BE ADDED TO THE POOL. THIS LIMITATION SHALL NOT APPLY TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS DESCRIBED IN THE HOUSING SUBELEMENT. ALL UNUSED DISTRIBUTED ALLOCATIONS AS OF JANUARY 1 OF EACH YEAR SHALL BE REASSIGNED TO THE ALLOCATION POOL ADMINISTERED BY TRPA, BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2009 AND UNTIL ADOPTION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE, LOCAL JURISDICTIONS MAY ELECT TO RETAIN THOSE ALLOCATIONS EARNED THROUGH THE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS AND UNUSED BY DECEMBER 31. **§§§** THE ALLOCATION POOL SHALL BE USED TO ALLOW PROPERTY OWNERS WHO RETIRE SENSITIVE PARCELS TO RECEIVE AN ALLOCATION, APPLICANTS FOR MODERATE HOUSING UNITS UNDER THE MODERATE HOUSING PROGRAM TO RECEIVE ALLOCATIONS, AND FOR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS TO EARN ALLOCATIONS FOR

---
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§§§ Amended 7/22/2009
ANNUAL DISTRIBUTION. ALLOCATIONS ASSIGNED YEARLY TO EACH JURISDICTION SHALL BE LINKED TO THE LOCAL JURISDICTION’S PERFORMANCE ON PERMIT COMPLIANCE, IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER QUALITY AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS AND MONITORING, AND INCREASED TRANSIT OPERATIONS. THE ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ALLOCATIONS EACH YEAR FOR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS SHALL NOT EXCEED THE FOLLOWING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXIMUM YEARLY ALLOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL Dorado County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement Goal DP-3 and associated policies DP3.1 through 3.3 on February 21, 2012.

GOAL #DP-3

ENCOURAGE CONSOLIDATION OF DEVELOPMENT AND RESTORATION OF SENSITIVE LANDS THROUGH SEPARATE TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS AND TRANSFER OF LAND COVERAGE PROGRAMS.

POLICIES

DP-3.1. TRANSFERS OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS TO PARCELS IN AREAS DESIGNATED AS RECEIVING AREAS IN PLAN AREA STATEMENTS MAY BE PERMITTED SHALL BE ENCOURAGED IN ACCORDANCE WITH REGIONAL PLAN POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCES. THE NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS THAT MAY BE TRANSFERRED IS LIMITED TO ONE UNIT FOR UNDEVELOPED PARCELS, OR TO THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS EXISTING ON A DEVELOPED PARCEL.

A. Residential development and residential development rights may be transferred with approval of TRPA. Residential development rights transferred from undeveloped parcels may only be exercised on a receiving parcel, upon receiving a residential allocation in accordance with the provisions regarding those allocations.

B. As provided in Goal #2 of this subelement and Goal #2 of the Land Use
Subelement, up to 1,400 Residential bonus units may be granted to parcels for multi-residential units in conjunction with transfer of development rights from other parcels or other agency incentive programs. Ordinances shall establish detailed provisions which shall provide for bonuses of varying amounts in relation to a right transferred or implementation of an agency incentive program, depending on the public benefits being provided by the project. More bonuses shall be granted prioritized for affordable housing projects and projects within community plans, Town Centers, the Regional Center, and the High Density Tourist District than for those outside CPs. Other benefits to consider shall include the extent of coverage planned, transportation improvements, water quality improvements, and scenic improvements, and proximity to essential services. More bonuses shall be granted for projects designed to house local residents at median income or below.

DP-3.2. TRANSFERS OF EXISTING TOURIST ACCOMMODATION UNITS INTO DESIGNATED AREAS SHALL BE ENCOURAGED IN ACCORDANCE WITH REGIONAL PLAN POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCES MAY BE PERMITTED.

A. Existing tourist accommodation units may be transferred to designated areas with approval of TRPA, in conjunction with TRPA approval of a project. For bonus Tourist Accommodation Units to be awarded, buildings containing Tourist Accommodation Units to be transferred from the sending parcel shall be removed and the site shall be restored to a natural or near natural condition. The buildings shall be removed and the site restored, except in special circumstances of public benefits as set forth by ordinance.

B. As provided in Goal #2 of this subelement and Goal #2 of the land Use Subelement, up to 400 additional tourist accommodation units may be granted as bonus units in conjunction with transfer of development. Ordinances shall establish detailed provisions which shall allow bonuses of varying amounts in relation to a unit transferred, depending on the public benefits being provided by the project. No bonuses shall be prioritized for projects development within outside adopted CPs, community plans, Town Centers, the Regional Center and the High Density Tourist District. Benefits to consider shall include extent of coverage planned, transportation improvements, water quality improvements, scenic improvements, availability of essential services, and accessory services provided.

DP-3.3. TRANSFERS OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA INTO DESIGNATED AREAS SHALL BE ENCOURAGED IN ACCORDANCE WITH REGIONAL PLAN POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCES.

A. Existing commercial floor area may be transferred to designated areas with approval of TRPA. For bonus Commercial Floor Area to be awarded, buildings containing Commercial Floor Area to be transferred from the sending parcel shall be removed and the site shall be restored to a natural or near natural condition.

^Amended 10/25/06
**B. Additional commercial floor area may be granted in conjunction with transfer of development.** Ordinances shall establish detailed provisions which shall allow additional commercial floor area of varying amounts in relation to a unit transferred, depending on the public benefits being provided by the project. Additional commercial floor area shall be prioritized for projects within community plans, Town Centers, the Regional Center and the High Density Tourist District. Benefits to consider shall include extent of coverage planned, transportation improvements, water quality improvements, scenic improvements, and accessory services provided. TRPA shall reserve a portion of available commercial floor area to encourage development transfers.

*Note: The RPU Committee (4-1) supported the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement policy DP-3.4 on February 21, 2012.*

**DP-3.43. LAND COVERAGE MAY BE TRANSFERRED AS SET FORTH IN GOAL #3, POLICY 2, OF THE LAND USE SUBELEMENT, WITHIN THE RELATED HYDROLOGIC AREA, PROVIDED THE COVERAGE LIMITS SET FORTH IN THE LAND USE SUBELEMENT ARE NOT EXCEEDED.**

The transfer of land coverage may be implemented by parcel consolidation, parcel retirement, land coverage banking systems or other mechanisms approved by the TRPA.

**A. Coverage utilized as mitigation for excess coverage on commercial, mixed-use and tourist accommodation projects shall be existing hard coverage or soft coverage in the 1b land capability district as defined by ordinance, except where the Governing Board finds that there is an inadequate supply of hard coverage at a reasonable cost in the related hydrologic area. In that event, the Board Code may authorize an increase in the supply of coverage for transfer in the following order of priority: (1) including existing soft coverage or disturbed areas within the definition of coverage; and (2) by including potential coverage; and (3) redefining the hydrologic boundaries in that area. Potential coverage shall be defined as base coverage.**

**B. Coverage transferred or used as mitigation to accommodate residential projects, outdoor recreation projects, public service projects, regional public facilities, and public health and safety facilities may be either existing or potential coverage. Potential coverage shall be defined as base coverage.**

**C. Linear public facilities projects that require coverage, when transferring or mitigating coverage over base coverage, shall have the option of transferring hard or soft coverage in accordance with these provisions.**

**D. TRPA, in cooperation with other agencies, shall establish a land coverage banking system.**

**TRPA, to the extent possible, shall utilize a land coverage banking system to facilitate the elimination of excess land coverage and to provide transfer mechanisms. TRPA shall certify appropriate entities to acquire**
land coverage and implement restoration programs pursuant to this policy.

E. Coverage transfers shall be at a ratio of 1:1 or greater. Each square foot of coverage added by transfer shall require removal of one or more square feet of coverage, except for the special provision for additional commercial coverage over 50 percent, as set forth in the Goal LU-2 of Land Use Subelement and the Code of Ordinances. Goal #3, Policy 2.B and other rations as set by this plan.

F. Coverage transferred for a single-family house shall be from a parcel equal to, or more environmentally sensitive than, the receiving parcel.

G. In the case of individual parcels containing a stream environment zone (SEZ), the amount of coverage attributable to the SEZ portion of the parcel may be transferred to the non-SEZ portion of the parcel or may be utilized in the SEZ pursuant to the access provision set forth in Goal #1, Policy 5, of the Stream Environment Zone Subelement.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported to approve policy DP-3.5 language as modified on February 21, 2012.

DP-3.54. THE RESIDENTIAL PERMIT ALLOCATION SYSTEM SHALL PERMIT THE TRANSFER OF BUILDING ALLOCATIONS FROM PARCELS LOCATED ON SENSITIVE LANDS TO MORE SUITABLE PARCELS.

As part of the permit allocation system, TRPA shall permit the transfer of building allocations from parcels in stream environment zones, Land Capability Districts 1-3, lands determined to be sensitive under IPES, or Class 1-4 shorezones, to parcels outside of these areas. However, no allocations shall be transferred to any parcel that is below the current IPES line for the jurisdiction of the receiving parcel, the level defining the IPES top rank on January 1, 1989 unless the number of vacant parcels in the top rank is less than one-half the total inventory in that jurisdiction. Recipients of allocations may transfer across jurisdictional boundaries so long as the jurisdiction to which allocations are transferred has capacity to serve the additional development, both jurisdictions approve the transfer, and the receiving parcel is in land capability districts 4-7 or has a buildable n IPES rating above the January, 1989 level. Such inter-jurisdictional transfers shall be counted against the number of permits allocated to the jurisdiction from which the allocations are transferred.

Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported to approve policies DP-3.6 and 3.7 on February 21, 2012.

DP-3.65. BEFORE TRANSFER OF ANY DEVELOPMENT RIGHT OR LAND COVERAGE UNDER THIS GOAL IS EFFECTIVE, THE TRANSFERORSENDING LOT SHALL BE APPROPRIATELY RESTRICTED OR RETIRED. IN THE CASE WHERE AN ALLOCATION HAS BEEN TRANSFERRED, OR ALL THE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS OR COVERAGE HAS BEEN TRANSFERRED OFF A PARCEL DEEMED INAPPROPRIATE FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT, THE ENTIRE PARCEL SHALL BE RETIRED.
In restricting or retiring a parcel, the implementing ordinances shall consider the retirement of all bonded indebtedness, site restoration, removal of future development potential, disclosure statements, public notice or recordation, and other requirements TRPA deems necessary. All transfers shall be approved by the affected jurisdictions.

**DP-3.76. TRANSFERS OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS, OTHER THAN LAND COVERAGE, SHALL BE LIMITED TO EQUIVALENT USES WITH NO INCREASE IN THE PARAMETERS BY WHICH THE USES ARE MEASURED BY THIS PLAN (E.G., FLOOR AREA, UNITS, PAOT) PLUS BONUS UNITS AWARDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN AND CODE OF ORDINANCES. EQUIVALENT USES SHALL BE DEFINED BY ORDINANCE. DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS DUE TO THE RESULTING PROJECTS SHALL BE ADDRESSED AS PART OF THE PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS.**

**Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement Goal DP-4 and Policies 4.1B and 4.2 on February 21, 2012.**

**GOAL #DP-4**

**CONDITION APPROVALS FOR—OF NEW DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT IN THE TAHOE REGION ON POSITIVE IMPROVEMENTS IN OFF-SITE EROSION AND RUNOFF CONTROL AND AIR QUALITY.**

To generate offsetting mitigation measures, which in turn will accelerate progress toward meeting the environmental thresholds, the Agency will implement the following policies:

**POLICIES**

**DP-4.1. NEW AND REDEVELOPED RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND PUBLIC PROJECTS SHALL COMPLETELY OFFSET THEIR WATER QUALITY IMPACTS THROUGH ONE OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS:**

**Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement Policy 4.1A on February 21, 2012.**

A. Implementing on-site and/or off-site erosion and runoff control projects concurrent with the impact from the project as a condition of project approval and subject to Agency concurrence as to effectiveness, or

B. Contributing to a fund established by the Agency water quality mitigation fund for implementing off-site erosion and runoff control projects. The amount of such contributions is established by Agency ordinance.

This policy continues the water quality mitigation funds established as part of TRPA's Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan. The fee schedules and distribution formula shall be reviewed and revised as
part of the Agency’s implementing ordinances and programs.

**DP-4.2. ALL PROJECTS SHALL OFFSET THE TRANSPORTATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF THEIR DEVELOPMENT.**

The implementing ordinances for the Regional Plan will define stationary sources of air pollution which may locate in the Region, and define what constitutes a significant environmental impact on air quality from stationary sources. Commercial and residential development contribute indirect impacts to air quality by increasing the number of vehicle trips in the Region. The cumulative impact of such trips is significant.

The ordinances will establish a fee to offset the impacts from minor projects. The fee will be assessed on both commercial and residential development. The ordinances will also define what projects have significant environmental impacts; these projects will be required to complete an EIS and mitigate air quality and traffic impacts with specific projects or programs.
Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Financing Subelement Goals and Policies on February 21, 2012.

FINANCING

The purpose of this Subelement is to set forth the financing policies and programs to implement the Regional Plan. The Subelement provides for the creation of new revenue sources, the phasing of expenditures to meet performance targets, and coordination of financing programs with other agencies.

Adequate long-term financing is essential to meet the environmental thresholds and protect the values of the Tahoe Region. The Regional Plan creates a linkage between the rate of funding for capital improvements, the development management system, and the environmental thresholds. If progress toward meeting the environmental thresholds is slower than anticipated, the Plan calls for adjustments in the rate of both capital improvements and development.

GOAL #FIN-1

IN COOPERATION WITH A MULTI-SECTOR REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP OTHER AGENCIES, SECURE PROVIDE FUNDS TO CARRY OUT THE ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM AND OTHER PROGRAMS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN, PROVIDE FOR REVENUE SOURCES THAT DISTRIBUTE COSTS EQUITABLY AMONG THE USERS OF THE BASIN, MEET PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES, AND ATTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS.

It will cost approximately $259 million (1982 dollars) over 20 years to implement the Regional Plan and attain the environmental thresholds. The major expenditures under the Plan are for water quality ($146 million) and transportation ($113 million).

The implementing agencies in the Basin have only limited ability to provide funds for capital improvements at this time. It will take time to develop new revenue sources. Therefore, the Regional Plan provides for a low-cost program for the first five years, while new sources are being developed, and triggers Phase II development priorities with funding of Phase II capital improvements.

In the first five years, transportation needs are about $32 million (1982), primarily for expansion of existing systems. For water quality, the needs are about $30 million, targeted to the most cost-effective locations for erosion and runoff control.

POLICIES

FIN-1.1. TRPA IN COOPERATION WITH A REGIONAL MULTI-SECTOR PARTNERSHIP, SHALL DEVELOP AND CARRY OUT FINANCIAL PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE THE FUNDING NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THE ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM FOR WATER QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION.

The expected sources of revenue during the first five years are mitigation funds, Burton/Santini Act funds, sales taxes, and room occupancy taxes. The
expediency and revenue-gathering ability of these sources, the best mix, and the priority will be set forth through implementing programs.

The potential revenue sources TRPA will evaluate for use during later phases of the capital improvements program are utility taxes, assessments, automobile registration and license fees, property transfer taxes, and Forest Service special use fees.

**FIN-1.2.** FINANCIAL PROGRAMS SHALL PROVIDE FOR AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF COSTS AMONG GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AND BASIN USER GROUPS.

Since many people throughout the Region, the nation, and the world enjoy the amenities of the Tahoe Region, the Regional Plan calls for a financial approach that spreads the costs of protecting environmental quality among property owners, businesses, overnight and day visitors, transportation systems users, and local, state, and federal governments.

**GOAL #FIN-2**

COORDINATE THE REVENUE PROGRAM FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN WITH OTHER RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES; DIRECT THE UTILIZATION OF REGIONAL REVENUES TO SOLVE HIGH-PRIORITY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS CONSISTENT WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN WATER QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS.

TRPA depends on the actions of local governments, state environmental agencies and transportation departments, and special entities including the Tahoe Transportation District to carry out the Environmental capital Improvements Programs, and other programs (e.g., enforcement). Therefore, the development of a financing approach has been coordinated, and will continue to be coordinated, with these other entities. TRPA will oversee the use of the regional revenue sources to ensure the proper phasing of capital improvements.

**POLICIES**

**FIN-2.1.** THE AGENCY SHALL CONSULT WITH OTHER RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES AND ESTABLISH REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT WATER QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PRIORITIES CONSISTENT WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN.

Local units of government and other implementing agencies require flexibility in scheduling capital improvements. TRPA, after in consultation with those entities, will provide guidance on project priorities and, through project review, will ensure that all capital improvements are consistent with the Regional Plan. The detailed capital improvements program will be reviewed and revised periodically in cooperation with all the affected agencies.

**FIN-2.2.** THE AGENCY SHALL CONSULT WITH OTHER RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LONG-TERM REVENUE PROGRAMS, TO AVOID DUPLICATION OF EFFORT, AND TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT CAPITAL PROGRAMS.

All of the agencies which will carry out water quality and transportation programs under this Plan have similar financial needs. Working in cooperation with these
entities, TRPA will identify programs that generate funds efficiently and with minimal administrative burden so as to assist them in fulfilling their capital needs.

**FIN-2.23. REGIONAL REVENUE SOURCES SHALL BE APPLIED TO HIGH-PRIORITY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS THROUGHOUT THE REGION.**

Because many of the Tahoe Region's environmental problems are regional in nature, and do not observe jurisdictional boundaries, it is appropriate to develop and administer regional revenue sources (e.g., utility taxes) to pay for high-priority capital improvements, as set forth in the Environmental Capital Improvements Program.

**GOAL #FIN-3**

**THROUGH A THE ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM, MAKE PROGRESS TOWARD AND MEET THE PERFORMANCE TARGETS IDENTIFIED IN THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SUBELEMENT FOR WATER QUALITY REDUCTIONS IN LOADS OF DISSOLVED INORGANIC NITROGEN TO LAKE TAHOE AND RESTORATION OF SEZS.**

The Environmental Capital Improvements Program identifies the water quality programs necessary to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds. The program specifies projects, costs, and responsible entities over a 20-year schedule.

The capital improvements for water quality stress the most cost-effective projects during the first phase, and move into less cost-effective projects in later phases, to give TRPA and other agencies an opportunity to develop new revenue sources for the more expensive projects. The most cost-effective water quality projects in terms of nutrient and sediment load reductions are those which emphasize slope stabilization and revegetation. The least cost-effective projects (which, it must be emphasized, are still essential for meeting water quality objectives) are those which emphasize storm drainage.

**POLICIES**

**FIN3.1. LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT, STATE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENTS, AND OTHER AGENCIES SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CARRYING OUT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FOR WATER QUALITY, WITH OVERSIGHT BY TRPA. FUNDING ASSISTANCE FROM REGIONAL REVENUE SOURCES SHALL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH OVERSIGHT BY TRPA.**

As in the existing water quality plan for the Basin, the primary responsibility for carrying out capital improvement projects lies with local government, CalTrans, NDOT, and the U.S. Forest Service. Utility districts also have capital improvement programs related to water quality, but the Capital Improvements Program does not discuss these in any detail. A Regional Multi-Sector Partnership, through its financial program, TRPA shall develop means of assisting local governments with funding.

**FIN3.2. TRPA SHALL COORDINATE WITH LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT AND STATE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENTS TO GENERALLY OBSERVE THE PRIORITIES SET FORTH IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM TO ENSURE THAT PLANNED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND...**
AVAILABLE REVENUES ARE CONSISTENT.

Although implementing agencies may have other considerations which affect project priorities (e.g., earmarked funding sources, projects already "in the pipeline"), they should generally observe the priorities set forth in the capital improvements program, which have been tailored to be consistent with the financial program and the development management system. TRPA will review project proposals to ensure consistency with the Plan.

FIN3.3. ALL ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS SHALL BE DESIGNED AND CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE HANDBOOK OF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.

The Handbook of Best Management Practices sets forth both temporary (construction) and permanent BMPs that will apply to many of the remedial water quality projects in the capital improvements program. Where applicable, these BMPs should be fully implemented.

GOAL # FIN-4

THROUGH AN ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM, MAKE PROGRESS TOWARD AND MEET THE PERFORMANCE TARGETS IDENTIFIED IN THE MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION SUBELEMENT FOR AIR QUALITY AND TRANSPORTATION REDUCTIONS IN VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED AND EMISSIONS OF OXIDES OF NITROGEN FOR PHASES I-IV OF THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT.

The capital improvements program identifies the transportation system improvements necessary to attain and maintain environmental thresholds. The four-phase program, to be carried out over 20 years, is expected to meet the performance criteria set forth in the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement.

The capital improvements program for transportation emphasizes a cautious approach to transportation-related investments during the first five-year phase. TRPA will bring about necessary reductions in VMT and NOx emissions through improvements in existing transportation programs. More capital intensive programs, such as the fixed guideway and the Lake ferries, will occur in Phase III and IV, after the Agency has had the opportunity to (1) build ridership on existing systems, (2) develop new sources of funding, and (3) evaluate the need for more expensive systems based on the reduction of nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe.

POLICIES

FIN-4.1. THE TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT AND LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CARRYING OUT THE TRANSPORTATION PORTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM, WITH FUNDING ASSISTANCE FROM REGIONAL REVENUE SOURCES, AND WITH THE COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT OF TRPA.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact designated the Tahoe Transportation District to implement transit and public transportation improvements contained in the Regional Plan. Other related improvements should be the responsibility of local, state, or federal government, depending upon the jurisdiction. The financial program distributes regional revenues to the implementing agencies.
FIN-4.2. TRPA SHALL COORDINATE WITH THE TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT, AND LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT TO PRIORITIZE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS SET FORTH IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM TO ENSURE THE APPROPRIATE PHASING OF IMPROVEMENTS AND THAT PLANNED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMS ARE CONSISTENT WITH AVAILABLE FUNDING.

The proper phasing of transportation improvements under this Plan is essential since it will take several years to increase public transit ridership to improve public awareness of transportation-related problems, to refine cause-effect relationships, and to develop new revenue sources for the later phases. For this reason, agencies which provide transportation improvements must follow the priorities set forth in the Plan.

3. TRPA SHALL REVIEW AND APPROVE ALL TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS.

To ensure consistency between proposed transportation improvements and this Plan, TRPA shall review and approve all project proposals.
Note: The RPU Committee unanimously (5-0) supported the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement Goals and Policies with the exception of ME 3.1 A on February 21, 2012.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement serves three functions. First, it establishes performance standards for evaluating the effectiveness of the Regional Plan and, if necessary, triggering Plan revisions. Second, it identifies needs for further study in the area of cause-effect relationships. Third, it establishes a monitoring program to collect and analyze data necessary to evaluate progress toward maintenance of the environmental thresholds.

GOAL #ME-1

EVALUATE PROGRESS TOWARD ATTAINING AND MAINTAINING THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS THROUGH THE USE OF A DETAILED MONITORING PROGRAM AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

POLICIES

ME-1.1. THE AGENCY SHALL PREPARE THRESHOLD EVALUATION REPORTS EVERY FOUR YEARS USE REASONABLE PROGRESS LINES (SEE EXAMPLE, FIGURE 7) TO EVALUATE THE STATUS AND TREND OF THRESHOLD STANDARD ATTAINMENT AND PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE REGIONAL PLAN. THE REASONABLE PROGRESS LINES SHALL BE SET FORTH IN AGENCY ORDINANCE.

FIGURE 7
EXAMPLE: REASONABLE PROGRESS LINE
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The thresholds for pelagic Lake Tahoe and littoral Lake Tahoe call for a reduction in dissolved organic nitrogen (DIN) loads from surface runoff by approximately 50 percent. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities Study Report (TRPA, 1982) states that the basin wide 1973-81 annual average was ten tons/year for DIN.

**ME-1.2.** BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE THRESHOLD EVALUATION REPORTS AND UPDATED THE SPECIAL STUDIES AND INFORMATION DESCRIBED UNDER GOAL #2, THE TRPA SHALL CONSIDER CHANGES TO THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT STANDARDS ADJUST THE REASONABLE PROGRESS LINES AT LEAST EVERY FIVE YEARS TO REFLECT THE BEST AVAILABLE DATA AND SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.

Because of uncertainty in identifying and quantifying cause-effect relationships for air quality, water quality, and other environmental components, this Plan identifies study needs to clear up the uncertainty. Based on the results of these studies, the Agency may adjust the reasonable progress lines to make them consistent with the latest scientific information.

**ME-1.3.** BASED ON DEGREE OF PROGRESS TowARD ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS, AS MEASURED IN THRESHOLD EVALUATION REPORTS POLICY 1, TRPA SHALL MAKE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE REGIONAL PLAN.

TRPA shall adjust the Regional Plan periodically on the basis of information reported in the periodic threshold evaluation report If this Regional Plan produces the expected benefits to the environment sooner than anticipated, or more slowly than anticipated, TRPA will make adjustments to the Regional Plan in one or more of the following areas: (1) annual residential and commercial project allocations; (2) development priorities; (3) capital improvement program; (4) enforcement program; or (5) financial program.

The detailed monitoring program may also provide information outside the realm of the key indicators that would indicate a need for adjustment in one of the five areas.

**GOAL #ME-2**

**IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONSHIPS FOR LAKE TAHOE AND THE LAKE TAHOE REGION.**

**POLICIES**

**ME-2.1.** TRPA SHALL COMPLETE STUDIES AND UTILIZE DATA FROM OTHER RELEVANT STUDIES TO CONTINUALLY ADVANCE THE UNDERSTANDING OF CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONSHIPS FOR LAKE TAHOE AND THE LAKE TAHOE REGION. STUDIES THAT RELATE TO AREAS OF THRESHOLD NON-ATTAINMENT SHOULD BE PRIORITIZED.

**ME-2.2.** BASED ON THE RESULTS OF ONGOING STUDIES, TRPA SHALL MAKE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE REGIONAL PLAN TO MORE EFFECTIVELY AND EFFICIENTLY ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINANTS AND THE SOURCES OF THOSE CONTAMINANTS. EVALUATE AND REFININE ESTIMATES OF NITROGEN LOADING TO LAKE TAHOE FROM RUNOFF AND ATMOSPHERIC DEPOSITION.
It is important to understand more clearly the relative contributions of nitrogen to Lake Tahoe from surface runoff, groundwater, and atmospheric deposition; from natural and anthropogenic sources; and from controllable and uncontrollable sources. The Agency will use this information to refine its estimates of Lake Tahoe's nutrient budget.

2. DEVELOP INFORMATION ON THE EXACT SOURCES OF SEDIMENTS AND NUTRIENTS WITHIN INDIVIDUAL WATERSHEDS.

Through studies of sediment transport mechanisms, stream channel geometry, flow and load relationships, and sediment-nutrient relationships, TRPA will gain a better understanding of the processes and activities in the watershed which cause sediment and nutrient delivery to Lake Tahoe. TRPA will also attempt to develop better information on the sources of sediment and nutrients in urbanized portions of the Tahoe Region.

3. EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN MITIGATING THE WATER QUALITY IMPACTS FROM THE WATERSHED, AND RECOMMEND REVISIONS TO THE HANDBOOK OF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS APPROPRIATE.

When a better understanding of the causes and sources of pollutants, such as nitrogen, is arrived at, it will be important to evaluate how alternative management practices mitigate the impacts from each source.

4. IMPROVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONSHIPS AFFECTING VISUAL RANGE IN THE BASIN.

TRPA will conduct research into the contributions of auto, boat, and airplane emissions, wood smoke, particulates transported from upwind, fugitive dust, and natural background compounds to impaired visual range.

5. IMPROVE THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PIERS AND BUOYS AND FISH HABITATS AND FISH BEHAVIOR IN LAKE TAHOE.

TRPA will conduct research into uses and activities in the shorezone and their impacts on fish habitats and behavior. The study will consider such uses as piers, buoys, marinas, and breakwaters, and activities such as power boating.

6. ESTABLISH INSTREAM FLOW STANDARDS FOR EACH OF THE BASIN'S TRIBUTARIES.

During 1985, TRPA collected the data necessary to begin to set instream flow standards for approximately 64 tributary streams. The Agency will publish a report based on this data, and set instream flow standards designed to protect habitats for resident and migratory fish. (See Instream Flow Threshold, Resolution 82-11.)

7. EVALUATE THE FEASIBILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PONDING FACILITIES ALONG STREAM CORRIDORS AS A STRATEGY FOR REMOVING INSTREAM LOADS OF SEDIMENT AND NUTRIENTS.

Streams in the Lake Tahoe Basin act as receiving waters for overland runoff which may contain substantial quantities of sediments, nutrients, and other impurities. In the absence of an effective filtering mechanism along the stream...
such as a marsh, these contaminants eventually will be deposited into Lake Tahoe. Diversions of stream water into settling ponds or marshes might be an effective mechanism for cleansing the stream water prior to it emptying into Lake Tahoe. The feasibility of this concept should be further evaluated based on its technical and environmental merits and consistency with the other goals and policies of this Plan.

8. TRPA SHALL CONDUCT A SURVEY TO IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE EXISTING EXCESS COVERAGE IS CAUSING ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE.

Over a five-year period, TRPA shall survey the streams and watersheds in the Basin to identify areas that show empirical evidence of soil erosion or adverse changes in hydrological conditions as a result of excess coverage. The survey shall propose specific programs to address the problem of excess coverage and may include limits on new coverage, cover age removal, and remedial erosion and runoff control projects.

9. TRPA SHALL STUDY ON A CONTINUING BASIS THE CAUSE-EFFECT RELATIONSHIPS RELATED TO THE REGION'S ECONOMY, TO PROMOTE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE POSSIBLE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN.

Although economic cause-effect relationships are extremely difficult to establish, the Agency will track key economic indicators (see Goal #3) and investigate possible connections between these indicators and TRPA's policies, using both economic modeling and expert analysis.

GOAL #ME-3

IMPLEMENT A MONITORING PROGRAM TO EVALUATE THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLDS, THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN, AND THE IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCES AND PROGRAMS.

POLICIES

ME-3.1. IN COLLABORATION WITH FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL AGENCIES AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS, THE AGENCY TRPA SHALL MAINTAIN AN OPERATIONAL MONITORING PROGRAM, CONSISTING OF PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION, DATA COLLECTION, DATA STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL, AND DATA ANALYSIS. THE AGENCY SHALL USE THE PRODUCTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS AND EVALUATE PROGRESS UNDER THE REGIONAL PLAN.

The monitoring program shall include four the following main components:

a) Continuous scientific monitoring of environmental conditions related to the adopted thresholds standards, for pelagic Lake Tahoe, littoral Lake Tahoe, tributary streams, surface runoff, groundwater, coverage, stream habitat, lake habitat, carbon monoxide, ozone, visibility and nitrogen deposition.

b) Periodic evaluations of environmental conditions related to the adopted thresholds standards for odor, common vegetation, uncommon vegetation, sensitive plants, special interest species, significant habitat,
c) Monitoring carried out by TRPA or regional partners of socio-economic data to allow analysis of possible socio-economic impacts of the Regional Plan.

d) Monitoring of management-related data (e.g., numbers of permits issued, numbers and types of enforcement actions) to allow tracking and analysis of TRPA management functions.

e) As required under the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Goal #1, Policy 1(B)(5), The Agency shall monitor representative tributaries as needed to provide a basis for evaluating the relative health of the watershed within which development is contemplated and progress being made toward meeting thresholds. The monitoring program will monitor stream flows and concentrations of nutrients and sediments to determine annual pollutant loads. This monitoring program shall be in place in a local jurisdiction, and shall establish baseline water quality conditions, before the numerical level defining the top rank for any jurisdiction is lowered.

f) At least every five years, the Agency shall evaluate the results of its monitoring program. A special component of the monitoring program shall be designed to evaluate the success of IPES at the end of five years. This special component shall be the basis for extending, modifying, or eliminating IPES. The factors for monitoring shall include some non-scientific but readily observable matters, such as the rate of installation of remedial erosion control projects as set forth in the capital improvement program and the extent of retrofitting existing development with BMPs. Other factors may require more scientific analysis of data gathered, such as stream flow water quality. All such factors shall have predetermined regional and subregional benchmarks to measure against to evaluate the degree of success, based on the recommendations of the Agency’s technical committee on monitoring. Indications shall be provided of expected adjustments to be made depending on the results of monitoring. The results of the first five-year evaluation shall not affect the allocations in the sixth year of the schedule included in Goal #2, Policy 2 of the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement.

ME-3.2. THE AGENCY SHALL UTILIZE A SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL TO REVIEW PERIODICALLY THE TECHNICAL ASSUMPTIONS, TECHNIQUES, AND PROCEDURES ASSOCIATED WITH MONITORING AND ANALYSIS EFFORTS.

The Tahoe Science Consortium Science Advisory Panel, comprised of technical experts in various fields, will assist TRPA staff and the APC in developing and implementing the monitoring program. Panel members will be selected based on their technical expertise, professional objectivity, and impartiality.

ME-3.3. THE AGENCY WILL PUBLISH PERIODIC REPORTS COVERING PROGRESS ON THRESHOLD ATTAINMENT AND MAINTENANCE, RESEARCH, AND OVERALL MONITORING RESULTS.

The Agency will publish annual or semi-annual reports on the implementation of
the Monitoring and Evaluation Subelement. These reports will generally initiate routine problem assessment and program evaluation functions of the Agency.

**ME-3.4.** THE AGENCY SHALL UTILIZE WILL ESTABLISH A MULTI-SECTOR BASIN PARTNERSHIP A SOCIO-ECONOMIC ADVISORY PANEL TO HELP DEVELOP A SOCIO-ECONOMIC MONITORING PROGRAM, TO PERIODICALLY REVIEW AND REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE BASIN'S ECONOMY AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNING BOARD.

TRPA should consider the impacts of the Regional Plan on the Basin's economy and periodically consider adjustments consistent with attainment of environmental threshold carrying capacities. A panel of socio-economic experts should be assembled to assist TRPA in this task.

**ME-3.5.** ON AN ANNUAL BASIS TRPA WILL PREPARE A PRELIMINARY LIST OF WORK PRIORITIES. THIS LIST WILL BE DERIVED FROM THE MOST RECENT ANNUAL THRESHOLD REPORT, REGIONAL PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED BY STAFF AND STAKEHOLDERS, THE MOST RECENT ANNUAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM REPORT, THE ANNUAL REPORTS ON MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING, PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED BY THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION, AND SIMILAR INFORMATION. THE GOVERNING BOARD SHALL REVIEW THE PRELIMINARY LIST OF WORK PRIORITIES AND ARRANGE THE PROJECTS IN ORDER OF PRIORITY. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SHALL SUBMIT AN ANNUAL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN THAT INDICATES HOW THE WORK PRIORITIES WILL BE COMPLETED IN ORDER OF PRIORITY TO THE DEGREE POSSIBLE WITH THE RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO THE AGENCY. THE LIST OF PROJECTS AND ORDER OF PRIORITY SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE REGIONAL PLAN AS ATTACHMENT I AND SHALL BE UPDATED AND REPLACED ANNUALLY FOR THE PERIOD PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE NEXT ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET BUT AFTER INITIAL ADOPTION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN INCLUDING THIS POLICY, THE LIST OF PROJECTS IN ATTACHMENT I WILL BE CONSIDERED THE PRELIMINARY LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR THE GOVERNING BOARD TO ARRANGE IN ORDER OF PRIORITY AND FOR SUBSEQUENT PREPARATION OF THE ANNUAL AGENCY WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET.