NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 8, 2006, at the TRPA Offices, located at 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

October 13, 2006

[Signature]
John Singlaub
Executive Director
All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item not listed on the agenda may do so at this time. Public comment on Public Hearing items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Scoping of the Environmental Document for the Amendment of Resolution 82-11 to update the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, pursuant to the recommendations of Pathway 2007. Page 1

B. Scoping for the Sierra Colina LLC Multiple Dwelling Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Page 49

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Called to order at 9:30 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Combs, Mr. Romsos for Ms. Davidson, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Krause, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Mauer, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Tolhurst

Ms. Schmidt attended at 9:40 a.m.
Ms. Kemper attended at 9:50 a.m.
Mr. Zuckerman attended at 10:00 a.m.

Members Absent: Mr. Harris, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Riley, Ms. Sertic

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Tolhurst moved to approve the agenda
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No Public Comment.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Combs moved to approve the minutes as amended.
Motion carried.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Tahoe Transportation Commission

Staff member Nick Haven updated the APC on the TTC meeting.
1. Amendment to the Federal Transportation Improvement Program
2. Amendment to the Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Amendment of Code and Goals and Policies to extend the Allocation Programs for Residential, Commercial, Tourist and Recreation until adoption of the Pathway 2007 Regional Plan Update.

Staff member Lisa O’Daly presented the staff summary outlining the proposed Allocation Programs for the Interim. Staff is requesting that the APC recommend to the Governing Board approval of the proposed Interim Allocations.

Staff member Paul Nielsen responded to questions of the Committee. There would be no changes in the maximum allocations to the individual jurisdictions. The Annual Performance Evaluation takes place in the fall and the allocations will be established in December for the following year.

Director John Singlaub responded to the question of APC Member, Ron McInyre, that currently criteria for a “Demonstration Project” has not been established, but if a project needs fifty units of moderate housing allocations, and it meets the criteria, it would receive the fifty allocations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. John Falk, Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors, stated that he was in favor of recommendation of approval to the Governing Board of the proposed Interim Allocations. There had been a massive amount of effort in finding the middle ground providing a seamless transition. The proposal is necessary to maintain the good faith participation and continuation to the Pathway Process. This should allow for a smooth transition until the new Regional Plan is complete. He recognizes the need for moderate housing and it should not be unduly burdensome for moderate projects, but that it is necessary to ensure the market share is protected in the P7 process with the appropriate environmental protections.

2. Pat Davidson, The Contractors’ Association of Truckee Tahoe also supports the proposed Interim Allocations. Her comments are attached.

3. John Friedrich, League to Save Lake Tahoe, recognizes that the Interim Allocation program is a reasonable proposal and correctly defers the larger Issues to Pathway 2007. He also recognizes the need for moderate income Housing, but it should not be exempt from the allocation process, that it would be prudent to look ahead and anticipate. Perhaps establish a rainy day fund and consider the potential to set aside moderate housing from market rate allocations. He expressed concern that Pathway 2007 would possibly take a third year, and that another document would be required to address the interim program again. He suggested reconsidering at the end of next year to assess whether to continue with the program or to budget for an extra year for a smooth and seamless transition. Also to provide enhanced incentives for utilization of moderate income housing and environmentally sensitive parcel retirements.
4. Jennifer Merchant also expressed concern that there was a potential for a third year requirement of Interim Allocations. Jennifer felt that Placer County had contributed most of the allocations to the Allocation Pool and would like to see an increase in allocations be given to that County. She questioned why so few buildable lots existed in Placer County and was concerned that lots were being retired in Placer County in exchange for allocations being used in the South Shore. Ms. Merchant felt the Special Project criteria focused on larger projects and that smaller projects should be able to compete. Perhaps develop a simple EIP system that allows smaller projects to go forward. She was also concerned that a large project could take all of the bonus unit TAU's. Ms. Merchant stated that through a lottery drawing of seventy-two applications, fifty were approved.

5. Michael Donahoe, Tahoe Area Sierra Club, stated that he has been an active member of Pathway 2007 process and a Forum representative of national environmental firms. Since he was not able to review the 2006 Threshold Evaluation Report it was not possible to make a decision on the Interim Allocation Program, which is needed to prevent turmoil during the interim period. He is concerned that the current program is not working. He states that TRPA should use the interim period conservatively by allowing only “benign” projects. He could support the Interim Allocations if it has the limitation that the new allocations should be used for projects that utilize existing subdivisions or previously disturbed sites.

Mr. Donahoe continued that he would not encourage the proposal without further and full EIS of undisturbed land and he would hope that would be incorporated into the Interim plan so he could support the plan.

Staff member Lisa O'Daly responded to Ms. Merchant's questions. The pool is always available to any jurisdiction and they are not proposing to change the system. Any sensitive lots that are retired moves the IPES line downward. The special projects criteria have not changed. There are 172 TAU's left in special projects, there have not been many allocated in the last twenty years, one hundred and forty-five are distributed and available in each community plan. Also any small project that met the criteria would be eligible for allocation.

Staff member Paul Nielsen reiterated that these numbers are estimates that are based on past demand and the allocations are awarded in December 2006 and December 2007. The jurisdictions can reserve allocations for moderate income.

The third year concerns could be alleviated by the code conversion program that encourages retirement in SEZ, for example 20 motel units can be converted to residential. Removing non-confirming uses can be converted to residential. Sensitive lot retirement programs have existing programs for environmental improvement.

Staff member Gabby Barrett, in response to Mr. Combs question of how development rights are transferred from one jurisdiction to the other, stated that both must approve the transfer.
APC member, Ron McIntyre made a motion to modify the staff recommendation document to have the moderate housing portion taken out of the allocations and be considered like affordable.

Mr. Combs seconded.

Member Comments:

APC member Mr. Ramsos stated that there would be a need to clarify the scope of the development.

APC member Mr. Combs stated the concept of moderated should be exempt from allocations requirements and there should be an unlimited pool for affordable and moderate.

APC member Mr. McIntyre stated that moderate is part of HUD’s analysis and should have been Included in the original plan.

APC member Mr. Plemel stated that he would support the staff recommendation, he can not support the motion because it has not been analysed.

APC member Mr. Tolhurst said he does agree that small projects should have more opportunity to obtain CFA allocations. He could see the moderate included in the new plan, but did not support the motion.

APC member Ms. Kemper said she would like to hear staff’s opinion on the concept of allocations being restricted to restricted and reserved sites. She also thought she some allocations should be reserved for a third year.

Staff Member John Singlaub indicated that most subdivisions have not been analyzed, they were established in the 20’s and 40’s and that most of the allocations are within these subdivisions.

APC member Ms. Jamin stated that she agreed with Mr. Plemel, that there needs to be more discussion of moderate housing in the P7 process, however right now it might jeopardize public support in the interim.

APC member Mr. Plemel does support the inclusion of moderate housing, but just not now.

A vote was taken on the motion:

AYES: Mr. Combs, Mr. Jepsen, Mr. McIntyre

NAYES: Mr. Lawrence, Ms. Krause, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Zuckerman, Ms. Jamin, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Mauer, Mr. Ramsos, Ms. Schmidt, Mr. Tolhurst.

Motion denied.

Mr. Ramsos made a motion to approve the staff recommendation as presented.
Ms. Krause seconded.

Motion carried unanimously.

B Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (US 50 to the Mouth of the Upper Truckee River).

Staff member Mike Elam stated that this presentation is an information gathering process to invite public comments on the NOP. There was a public hearing on October 4, 2006 and another will be held at the Governing Board meeting October 25, 2006. The 30 day comment period on the scope of the EIS ends November 2nd, and then we will proceed with the EIS draft.

Staff member Mike Elam introduced Rick Robinson of the CTC, who began the presentation of the NOP.

Curtis Allen the EDAW project director stated that this has been a long and careful planning process that has been sponsored by CTC, TRPA and the Bureau of Reclamation. There is not a preferred alternative, but after analysis of the various alternatives the final alternative may result in a combination of the different features.

Comments

APC member Ms. Jamin stated as the Department head of Parks and Recreation she has a keen interest in seeing this incorporated in the parks program.

APC member Mr. Tolhurst stated that the alternative selected should not deny access to the Lake.

Rick Robinson responded to an APC member question that the corporate yard is part of a settlement and was given a 99 year lease. Mr. Robinson stated that there was hope that the present treatment facility may be trying to find a higher capability plant and that the cost of doing the BMP's may encourage it to move.

APC member Ms. Kemper said that her staff was involved with modeling tools to quantify load reductions and long and short term impacts.

APC member Mr. Romsos was encouraged and supportive of CTC. He was wondering how they were dealing with non-native species and the issues of restoration. He also stated that the area was a wintering site for the bald eagle.

APC member Mr. Tolhurst said that he was not an expert on SEZ and was concerned about the effects of the flooding of the marsh.

Mr. Robinson stated that the homes in the Keys had been build on a 100 year flood plan and that the sediment buildup has happened for years, eons.
Executive Director Mr. Singlaub stated that getting development out of the area is extremely important.

Public Comments

Michael Donohoe, Tahoe Area Sierra Club, states that it is a great project and he looks forward to seeing it develop. The mission is to explore, enjoy, protect and to prevent rogue trails that adversely impact the area. This is not just a local, but a national treasure to be protected.

Public Comment Closed

No Action Required.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Mr. Singlaub gave the Executive Director’s Report.

B. Legal Counsel

Mr. Kahn stated the Charles Bluthe suit has been stayed during settlement discussions. The Kings’ Beach spill has reached a settlement that includes the responsible parties to pay for an emergency bypass for NPTUD. The Governing Board will the Airport tree cutting situation at the next board meeting.

C. APC Members

Mr. Tolhurst announced that there will be a joint TTC/TTD meeting on November 3rd at 10:00 at the TRPA office.

Ms. Kemper announced that there is a workshop today here at Kings’ Beach at 1:30 on grazing issues in getting a more consistent regulatory strategy. Also prioritizing and review the issues for he next 3 years.

Mr. Zuckerman, Principal Planner for Douglas County, introduced himself as the replacement for Ms. Bovat.

Mr. McIntyre asked the status of the A9A Re-alignment project.

Executive Director responded that there was a problem with the consultant, and we are looking to find money to find a new consultant to complete an EIS and move forward.
Chairman Tolhurst adjourned the meeting at 12:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Danna Meyer
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
October 11, 2006

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

RE: Agenda Item VI. Amendment of Code and Goals and Policies to extend the Allocation Programs for Residential, Commercial, Tourist and Recreation until adoption of the Pathway 2007 Regional Plan Update, and other matters related thereto.

As you know, we have been following this issue since it was agendized months ago. We continue to support a smooth and seamless transition into an interim residential allocation program.

Since it appears that no change will be made at this juncture for added policy to shield moderate income housing – i.e. moderate units will be in direct competition with market rate for the limited number of available allocations – I would like to propose some added language that serves as a “Statement of Intent” for the record – not as part of the changes to the Code, Goals and Policies, or Community Plans.

The “Statement” would be a clear assertion on your part that it was never the intent of this interim residential allocation program to stymie or make more difficult the provision of moderate income housing. Further, the “Statement” could add that in the event a moderate income project comes forward to draw from the interim pool, some discussion or consideration be made about granting a one time exemption (or other relief valve) to that moderate income housing project. This “Statement” recognizes a balance is needed: We know there is a critical need for workforce (moderate income) housing in the Basin and we want the resulting social and environmental benefits - stronger family/community ties and reduced commute time/emissions. We also do not want to disrupt the orderly progression of the market rate unit program and distribution of those allocations.

This Statement doesn't legally commit TRPA to anything other than recognizing an intent and possibly considering some alternative if a moderate income housing project comes forward during the interim period.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to your decision.

Sincerely,

Pat Davison
Executive Director

P.O. Box 10570 • Truckee CA 96162 • 530-550-9999 • fax 530-550-9998 • info@ca-tt.com
MEMORANDUM

November 1, 2006

To:         Advisory Planning Commission
From:       TRPA Staff
Subject:    Next Step in Pathway Process: Workshop for Scoping of Environmental Document to Update the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

BACKGROUND: The purpose of this staff summary is to outline the agenda item before you. An environmental assessment (EA) is being prepared in anticipation of the adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (thresholds) in 2007, as part of the Pathway 2007 Regional Plan Update. Consider the following points as background on the item:

- The Pathway collaborative process has been underway for four years and the EA work going forward reflects the collective input from the public, scientists/technical specialists, agency staff and policy makers.
- The recommendations contained in the Pathway Collaborative Alternative, which is outlined on the following page, include changes that will streamline thresholds and allow TRPA and partner agencies greater opportunities to achieve the vision set forth in the Compact.
- A major step in the Pathway process is the adoption of thresholds, which is slated for spring/summer 2007. The EA being prepared will provide the necessary analysis for this Governing Board action.
- Resolution 82-11, which was adopted in 1982, will need to be amended and adopted as a guiding policy document preceding threshold adoption in spring/summer 2007.
- TRPA staff will work with the community to develop input to the Regional Plan package. An Environmental Impact Statement/Report (EIR/EIS) will be prepared before the Governing Board can adopt the new Regional Plan. October 2008 is the target for adoption of the new plan.

PROPOSED ACTION: Staff is notifying the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) of commencement of the preparation of the EA for the update of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities.

Staff is requesting that the APC comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and related attached documents. Staff is requesting an APC recommendation on the proposed inclusion of a No Action Alternative, a Collaborative Alternative, and any other issues that should be addressed in the Threshold Update EA.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the APC endorse the two threshold alternatives as listed in the NOP - (1) No Action Alternative, i.e. the existing Thresholds and (2) the Pathway Collaborative Alternative.

PROPOSED EA ALTERNATIVES FOR THRESHOLD UPDATE: The following are brief descriptions of the two EA alternatives for the 2007 Thresholds Update. The attached NOP has more detailed descriptions.

The No Action Alternative for Thresholds is based on keeping in place TRPA’s Thresholds as adopted under Resolution 82-11 as amended. Currently there are nine Threshold categories: water quality, air quality, soil conservation, recreation, wildlife, fisheries, scenic quality, vegetation, and noise. Current thresholds are administered based on 40 adopted standards (e.g. soil conservation – impervious cover) that are set out as numerical, management and policy standards. TRPA tracks progress on attainment using 36 indicators (e.g., WQ-2: secchi disk transparency of 33.4 meters) and standards derived from the 40 adopted thresholds.

The Pathway Collaborative Alternative for Thresholds is the result of staff summarizing four years of Pathway research and collaboration. It proposes:

1. Generally improved levels of environmental assessment, management and protection
2. A new format (Desired Condition, Indicator, Standard) suitable for adaptive management that better matches the format of Pathway partner agencies such as the USDA Forest Service
3. A recognition that different thresholds standards may be appropriate for different areas (i.e. the transect concept that treats urban areas differently than non-urban)
4. A streamlining of threshold standards and indicators, and
5. Calls for tracking transportation and socioeconomics progress without having threshold status.

The Collaborative Alternative includes all Desired Condition statement recommendations that had consensus of the Pathway Forum, a group of 43 interested citizens participating in Pathway. Figure 3 shows the proposed Desired Conditions and the ones recommended for Threshold status. Changes are as follows:

- There are eight threshold categories proposed versus the existing nine.
- There are 20 Threshold Desired Conditions proposed versus the existing 40 adopted thresholds.
- There are 27 indicators and standards being proposed as Threshold Standards versus the existing 36 indicators and standards.

DISCUSSION: This hearing is one of several planned scoping sessions for environmental documents that address the update of the Thresholds and Regional Plan. Consistent with the schedule presented to the APC in May, this APC hearing is for considering the scope of an EA addressing proposed Threshold Update alternatives. There will be additional scoping sessions for an EIS for the update of the Goals and Policy Plan in the late spring of 2007. Key TRPA Pathway tasks and dates follow.
Figure 1 TRPA Pathway Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment on EA Scope for Thresholds Update</td>
<td>November 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Public Comment Period</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA Action on Updated Thresholds</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of Goals and Policies</td>
<td>June 2006- March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS Scope for Goals and Policies</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Thresholds and G&amp;P</td>
<td>June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of Code, PAS, EIP, etc.</td>
<td>May 2007 – August 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Code, PAS, EIP, etc</td>
<td>October 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

Pathway 2007 Collaborative Proposed Thresholds
October 28, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>DC Recommended by the Forum</th>
<th>Proposed Desired Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed TRPA Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Lake Tahoe Clarity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Human &amp; Environmental Health</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils / SEZ</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>DC 1 Land Coverage and Disturbance</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC 2 Watershed and Fluvial Functioning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Forum</td>
<td>DC 3 Urban Soils and SEZ Functioning</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC 4 Rural Forest and SEZ Functioning</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Visibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Human &amp; Ecosystem Health</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Single Event Noise Sources</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Cumulative Noise Levels</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 3 Effects on Wildlife</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife &amp; Fisheries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Biological Integrity of Terrestrial Ecosystems</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Sustainability of Special Status Species</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 3 Biological Integrity of Aquatic Ecosystems</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Healthy Vegetation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Plant Communities of Concern</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 3 Special Status Species</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 4 Hazardous Fuels</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 5 Urban Vegetation</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Natural Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Community Design</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 3 Dark Sky</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Opportunity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Access</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC 3 Education</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Sustainable Economy</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 3 Town Centers</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 4 Social Communities</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC 5 Regulatory Framework</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 1 Mobility/Socio-Economic Vitality</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>DC 2 Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded areas represent DCs considered but not recommended for Threshold Status.
IMPORTANT NOTE: All of the vision and desired condition statements listed in the Pathway Collaborative Alternative have been recommended by the Pathway Forum with the exception of the Soil Conservation Desired Conditions. The soils work is still under development by the Pathway Agencies. While the Forum reached consensus on all desired conditions except soils, they did not reach consensus on proposed standards and indicators. Forum members are being invited to comment on the standards and indicators as part of the EA process.

The standards and indicators recommended in Collaborative Alternative (see Attachment A Exhibit B) are based on the collaborative efforts of the four Pathway Agencies as documented in the Pathway Evaluation Report (Version 1.1). TRPA staff has made minor modifications to the Pathway recommendations for technical reasons and where proposed standards and indicators were not Type I or Type II, has recommended staying with the current standards and indicators as explained below.

The standards and indicators vary in their stage of development i.e. Types I, II, and III. Some are based on more complete scientific information and are therefore better-defined than others that are only conceptually identified (Types II and III) and need to be more fully developed. Most of the working sets of indicators and standards are included in the proposed action. Other indicators and standards are projected for full development after March of 2007, and, pursuant to adaptive management will be phased in when completed, reviewed, and approved by TRPA.

PATHWAY PROCESS TO DATE: As part of the Pathway 2007 planning process, the TRPA, together with the three other Pathway agencies, has been receiving input regarding future management of the Tahoe region from federal, state, and local governments; stakeholders of the Tahoe Region; technical and scientific experts; public-interest groups; the general public; and the Pathway Forum. Some highlights of how the Collaborative Alternative was developed are as follows:

- Held five public visioning workshops in and out of the Tahoe Basin
- Conducted 1800 individual surveys and eight focus groups in and out of the Basin
- Held numerous meetings of 11 technical working groups
- Held 17 Forum Meetings with numerous subcommittee meetings
- Held 12 Place-Based planning workshops and two Latino community workshops
- Conducted many meetings among the four Pathway agencies.

The TRPA staff will work with Pathway partner agencies and the public to develop proposed management strategies, programs, projects, and regulations to achieve the desired conditions set out in the EA. The entire package, including management strategies and refined indicators and standards will be analyzed in an EIS on the Regional Plan during 2007 to 2008.
For reference and background, the APC is welcome to read the Pathway 2007 Evaluation Report (September 2005) and the recently drafted addendums that were the result of collaborating with the Forum. For copies, see the Pathway 2007 Web site: www.pathway2007.org. If you need assistance obtaining documents please contact Suzie Belser at 775-589-5299.

**Attachments & Exhibits:**

Attachment A – Notice of Preparation

- Exhibit A – No Action (Existing Thresholds)
- Exhibit B – Collaborative Proposal
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY’S UPDATED ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

PROPOSED PROJECT
The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) to consider the potential effects of updates to the environmental threshold carrying capacities (Thresholds) and current Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region. This project will comply with all TRPA environmental document requirements in Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Compact), Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Article VI of the TRPA Rules of Procedure.

The Compact requires TRPA to establish Thresholds and adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances to achieve and maintain Thresholds while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development in the Tahoe Region consistent with the Thresholds.

As defined by the TRPA Compact, Thresholds are environmental standards necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region. The current regional plan addresses Thresholds for air quality, water quality, soil conservation, vegetation preservation, noise, scenic quality, wildlife, fisheries, and recreation.

It has been 20 years since the adoption of the first comprehensive TRPA Regional Plan. Therefore, TRPA is proposing to evaluate existing Thresholds and update the Thresholds and Regional Plan where changes are deemed necessary. An objective of the Threshold and Regional Plan update is to improve the existing Thresholds pursuant to the recommendations of the 2006 Threshold Evaluation in order to achieve the mandates of the Compact.

Alternatives to be evaluated in the EA for the updated Thresholds and Regional Plan are likely to include: (1) a “No Action” Alternative (Exhibit A) that retains all aspects of the current Thresholds and Regional Plan, (2) a Collaborative Alternative (Exhibit B) developed with the Pathway Agency staff, resource experts, and reviewed by the Pathway 2007 Public Forum, and (3) other alternatives that may be developed as part of this process so as to provide comparative information for final decision-making.

TRPA’s 1982 thresholds will remain in effect until all environmental analysis is completed and a final action is taken by the TRPA Governing Board to formally adopt revised thresholds and/or an updated TRPA Regional Plan.

LEAD AGENCY
TRPA will serve as the lead agency for the EA
YOUR VIEWS ARE REQUESTED
The publication of this notice initiates the TRPA public scoping process for the EA on the TRPA Thresholds Update. TRPA invites the views of the public and local, state, and federal agencies regarding the scope and content of environmental issues to be addressed by TRPA. At this time, TRPA is requesting scoping comments specific to the update of TRPA’s environmental threshold carrying capacities.

RESPONSE TIME
This is scoping will occur during November, 2006. Please send your comments to the address below. Responses for the final scoping must be received no later than the Final scoping hearing November 15, 2006 for Threshold Update alternatives.

Threshold and Regional Plan Update - Comments
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Post Office Box 5310
Stateline, NV  89449

SCOPING MEETINGS
You are invited to attend public scoping hearings at the TRPA Governing Board (GB) and Advisory Planning Commission (APC) meetings on the following dates:

November 8, 2006  APC  Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
                  128 Market St., Stateline, NV

November 15, 2006  GB  North Tahoe Conference Center
                    8318 North Lake Blvd. Kings Beach, Ca.


The purpose of these hearings is to receive comments on and discuss the scope of revisions to the Thresholds. Written or verbal comments are welcome.

Additional opportunities to participate in the scoping process are available as part of the Pathway 2007 planning process and place-based planning initiative. Information is available at: http://www.pathway2007.org/public.aspx

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
If you have further questions or require additional information regarding this matter, please contact Larry Benoit or Gordon Barrett at TRPA (address above) or 775-588-4547.

This Notice of Preparation was circulated beginning on November 1, 2006.
RESOLUTION NO. 82-11

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (“TRPA”) finds:

1. On December 19, 1980 the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (“Compact”) was amended, requiring, among other things, that the TRPA adopt Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region. The Compact further requires that, within one (1) year after the adoption of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities TRPA shall amend its regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements, as implemented through Agency ordinances, rules and regulations, achieves and maintains the adopted Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities.

2. The Compact finds, among other things, that: (a) the waters of Lake Tahoe and other resources of the Lake Tahoe Region are threatened with deterioration or degeneration; (b) said region exhibits unique environmental and ecological values; (c) said region is experiencing problems of resource use and deficiencies of environmental control; (d) increasing urbanization is threatening the ecological values of said region; (e) maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by said region; (f) there is a public interest in protecting, preserving and enhancing said values for the residents of and visitors to said region; (g) in order to preserve the scenic beauty and outdoor recreational opportunities of said region, there is a need to insure an equilibrium between said region’s natural endowment and its man-made environment; and (h) it is imperative that there be established a TRPA with the powers, among others, to establish Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances which will achieve and maintain such capacities while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent therewith.

3. The Compact defines “environmental threshold carrying capacity” as “an environmental standard necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region”.

4. Although not required to do so by the Compact, the Governing Body and Advisory Planning Commission of the TRPA, prior to the adoption of this resolution, conducted duly-noticed public hearings, at which hearings considerable oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered by the Governing Body and Advisory Planning Commission. Evidence in the record of said hearings, which evidence is hereby determined substantial, established that each of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted by this resolution is necessary to maintain significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the Lake Tahoe region or to maintain public health and safety within the region.
5. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted hereby comply in all respects, procedural and substantive, with the Compact, as amended, and are necessary to effectuate and implement the same.

6. In addition to other evidence received at said public hearings, the Governing Body of the TRPA, prior to the adoption of this resolution, has received for the administrative record and had opportunity to review, a lengthy detailed study report concerning the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, which report was prepared by TRPA staff and consultants and substantiates the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted hereby.

7. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted by this resolution were the subject of an environmental impact statement (“EIS”), which was prepared, considered, circulated, certified and otherwise processed, reviewed and approved by the TRPA in accordance with the substantive and procedural provisions of Article VII of the Compact. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Governing Body further finds that the said EIS contained the information required by Article VII (a)(2) of the Compact and provided the Governing Body substantial information upon which it could base a reasoned review and evaluation of the environmental impacts of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted by this resolution. The Governing Body further finds that, prior to approving this resolution, it made the alternative written findings required by Article VII (d) of the Compact, a separate written finding having been made for each significant effect identified in the EIS as resulting from the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted hereby. The Governing Body further finds that said written findings are supported by substantial evidence in the record.

8. Pursuant to Article II (I) of the Compact, Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities are to include, but not be limited to, standards for air quality, water quality, soil conservation, vegetation preservation and noise, thus permitting, if not requiring, the adoption of standards for other elements necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the Lake Tahoe Region or to maintain public health and safety within the region.

9. In certain instances it was not reasonably possible or feasible to set forth Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities as numerical standards, requiring in such instances that standards be set forth as management standards. The Governing Body further finds that the inability to set forth a numerical standard for a particular Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity does not render such Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity improper or inappropriate for adoption under the Compact. In association with adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, the Governing Body is adopting policy statements that will provide specific direction for Agency staff in development of the regional plan. It is the intent of the Governing Body that amendment or repeal of the Policy Statements shall be subject to the dual-majority voting provisions of Article III (g)(1) of the Compact.

10. The definition of “environmental threshold carrying capacity” set forth in Article II (i) of the Compact requires an exercise of discretion by the Governing Body in setting a standard “necessary to maintain a significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region.” In approving this resolution, the Governing Body of the TRPA recognizes that it
must amend the TRPA regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements, as implemented through TRPA ordinances, rules and regulations, achieves and maintains the adopted Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities. The Governing Body further recognizes that it is required under Article V (d) of the Compact to adopt a regional plan attaining and maintaining federal, state, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the Lake Tahoe Region for which such standards are applicable.

11. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities adopted by this resolution are to be achieved and maintained through implementation of TRPA’s regional plan, may be achieved and maintained pursuant to an orderly time schedule adopted for that purpose.

12. In adopting this resolution, the TRPA Governing Body expressly recognizes that there is a distinction between adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and the subsequent planning process resulting in an amended regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements achieves and maintains the adopted Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities.

13. Inasmuch as the Compact specifies no particular method for the adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, this resolution is a proper method for the adoption thereof.

14. The Governing Body recognizes that, in adoption of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, it is establishing standards for the Lake Tahoe Region which must be carried out through the regional plan and that its jurisdiction to achieve and maintain those standards is limited to the Lake Tahoe Region.

15. The Governing Body recognizes that, in establishing Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region, it is establishing the basis for a long-term program which will protect and enhance the significant environmental values of the region, which program will be reviewed from time to time to ensure its consistency with the currently available scientific evidence and technical and other information. Attainment of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities prior to the dates scheduled in the regional plan, while beneficial, is not required.

16. The Governing Body recognizes that the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, provides for the adoption of an orderly program to attain the environmental standards through the development of its regional plan, including time schedules for implementation of specific measures necessary to attain those standards and that an immediate or short-range demonstration of attainment of some standards is physically impossible.

17. The Governing Body recognizes and respects the legislative intent of the States of Nevada and California and the United States Congress in entering into and approving the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended.

18. The Governing Body recognizes that the degree of success in attaining and maintaining the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities depends upon a program of mutual cooperation among the two states, local governmental entities, the Federal Government and the private sector in implementing its regional plan.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as follows:

1. That the Governing Body will develop its regional plan, recognizing that out-of-basin sources of air pollution may affect its ability to achieve and maintain environmental standards. The cooperation of the States of California and Nevada and the Federal Government will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.

2. That the Governing Body hereby recognizes the long-term nature of the planning process established by the Compact and further recognizes that attainment and maintenance of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities is a continuing process requiring establishment of time schedules by which the environmental standards will be attained, and the Governing Body intends to amend its regional plan to meet such requirements with realistic time schedules and the best available means.

3. That the Governing Body hereby recognizes the long-term nature of the planning process established by the Compact and further recognizes that some of the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for water quality are currently being, and will likely continue to be, exceeded until some time after the full implementation of the loading reductions prescribed by the thresholds.

4. The Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities shall be reviewed by staff and the Governing Body at the time of adoption of the regional plan to assure that said plan and the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities are consistent, and shall be reviewed at least every five years thereafter by the most appropriate means. After such review, the pertinent environmental threshold standards shall be amended where the scientific evidence and technical information indicate:

   (a) two or more threshold standards are mutually exclusive; or

   (b) substantial evidence to provide a basis for a threshold standard does not exist; or

   (c) a threshold standard cannot be achieved; or

   (d) a threshold standard is not sufficient to maintain a significant value of the Region or additional threshold standards are required to maintain a significant value.

The Agency shall maintain a monitoring program to determine progress towards attainment of threshold standards and to provide the basis for such review and amendment of the threshold standards pursuant to the foregoing criteria.

5. That the Governing Body hereby recognizes the long-term nature of establishing, planning for and actually achieving the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and will diligently pursue the attainment of those environmental standards through the regional plan and its schedule for implementation. The Governing Body further recognizes that the environmental standards adopted hereby may be considered as part of the environmental review process on projects reviewed pursuant to Article VI (b) of the Compact during the period of time prior to adoption of the regional plan.
envisioned by Article V(c) of the Compact and adoption of the ordinances required by Article V (g), and that no provision of this resolution or the environmental standards adopted hereby shall affect the maximum number of building permits authorized under the provisions of Article VI(c) of the Compact.

6. That the Governing Body hereby adopts the following as a statement of intent, which will guide the development of the regional plan and actions subsequent to the adoption of that plan:

(a) The Governing Board hereby finds and declares that in adopting these Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities it does not intend, and it shall not be construed as authorizing the Agency, to exercise its power to grant or deny a permit in a manner which shall take or damage private property for public use without payment of just compensation.

(b) Nothing in the adoption of these Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities is intended to increase or decrease the rights of any property owner under the Constitution of California, Nevada or the United States.

(c) It is the intent of the Governing Body that the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities will provide the basis for the adoption and enforcement of a regional plan and implementing ordinances which will achieve and maintain such capacities while at the same time providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such capacities. It is further the intent of the Governing Body that the regional plan will provide for carrying out all of the policies expressed in Article I of the compact.

7. That the Governing Body directs that the regional plan be so structured as to require a fair share of the financial resources required to implement the plan be borne by each of the entities or groups with interests in the region, including the State of California, the State of Nevada, the United States Government, entities of local government with jurisdiction within the Lake Tahoe Region, and the private sector; and

8. That the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities set forth in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, be, and the same hereby are, adopted pursuant to Article V (b) of the Compact.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency this twenty-sixth day of August, 1982, by the following vote:
RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION

WATER QUALITY

Pelagic Lake Tahoe

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen (N) loading from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. Achieve the following long-term water quality standards:

- Annual mean phytoplankton primary productivity: 52gmC/m²/yr.
- Winter (December - March) mean Secchi disk transparency: 33.4m.

POLICY
This threshold is currently being exceeded and will likely continue to be exceeded until some time after full implementation of the loading reductions prescribed by the thresholds.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient standards for primary productivity and transparency.

Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50 percent, from groundwater approximately 30 percent, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the Agency has no direct control over out-of-basin sources. The cooperation of the states of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.

Littoral Lake Tahoe

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loading to Lake Tahoe from all sources by 25 percent of the 1973-81 annual average.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads from surface runoff by approximately 50 percent, from groundwater approximately 30 percent, and from atmospheric sources approximately 20 percent of the 1973-81 annual average. This threshold relies on predicted reductions in pollutant loadings from out-of-basin sources as part of the total pollutant loading reduction necessary to attain environmental standards, even though the Agency has no direct control over out of Basin sources. The cooperation of the states of California and Nevada will be required to control sources of air pollution which contribute nitrogen loadings to the Lake Tahoe Region.
NUMERICAL STANDARD
Decrease sediment load as required to attain turbidity values not to exceed three NTU. In addition, turbidity shall not exceed one NTU in shallow waters of the Lake not directly influenced by stream discharges.

Reduce the loading of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources to meet the 1967-71 mean values for phytoplankton primary productivity and periphyton biomass in the littoral zone.

Tributaries
NUMERICAL STANDARD
Attain applicable state standards for concentrations of dissolved in organic nitrogen, dissolved phosphorus, and dissolved iron. Attain a 90 percentile value for suspended sediment concentration of 60 mg/1.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment load to achieve loading thresholds for littoral and pelagic Lake Tahoe.

Surface Runoff
NUMERICAL STANDARD
Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for dissolved inorganic nitrogen of 0.5 mg/1, for dissolved phosphorus of 0.1 mg/1, and for dissolved iron of 0.5 mg/1 in surface runoff directly discharged to a surface water body in the Basin.

Achieve a 90 percentile concentration value for suspended sediment of 250 mg/1.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce total annual nutrient and suspended sediment loads as necessary to achieve loading thresholds for tributaries and littoral and pelagic Lake Tahoe.

Groundwater
MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Surface runoff infiltration into the groundwater shall comply with the uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guidelines as set forth in Table 4-12 of the Draft Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study Report, May, 1982.

Where there is a direct and immediate hydraulic connection between ground and surface waters, discharges to groundwater shall meet the guidelines for surface discharges, and the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality Guide lines shall be amended accordingly.

Other Lakes
NUMERICAL STANDARD
Attain existing water quality standards.
SOIL CONSERVATION

Impervious Cover

MANAGEMENT STANDARD

Stream Environment Zones

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Preserve existing naturally functioning SEZ lands in their natural hydrologic condition, restore all disturbed SEZ lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands, and restore 25 percent of the SEZ lands that have been identified as disturbed, developed or subdivided, to attain a 5 percent total increase in the area of naturally functioning SEZ lands.

AIR QUALITY

Carbon Monoxide

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain carbon monoxide concentrations at or below 9 parts per million averaged over 8 hours provided that each state shall review and certify to TRPA by February 28, 1983, as to what their carbon monoxide standards are as of that date, and this TRPA threshold standard shall be changed effective February 28, 1983, if necessary, to be the applicable state carbon monoxide standard applicable to the respective portions of the region in accordance with Article V (d) of the Compact.

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce traffic volumes on the U.S. 50 Corridor by 7 percent during the winter from the 1981 base year between 4:00 p.m. and 12:00 midnight, provided that those traffic volumes shall be amended as necessary to meet the respective state standards.

Ozone

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain ozone concentrations at or below 0.08 parts per million averaged over 1 hour.

Maintain oxides of nitrogen (NOx) emissions at or below the 1981 level.

Regional Visibility

NUMERICAL STANDARDS
Achieve 171 kilometers (103 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Achieve 97 kilometers (58 miles) at least 90% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Reduce wood smoke emissions by 15% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs.
Subregional Visibility

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Achieve 87 kilometers (54 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate matter.

Achieve 26 kilometers (16 miles) 90% of the year as measured by particulate matter.

Reduce suspended soil particles by 30% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs. Reduce wood smoke emissions by 15% of the 1981 base values through technology, management practices and educational programs. Reduce vehicle miles of travel by 10% of the 1981 base values.

Nitrate Deposition

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Reduce the transport of nitrates into the Basin and reduce oxides of nitrogen (NOx) produced in the Basin consistent with the water quality thresholds.

Reduce vehicle miles of travel in the Basin by 10% of the 1981 base year values.

Odor

POLICY STATEMENT
It is the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in the development of the Regional Plan to reduce fumes from diesel engines to the extent possible.

VEGETATION PRESERVATION

Common Vegetation

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Increase plant and structural diversity of forest communities through appropriate management practices as measured by diversity indices of species richness, relative abundance, and pattern.

- Maintain the existing species richness of the Basin by providing for the perpetuation of the following plant associations:
  - Yellow Pine Forest: Jeffrey pine, White fir, Incense cedar, Sugar pine.
  - Red Fir Forest: Red fir, Jeffrey pine, Lodgepole pine, Western white pine, Mountain hemlock, Western juniper.
  - Subalpine Forest: Whitebark pine, Mountain hemlock, Mountain mahogany.
  - Shrub Association: Greenleaf and Pinemat manzanita, Tobacco brush, Sierra chinquapin, Huckleberry oak, Mountain whitethorn.
  - Sagebrush Scrub Vegetation: Basin sagebrush, Bitterbrush, Douglas chaenactis.
  - Deciduous Riparian: Quaking aspen, Mountain alder, Black cotton-wood, Willow.
  - Meadow Associations (Wet and Dry Meadow): Mountain squirrel tail, Alpine gentian, Whorled penstemon, Asters, Fescues, Mountain brome, Corn lilies, Mountain bentgrass, Hairgrass, Marsh marigold, Elephant heads, Tinker's penney, Mountain Timothy, Sedges, Rushes, Buttercups.
Wetland Associations (Marsh Vegetation): Pond lilies, Buckbean, Mare's tail, Pondweed, Common bladderwort, Bottle sedge, Common spikerush.

Cushion Plant Association (Alpine Scrub): Alpine phlox, Dwarf ragwort, Draba.

- Relative Abundance - of the total amount of undisturbed vegetation in the Tahoe Basin;
  1. Maintain at least four percent meadow and wetland vegetation.
  2. Maintain at least four percent deciduous riparian vegetation.
  3. Maintain no more than 25 percent dominant shrub association vegetation.
  4. Maintain 15-25 percent of the Yellow Pine Forest in seral stages other than mature.
  5. Maintain 15-25 percent of the Red Fir Forest in seral stages other than mature.

- Pattern - Provide for the proper juxtaposition of vegetation communities and age classes by;
  1. Limiting acreage size of new forest openings to no more than eight acres.
  2. Adjacent openings shall not be of the same relative age class or successional stage to avoid uniformity in stand composition and age.

A nondegradation standard to preserve plant communities shall apply to native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold.

Native vegetation shall be maintained at a maximum level to be consistent with the limits defined in the Land Capability Classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, California-Nevada, A Guide For Planning, Bailey, 1974, for allowable impervious cover and permanent site disturbance.

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board that a nondegradation standard shall permit appropriate management practices.

Late Seral and Old Growth Forest Ecosystems

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Attain and maintain a minimum percentage of 55% by area of forested lands within the Tahoe Region in a late seral or old growth condition, and distributed across elevation zones. To achieve the 55%, the elevation zones shall contribute as follows:

- The Subalpine zone (greater than 8,500 feet elevation) will contribute 5% (7,600 acres) of the forested lands;
- The Upper Montane zone (between 7,000 and 8,500 feet elevation) will contribute 30% (45,900 acres) of forested lands;
- The Montane zone (lower than 7,000 feet elevation) will contribute 20% (30,600 acres) of forested lands.

---

§ Amended 5/23/01
Trained lands within TRPA designated urban areas are excluded in the calculation for threshold attainment. Areas of the montane zone within 1,250 feet of urban areas may be included in the calculation for threshold attainment if the area is actively being managed for late seral and old growth conditions and has been mapped by TRPA. A maximum value of 40% of the lands within 1,250 feet of urban areas may be included in the calculation.

Because of these restrictions the following percentage of each elevation zone must be attained to achieve this threshold:

- 61% of the Subalpine zone must be in a late seral or old growth condition;
- 60% of the Upper Montane zone must be in a late seral or old growth condition;
- 48% of the Montane zone must be in a late seral or old growth condition;

**Uncommon Plant Communities**

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**

Provide for the nondegradation of the natural qualities of any plant community that is uncommon to the Basin or of exceptional scientific, ecological, or scenic value. This threshold shall apply but not be limited to (1) the deepwater plants of Lake Tahoe, (2) Grass Lake (sphagnum bog), (3) Osgood swamp, and (4) the Freel Peak Cushion Plant community.

**Sensitive Plants**

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**

Maintain a minimum number of population sites for each of five sensitive plant species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Number of Population Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carex paucifluctus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisia pygmaea longipetala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draba asterophora v. macrocarpa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draba asterophora v. asterophora</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rorippa subumbellata</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WILDLIFE**

**Special Interest Species**

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**

Provide a minimum number of population sites and disturbance zones for the following species:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species of interest</th>
<th>Population sites</th>
<th>Disturbance zone (mi.)</th>
<th>Influence zone (mi.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goshawk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle (Winter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Eagle (Nesting)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Eagle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mapped areas</td>
<td>Meadows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Habitats of Special Significance

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
A nondegradation standard shall apply to significant wildlife habitat consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations.

FISHERIES

Stream Habitat

NUMERICAL STANDARD
Maintain the 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat as indicated by the Stream Habitat Quality Overlay map, amended May 1997, based upon the re-rated stream scores set forth in Appendix C-1 of the 1996 Evaluation Report.

Instream Flows

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
Until instream flow standards are established in the Regional Plan to protect fishery values, a nondegradation standard shall apply to instream flows.

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to seek transfers of existing points of water diversion from streams to Lake Tahoe.

Lahontan Cutthroat Trout

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board to support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Lake Habitat

MANAGEMENT STANDARD
A nondegradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe. Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat as indicated by the Prime Fish Habitat Overlay Map dated 5/19/97 as may be amended from time to time.
## NOISE

### Single Noise Events

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**
The following maximum noise levels are allowed: All values are in decibels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Less Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Greater Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Monitoring Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>80¹</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,500 m-start of takeoff roll 2,000 m-runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.1²</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6,500 m-start of takeoff roll 2,000 m-runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercraft³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pass-By Test</td>
<td>82 $L_{max}$</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50 ft.-engine at 3,000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shoreline Test</td>
<td>75 $L_{max}$</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Microphone 5 ft. above water, 2 ft., above curve of shore, dock or platform. Watercraft in Lake, no minimum distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stationary Test</td>
<td>88 $L_{max}$ for boats manufactured before January 1, 1993;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Microphone 3.3 feet from exhaust outlet - 5 feet above water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 $L_{max}$ for boats manufactured after January 1, 1993</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles Less Than 6,000 GVW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles Greater Than 6,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Road Vehicles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The single event noise standard of 80 dB $L_{max}$ for aircraft departures at Lake Tahoe Airport shall be effective immediately. The single event noise standard of 80 dB $L_{max}$ 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 and consideration of the relevant factors, including best available technology and environmental concerns, and shall maximize the reduction in noise impacts caused by aircraft arrivals while allowing for the continuation of general aviation and commercial service. The beginning arrival standard shall not exceed 84 dB for general aviation and commuter aircraft, and 86 dB for transport category aircraft.

2. Between the hours of 8 p.m. and 8 a.m.

3. Failure to meet any one of these three test standards exceeds the single noise event threshold for watercraft.

§ Amended 7/23/03
Cumulative Noise Events

**NUMERICAL STANDARD**
Background noise levels shall not exceed the following levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Average Noise Level Or CNEL range (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Facilities</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 the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to define, locate, and establish CNEL levels for transportation corridors.

**RECREATION**

**POLICY STATEMENT**
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to preserve and enhance the high quality recreational experience including preservation of high-quality undeveloped shorezone and other natural areas. In developing the Regional Plan, the staff and Governing Body shall consider provisions for additional access, where lawful and feasible, to the shorezone and high quality undeveloped areas for low density recreational uses.

It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body in development of the Regional Plan to establish and ensure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation is available to the general public.

**SCENIC RESOURCES**

**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.

---

§ Amended 5/28/97
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.

Built Environment

POLICY STATEMENT
It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Body 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.
Collaborative Alternative

Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity

Update

Proposed Threshold/Adaptive Management Format

Key:

**Vision**
Statement of the overall desired future conditions of the Resource.

**Threshold Value Statement**
(Desired Condition)
Statement of a Compact “significant Scenic, Recreational, Educational, Scientific or Natural Value of the Region” (a.k.a. Threshold Value Statement)

**Threshold Assessment Indicator**
(Indicator)
An Assessment Measurement of Threshold Attainment

**Threshold Standard**
(Standard)
The Assessment Measurement Standard that signifies Threshold Attainment (a.k.a. Threshold Standard)

Other Desired Conditions, Indicators and Standards to be tracked in the Adaptive Management System but are not recommended to be TRPA Thresholds.
**AIR QUALITY**

**Air Quality Vision**
Air quality in the Lake Tahoe Basin is healthful for residents, visitors, and ecosystems and supports excellent visibility.

**Proposed Desired Conditions**

1 **Visibility**
Visibility in the Lake Tahoe Basin is at 2001 – 2003 levels or better.

2 **Human and Ecosystem Health**
Air quality in the Lake Tahoe Basin is healthy for humans and ecosystems.

**Proposed Indicators**

**Visibility**
Basin-wide and local light extinction -- light extinction allows calculation of visible range. (Type I)

**Human and Ecosystem Health**
Number of exceedances of health standards for: carbon monoxide; ozone; and particulate matter. (Human Health: Type I; Ecosystem Health: Type III)

**Proposed Standards**

**Basin-wide Visibility**
Light extinction calculated at Bliss State Park equivalent to 116 miles of visual range for 50% of the year and 72 miles of visual range for 90% of the year.

**Local Visibility**
Light extinction calculated at South Lake Tahoe equivalent to 58 miles of visual range for 50% of the year and 34 miles of visual range for 90% of the year.

**Human Health**
Zero exceedances of the most restrictive Federal, California or Nevada human health standards for ozone, for carbon monoxide and for particulate matter.*

**Ecosystem Health**
To be established after 2008 as air pollutant impacts to ecosystems are identified.
### Air Quality (cont.)

*Recommended Air Quality Standards for Human Health.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Highest 8-hour average – Not to equal or exceed:</td>
<td>6 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 1-hour average – Not to exceed:</td>
<td>20 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Highest 1-hour average – Not to exceed:</td>
<td>0.09 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 8-hour average – No to exceed:</td>
<td>0.07 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>Annual arithmetic mean – Not to exceed:</td>
<td>20 µg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 24-hour average – Not to exceed:</td>
<td>50 µg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>Annual arithmetic mean – Not to exceed:</td>
<td>12 µg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest 24-hour average – Not to exceed:</td>
<td>25 µg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- The 24-hour standard of 25 µg/m$^3$ is currently proposed by California Air Resources Board (CARB). Should CARB adopt this standard, it will automatically apply to the entire Basin.

ppm = parts per million  
µg/m$^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter
WATER QUALITY

Water Quality Vision: Exceptional water quality provides restored clarity, environmental and human health, and human enjoyment of Lake Tahoe waters.

Proposed Desired Conditions

1. Lake Tahoe Clarity
   Restore, and then maintain the waters of Lake Tahoe for the purposes of human enjoyment and preservation of its ecological status as one of the few large, deepwater, ultraoligotrophic lakes in the world with unique transparency, color and clarity.

2. Human & Environmental Health
   Water quality conditions in the Lake Tahoe basin protect human and environmental health.

Proposed Indicators

Pollutant Loading Sources
Measurement of fine sediment, nitrogen and phosphorus loads from tributaries, storm water, stream channel erosion, ground water, and atmosphere. (Type III)

Pollutant Loading Effects
Secchi depth measurement in deep water of Lake Tahoe. (Type I). Nearshore (shallow) aesthetics (Type III).

WQ Health Conditions Report
Summary of health-based water quality information and data from Tahoe Basin ground and surface waters. (Type II)

Index of Biological Integrity (IBI)
To be determined by Wildlife and Fisheries Technical Working Group. (Type II)

Proposed Standards

Pollutant Load Reductions
The TMDL Process (including modeling efforts) will be used in concert with the management strategies to determine pollutant reductions for achieving the clarity standards by 2008

Clarity
Secchi depth transparency shall not be less than annual average of 29.7 m. (Appropriate nearshore aesthetic standard(s) will be developed after 2008.) Existing (shallow) turbidity standard in place until new standards adopted.*

WQ Violations
Compliance with established federal, state and local standards.

IBI Index – See standards for Index of Biological Integrity, reference Wildlife and Fisheries Chapter.
Water Quality (cont.)

*Existing TRPA Standard

WQ-1 Turbidity (Shallow): Decrease sediment load as required to attain turbidity values not to exceed three NTU. In addition, turbidity shall not exceed one NTU in shallow waters of the Lake not directly influenced by stream discharges.
Soil Conservation & Stream Environment Zones (SEZ)

(PLACEHOLDER)

Soil Conservation & Stream Environment Zones to be delivered under separate cover.
VEGETATION

Vegetation Vision
Vegetation in the Lake Tahoe Basin is healthy and dynamic with the full compliment of native plant communities, wildlife habitats and ecological processes.

Proposed Desired Conditions

1: Healthy Vegetation
A full range of native species, development stages, habitats and ecological processes occur.

2: Plant Communities of Concern
The natural conditions and functions of plant communities of concern are sustained.

3: Special Status Species
Populations of native, threatened, endangered, rare, special interest or sensitive species found in the Basin are maintained at or above sustainable levels.

4: Hazardous Fuels
Fuel conditions pose low wildfire risk to communities.

5: Urban Vegetation
Vegetation in the urban zones is predominantly native, water-efficient and non-invasive. Urban vegetation contributes to defensible space, water quality protection, and scenic and local community values.

Proposed Indicators

Healthy Vegetation
Departure from historic vegetation structure. (Type I)

Plant Communities of Concern
Ecological status index. (Type I)

Special Status Species
Conservation status (high, medium, low priority) (Type I)

Hazardous Fuels
Predicted fire behavior. (Type I)

Urban Vegetation
Proportion of parcels that meet approved vegetation criteria. (Type III)

Proposed Standards

Achieve 3% reduction in departure from historic* for each vegetation/forest type over 5-year evaluation period.

Maintain or improve the ecological status of all monitored locations in an evaluation period.

Maintain existing occurrences of high and medium priority species.

Predicted fire behavior in treated areas of urban and WUI zones does not exceed surface fire type.

None proposed at this time.

* Historic is based on reconstructive vegetation structure studies that are adjusted for climatic and human caused changes.
WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES

Vision
Environmental conditions in the Lake Tahoe Basin support healthy and sustainable native terrestrial and aquatic animal populations and vegetation communities.

Proposed Desired Conditions

1. Biological Integrity of Terrestrial Ecosystems:
The functional, physical, chemical and biological integrity of the Basin’s terrestrial ecosystem are maintained at or above a sustainable level.

2. Sustainability of Special Status Species:
Populations of, and environmental conditions and processes important to native threatened, endangered, rare, special interest or sensitive species are maintained at or above a sustainable level.

3. Biological Integrity of Aquatic Ecosystems:
The functional, physical, chemical and biological integrity of the Basin’s aquatic ecosystem are maintained at or above a sustainable level.

Proposed Indicators

1. Biological Integrity of Terrestrial Ecosystems:
- Proportion of Terrestrial Ecosystem component benchmarks (as measured with a vertebrate - index of biological integrity and other relevant indicators) met or exceeded within an evaluation period. (Type II)

2. Sustainability of Special Status Species:
- Proportion of Special Status Species that meet or exceed benchmarks (as measured by Productivity, Abundance, or Presence/ Absence and attribute indicators) within an evaluation period. (Type II)

3. Biological Integrity of Aquatic Ecosystems:
- Proportion of Aquatic Ecosystem component benchmarks as measured with various indexes of biological integrity and other relevant indicators met or exceeded within an evaluation period. (Type II)

Proposed Standards

All component benchmarks for terrestrial ecosystems are met or exceeded within an evaluation period.

Components Include:
- Montane Vegetation Zone
- Upper Montane Vegetation Zone
- Sub-alpine Vegetation Zone

Existing wildlife habitat ETCC in effect until amendments are approved.*

At least 20% of the benchmarks for Special Status Species (SSS) are met or exceeded within the first evaluation period. At least 40% of the benchmarks for SSS are met or exceeded by the second evaluation period. At least 60% of the benchmarks for SSS are met or exceeded by the third evaluation period. At least 80% of the benchmarks for SSS are met or exceeded by the fourth evaluation period.

Components Include:
- Streams
- Lake Tahoe
- Wetlands
- Small Lakes

Existing lake** and stream *** ETCC in effect until amendments are approved.
Wildlife and Fisheries (cont.)

Existing Threshold Standards

* W-2 Habitats of Special Significance
A nondegradation standard shall apply to significant wildlife habitat consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations.

** F-1 Lake Habitat
A nondegradation standard shall apply to fish habitat in Lake Tahoe. Achieve the equivalent of 5,948 total acres of excellent habitat as indicated by the Prime Fish Habitat Overlay Map dated 5/19/97 as may be amended from time to time.

*** Stream Habitat (F-2)
Maintain the 75 miles of excellent, 105 miles of good, and 38 miles of marginal stream habitat as indicated by the Stream Habitat Quality Overlay map, amended May 1997, based upon the re-rated stream scores set forth in Appendix C-1 of the 1996 Evaluation Report.
SCENIC QUALITY

Scenic Quality Vision
The Lake Tahoe Basin is internationally recognized for its outstanding natural beauty and is a resource of national significance. Characteristic views within the Basin are of the natural appearing forest, meadows, mountains, and expansive blue lake. The built environment harmonizes with this natural appearing setting in a sustainable manner that supports a vibrant community and healthy economy.

Proposed Desired Conditions

Natural Environment
Scenery viewed from Lake Tahoe and the Basin’s major roadways, public recreation areas, trails, and urban centers predominantly displays natural appearing forest, meadows, mountains, and the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. Development, where visible, complements the natural setting.

Community Design
Communities of the Lake Tahoe Basin are planned and designed with aesthetic characteristics that respect the local natural systems. Lake Tahoe’s built environment is diverse yet appropriate in scale and style. It helps foster the identity of individual communities and a sense of place.

Dark Sky
Views of the night sky from the naturally appearing areas of the Basin are conducive to stargazing. Light emanating from the built environment is carefully controlled to ensure safety and security without encroaching on the regional dark sky.

Proposed Indicators

Scenic Integrity
How much development is visible, its visual contrast, its level of dominance, and the number of viewpoints from which it is seen (Type I).

Scenic Quality Ratings
Measures the scenic quality of natural landscape views of individual scenic resources that can be seen from the travel routes, designated public recreation areas and bike trails (Type I).

Proposed Standards

Scenic Integrity Levels
Maintain or achieve the assigned numerical scenic integrity level rating assigned to each roadway and shoreline unit to achieve the desired condition for scenic resources.

Scenic Quality Ratings
Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned each resource as recorded in the Scenic Resources Inventory. Maintain or improve the numerical rating assigned to each identified scenic resource, as recorded in the 1993 Lake Tahoe Basin Scenic Resource Evaluation.

Community Design and Development Measures
Implementation of applicable design and development measures (Type II): Height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signage, and siting.

Community Design Index Level
Implementation of Development and Design Measures (height, bulk, texture, form, materials, colors, lighting, signage, siting and other design elements) in new, remodeled and redeveloped buildings to be compatible with the natural, scenic, recreation, and community desired visual values for the Region.
Noise Vision: Noise levels provide for community and neighborhood serenity, abundant quiet recreational areas, and are not harmful to wildlife.

Proposed Desired Conditions

1. Single Event Noise Sources
Single event noise levels are controlled to preserve the serenity of the community and neighborhood and provide abundant quiet recreation areas.

2. Cumulative Noise Levels
Community noise levels are controlled to preserve the serenity of the community and neighborhood and provide abundant quiet recreation areas.

3. Effects on Wildlife
Noise levels are controlled to protect wildlife.

Proposed Indicators

Noise Events
1. Numbers of individual exceedances.
2. Number of corrective actions taken.
3. Percent of planned monitoring completed.
   a. On-Highway Vehicles (Type I)
   b. Off-Highway Vehicles (Type I)
   c. Over-Snow Vehicles (Type I)
   d. Watercraft (Type I)
   e. Aircraft – Airport (Type I)
   f. Aircraft – Non-Airport (Type III)

Cumulative Noise Levels
1. Numbers of exceedances of the CNEL 24 hr standards. (Type I)
2. Numbers of exceedances of the 1 hr standards. (Type II)

Effect on Wildlife
Further investigation of the appropriate limits will be done by wildlife experts post 2008.

Proposed Standards

On-Hwy Vehicles – Same as the current CA and NV stds. (20" exhaust std for motorcycles.)*
OHVs – Same as the current CA stds. Basin wide.*
Over-Snow Vehicles – 73 db or equivalent std.*
Watercraft – Same as current TRPA stds.*
Aircraft – Airport Existing Standard ** – Non-Airport to be developed post 2008

Numerical standards will be based on those currently adapted.*** In addition, hourly noise levels for each area will be developed and proposed by 2008

Currently Under development.
Will be jointly developed with wildlife programs for appropriate levels, post 2008.
### Noise (cont.)

* Proposed Single Event Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Less Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Greater Than 35 MPH</th>
<th>Monitoring Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watercraft</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50 ft-engine at 3,000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>At Shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 &amp; Later Prior to 1993</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>SAE J205test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles less than 6,000 GVW</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tbd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road Vehicles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tbd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobiles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noise (cont.)

** Existing Aircraft – Airport Single Event Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Overall Monitoring Distances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>80(^i) 6,500 m-start of takeoff roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 m-runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.1(^2) 6,500 m-start of takeoff roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 m-runway threshold approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The single event noise standard of 80 dBA L\(_{max}\) for aircraft departures at Lake Tahoe Airport shall be effective immediately. The single event noise standard of 80 dBA L\(_{max}\) 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 dBA arrival standard shall be based on a review and consideration of the relevant factors, including best available technology and environmental concerns, and shall maximize the reduction in noise impacts caused by aircraft arrivals while allowing for the continuation of general aviation and commercial service. The beginning arrival standard shall not exceed 84 dBA for general aviation and commuter aircraft, and 86 dBA for transport category aircraft.

2. Between the hours of 8 p.m. and 8 a.m.
Noise (cont.)*** Existing and Proposed Cumulative Noise Level Standards

### Cumulative Noise Level Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>24-hr CNEL db</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel Facilities</td>
<td>55</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>

### Transportation Corridor Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>24-hr CNEL db</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe Airport</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Per TRPA Goals and Policies
**TRANSPORTATION**  
*(Not Proposed as a Threshold)*

**Transportation Vision**  
An innovative multimodal transportation system is in place that gives priority to viable alternatives to the private automobile, appeals to users and serves mobility needs, while improving the environmental and socioeconomic health of the Basin.

---

**Desired Conditions**

**Mobility/Socio-Economic Vitality**  
A multimodal transportation system that promotes viable alternatives for mobility needs, encourages alternative mode use, and decreases dependency on the private automobile.

**Environmental Impacts**  
The transportation system is integrated with environmental goals.

---

**Proposed Indicators**

**Mobility/Socioeconomic Indicator**  
An index that includes "usage" and "access" indicators such as: (Type II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percentage of Travel to Recreation Sites via Non-Auto Modes</td>
<td>1. A Measure or Measures of Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Access to Recreation Facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percentage of Travel to Commercial Core Areas via Non-Auto Modes</td>
<td>2. A Measure of Commercial Core Areas Meeting Transit-Oriented Design (TOD) Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-Auto Mode Share within and into the Basin.</td>
<td>3. A Measure or Measures of Overnight Population (resident and visitor) served by Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Environmental Impact Indicator**  
The Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) indicator and standard will be replaced by a Vehicle Impact indicator and standard. This will be either: an indicator directly relating vehicle impacts to water quality goals, based on targets identified by the TMDL; OR a traffic volume or vehicle-miles traveled indicator, with a standard based on technically feasible but challenging reductions identified through the traffic model, which will be ready by the end of 2007.

Other Environmental Indicators for Transportation will be housed in other environmental resource areas. Specific attention will be given to the integration with Water Quality, Air Quality, Wildlife, Vegetation, Noise, Scenic, and SEZ.
Transportation (cont.)

Proposed Standards

Usage

1. Percentage of Travel to Recreation Sites via Non-Auto Modes. Standard to be determined after 2007.

2. Percentage of Travel to Commercial Core Areas via Non-Auto Modes. Standard to be determined after 2007.


Access


Numeric standard for Transportation Environmental Impact Indicator to be set after 2007.
RECREATION

Recreation Vision
The Lake Tahoe Basin’s unique natural, cultural and human environments provide sustainable recreation opportunities consistent with public desires and natural resource capacities. Recreation is linked to irreplaceable natural assets, the regional economy, and social well-being.

Proposed Desired Conditions

1: Opportunity
Provide a suitable spectrum of high-quality recreational opportunities while sustaining Lake Tahoe’s natural setting as an outstanding recreation destination.

2: Access
Provide additional high-quality access where lawful and feasible to natural areas and shorezone consistent with desired resource conditions and user expectations.

3: Education
Residents and visitors are educated about the recreation opportunities, appropriate behavior and the unique natural and cultural environments of Lake Tahoe. NOTE: No indicators or standards recommended.

Proposed Indicators

**OPPORTUNITY**
1. Rec Survey: Quality of opportunities (Type I)
2. Number of recreation opportunities (Type I and II)
3. Implementing adopted recreation plans (Type III)

**ACCESS**
1. Available access to public land, shorezone, and trails (Types I and II)
2. Rec Survey: Access quality (Type I)

Proposed Standards

**OPPORTUNITY**
1. Response demonstrates that the majority of opportunity attributes indicate high quality experiences.
   - Recreation providers respond when recreation quality does not meet D.C.
2. Maintain existing # of inventoried Tahoe resource-dependent public recreation facilities & opportunities and improve or create 10% of that baseline # of facilities every five years.
3. Specific recreation providers shall identify their top priority projects that meet the D.C. from adopted recreation plans and pursue implementing 50% of their list during the plan period.

**ACCESS**
1. Maintain and increase quantity of land available for public recreation access by:
   - Continuing Federal and State Public Land Acquisition Programs. Target: 20,275 additional acres
   - Increasing public shoreline ownership to 50% for Lake Tahoe. Target: 9,701.34 additional linear feet
   - Ensuring no net loss of shoreline that currently provides public or quasi-public access to Lake Tahoe. Target: 100% retained (linear feet)
   - Retaining all existing acreage associated with public ROWs and easements that provide access to public lands and waterways. Target: 100% retained (acres)
   - Trails Built, Designated, Relocated or Improved/Upgraded: Target: 50 miles every 5 years, paved; 20 miles every 5 years, unpaved
   - # New Trailheads Developed, or Existing TH Improved or Newly Served by Transit: Target: One every two years
2. Response indicates that the majority of recreation access attributes indicate high quality access.
SOCIO-ECONOMICS

(Not Proposed as a Threshold)

SOCIO-ECONOMICS VISION
There is a sustainable balance between environmental protection and conservation practices that provide the basis for the region’s unique natural characteristics, a base recreation and tourism economy, other diverse economic sectors, attractively built communities, diverse social populations, and an exceptional quality of life. The Lake Tahoe Basin as an international model for sustainable alpine communities that applies the best known practices in economic development, environmental protection, regulatory and planning process, community design, and inclusive resident and visitor communities.

Proposed Desired Conditions

1: Sustainable Economy
The economy has sustainable employment and earnings to capitalize on the base recreation/tourism sector, seek opportunities for economic diversity, and revitalization.

2: Housing Opportunities
There are housing opportunities for full-time and seasonal residents, with attention to workers employed within the Basin.

3: Town Centers
Tahoe has pedestrian-friendly town centers with diverse businesses and public services collocated with efficient non-auto oriented transportation options.

4: Social Communities
Tahoe is a stable socially-diverse community, with opportunities for locally-owned businesses, a strong educational system, visual and performing arts, multicultural events, and an active and responsible community.

5: Regulatory Framework
There is a responsive and effective, user-friendly regulatory framework with consistency across all federal, state, and local regulatory agencies for all projects.
Socio-Economics (cont.)

Proposed Indicators

1. Travel Generated Impact Model (type I)
2. Wage and employment distribution (type I)
3. Number of business starts and closures (type II)
4. Percent households afford median priced home
5. Home price distribution
6. Avg rental rate
7. Existing home sales
8. Unsold inventory
9. Median time on market
10. 30 yr. FRM.

1. Percent mixed use (sf com/res) (type II)
2. Percent com. mix (retail, office, services) (type II)
3. Pedestrian Amenities (sidewalks, lighting, benches, bus/bike facilities) (Type II)

1. Poverty rate (type I)
2. School enrollment (type I)
3. Population demographics (type I)
4. Health insured households (type I)
5. Transportation origin/destination (type II)
6. Percent local business ownership (type II)
7. Arts funding / local giving ratio (Type III)

1. Permit data tracking (percent incomplete, time, type of project) (type I)
2. Project permitting cost distribution (Type II)

No Standards are proposed at this time
MEMORANDUM

October 30, 2006

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Committee
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Determination of Scope, Sierra Colina, LLC, Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Douglas County, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 1318-23-301-001, TRPA File Number 20060695

**Proposed Action:** No formal action is proposed for this item at this time. Staff is requesting comments from the members of the Advisory Planning Committee and the public on the scope and content of a proposed TRPA EIS for the project referenced above. Once the scoping of the EIS has been completed, the final scope of the EIS will be prepared to reflect comments received. In addition, certain components of the proposed project may be changed to address comments and/or concerns raised during the scoping process.

**Project Location:** The project area, located east of Highway 50 between Lake Village and Kahle Park, consists of an 18-acre undeveloped parcel. The undeveloped parcel is forested with areas of shrubby vegetation and rock outcrops and boulders. The parcel has been verified as Land Capability Classes 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 4, 5, and 6. All proposed development will be located within the high capability portions of the parcel (Classes 4, 5, and 6).

**History:** Although the project area is undeveloped, there have been three previous multiple family projects and one regional plan amendment proposed. The 1992 regional plan amendment resulted in this parcel being reclassified from a Conservation designation to a Residential designation, thus allowing the possibility of residential development. Two of the previous multiple family dwelling proposals, in 1992 and 2000, were withdrawn from review. The third proposal, in 1998, was denied by the TRPA Governing Board due to a lack of necessary votes to make the required findings and the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.

**Description:** The currently proposed project includes a 50-unit multi-family residential development, linear public facilities (streets, sidewalks, and bike trails), a planned unit development subdivision to convert the multiple family units to condominiums, and a Plan Area Statement amendment that would allow the transfer of existing residential units of use into the project area. Nine of the fifty residential units are currently proposed to be deed restricted as Moderate Income Housing (eligible for rent or sale at rates affordable to people who make not more than 120 percent of the Douglas County median income). All other units will be market rate.

/ta

AGENDA ITEM VI.B
Alternatives: In addition to the proposed project, the EIS will evaluate other project alternatives, each at an equal level of detail. The alternatives being considered at this time include a single family estate, a multi-family project with a lower density, a multi-family project with a higher density, and a no-project alternative.

Scope of Environmental Document and Notice of Preparation: The proposed scope of the EIS is included as Attachment “A.”

TRPA has retained EDAW to prepare the EIS through a three-way agreement of which the expense will be paid by the applicant (Sierra Colina LLC), and TRPA will direct the preparation of the EIS.

The TRPA Code also requires that the Agency consult with federal, state, and local agencies with expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved and consult the public during the preparation of the EIS. Staff will be working with the Nevada State Clearinghouse to ensure appropriate involvement from State Agencies.

TRPA staff will hold a total of three public scoping meetings. The meeting times and locations are identified on Page 3 of the attached NOP. Comments from the Advisory Planning Commission, the Governing Board, and the public will be incorporated into the final scope of the document. The deadline to submit comments regarding the scope of this environmental document will be November 15, 2006.

Request: Staff requests that the Advisory Planning Committee assist in scoping the environmental document and solicit public comments at the public hearing. No other action is required at this time.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please call Theresa Avance, AICP at (775) 588-4547 extension 224. If you wish to comment in writing please send comments to:

Theresa Avance, AICP, Senior Planner
Environmental Review Services
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
Email: tavance@trpa.org

Attachments:
A. Notice of Preparation
NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: Nevada State Clearinghouse  
Cooperating Agencies  
Responsible and Trustee Agencies  
Interested Parties and Organizations  
Affected Property Owners

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Sierra Colina Village Project

Lead Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
P.O. Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89448  
Contact: Theresa Avance  
Phone: (775) 588-4547 x 224 Fax: (775) 588-4527  
Email: tavance@trpa.org

Project Title: Sierra Colina Village Project

Project Location: The project site is approximately 18 acres in Douglas County, Nevada, bounded by U.S. Highway 50 to the west, Lake Village Drive/Echo Drive to the north, a U.S. Forest Service parcel to the east, and Kahle park and commercial development to the south.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is initiating preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Sierra Colina Village Project. This document is being prepared pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. This notice meets the TRPA noticing requirements for a Notice of Preparation (NOP).

We would like to know the views of interested persons, organizations, and agencies as to the scope and content of the information to be included and analyzed in the EIS. Agencies should comment on the elements of the environmental information that are relevant to their statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed action.

In compliance with the time limits mandated by the TRPA, please respond at the earliest possible date, but no later than November 15, 2006. Please send your written responses to Theresa Avance, Project Manager, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, at the address shown above. Responses should include the name of a contact person at your agency or organization.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project (Alternative 1) includes: a multi-family residential development, linear public facilities, Plan Area Statement amendment, and a PUD subdivision.

Multi-Family Residential Development

The applicant, Sierra Colina, LLC, proposes to construct 50 residential units on an undeveloped 18-acre parcel (APN# 1318-23-301-001) in Stateline, Nevada. The proposed project would contain 29 building footprints that consist of 21 duplexes and 8 single-family buildings. All units would be 2-stories high. Nine of the 50 proposed homes would be deed-restricted moderate-income homes commingled among the market priced homes. Proposed vehicle access to the project site would be from two locations on Lake Village Drive. The applicant intends to apply for a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Certification for the project. LEED Certification recognizes performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor environmental quality.

Linear Public Facilities

The proposed project includes four linear public facilities, including 2 pedestrian/bike paths, a pedestrian path, and a 20-foot wide linear parkway. These facilities would be available for use by residents of Sierra Colina Village and non-residents. Upon completion of the project, the applicant proposes to convey, per Code Section 41.3.A, approximately 10.7 acres of the Sierra Colina
parcel to a public entity for preservation of open space. The acreage would include all portions of Burke Creek and its associated
steam environment zone (SEZ), the linear public facilities, and the bulk of the scenic setback land on the parcel.

Plan Area Statement Amendment

The proposed project includes a Plan Area Statement (PAS) amendment that would:

1. Allow Special Area #1 (the Sierra Colina parcel) of PAS 073 Special Designation (Transfer Development Rights) TDR to
include existing development, and

2. Allow Special Area #1 (the Sierra Colina parcel) of PAS 073 to be eligible to receive Bonus Units.

PUD Subdivision

The proposed project includes an application for subdivision of the Sierra Colina parcel via a planned unit development.

ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the proposed project (Alternative 1), the EIS will evaluate alternatives at an equal level of detail. At this time,
it is expected that the alternatives will include the following:

Alternative 2: Single family Grand Estate. This alternative would require using most of the parcel’s allowable coverage. The
site design would include a main house, guest house, family entertainment center, fitness center, caretaker home,
maintenance equipment building, smaller accessory and maintenance buildings, tennis court, sport court, and accessory uses.
No public access or open space conveyance would be provided.

Alternative 3: Less Dense Alternative. This alternative would include the construction of 37 market rate homes within 22
footprints (15 duplexes and 7 single homes). This alternative would result in approximately 13,000 square feet less land
coverage than the proposed project. Like the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include the multiple linear public
facilities, a PAS amendment, a PUD subdivision and conveyance of open space to a public entity. However, none of the
homes would be deed-restricted moderate income.

Alternative 4: Increased Density Alternative. This alternative would include the construction of 54 homes within 20
footprints, including 42 market rate homes and 12 deed-restricted moderate income homes. Twenty of the homes (including
the 12 deed-restricted moderate income homes) would be located within a single Tahoe ‘lodge style’ building with tuck-
under (i.e., basement) parking. The remaining footprints would contain 15 duplexes and 4 single-family homes. This
alternative would result in approximately 5,000 square feet less land coverage than the proposed project. Like the proposed
project, Alternative 4 would include the multiple linear public facilities, a PAS amendment, a PUD subdivision and
conveyance of open space to a public entity.

Alternative 5: No Project. This alternative would assume maintenance of the site in its existing condition.

PUBLIC SCOPING

Three public scoping meetings will be conducted to provide you with the opportunity to learn more about the proposed action
and to submit comments on the content of the EIS. The scoping meetings will be held at the following times and locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, October 17, 2006</th>
<th>Wednesday, October 25, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</td>
<td>Governing Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>See agenda item at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateline, NV 89449</td>
<td>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128 Market Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stateline, NV 89449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wednesday, November 8, 2006
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting
See agenda item at:
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

If you have further questions or require additional information please contact TRPA project manager, Theresa Avance, using the contact information provided above.

[Signature]
TRPA Project Manager

10-4-06
Date