Recommendations for Policies Deferred by the RPU Committee
January 10, 2012

1. LU-2 Implementation Measure for Land Capability Field Verification

   Background: As part of the broader effort to eliminate ineffective and inefficient regulations and procedures, staff recommended waiving field verification of land capability mapping when the land capability is not in question. The RPU Committee requested that the implementation measure include criteria for determining when field verification of site-specific land capability mapping is not required.

   Recommendation:
   Staff recommends the following Implementation Measure:
   - 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.

2. LU-2 Implementation Measures for Allocations

   Background: Numerous questions were raised at the January 4 Committee meeting regarding LU-2 Implementation Measures for allocations. TRPA met with Local Government staff and prepared modified recommendations.

   Recommendation:
   Staff recommends the following Implementation Measures:
   - 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. Quantities in Alternative 3 should be the preferred alternative for the Draft EIS and changes to the Alternative 3 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:

- There should not be a maximum yearly release of residential allocations and CFA. Instead, allocations should be released 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 allocations, bonus units and CFA held by TRPA and Local Governments should be evaluated annually and modified if necessary 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.

- 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 be held by TRPA and used for development transfer matches and existing Bonus Unit programs.

- The performance system should be evaluated every four years as part of each regional plan update 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></td>
<td>ALT. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Allocations</td>
<td>6475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Bonus Units</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>0</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>0</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.
3. **LU-3 Implementation Measure for Subdivisions**

**Background:** The RPU Committee directed staff to provide information related to the two-step subdivision process and a more detailed explanation of recommended changes.

**Recommendation:**
Staff does not recommend changing the two-step subdivision process. The requested memo on the topic is being distributed with this document. Staff recommends the following Implementation Measure:

- Amend the Code of Ordinances to allow for the subdivision of existing residential and tourist units within mixed-use facilities, subject to limitations. Subdivided residential and tourist units would be treated the same as un-subdivided units for purposes of density calculations and other development code requirements.

4. **LU-3 Implementation Measure for Development in the Recreation District**

**Background:** The RPU Committee directed staff to work on this Implementation Measure with the subdivision topic. The recommended amendment would permit certain land uses in the Recreation District outside the urban area as a part of a conforming Local Plan or Master Plan. This provision is anticipated to be used in ski area master plans.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the following Implementation Measure:

- Amend the Code of Ordinances to allow the development and subdivision of tourist, commercial and residential uses in the Recreation District outside the Urban Area as a component of a Local Plan or other Master Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan.

5. **LU-3 Implementation Measure for Transfer Ratios**

**Background:** The RPU Committee voted on the transfer ratio table in the LU-3 Implementation Measures, but the action did not specify introductory text. Staff distributed introductory language on December 15, 2011 that would permit Local Plans to establish alternative transfer ratios for unique situations. The updated language was mistakenly omitted from the most recent Land Use Element draft.

**Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the following Implementation Measure:

- 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 Local 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.

6. **Policy CD-2.1(E) Signs**

**Background:** The RPU Committee deferred action on signs at the January 4, 2012 meeting and
directed staff to work on revisions with Local Governments.

Recommendation:
Staff recommends the following Policy language:

E. Signing: In determining sign design, the following should be considered:

1) Off premise signs **should be are** prohibited, except in accordance with a Conforming Local Plan or a sign program that has been approved by TRPA. Any allowance for off premise signs should include design and location restrictions to minimize and mitigate significant scenic impacts.

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 height, lighting, and square footage for on premise signs shall be formulated and shall be consistent with the land uses permitted in each district.

7. **Policy HS-3.1 Housing**

Background: Staff has had significant discussions with Local Governments regarding housing policies. The general consensus is that the RPU does not address housing affordability issues as thoroughly as desired. Specifically, many of TRPA’s regulations increase the cost of housing and prevent full implementation of Local Government housing programs. Because the issue is complex and will require an environmental analysis, staff recommends that housing policies and ordinances be updated through a focused effort after adoption of the Regional Plan update.

Recommendation:
Staff recommends the following Policy language:

HS-3.1 TRPA shall regularly review its Policies and Regulations to remove identified barriers preventing the construction of necessary affordable housing in the basin.