TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.gov

STAFF REPORT

Date: April 21, 2021

To: TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Regional Plan Conformance Review of the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan and Associated Amendments to Chapters 34, 36, and 38 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances

---

Summary and Staff Recommendation:
Washoe County submits the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan (WCTAP), to TRPA for conformance review with the TRPA Regional Plan. Staff requests that the Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) review the attached materials and recommend approval of the proposed WCTAP to the Governing Board.

Required Motions:
In order to recommend approval of the proposed Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan, RPIC must make the following motions, based on the staff summary:

1) A motion to recommend Governing Board approval of the required findings, including a finding of no significant effect, for the adoption of the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan and amendments to Chapter 34, 36, and 38 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, as provided in Attachment D.

2) A motion to recommend Governing Board adoption of Ordinance 2021-__, amending Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, to amend TRPA's Regional Plan to incorporate the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan, as provided in Attachment K.

3) A motion to recommend Governing Board adoption of Ordinance 2021-__, amending Ordinance 87-9, as previously amended, to amend TRPA's Code of Ordinances to incorporate references to the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan into Chapters 34, 36, and 38, as provided in Attachment L.

Washoe County Approval:
The Washoe County Board of County Commissioners unanimously adopted the area plan by approving a master plan amendment, regulatory zone amendment, and development code amendment on January 26, 2021. As part of the first reading in 2020, the County Commissioners made two modifications to the development code: (1) a modification to the coverage reduction standard in response to TRPA staff requests; and (2) a modification to the standard that automatically reduces front setbacks for corner lots and steeply sloping lots. The modification to the setback standard would require an administrative review process with notice to neighboring property owners if reduced setbacks were proposed for a primary structure.

review process with notice to neighboring property owners if reduced setbacks were proposed for a primary structure.

Background:
TRPA's 2012 Regional Plan Update establishes adoption procedures for area plans prepared by a public agency. The Governing Board must find that the area plan conforms to the Regional Plan and then adopt it before the plan takes effect. An adopted conforming area plan then becomes a part of the Regional Plan. Since 2012, TRPA has adopted five conforming area plans.

The WCTAP covers all land in Washoe County's portion of the Lake Tahoe watershed. Area plan boundaries are contiguous with TRPA's boundary line on the north and east sides, the California State Line on the west side and the Washoe County / Carson City boundary on the south side. This area includes the unincorporated communities of Incline Village and Crystal Bay, totaling 53 square miles with a population of just under 10,000 (Census 2010). Three designated Town Centers are located within the area plan boundaries: Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and the Nevada portion of North Stateline (to be renamed Crystal Bay Tourist).

The county has been working closely with TRPA staff since August 2019 on revising preliminary plan proposals to meet the requirements in Chapter 13, *Area Plans*, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, which culminated in the publication of a Public Review Draft. In October 2019, RPIC received an informational presentation regarding the county's approach and the targeted changes proposed in the plan. RPIC provided the following feedback, which was incorporated into the county-adopted plan:

Feedback: General support was expressed for certain plan components:

- Greenhouse gas reduction policy and standard.
- Proposal to accommodate higher densities for residential care and nursing and personal care uses.

Feedback: There may be opportunities to integrate the plan with the "mobility hub" concept articulated in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The plan should not preclude mobility hubs.

Revision: The project list in Chapter 3, *Transportation*, has been revised to include all applicable projects identified by the Regional Transportation Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and Transit Master Plan. This includes recognizing the Transit Master Plan's proposal for establishing two mobility hubs in Incline Village. Under the Transit Master Plan, a hub would be established near the East Shore Trail parking lots (South Incline Mobility Hub) and one in the commercial town center (Incline Village Mobility Hub). Map 3.3, *Envisioned Transit Services,* also illustrates the approximate location of mobility hubs in relation to the Town Centers and proposed transit routes. A prior proposal to remove "vehicle storage and parking" as a permissible use from the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone was eliminated, to ensure that establishment of such uses in association with the South Incline Mobility Hub would continue to be permissible.

Feedback: Opportunities for additional parking should be provided. The parking at the East Shore trail seems to be insufficient for the demand.

Revision: The plan has been revised to align with the mobility hub concept identified in the RTP. Integrating recreational facilities with transit facilities and services is the plan's primary strategy for managing recreational parking demand. In addition to aligning with RTP, the plan includes the parking and transit stop improvements proposed with the State Route 28 Corridor Plan. The WCTAP also sets forth the following provisions:

- Policy T6-7 requires parking with pedestrian and bicycle connections in association with the development of new trailheads.
- Action T-5 commits the county to develop a parking management plan in coordination with TRPA and the local transportation management association.
- Policy R1-8 requires the county to work with public land managers when planning future recreation improvements to address such impacts as parking.

Area Plan Approach:

The WCTAP consolidates and updates several planning documents:

- The Tahoe Area Plan, a component of the Washoe County Master Plan adopted by Washoe County, but not by TRPA.
- Article 220 of the Washoe County Development Code, referred to as the "Tahoe Modifiers," adopted by Washoe County, but not by TRPA.
- Four community plans jointly adopted by Washoe County and TRPA in 1996.
- Washoe County Signage, Parking, and Design Guidelines and Standards jointly adopted by Washoe County and TRPA in 1996.
- 23 plan area statements adopted by TRPA, but not Washoe County, in 1987.

The county has chosen to adopt existing TRPA community plan and plan area statement boundaries, permissible uses, and density restrictions as new county regulatory zones. As part of this effort, the area plan carries through existing standards and policies in community plans and plan area statements. Some policy language has been added to reflect current conditions, while obsolete and redundant language has been removed (See Attachment I for disposition of existing policies).

Beyond carrying through existing policy, the WCTAP does include a few targeted changes. These include incorporation of Town Center redevelopment incentives provided for in the Regional Plan (e.g. increased coverage allowances), some minor changes in permissible uses, and merging the development rights pools into a single countywide pool. Though the resulting area plan doesn't make major changes to policy, it does offer two significant immediate benefits:

(1) **Eliminates the longstanding issue of conflicting zoning.** Under present conditions, the county designates all land in the Tahoe Basin with standard county regulatory zones. These zones establish different use and density standards from those in TRPA's plan area statements and community plans. This creates confusion for staff and the general public when attempting to determine what is allowed on a parcel. By adopting new regulatory zones in keeping with the

Regional Plan, the area plan will establish one set of zoning standards that will be recognized by both the county and TRPA.

(2) **Encourages environmentally beneficial redevelopment.** The area plan incorporates all of the incentives for Town Center redevelopment that the Regional Plan provides. Allowing additional height, coverage, and density can make redevelopment more economically feasible, while also ensuring high quality design and incorporation of water quality improvements. Moreover, improving site design and aesthetics and encouraging active uses in Town Centers helps to make transit operations more efficient and creates environments that are more welcoming to pedestrians and cyclists.

Attachment A provides a summary of the targeted policy changes contained in the WCTAP.

Substitute Standards:
An area plan may propose substitute standards that apply in place of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The area plan proposes the following substitute standards:

- **Parking, Design, and Signage.** In place of TRPA Code Chapters 34, 36, and 38 substitute parking, design, and signage standards presently apply within the four Washoe County community plans. The area plan would carry these standards through with a few minor edits and would apply them only within the same four regulatory zones. Outside of those regulatory zones, Chapter 34, 36, and 38 standards would continue to apply.

- **Residential Care and Nursing and Personal Care Density.** In lieu of TRPA Code Section 31.3, the maximum density for residential care and nursing and personal care uses within Town Centers would be increased from 25 persons per acre to 40 persons per acre. Outside of Town Centers, density limitations in Section 31.3 would continue to apply to these uses. The IEC concludes that adding this substitute standard would not result in significant impacts, as the use intensity would be less than other permissible uses at allowed densities in the Town Centers (e.g. tourist accommodation, multi-family residential, etc.).

Amendments to the Code of Ordinances:
As indicated above, substitute standards will apply with respect to parking, design, and signage. This proposal includes amendments to Chapters 34, 36, and 38 of the Code of Ordinances. These amendments will recognize that the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan Design Standards and Guidelines are the controlling standards for parking, design, and signage within the following regulatory zones:

- Crystal Bay Tourist
- Incline Village Commercial
- Incline Village Tourist
- Ponderosa Ranch

Regional Plan Conformance & Required Findings:
The county has prepared the WCTAP pursuant to Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, which implements many of the requirements identified in Regional Plan Policies LU-4.5 through LU-4.13. Staff has reviewed the proposed area plan for compliance with each standard in Chapter 13. The plan complies with all applicable standards. Applicable findings are included in Attachment D and are supported by the checklist in Attachment C.

Threshold Indicators and Compliance Measures:
Staff has prepared tables in Attachment E to consider the effect of the proposed area plan on threshold indicators and compliance measures. This information helps to substantiate the threshold-related findings in Attachment D.

Environmental Review:
Washoe County has prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the WCTAP, which is provided in Attachment F. The IEC, which tiers from the RPU Environmental Impact Statement, concludes that the proposed area plan would not result in any further significant environmental effects.

Public Comment:
A summary of public comment and the associated responses is provided in Attachment G. The comments themselves are included in Attachment H. Some of the major issues raised include the following:

- **Short-Term Rentals**
  The WCTAP does not address short-term rentals. Instead, the county has chosen to adopt a countywide ordinance that regulates short-term rentals. This ordinance was formally adopted on March 23, 2021. After the county has an opportunity to implement it, the County Commissioners intend to review the ordinance in the fall to determine if any changes need to be made.

- **Future Use of the Old Incline Elementary School**
  The former Incline Elementary School is located at the southwest corner of Southwood Boulevard and State Route 28. This area is part of the Incline Village Commercial zoning district and is within a Town Center. The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) recently authorized its Executive Director to enter into a purchase agreement with the Washoe County School District to acquire the site. The old elementary school was identified in the 2017 Transit Master Plan for future use as a mobility hub. This proposal has generated significant interest by the community. To address this, TTD held four workshops in February and a listening session in March. TTD plans to complete an alternative sites analysis before pursuing a specific project and emphasizes that its purchase of the old elementary school does not mean that it will ultimately choose to build a transit hub there.

  The area plan recognizes the potential for the old elementary school to become a mobility hub in alignment with the Transit Master Plan. The plan, however, does not select the site or foreclose other possibilities sites. The site's zoning under the area plan allows for a variety of uses.

Memorandum of Understanding:
Should the TRPA Governing Board determine that the WCTAP conforms with the Regional Plan, TRPA and Washoe County plan to move forward with the development of a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The MOU will specify the extent to which permitting activities in the area plan will be delegated to the county in accordance with Section 13.7 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Future Amendment Package:
The county began holding hearings for area plan adoption in early 2020. Since that time, TRPA staff has identified a few technical errors and omissions that should be addressed with a future amendment

package. These changes are summarized in Attachment M. Any future amendments to the plan will need to go through the TRPA review and adoption process to ensure conformity with the Regional Plan.

Washoe County has committed to implementing the area plan once it is adopted. To do so, the county may choose to address other implementing actions identified in the WCTAP as part of a future amendment package. Several of the implementing actions identified in the area plan would involve amending the plan, including the following examples:

- Updating the land use concept plans for the four mixed-use and tourist districts (Action LU-4).
- Establishing new incentives to encourage development of workforce housing (Actions LU-5 and LU-6)
- Comprehensively updating the design standards and guidelines (Action LU-7).
- Overseeing a collaborative planning process to determine future land uses and development requirements in the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone (Actions LU-12 and LU-13).
- Establishing access management standards (Action T-2).

Contact Information: If you have questions regarding this item, please contact Michael Conger, AICP, Senior Planner, TRPA at (775) 589-5221 or mconger@trpa.org or Eric Young, PhD, Senior Planner, Washoe County at (775) 328-3613 or eyoung@washoecounty.us.

Attachments:

A. Memo from Washoe County
B. Washoe County Area Plan
C. Conformance Checklist
D. Required Findings
E. Threshold Indicators and Compliance Measures
F. Initial Environmental Checklist
G. Summary of Public Comments
H. Public Comments
I. Disposition of Existing Community Plan and Area Plan Policies
J. Regulatory Zones and Permissible Uses
K. Adopting Ordinance – Area Plan
L. Adopting Ordinance – Code of Ordinance Amendments
M. Draft Future Amendment Package

Attachment A

Memo from Washoe County

WASHOE COUNTY
COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Planning and Building

1001 EAST 9TH STREET
RENO, NEVADA 89512-2845
PHONE (775) 328-6100
FAX (775) 328.6133

April 2, 2021

To: TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee

From: Eric Young, Senior Planner, Washoe County Planning and Development Division

Subject: Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan

SUMMARY:
Washoe County asks the TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) to consider recommended approval of the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan to the TRPA Governing Board. The proposed area plan serves to consolidate and bring current 27 local plans (23 Plan Area Statements and four Community Plans) under one local area plan for the Tahoe portion of Washoe County, Nevada.

The proposed plan also serves to encourage environmentally beneficial redevelopment through Regional Plan incentives such as increased height, coverage, and density for town centers located within an area plan. The Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan has three town centers – Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, and Incline Village Tourist – all with aging, legacy development.

For the most part, the area plan carries forward existing permissible land uses and densities from the Plan Area Statements and Community Plans, with a few exceptions as detailed within the "Overview of the Area Plan" section below.

The Washoe County Board of County Commissioners unanimously adopted the area plan by approving a master plan amendment, regulatory zone amendment, and development code amendment on January 26, 2021.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PLAN:
Washoe County had two primary goals that guided decision making in the development of the area plan. The first was to develop an area plan that is consistent with and supportive of the Regional Plan. Significant collaboration with both TRPA staff and the staff at Ascent Environmental was necessary to achieve this goal. Washoe County's area plan articulates updated goals and policies and establishes new development code language and new implementing strategies. The Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) found that the proposed plan does not result in significant environmental effects and does not require further mitigation to be consistent with the Regional Plan's environmental standards. TRPA staff's review ensured that our area plan contains the right mix of polices, codes, and commitments in accordance to TRPA"s Code of Ordinance Chapter 13: *Area Plans* to support and facilitate not only conformance but implementation of the Regional Plan.

The second critical goal of this update was to remove the legacy system of dual land use regulatory zoning that has confounded both property owners and staff. In the past, project proponents were required to comply with both Washoe's county-wide regulatory zoning and regulatory zoning under the applicable Plan Area Statement or Community Plan. At times, there were conflicts between the Washoe County zoning and local plans zoning. The new area plan consistently establishes one planning regime, based on the existing zoning in the Plan Area Statements and Community Plans. All existing zoning boundaries remain the same, and there are only minor adjustments to permissible uses and special policies, in each case designed to better implement the Regional Plan.

Washoe County is proposing amendments to the existing local plans as part of this area plan that fit into three broad categories. These categories are 1) amendments to Goals and Policies, 2) amendments that relate more specifically to land use such as development standards and permissible uses, and 3) amendments that relate to document usability and customer service. The third category is primarily an exercise in creating a contemporary format that contains the cross references, graphics, and underlying structure necessary to provide access to the information contained in the documents.

The proposed changes to goals and policies and land uses are summarized in the following table:

Area Plan Element	Proposed Change from Existing Plan, Map, or Ordinance	Summary of Change
Goals and Policies	Adds, deletes, and modifies existing goals and policies as documented in the Area Plan	Deletes goals and policies no longer applicable to the plan area, or those that have previously been implemented. Adds or modifies goals and policies to implement the Regional Plan and respond to current conditions. Consolidates goals and policies from multiple CPs and PAS that address the same topic. (see Appendix A, "Table of Proposed Goal and Policy Changes")
Land Use (Zoning Districts)	Existing regional land use and zoning district boundaries remain unchanged. District names are changed.	PAS and CP districts are referred to as neighborhood districts. All district boundaries remain unchanged. (see Area Plan Regulatory Zone Map)
Land Use (Permissible Uses)	Ponderosa Ranch Special Area #1 permissible uses and special policies change.	▸ Existing permissible uses removed: ◤ Food and beverage retail sales ◤ Outdoor amusements ◤ Vehicle storage and parking ▸ New residential uses allowed with a special use permit: ◤ Nursing and personal care ◤ Residential care ▸ New commercial uses allowed:

		◤ Professional offices ◤ Financial services ▶ New commercial uses allowed, subject to special policies: ◤ Amusements and recreation services (limited to indoor movie theater, athletic clubs, and sauna/spa/hot tubs) ◤ Business support services (limited to blue printing, commercial art and design, and computer/IT support) ◤ Animal husbandry (limited to animal hospitals and veterinary offices) ◤ (see Development Code Section 110.220.165)
	Fairway Neighborhood allowable uses and special policies change.	Day use would be changed from allowed with a special use permit to allowed. (see Development Code Section 110.220.295)
Land Use (Town Center Height)	Within town centers maximum allowable height would be increased consistent with the Regional Plan, and subject to additional greenhouse gas reduction requirements.	Maximum building height in Town Centers would be increased from 42 feet (subject to TRPA Code Section 37.4) to 56 feet and four stories. Height increases beyond those currently allowed are allowed only of the project meets green building standards. This includes a second and third story stepped back for height for transitional areas within town centers and adjacent to areas outside of town centers. (see Development Code Section 110.220.35)
Land Use (Town Center Density)	Within town centers maximum allowable density would be increased consistent with the Regional Plan. Additional density proposed for nursing and personal care uses.	Multi-family residential density in town centers is increased from a maximum of 15 units/acre to a minimum of 15 units/acre and maximum of 25 units/acre. Increase density in town centers for residential care and nursing and personal care uses from 25 person per acre to 40 persons per acre. Increase density for tourist accommodation uses in town centers from 15 to 40 units per acre depending on the percentage of units that have kitchens to 40 units per acre regardless of the number of units that have kitchens. (see Development Code Section 110.220.35)
Land Use (Town Center Coverage)	Revise maximum transferred coverage limits consistent with the Regional Plan.	The existing maximum transferred coverage limits for commercial facilities within CPs allows for up to 70 percent coverage on high capability lands for vacant parcels and 50 percent of high capability lands on developed parcels. Within town centers, the maximum transferred coverage limit would change to 70 percent of high capability lands farther than 300 feet from the Lake Tahoe (at high water) and 50 percent of high capability lands within 300 feet of Lake Tahoe. Coverage limits for CP areas outside of town centers would not change. (see Development Code Section 110.220.35)
Land Use (Excess Coverage Mitigation)	Revise excess coverage mitigation to require onsite coverage reduction.	The existing TRPA code Section 30.6 provides options for excess coverage mitigation including through payment of in-lieu excess coverage mitigation fees. The area plan would require project areas where existing coverage exceeds 70 percent to reduce coverage onsite. (see Development Code Section 110.220.40)
Land Use (Design Standards)	No change. Existing design standards and guidelines in	Design standards for Area Plan neighborhoods would be carried forward from PASs and CPs exactly as they are currently stated in *Washoe County Signage, Parking & Design Standards & Guidelines* to the new *Tahoe Planning Area Design*

	adopted PASs and CPs would be carried forward in the Area Plan.	*Standards and Guidelines.* The new manual would be included in Article 220 (Tahoe Area) of the Washoe County Development Code. No change.
Land Use (Allocation of TAUs, RBUs and CFA)	Consolidates the various pools of commercial floor area (CFA), tourist accommodation unit (TAU), and residential bonus unit (RBU) within the CPs and modifies the requirements for allocation of CFA and TAUs.	CFA, TAU, and RBUs that are currently allocated to specific PASs and CPs. They would be consolidated into a single pool that is available for eligible projects throughout the plan area as shown in Table 2.4-2. Revise the allocation of CFA and TAUs from a first come first served basis to a first come first served basis within town centers. Projects outside of town centers would only be eligible for allocations of CFA or TAUs if the project meets green building standards. (see Development Code Section 110.220.20)
Land Use (Setbacks)	Carries forward existing setback standards with targeted changes for corner and sloping lots	Carry forward most existing setback requirements. Modify setback requirements for structures build on corner lots and parcels with at least a 20 percent slope. This change would allow buildings to be placed on the front property line, subject to limitations and setbacks from roadways and corners. (see Development Code Section 110.220.60)
Greenhouse Gases	Provides new requirements and incentives for green buildings design to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	All new structures built by Washoe County that contain habitable space and will be open to the public must be designed and built to an industry recognized industry recognized sustainable building construction and greenhouse gas reduction standard. Fees for CFA, TAU, and residential allocations are waived for projects that meet an industry recognized sustainable building construction and greenhouse gas reduction standard. Projects outside town centers are only eligible for new allocations of CFA or TAUs if they meet an industry recognized sustainable building construction and greenhouse gas reduction standard. (see Development Code Sections 110.220.415 and 110.220.20)
Natural Hazards	Standardizes and codifies the applicability of requirements for development at risk of natural hazards.	Currently, Washoe County reviews project applications on an ad hoc basis for risk of natural hazards including areas prone to landslide, flood, seismic hazards, seiche, and wildfire. The Area Plan identifies locations prone to these hazards and codifies review requirements to ensure they are applied consistently. (see Development Code Section 110.220.125)
Urban Bear Strategy	Requires that all permitted development or activities comply with an urban bear strategy.	All permitted development or activities must comply with the Washoe County Urban Bear Strategy. (see Development Code Section 110.220.115)

Taken together, Washoe County feels the changes described in the table above are consistent with our stated goal of creating a plan that is consistent with and supportive of the Regional Plan, as well as responding to the community's sense of character and identity.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

The Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan was initiated in 2013. Since that time, there have been six public hearings as outlined below. The Washoe County Board of County Commissioners unanimously adopted the area plan at the January 26, 2021 hearing.

- **Washoe Board of County Commissioners**, Second Reading of Development Code, Plan Adoption
  January 26, 2021
- **Washoe Board of County Commissioners,** First Reading of Development Code
  March 10, 2020
- **Washoe County Planning Commission**, Adoption Recommendation
  February 4, 2020
- **TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee**, Informational Presentation
  October 23, 2019
- **Washoe County Planning Commission**, Master Plan Amendment Initiation
  October 21, 2019
- **Washoe County Planning Commission**, Master Plan Amendment Initiation
  November 7, 2018

During the October 2019 RPIC presentation, RPIC members wanted to ensure that the area plan and the Tahoe Transportation District's Long-Range Transit Plan are consistent, and that the area plan supports and provides for the mobility hubs identified in that plan. In response to this concern, Washoe County staff added the potential mobility hubs as called for in the transit plan to the appropriate maps in the Transportation Chapter of the area plan. Staff also added references to the potential mobility hubs throughout the transportation chapter where appropriate. More information on the mobility hubs is located in the subsequent "Public Outreach and Comment" section below.

Additionally, RPIC commended Washoe County for the included greenhouse gas reduction standards. Washoe County's newly proposed greenhouse gas reduction standards are the first to be applied in the Nevada side of the basin. These will likely form the basis of any standards the county may adopt when it updates the rest of its area plans outside the basin. The reduction of greenhouse gas is approached in three separate ways. First, a standard is established for all new multi-family development and any habitable space developed by Washoe County that requires developing to a recognized sustainable greenhouse gas and building construction standard such as Living Building Challenge, Net Zero Energy Building, LEED, Energy Star, Green Globes, national Green Building Standard, or other similar standard. Next, it creates incentives for other types of development to adopt this standard by waiving the fees associated with residential allocations, commercial floor area, or tourist accommodation units. And finally, the plan establishes that development to this standard is required to obtain commercial floor

area or tourist accommodation units outside a town center boundary. RPIC did not request any changes to the GHG standards at that time.

PULIC OUTREACH AND COMMENT:

In addition to the public hearings listed above, Washoe County facilitated four community workshops, six Citizens' Advisory Board Meetings, and two other local organizational meetings as outlined below to inform the community about the planning process and solicit feedback. Public noticing requirements were followed in accordance to Washoe County's regulations.

- **Public Workshops:** February 21, 2013; April 24, 2014; September 28, 2016; December 9, 2019
- **Citizens' Advisory Board Meetings:** October 2016; March 2017; July 2017; November 2018; March 2019; September 2019
- **Local Organizational Meetings:**
    - Incline Village General Improvement District Board of Directors, June 19, 2019
    - Incline Village / Crystal Bay Visitor's Bureau, January 15, 2020

Additionally, TRPA and Washoe staff developed a public interactive webpage that details proposed changes from existing plans, the area plan process, comparison of zoning regulations, and provides a draft of the plan.

The public review draft was made widely available in October 2019 and was circulated in several ways. The primary method of contact with public and private agencies was through the agency review checklist system that Washoe County regularly uses the review of all discretionary projects in the county. With the assistance of TRPA staff, we were also able to supplement our list of appropriate agencies to ensure we provided the broadest list possible of potential reviewers. The Agency review checklist that was ultimately utilized for the update is attached. The plan was also made available through the public webpage mentioned above, the County's website, and distributed to the Citizens' Advisory Board.

Regarding agency comments, we received input that resulted in our ability to clarify several graphics and other similar issues related to the presentation of accurate and comprehensive data. The League to Save Lake Tahoe responded with ideas for improved clarity as well as a few requests for changes. In most cases the League was requesting Washoe County to establish standards beyond the current TRPA requirements, or to ask Washoe County to extend newly proposed requirements beyond the threshold we proposed.

A public comment summary is included as Attachment G to this packet. A full list of comments is included as Attachment H.

Of particular interest from the community and public was the regulation of short term rentals (STRs) and the proposed mobility hubs. The community sought language in the area plan specific to STRs. However, during this same period Washoe County was in the beginning stages of developing an STR ordinance and did not seek to regulate STRs through the Area Plan. Washoe County has now adopted an ordinance specific to STRs and is currently implementing the application and permitting provisions it contains. The county intends to review how its implementation program is unfolding and consider adjustments to the ordinance by the end of 2021.

During the month of February 2021, the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) facilitated a series of webinars for the community regarding the potential mobility hubs and how those fit into both local and regional transportation needs. Prior to these meetings there was a great deal of concern about the potential location of a mobility hub at a former school site. Questions and responses from these meetings have been posted to the following website: https://inclinevillagemobilityhub.org . TTD has committed to continuing outreach to engage the community, as alternative sites are considered and the facilities and features a mobility hub might include are determined.

Attached Exhibits

- Resolution adopting the Master Plan Amendments
- Resolution adopting the Regulator Zone Amendments
- Ordinance adopting revisions to Article 220 and adopting Article 220.1 of Chapter 110 of the Washoe County Code

WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION

1001 E. 9th Street
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 328-2000

RESOLUTION
ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE WASHOE COUNTY MASTER PLAN, TAHOE AREA MASTER PLAN (WMPA19-0007)

WHEREAS, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopted a resolution to approve **Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0007 (Tahoe Area Master Plan),** amending the Washoe County Master Plan, Volume 2, Tahoe Area Plan, including changes to the goals, policies, and maps; and,

WHEREAS, on February 4, 2020, the Washoe County Planning Commission held a public hearing and approved the proposed amendment and adopted Planning Commission Resolution Number 20-06 adopting Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0007; and recommended that the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners adopt the proposed amendment; and,

WHEREAS, upon holding a subsequent public hearing on January 26, 2021, this Board voted to adopt the proposed amendment, having affirmed the following findings made by the Planning Commission in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15:

1. Consistency with Master Plan. The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Master Plan.

2. Compatible Land Uses. The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.

3. Response to Changed Conditions. The proposed amendment identifies and responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.

4. Availability of Facilities. There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed Master Plan designation.

5. Desired Pattern of Growth. The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource. And;

WHEREAS, Under Chapter 13, Section 13.6.4 of the Tahoe Code of Ordinances, before this adoption can become effective, this Board must submit this proposed amendment to the Tahoe Regional Governing board and receive a final determination that the proposed amendment conforms with the Tahoe Regional Plan;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners does hereby ADOPT the amendment to the Tahoe Master Plan (WMPA19-0007), as set forth in Exhibit A-1 attached

hereto, to become effective if and when the County has received a final determination that the amendment conforms to the Tahoe Regional Plan.

ADOPTED this 26th day of January 2021, to be effective only as stated above.

WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION

_____
Bob Lucey, Chair

ATTEST:

_____,
Janis Galassini, County Clerk

WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION

1001 E. 9th Street
Reno, Nevada 89512
(775) 328-2000

RESOLUTION
ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE TAHOE AREA
REGULATORY ZONE MAP (WRZA19-0007)

WHEREAS, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopted a resolution to approve **Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA19-0007 (Tahoe Regulatory Zone Map)**, subject to final approval of the associated Master Plan amendment (WMPA19-0007) and a finding of conformance with the 2012 Tahoe Regional Plan, to amend the Tahoe area Regulatory Zone map in order to adopt the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Regulatory Zone boundaries; and,

WHEREAS, On February 4, 2020, the Washoe County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendment and recommended that the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners adopt Regulatory Zone Amendment Case No. WRZA19-0007, Planning Commission Resolution Number 20-07; and,

WHEREAS, upon holding a subsequent public hearing on January 26, 2021, this Board voted to adopt the proposed amendment, having affirmed the following findings as made by the Planning Commission, pursuant to Washoe County Code Section 110.821.35:

1. Consistency with Master Plan. The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Master Plan.

2. Compatible Land Uses. The proposed amendment will not result in land uses which are incompatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.

3. Response to Changed Conditions; more desirable use. The proposed amendment identifies and responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.

4. Availability of Facilities. There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed amendment.

5. No Adverse Effects. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan.

6. Desired Pattern of Growth. The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services. And;

WHEREAS, This action will become effective upon a favorable conformance review of the accompanying Master Plan Amendment (WMPA19-0007 Tahoe Area Master Plan) by the Tahoe Regional Planning authorities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners does hereby ADOPT the amendment to the Tahoe Regulatory Zone Map (Case No. WRZA19-0007), as set forth in Exhibit B-1 attached hereto, to become effective if and when the County has received a final determination that Master Plan Amendment Case No. WMPA19-0007 conforms to the Tahoe Regional Plan.

ADOPTED this 26th day of January 2021, to be effective only as stated above.

WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION:

_____
Bob Lucey, Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Janis Galassini, County Clerk

WORKING COPY
INFORMATION ONLY

REGULAR TEXT: NO CHANGE IN LANGUAGE

~~STRIKEOUT TEXT~~: DELETE LANGUAGE

BOLD TEXT: NEW LANGUAGE
****

Notice: Per NRS 239B.030, this document does not contain personal information as defined in NRS 603A.040

Summary: *Amends the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code) by updating Article 220* Tahoe Area Modifiers*, and adding Article 220.1* Tahoe Area Design Standards*, to ensure Washoe County's development standards conform to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Regional Plan.*

BILL NO. ____

ORDINANCE NO. ____

Title:

An ordinance amending the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code), replacing Article 220, Tahoe Area Plan modifiers with two new articles, Article 220 Tahoe Area Plan modifiers and Article 220.1 Tahoe Area Design Standards. These amendments are meant to ensure the express conformance of Washoe County's plans with the 2012 Regional Plan adopted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and are generally not intended to increase densities or intensities beyond what is currently permitted by the Regional Plan. The changes include but are not limited to the following: Adopting the TRPA's permissible uses set forth in TRPA Regional Plan Chapter 21, Permissible Uses, in lieu of Washoe County's allowed uses set forth in Article 302 of the Washoe County Development Code; Adopting design standards that are in conformance with the requirements set forth in the TRPA Regional Plan Chapter 13 Area Plans and Chapter 36 Design Standards; Adopting development standards that are consistent with the development standards set forth in the TRPA Regional Plan; Adopting neighborhood plans utilizing the boundaries and allowed uses of TRPA's plan area statements and community plans in lieu of Washoe County's regulatory zones set forth in Article 106 of the Washoe County Development Code; and including the Washoe County Planning Commission's direction to expand an available density incentive from memory care only to all residential care and nursing care uses; and other matters necessarily

connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

WHEREAS:

A. This Commission desires to amend Article 220 and to add Article 220.1 to the Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code,) in order to conform with the Tahoe Regional Plan; and,

B. The Washoe County Planning Commission initiated the proposed amendments to Washoe County Code Chapter 110, Development Code, by Resolution Number 19-22 on October 21, 2019 creating Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA19-0007; and,

C. The amendments and this ordinance were drafted in concert with the District Attorney, and the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing for WDCA19-0007 on February 4, 2020, and adopted Resolution Number 20-08 recommending adoption of this ordinance; and,

D. Following a first reading and publication as required by NRS 244.100 (1), and after a duly noticed public hearing, this Commission desires to adopt this Ordinance; and,

E. This Commission has determined that this ordinance is being adopted pursuant to requirements set forth in Chapter 278 of NRS; therefore it is not a “rule” as defined in NRS 237.060 requiring a business impact statement.

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF WASHOE COUNTY DOES HEREBY ORDAIN:

SECTION 1. Sections 220.00 through 220.45 of Article 220 *Tahoe Area Modifiers*, of the Washoe County Code are hereby deleted and replaced with sections 220.00 through 220.445 as follows:

Attachment B

Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan
Washoe County Area Plan

Attachment C

Area Plan Conformance Checklist

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Area Plan Finding of Conformity Checklist

Area Plan Information

Area Plan Name:	Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan
Lead Agency:	Washoe County
Submitted to TRPA:	January 26, 2021
TRPA File No:	N/A

Conformity Review

Review Stage:	Final Review - After Local Adoption
Conformity Review Date:	April 1, 2021
TRPA Reviewer:	Michael Conger

Hearing Dates

Lead Agency Approval:	January 26, 2021
APC:	TBD – Anticipated May 2021
Governing Board:	TBD – Anticipated May 2021
Appeal Deadline:	TBD
MOU Approval Deadline:	TBD

Characteristics

Geographic Area and Description:	All of Washoe County within the Tahoe Basin
Land Use Classifications:	Mixed Use, Residential, Conservation, Recreation, Tourist, Backcountry, Wilderness
Alternative Development Standards:	(1) **Substitute parking standards.** Contained within the Design Standards document. Applies only within the four Mixed-Use and Tourist regulatory zones. Replaces Chapter 34, *Driveway and Parking Standards*.

(2) **Substitute signage standards.** Contained within the Design Standards document. Applies only within the four Mixed-Use and Tourist regulatory zones. Replaces Chapter 38, *Signs*.

(3) **Substitute design standards.** Contained within the Design Standards document. Applies only within the four Mixed-Use and Tourist regulatory zones. Replaces Chapter 36, *Design Standards*.

(4) **A substitute density standard** for nursing/personal care and residential care uses. The standard would allow 40 (rather than 25) persons per acre in Town Centers. Replaces the applicable standard within Subsection 31.3.2, *Table of Maximum Densities*.

Conformity Checklist

		TRPA Code Section	Conformity YES	NO	N/A
A. Contents of Area Plans					
1	General	13.5.1	●		
2	Relationship to Other Code Sections	13.5.2	●		
B. Development and Community Design Standards					
	Building Height				
1	Outside of Centers	13.5.3	●		
2	Within Town Centers	13.5.3	●		
3	Within the Regional Center	13.5.3			●
4	Within the High-Density Tourist District	13.5.3			●
	Density				
5	Single-Family Dwellings	13.5.3	●		
6	Multiple-Family Dwellings outside of Centers	13.5.3	●		
7	Multiple-Family Dwellings within Centers	13.5.3	●		
8	Tourist Accommodations	13.5.3	●		
	Land Coverage				
9	Land Coverage	13.5.3	●		
10	Alternative Comprehensive Coverage Management	13.5.3.B.1			●

		TRPA Code Section	Conformity YES	NO	N/A
	Site Design				
11	Site Design Standards	13.5.3	●		
	Complete Streets				
12	Complete Streets	13.5.3	●		
C.	**Alternative Development Standards and Guidelines Authorized in an Area Plan**				
1	Alternative Comprehensive Coverage Management System	13.5.3.B.1			●
2	Alternative Parking Strategies	13.5.3.B.2			●
3	Areawide Water Quality Treatments and Funding Mechanisms	13.5.3.B.3			●
4	Alternative Transfer Ratios for Development Rights	13.5.3.B.4			●
D.	**Development Standards and Guidelines Encouraged in Area Plans**				
1	Urban Bear Strategy	13.5.3.C.1	●		
2	Urban Forestry	13.5.3.C.2			●
E.	**Development on Resort Recreation Parcels**				
1	Development on Resort Recreation Parcels	13.5.3.D			●
F.	**Greenhouse Gas Reduction**				
1	Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy	13.5.3.E	●		
G.	**Community Design Standards**				
1	Development in All Areas	13.5.3.F.1.a	●		
2	Development in Regional Center or Town Centers	13.5.3.F.1.b	●		
3	Building Heights	13.5.3.F.2	●		
4	Building Design	13.5.3.F.3	●		
5	Landscaping	13.5.3.F.4	●		
6	Lighting	13.5.3.F.5	●		
7	Signing – Alternative Standards	13.5.3.F.6	●		
8	Signing – General Policies	13.5.3.F.6	●		

		TRPA Code Section	Conformity YES	NO	N/A
H.	**Modification to Town Center Boundaries**				
1	Modification to Town Center Boundaries	13.5.3.G			●
I.	**Conformity Review Procedures for Area Plans**				
1	Initiation of Area Planning Process by Lead Agency	13.6.1	●		
2	Initial Approval of Area Plan by Lead Agency	13.6.2	TBD		
3	Review by Advisory Planning Commission	13.6.3	TBD		
4	Approval of Area Plan by TRPA	13.6.4	TBD		
J.	**Findings for Conformance with the Regional Plan**				
	General Review Standards for All Area Plans				
1	Zoning Designations	13.6.5.A.1	●		
2	Regional Plan Policies	13.6.5.A.2	●		
3	Regional Plan Land Use Map	13.6.5.A.3	●		
4	Environmental Improvement Projects	13.6.5.A.4	●		
5	Redevelopment	13.6.5.A.5	●		
6	Established Residential Areas	13.6.5.A.6	●		
7	Stream Environment Zones	13.6.5.A.7	●		
8	Alternative Transportation Facilities and Implementation	13.6.5.A.8	●		
	Load Reduction Plans				
9	Load Reduction Plans	13.6.5.B	●		
	Additional Review Standards for Town Centers and the Regional Center				
10	Building and Site Design Standards	13.6.5.C.1	●		
11	Alternative Transportation	13.6.5.C.2	●		
12	Promoting Pedestrian Activity	13.6.5.C.3	●		
13	Redevelopment Capacity	13.6.5.C.4	●		
14	Coverage Reduction and Stormwater Management	13.6.5.C.5	●		
15	Threshold Gain	13.6.5.C.6	●		

		TRPA Code Section	Conformity YES	NO	N/A
Additional Review Standards for the High-Density Tourist District					
16	Building and Site Design	13.6.5.D.1			●
17	Alternative Transportation	13.6.5.D.2			●
18	Threshold Gains	13.6.5.D.3			●
K. Area Plan Amendments					
1	Conformity Review for Amendments to an Area Plan	13.6.6			●
2	Conformity Review for Amendments Made by TRPA to the Regional Plan that Affect an Area Plan – Notice	13.6.7.A			●
3	Conformity Review for Amendments Made by TRPA to the Regional Plan that Affect an Area Plan – Timing	13.6.7.B			●
L. Administration					
1	Effect of Finding of Conformance of Area Plan	13.6.8	TBD		
2	Procedures for Adoption of Memorandum of Understanding	13.7	TBD		
3	Monitoring, Certification, and Enforcement of an Area Plan	13.8	TBD		
4	Appeal Procedure	13.9	●		

Conformity Review Notes

A. CONTENTS OF AREA PLANS

1. General ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.1

Requirement An Area Plan shall consist of applicable policies, maps, ordinances, and any other related materials identified by the lead agency, sufficient to demonstrate that these measures, together with TRPA ordinances that remain in effect, are consistent with and conform to TRPA's Goals and Policies and all other elements of the Regional Plan. In addition to this Section 13.5, additional specific requirements for the content of Area Plans are in subsection 13.6.5.A. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that is associated with an approved Area Plan is a separate, but related, approval and is not part of the Area Plan.

Notes The Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan consists of goals, policies, actions, projects, maps, ordinances, and related materials that conform to the Regional Plan. The proposed land use and zoning maps are consistent with Regional Plan Map 1, *Conceptual Regional Land Use Map*. No modifications to Town Center boundaries are proposed.

The Area Plan largely carries through existing policies from the Community Plans and Plan Area Statements. TRPA staff has reviewed proposed policy additions, modifications, consolidations, and deletions and determined that they are consistent with the Regional Plan.

2. Relationship to Other Sections of the Code ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.2

Requirement This section is intended to authorize development and design standards in Area Plans that are different than otherwise required under this Code. In the event of a conflict between the requirements in this section and requirements in other parts of the Code, the requirements in this section shall apply for the purposes of developing Area Plans. Except as otherwise specified, Code provisions that apply to Plan Area Statements (Chapter 11), Community Plans (Chapter 12), and Specific and Master Plans (Chapter 14) may also be utilized in a Conforming Area Plan. If an Area Plan proposes to modify any provision that previously applied to Plan Area Statements, Community Plans, or Specific and Master Plans, the proposed revision shall be analyzed in accordance with Code Chapters 3 and 4.

Notes

The Area Plan's development standards will be located in Chapter 110, Article 220 of the Washoe County Code, which is commonly referred to as the "Tahoe Modifiers." The Tahoe Modifiers are also included in Appendix A of the Area Plan.

As proposed, the Tahoe Modifiers comply with the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Substitute standards are proposed for design, signage, and parking within the Mixed-Use and Tourist regulatory zones and are contained in Appendix B, Design Standards and Guidelines (to be adopted as Article 220.1). An additional substitute standard is proposed to allow increased density for nursing/personal care and residential care uses within a Town Center.

The Tahoe Modifiers refer to the TRPA Code for regulatory language where needed.

B. DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY DESIGN STANDARDS

Area plans shall have development standards that are consistent with those in Table 13.5.3-1

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT

1. Outside of Centers ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Building height standards shall be consistent with Code Section 37.4.

Notes

Section 110.220.50 of the Washoe County Development Code refers to TRPA Chapter 37 for height limitations outside of Town Centers.

2. Within Town Centers ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Building height is limited to a maximum of 4 stories and 56 feet.

Notes Building heights within Town Centers are established in Section 110.220.35 of the Washoe County Code. The maximum height is 56 feet. Greenhouse gas reduction standards must be met to qualify for the additional height.

3. Within the Regional Center ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Building height is limited to a maximum of 6 stories and 95 feet.

Notes The Regional Center is not located in Washoe County.

4. Within the High-Density Tourist District ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Building height is limited to a maximum of 197 feet.

Notes The High-Density Tourist District is not located in Washoe County.

DENSITY

5. Single-Family Dwellings ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Single-family dwelling density shall be consistent with Code Section 31.3.

Notes Consistent with TRPA Code Section 31.3, single family dwelling density in Washoe County is limited to one residence per parcel, plus one accessory residence where allowed. Under TRPA Code Chapter 21, an accessory residence may be developed only on parcels of an acre or more in size. Density limitations for residential regulatory zones are established in Sections 110.220.175 through 335 in the Washoe County Development Code. These standards adhere to TRPA Chapter 21 and 31 standards.

6. Multiple-Family Dwellings outside of Centers ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Multiple-family dwelling density outside of Centers shall be consistent with Code Section 31.3.

Notes Consistent with TRPA Code Section 31.3, multiple-family dwelling density is limited to 15 units per acre outside of the Town Centers. Density limitations for residential regulatory zones are established in Sections 110.220.175 through 335 of the Washoe County Development Code. Outside of Town Centers, multiple family dwellings are only allowed in the following regulatory zones at the listed densities:

- Incline Village Tourist .....15 u/ac
- Incline Village 3.....Per subdivision map

- Incline Village 4.....Per subdivision map
- Incline Village Residential.....15 u/ac
- Crystal Bay Condominiums (Special Area) .....4 u/ac
- Fairway (Special Area) .....15 u/ac
- Mt. Shadows.....15 u/ac

7. Multiple-Family Dwellings within Centers ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Multiple-family dwelling density within Centers shall be a maximum of 25 units per acre.

Notes

Washoe County Code Section 110.220.35 establishes a minimum density of 15 units per acre and a maximum density of 25 units per acre for residential development within Town Centers.

The Development Code proposes establishing an alternative maximum density standard for residential care and nursing and personal care uses that are focused on memory care. This would allow up to 40 persons per acre, rather than the normal maximum (TRPA Code Chapter 31) of 25 persons per acre.

8. Tourist Accommodations ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Tourist accommodations (other than bed and breakfast) shall have a maximum density of 40 units per acre.

Notes

The proposed Washoe County Development Code would establish a maximum density for tourist accommodation units of 40 units per acre for hotel/motel units and timeshare units within the Town Centers. This density would apply regardless of how many units have kitchens. Tourist accommodation densities in Town Centers are established in Sections 110.220.135 through 165.

LAND COVERAGE

9. Land Coverage ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Land coverage standards shall be consistent with Section 30.4 of the TRPA Code.

Notes

Section 110.220.20, Subsection 6 refers to TRPA Code Chapter 30 for land coverage compliance requirements.

10. Alternative Comprehensive Coverage Management System ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

See Section C.1 of this document.

SITE DESIGN

11. Site Design Standards ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Area plans shall conform to Section 36.5 of the TRPA Code.

Notes The development standards in Washoe County Code Section 110.220.40, Subsection 4, conform with the standards in TRPA Code Section 36.5.

COMPLETE STREETS

12. Complete Streets ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3

Requirement Within Centers, plan for sidewalks, trails, and other pedestrian amenities providing safe and convenient non-motorized circulation within Centers, as applicable, and incorporation of the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Plan.

Notes The Area Plan proposes a comprehensive network of Class I multi-use trail projects and Class II bike lane projects (see Chapter 3). The Design Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B, Chapters 1 and 12) establish road improvement requirements for new development in mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones.

C. ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES AUTHORIZED IN AREA PLANS

1. Alternative Comprehensive Coverage Management System ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.B.1

Requirement An Area Plan may propose a comprehensive coverage management system as an alternative to the parcel-level coverage requirements outlined in Sections 30.4.1 and 30.4.2, provided that the alternative system shall: 1) reduce the total coverage and not increase the cumulative base allowable coverage in the area covered by the comprehensive coverage management system; 2) reduce the total amount of coverage and not increase the cumulative base allowable coverage in Land Capability Districts 1 and 2; and 3) not increase the amount of coverage otherwise allowed within 300 feet of high water of Lake Tahoe (excluding those areas landward of Highways 28 and 89 in Kings Beach and Tahoe City Town Centers within that zone). For purposes of this provision, "total" coverage is the greater of existing or allowed coverage.

Notes Washoe County has chosen not to develop an alternative comprehensive coverage management system. This is an optional component.

2. Alternative Parking Strategies ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.B.2

Requirement An Area Plan is encouraged to include shared or area-wide parking strategies to reduce land coverage and make more efficient use of land for parking and pedestrian uses. Shared parking strategies may consider and include the following:

- Reduction or relaxation of minimum parking standards;
- Creation of maximum parking standards;
- Shared parking;
- In-lieu payment to meet parking requirements;
- On-street parking;
- Parking along major regional travel routes;
- Creation of bicycle parking standards;
- Free or discounted transit;
- Deeply discounted transit passes for community residents; and
- Paid parking management

Notes

Washoe County has chosen not to develop alternative parking strategies. This is an optional component. The Area Plan does include policies and standards that mirror some of the listed parking strategies:

- **Action T-5**: *Parking Management Plan* – The county will work with TRPA and the local transportation management association to develop a parking management plan.
- **Policy T6-4**: *Maximum Parking* – Parking lots in the Crystal Bay Tourist and Incline Village Tourist regulatory zones shall include no more than the minimum number of required parking spaces.
- **Design Standards, Appendix A**: *Parking Demand Table* – Maximum parking is established by multiplying the minimum number by 1.1.

Additionally, TART presently operates fare-free transit in the planning area.

3. Areawide Water Quality Treatments and Funding Mechanisms ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.B.3

Requirement An Area Plan may include water quality treatments and funding mechanisms in lieu of certain site-specific BMPs, subject to the following requirements:

- Area-wide BMPs shall be shown to achieve equal or greater effectiveness and efficiency at achieving water quality benefits to certain site-specific BMPs and must infiltrate the 20-year, one-hour storm;
- Plans should be developed in coordination with TRPA and applicable state agencies, consistent with applicable TMDL requirements;
- Area-wide BMP project areas shall be identified in Area Plans and shall address both installation and ongoing maintenance;
- Strong consideration shall be given to areas connected to surface waters;

- Area-wide BMP plans shall consider area-wide and parcel level BMP requirements as an integrated system;
- Consideration shall be given to properties that have already installed and maintained parcel-level BMPs, and financing components or area-wide BMP plans shall reflect prior BMP installation in terms of the charges levied against projects that already complied with BMP requirements with systems that are in place and operational in accordance with applicable BMP standards.
- Area-wide BMP Plans shall require that BMPs be installed concurrent with development activities. Prior to construction of area-wide treatment facilities, development projects shall either install parcel-level BMPs or construct area-wide improvements.

Notes Washoe County has chosen not to develop an areawide water quality program. This is an optional component. Each parcel will be responsible for meeting applicable water quality standards with on-site improvements.

4. Alternative Transfer Ratios for Development Rights ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.B.4

Requirement Within a Stream Restoration Plan Area as depicted in Map 1 in the Regional Plan, an Area Plan may propose to establish alternative transfer ratios for development rights based on unique conditions in each jurisdiction, as long as the alternative transfer ratios are determined to generate equal or greater environment gain compared to the TRPA transfer ratios set forth in Chapter 51: Transfer of Development.

Notes There are no Stream Restoration Plan Areas within Washoe County.

D. Development Standards and Guidelines Encouraged in Area Plans

1. Urban Bear Strategy ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.C.1

Requirement In Area Plans, lead agencies are encouraged to develop and enforce urban bear strategies to address the use of bear-resistant solid waste facilities and related matters.

Notes Section 110.220.115 of the Washoe County Development Code requires compliance with the most current Washoe County Urban Bear Strategy and other relevant regulations. The County's bear strategy relies on regulations, education, and outreach through the Washoe County Health District. Incline Village General Improvement District also has regulations that address solid waste disposal.

2. Urban Forestry ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.C.2

Requirement In Area Plans, lead agencies are encouraged to develop and enforce urban forestry strategies that seek to reestablish natural forest conditions in a manner that does not increase the risk of catastrophic wildfire.

Notes Washoe County has chosen not to develop an urban forestry strategy at this time. This is an optional component. The County does propose to develop an urban forestry strategy in the future (Chapter 4, Action C-5).

E. DEVELOPMENT ON RESORT RECREATION PARCELS

1. Development on Resort Recreation Parcels

☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.D

Requirement In addition to recreation uses, an Area Plan may allow the development and subdivision of tourist, commercial, and residential uses on the Resort Recreation District parcels depicted on Map 1 of the Regional Plan and subject to the following conditions:

- The parcels must become part of an approved Area Plan;
- Subdivisions shall be limited to "air space condominium" divisions with no lot and block subdivisions allowed;
- Development shall be transferred from outside the area designated as Resort Recreation; and
- Transfers shall result in the retirement of existing development.

Notes There are no Resort Recreation designated parcels within Washoe County.

F. GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION

1. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy

☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.E

Requirement To be found in conformance with the Regional Plan, Area Plans shall include a strategy to reduce emissions of Greenhouse Gases from the operation or construction of buildings. The strategy shall include elements in addition to those included to satisfy other state requirements or requirements of this code. Additional elements included in the strategy may include but are not limited to the following:

- A local green building incentive program to reduce the energy consumption of new or remodeled buildings;
- A low interest loan or rebate program for alternative energy projects or energy efficiency retrofits;
- Modifications to the applicable building code or design standards to reduce energy consumption; or
- Capital improvements to reduce energy consumption or incorporate alternative energy production into public facilities.

Notes Washoe County's greenhouse gas reduction strategy is outlined in Washoe County Code Section 110.220.415. The strategy includes two elements: development standards and incentives.

First, standards would require that any new public buildings meet an industry-recognized sustainable building construction standard, such as LEED. This standard would also apply to

development seeking CFA allocations outside of a Town Center and projects within the Town Center that seek to qualify for additional height pursuant to Section 110.220.35.

The second element is an incentive program, where the County will waive allocation fees for new developments that voluntarily meet the industry recognized sustainability standards. Additionally, development within Town Centers would need to meet the greenhouse gas reduction requirement in order to qualify for additional height (Section 110.220.35).

G. COMMUNITY DESIGN STANDARDS

To be found in conformance with the Regional Plan, Area Plans shall require that all projects comply with the design standards in this subsection. Area Plans may also include additional or substitute requirements not listed below that promote threshold attainment.

1. Development in All Areas

☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.1.a

Requirement All new development shall consider, at minimum, the following site design standards:

- Existing natural features retained and incorporated into the site design;
- Building placement and design that are compatible with adjacent properties and designed in consideration of solar exposure, climate, noise, safety, fire protection, and privacy;
- Site planning that includes a drainage, infiltration, and grading plan meeting water quality standards, and
- Access, parking, and circulation that are logical, safe, and meet the requirements of the transportation element.

Notes Washoe County Code Section 110.220.40 establishes areawide design standards. The first two standards are addressed in Subsections 1 and 9, respectively. The third and fourth standards are addressed in Subsections 6 and 8 by referring to TRPA Code Chapter 33 (Grading and Construction) and Chapter 34 (Driveway and Parking Standards). Within the four designated mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones, the Design Standards in Appendix B apply in lieu of Chapter 34.

2. Development in Regional Center or Town Centers

☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.1.b

Requirement In addition to the standards above, development in Town Centers or the Regional Center shall address the following design standards:

- Existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall connect properties within Centers to transit stops and the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian network.
- Area Plans shall encourage the protection of views of Lake Tahoe.
- Building height and density should be varied with some buildings smaller and less dense than others.
- Site and building designs within Centers shall promote pedestrian activity and provide enhanced design features along public roadways. Enhanced design features to be considered include increased setbacks, stepped

heights, increased building articulation, and/or higher quality building materials along public roadways.

- Area Plans shall include strategies for protecting undisturbed sensitive lands and, where feasible, establish park or open space corridors connecting undisturbed sensitive areas within Centers to undisturbed areas outside of Centers.

Notes The proposed Area Plan establishes building height standards for the Town Centers in Development Code Section 110.220.35(1) and (2). Additionally, the Design Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B) provide site design, building design, circulation, and parking standards that promote pedestrian activity and preserve natural areas within Town Centers.

3. Building Heights ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.2

Requirement

- Area Plans may allow building heights up to the maximum limits in Table 13.5.3-1 of the Code of Ordinances
- Building height limits shall be established to ensure that buildings do not project above the forest canopy, ridge lines, or otherwise detract from the viewshed.
- Area Plans that allow buildings over two stories in height shall, where feasible, include provisions for transitional height limits or other buffer areas adjacent to areas not allowing buildings over two stories in height.

Notes The Area Plan relies on TRPA Code Chapter 37 to establish height requirements outside of Town Centers. Within Town Centers, height requirements are established in Section 110.220.35(1) and (2). These standards establish a height limit of 56 feet, which is consistent with Table 13.5.3-1. Additionally, they provide for transitional height for properties at the edge of the Town Centers.

4. Building Design ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.3

Requirement Standards shall be adopted to ensure attractive and compatible development. The following shall be considered:

- Buffer requirements should be established for noise, snow removal, aesthetic, and environmental purposes.
- The scale of structures should be compatible with existing and planned land uses in the area.
- Viewsheds should be considered in all new construction. Emphasis should be placed on lake views from major transportation corridors.
- Area Plans shall include design standards for building design and form. Within Centers, building design and form standards shall promote pedestrian activity.

Notes The first three standards are addressed in Washoe County Code Section 110.220.40, Subsection 9. The last standard is addressed through the Design Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B).

5. Landscaping ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.4

Requirement The following should be considered with respect to this design component of a project:

- Native vegetation should be utilized whenever possible, consistent with Fire Defensible Space Requirements.
- Vegetation should be used to screen parking, alleviate long strips of parking space, and accommodate stormwater runoff where feasible.
- Vegetation should be used to give privacy, reduce glare and heat, deflect wind, muffle noise, prevent erosion, and soften the line of architecture where feasible.

Notes These standards are addressed in Washoe County Code Section 110.220.40, Subsection 9.

6. Lighting ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.5

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

- Exterior lighting should be minimized to protect dark sky views, yet adequate to provide for public safety, and should be consistent with the architectural design.
- Exterior lighting should utilize cutoff shields that extend below the lighting element to minimize light pollution and stray light.
- Overall levels should be compatible with the neighborhood light level. Emphasis should be placed on a few, well-placed, low-intensity lights.
- Lights should not blink, flash, or change intensity except for temporary public safety signs.

Notes The proposed Area Plan refers to TRPA Code Chapter 36 for exterior lighting standards outside of the four designated mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones (Washoe County Code Section 110.220.40, Subsection 8). Within the mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones, the lighting standards in the Design Standards and Guidelines (Appendix B, Chapter 7) would instead apply. These standards are consistent with the requirements in TRPA Code Subparagraph 13.5.3.F.5.

7. Signing – Alternative Standards ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.6

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

Notes The Area Plan proposes to include alternative signage standards in the Design Standards document. These alternative standards would apply only within mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones. The standards are largely equivalent with the standards in TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 36. Application of the alternative sign standards should help to mitigate scenic impacts and improve aesthetics along scenic roadway units.

8. Signing – General Policies ☒ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.F.6

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

- Off-premise signs should generally be prohibited; way-finding and directional signage may be considered where scenic impacts are minimized and mitigated.
- Signs should be incorporated into building design;
- When possible, signs should be consolidated into clusters to avoid clutter.
- Signage should be attached to buildings when possible; and
- Standards for number, size, height, lighting, square footage, and similar characteristics for on-premise signs shall be formulated and shall be consistent with the land uses permitted in each district.

Notes Substitute signage standards are proposed for mixed-use and tourist areas in the Design Standards (Appendix B, Chapter 7). Outside of these areas, the Washoe County Code refers to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 38 for signage standards (Washoe County Code Section 110.220.40, Subsection 8). Chapter 38 standards exceed the above requirements.

H. MODIFICATION TO TOWN CENTER BOUNDARIES

1. Modification to Town Center Boundaries ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.5.3.G

Requirement When Area Plans propose modifications to the boundaries of a Center, the modification shall comply with the following:

- Boundaries of Centers shall be drawn to include only properties that are developed, unless undeveloped parcels proposed for inclusion have either at least three sides of their boundary adjacent to developed parcels (for four-sided parcels), or 75 percent of their boundary adjacent to developed parcels (for non-four-sided parcels). For purposes of this requirement, a parcel shall be considered developed if it includes any of the following: 30 percent or more of allowed coverage already existing on site or an approved but unbuilt project that proposes to meet this coverage standard.
- Properties included in a Center shall be less than ¼ mile from existing Commercial and Public Service uses.
- Properties included in a Center shall encourage and facilitate the use of existing or planned transit stops and transit systems.

Notes The Area Plan does not include any modifications to the Town Center boundaries.

I. CONFORMITY REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR AREA PLANS

1. Initiation of Area Planning Process by Lead Agency ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.1

Requirement The development of an Area Plan shall be initiated by a designated lead agency. The lead agency may be TRPA or a local, state, federal, or tribal government. There may be only one lead agency for each Area Plan.

Notes Washoe County, a local government, is serving as the lead agency for this Area Plan.

2. Initial Approval of Area Plan by Lead Agency ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.2

Requirement If the lead agency is not TRPA, then the Area Plan shall be approved by the lead agency prior to TRPA's review of the Area Plan for conformance with the Regional Plan under this section. In reviewing and approving an Area Plan, the lead agency shall follow its own review procedures for plan amendments. At a minimum, Area Plans shall be prepared in coordination with local residents, stakeholders, public agencies with jurisdictional authority within the proposed Area Plan boundaries, and TRPA staff.

If the lead agency is TRPA, the Area Plan shall require conformity approval under this section by TRPA only. No approval by any other government, such as a local government, shall be required.

Notes The Washoe County Planning Commission approved the Area Plan, Development Code, and Regulatory Zones at its February 4, 2020 meeting. The Board of County Commissioners completed their approvals on March 10, 2020 and January 26, 2021.

3. Review by Advisory Planning Commission ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.3

Requirement The TRPA Advisory Planning Commission shall review the proposed Area Plan and make recommendations to the TRPA Governing Board. The commission shall obtain and consider the recommendations and comments of the local government(s) and other responsible public agencies, as applicable. jurisdictional authority within the proposed Area Plan boundaries, and TRPA staff.

Notes The Area Plan will be scheduled for review by the Advisory Planning Commission upon completion of the local approval process.

4. Approval of Area Plan by TRPA ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.4

Requirement For Area Plans initiated and approved by a lead agency other than TRPA, the Area Plan shall be submitted to and reviewed by the TRPA Governing Board at a public hearing. Public comment shall be limited to issues raised by the public before the Advisory Planning Commission and issues raised by the Governing Board. The TRPA Governing Board shall make a finding that the Area Plan, including all zoning and development Codes that are part of the Area Plan, is consistent with and furthers the goals and policies of the Regional

Plan. This finding shall be referred to as a finding of conformance and shall be subject to the same voting requirements as approval of a Regional Plan amendment.

Notes The Area Plan will be scheduled for review by the Governing Board after local adoption and review by the Advisory Planning Commission. The Governing Board will need to find the Area Plan in conformance with the Regional Plan before it takes effect.

J. FINDINGS OF CONFORMANCE WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN

In making the general finding of conformance, the TRPA Governing Board shall make the general findings applicable to all amendments to the Regional Plan and Code set forth in Sections 4.5 and 4.6, and also the following specific review standards:

GENERAL REVIEW STANDARDS FOR ALL AREA PLANS

1. Zoning Designations ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.1

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall identify zoning designations, allowed land uses, and development standards throughout the plan area.

Notes The 23 existing Plan Area Statements and four existing Community Plans covering Washoe County have been carried over as 27 new regulatory zones. The Washoe County Development Code establishes permissible uses, density, and development standards in each of the regulatory zones.

2. Regional Plan Policies ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.2

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall be consistent with all applicable Regional Plan policies, including, but not limited to, the regional growth management system, development allocations, and coverage requirements.

Notes The Area Plan contains goals and policies that are largely in alignment with Regional Plan policies.

3. Regional Plan Land Use Map ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.3

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall either be consistent with the Regional Land Use Map or recommend and adopt amendments to the Regional Land Use Map as part of an integrated plan to comply with Regional Plan policies and provide threshold gain.

Notes The regulatory zones / districts are consistent with the Regional Plan land use map. Each zone corresponds with an established Regional Plan land use category.

4. Environmental Improvement Projects ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.4

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall recognize and support planned, new, or enhanced Environmental Improvement Projects. Area Plans may also recommend enhancements to planned, new, or enhanced Environmental Improvement Projects as part of an integrated plan to comply with Regional Plan Policies and provide threshold gain.

Notes The Area Plan recognizes and incorporates the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Planned environmental improvement projects are listed in Chapter 7.

5. Redevelopment ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall promote environmentally beneficial redevelopment and revitalization within town centers, regional centers and the High Density Tourist District.

Notes The Area Plan promotes redevelopment within Town Centers by incorporating the incentives established in the 2012 Regional Plan Update. Under the Area Plan, the three Town Centers in Washoe County will now be eligible for increased density, coverage, and height. This promotes compact development and aligns with the Regional Plan's land use and transportation strategies. Additionally, the proposal considers addition of new permissible uses to the Incline Village Commercial and Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zones to help broaden the range of uses.

6. Established Residential Areas ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.6

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall preserve the character of established residential areas outside of town centers, regional centers and the High Density Tourist District, while seeking opportunities for environmental improvements within residential areas.

Notes The Area Plan largely retains all existing use, density, and development standards for residential regulatory zones.

7. Stream Environment Zones ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.7

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall protect and direct development away from Stream Environment Zones and other sensitive areas, while seeking opportunities for environmental improvements within sensitive areas. Development may be allowed in disturbed Stream Environment zones within town centers, regional centers and the High-Density Tourist District only if allowed development reduces coverage and enhances natural systems within the Stream Environment Zone.

Notes The proposed Area Plan's overall approach is to incentivize redevelopment in existing Town Centers and to carry through existing protections of residential and conservation areas. Existing restrictions in the TRPA Code of Ordinances on development within Stream Environment Zones (SEZs) would continue to apply. The transfer of development rights

program further helps to encourage restoration of development in SEZs and transferring of those rights onto high-capability Town Center lands.

8. Alternative Transportation Facilities and Implementation ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.A.8

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall identify facilities and implementation measures to enhance pedestrian, bicycling and transit opportunities along with other opportunities to reduce automobile dependency.

Notes Proposed transportation facilities are shown in the Transportation Map at the end of Chapter 3. They are also listed on the project list in Chapter 3. Completion of these projects would result in a comprehensive 9.65-mile trail multi-use network throughout the community. It would also establish mobility hubs at Incline Village (proposed for the old elementary school) and South Incline (near Ponderosa Ranch). Additional mobility hubs would be established at Spooner Summit and Mount Rose to intercept visitors from out of the basin. The plan identifies transit service improvements in alignment with the Transit Master Plan, which largely relies on the mobility hub concept.

LOAD REDUCTION PLANS

9. Load Reduction Plans ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.B

Requirement TRPA shall utilize the load reduction plans for all registered catchments or TRPA default standards when there are no registered catchments, in the conformance review of Area Plans.

Notes As proposed, the area plan is consistent with Washoe County's Sediment Load Reduction Plan (SLRP). Chapter 4 of the area plan lists proposed water quality projects. In alignment with the SLRP, these projects focus on catchment areas that are targeted for sediment load reduction. Additionally, the county's program largely focuses on prioritizing installation of BMPs on private parcels.

ADDITIONAL REVIEW STANDARDS FOR TOWN CENTERS AND THE REGIONAL CENTER

10. Building and Site Design Standards ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.C.1

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall include building and site design standards that reflect the unique character of each area, respond to local design issues and consider ridgeline and viewshed protection.

Notes The Design Standards proposed as part of the Area Plan address building and site design in the area's four mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones. The standards largely implement the vision established in the Area Plan for these regulatory zones. The vision is one of mixed-use pedestrian-oriented town centers and creating a regional resort atmosphere at the Crystal Bay Tourist regulatory zone.

11. Alternative Transportation ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.C.2

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall promote walking, bicycling, transit use and shared parking in town centers and regional centers, which at a minimum shall include continuous sidewalks or other pedestrian paths and bicycle facilities along both sides of all highways within town centers and regional centers, and to other major activity centers.

Notes Please see the discussion in Section J.8*, Alternative Transportation Facilities and Implementation,* above.

12. Promoting Pedestrian Activity ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.C.3

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall use standards within town centers and regional centers addressing the form of development and requiring that projects promote pedestrian activity and transit use.

Notes The Design Standards that apply to the mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones, which include the three Town Centers, promote pedestrian activity through site design, building design, and transportation facility standards and guidelines. The permissible uses for these areas also promote an active, pedestrian-friendly environment.

13. Redevelopment Capacity ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.C.4

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall ensure adequate capacity for redevelopment and transfers of development rights into town centers and regional centers.

Notes The Area Plan considers existing, banked, and additional development rights in the Area Plan. Presently, additional Commercial Floor Area (CFA) allocations are only available in the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone (8,000 sqft) and outside of Community Plans (2,000 sqft). In order to ensure adequate commodities are available to promote Town Center development, Washoe County proposes to merge the existing five development rights pools into a single countywide pool. This would make Town Centers eligible to use these allocations.

As only 10,000 square feet of additional CFA is available, redevelopment will largely need to rely on other sources for development rights. These can include a combination of the following:

- Reuse of development rights that are already on the site.
- Transfer of development rights from another site, with the potential for bonus rights.
- Conversion of development rights (e.g. converting a TAU into 300 square feet of CFA).

14. Coverage Reduction and Stormwater Management ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.C.5

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall identify an integrated community strategy for coverage reduction and enhanced stormwater management.

Notes The proposed Area Plan includes general policies that promote coverage reduction and stormwater improvements. Additionally, a standard in Washoe County Code Section 110.220.40, Subsection 3, requires coverage reduction as part of any project on sites with over 70 percent existing coverage.

15. Threshold Gain ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.C.6

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall demonstrate that all development activity within Town Centers and the Regional Center will provide for or not interfere with Threshold gain, including but not limited to measurable improvements in water quality.

Notes The proposed Area Plan's overall strategy of redirecting development towards Town Centers and preserving the character of residential and conservation areas is consistent with the Regional Plan's approach to meeting and maintaining threshold standards. The Regional Plan relies heavily on the development and implementation of area plans in order to incentivize environmentally beneficial redevelopment. As projects redevelop, they will be required to comply with current design and BMP standards. This would result in direct improvements to scenic quality and water quality.

ADDITIONAL REVIEW STANDARDS FOR THE HIGH-DENSITY TOURIST DISTRICT

16. Building and Site Design ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.D.1

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall include building and site design standards that substantially enhance the appearance of existing buildings in the High Density Tourist District.

Notes The High-Density Tourist Core District is not located in Washoe County.

17. Alternative Transportation ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.D.2

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall provide pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities connecting the High-Density Tourist District with other regional attractions.

Notes The High-Density Tourist Core District is not located in Washoe County.

18. Threshold Gain ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.6.5.D.3

Requirement The submitted Area Plan shall demonstrate that all development activity within the High-Density Tourist District will provide or not interfere with

Threshold gain, including but not limited to measurable improvements in water quality. If necessary to achieve Threshold gain, off-site improvements may be additionally required.

Notes The High-Density Tourist Core District is not located in Washoe County.

K. AREA PLAN AMENDMENTS

1. Conformity Review for Amendments to an Area Plan ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.6.6

Requirement Following approval of an Area Plan, any subsequent amendment to a plan or ordinance contained within the approved Area Plan shall be reviewed by the Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board for conformity with the requirements of the Regional Plan. Public comment before the Governing Board shall be limited to consideration of issues raised before the Advisory Planning Commission and issues raised by the Governing Board. The Governing Board shall make the same findings as required for the conformity finding of the initial Area Plan, as provided in subsection 13.6.5; however, the scope of the APC and Governing Board's review shall be limited to determining the conformity of the specific amendment only. If the Governing Board finds that the amendment to the Area Plan does not conform to the Regional Plan, including after any changes made in response to TRPA comments, the amendment shall not become part of the approved Area Plan.

Notes The Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan is a new Area Plan, rather than an amendment to an existing Area Plan.

2. Conformity Review for Amendments Made by TRPA to the Regional Plan that Affect an Area Plan - Notice ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.6.7.A

Requirement TRPA shall provide lead agencies with reasonable notice of pending amendments that may affect Area Plans. TRPA also shall provide lead agencies with notice of Area Plan topics that may require amendment following adopted Regional Plan amendments pursuant to this section.

Notes The Area Plan is being reviewed for conformity with the Regional Plan in its current form. Future amendments to the Regional Plan may necessitate modifications to the Area Plan.

3. Conformity Review for Amendments Made by TRPA to the Regional Plan that Affect an Area Plan - Timing ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Citation 13.6.7.B

Requirement If TRPA approves an amendment to the Regional Plan that would also require amendment of an Area Plan to maintain conformity, the lead agency shall be given one year to amend the Area Plan to demonstrate conformity with the TRPA amendment. The Governing Board shall make the same findings as required for the conformity finding of the initial Area Plan, as provided in subsection 13.6.5; however, the scope of the Governing Board's review shall be limited to determining the conformity of only those amendments made by the lead agency to conform to the TRPA amendment. If the Governing Board finds that the other government fails to demonstrate conformity with the

TRPA amendment following the one-year deadline, then the Board shall identify the policies and/or zoning provisions in the Area Plan that are inconsistent and assume lead agency authority to amend those policies and provisions.

Notes The Area Plan is being reviewed for conformity with the Regional Plan in its current form. Future amendments to the Regional Plan may necessitate modifications to the Area Plan.

L. ADMINISTRATION

1. Effect of Finding of Conformance of Area Plan ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.6.8

Requirement By finding that an Area Plan conforms with the Regional Plan pursuant to the requirements of this chapter and upon adoption of an MOU pursuant to Section 13.7, the Area Plan shall serve as the standards and procedures for implementation of the Regional Plan. The standards and procedures within each Area Plan shall be considered and approved individually and shall not set precedent for other Area Plans.

Notes The Governing Board has not yet found the Area Plan to be in conformance with the Regional Plan.

2. Procedures for Adoption of Memorandum of Understanding ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.7

Requirement An Area Plan shall be consistent with the Procedures for Adoption of a Memorandum of Understanding.

Notes The memorandum of understanding has not yet been developed.

3. Monitoring, Certification, and Enforcement of an Area Plan ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.8

Requirement An Area Plan shall include notification, monitoring, annual review, and recertification procedures consistent with Code Section 13.8.

Notes Once found to be in conformance with the Regional Plan, TRPA will conduct monitoring, certification, and enforcement of the Area Plan pursuant to Code Section 13.8

4. Appeal Procedure ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A

Citation 13.9

Requirement The Area Plan shall include an appeal procedure consistent with Code Section 13.9.

Notes Appeals are addressed in Washoe County Code Section 110.220.435.

Attachment D

Required Findings

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR ADOPTION OF THE WASHOE COUNTY TAHOE AREA PLAN

Required Findings: The following Chapter 3, 4, and 13 findings must be made prior to adopting the WCTAP:

Chapter 3 Findings: The following finding must be made prior to adopting the WCTAP:

(1) Finding: The proposed Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

Rationale: Based on the completed Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), no significant environmental impacts have been identified as a result of the proposed area plan. The IEC was prepared to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the WCTAP and it tiers from and incorporates by reference specific analyses contained the Regional Plan Update (RPU) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), certified by the TRPA Governing Board on December 12, 2012.

The RPU EIS is a program-level environmental document that includes a regional cumulative scale analysis and framework of mitigation measures. The EIS provides a foundation for subsequent environmental review at an area plan level. Because the WCTAP is consistent with the Regional Plan, which was approved with a program-level EIS, the policies and objectives of the WCTAP are within the scope of the RPU EIS.

The IEC concludes that many potentially significant impacts are addressed by mitigation measures that were adopted as part of the RPU. All adopted mitigation measures required by the Regional Plan will be implemented as part of the WCTAP.

Subsection 13.3.1 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances states that all plans, policies, and regulations in the Regional Plan and the Code of Ordinances shall remain in effect unless superseded by the provisions of an area plan. As a result, existing baseline conditions for the purposes of the IEC reflect current 2020 conditions. These conditions include the following policy documents in effect for the Washoe County portion of the Tahoe Basin:

a. Regional Plan.
b. Regional Transportation Plan.
c. TRPA Code of Ordinances
d. Incline Village Commercial Community Plan
e. Incline Village Tourist Community Plan
f. Nevada North Stateline Community Plan
g. Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
h. The following Plan Area Statements:
    1. PAS 019 – Martis Peak

2. PAS 030 – Mount Rose
3. PAS 033 – Stateline Point
4. PAS 034 – Crystal Bay
5. PAS 035 – Crystal Bay Condominiums
6. PAS 036 – Incline Village #4 / Ponderosa
7. PAS 037 – Lakeview
8. PAS 038 – Wood Creek
9. PAS 039 – Incline Village #2
10. PAS 040 – Incline Village #1
11. PAS 041 – Incline Village #3
12. PAS 042 – Incline Village #5
13. PAS 043 – Chateau / Country Club
14. PAS 044 – Fairway
15. PAS 046 – Incline Village Residential
16. PAS 047 – Tunnel Creek
17. PAS 049 – Mill Creek
18. PAS 050 – Mt. Shadows
19. PAS 051 – Tyrolian Village
20. PAS 052 – Incline Ski
21. PAS 053 – Incline Lake
22. PAS 055 – East Shore
23. PAS 056 – Marlette Lake

The WCTAP largely carries through existing policy from the community plans and plan area statements. Only targeted changes are proposed. These include the following:

a. Consolidating, adding, deleting, and modifying existing goals and policies to eliminate obsolete language and respond to current conditions.
b. Adopting former community plan and plan area statement boundaries as new county regulatory zones.
c. Making modifications to permissible uses:
    1. Removing the following uses from the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone: food and beverage retail sales and outdoor amusements.
    2. Adding the following allowable uses, subject to special policies, in the Special Area of the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone: amusements and recreation services, business support services, animal husbandry.
    3. Adding the following allowable uses to Special Area #1 of the Incline Village Commercial regulatory zone: residential care and nursing and personal care.
    4. Making day use recreation an allowable, rather than special, use in the Fairway regulatory zone outside of the Special Area.
d. Implementing incentives for development within Town Centers including the following:
    1. Allowing additional height of up to 56 feet, where the development meets greenhouse gas reduction requirements.
    2. Allowing an increase in maximum multi-family residential density from 15 units per acre to 25 units per acre.

3. Allowing an increase in maximum hotel/motel and timeshare density from 15 units per acre to 40 units per acre, when more than 10 percent of units contain kitchens.
4. Increasing the maximum amount of transferred coverage for sites on high-capability lands to 70 percent.

e. Consolidating the local jurisdiction development rights pools for commercial floor area (CFA), tourist accommodation units (TAUs) and residential bonus units (RBUs) into a single countywide pool.
f. Requiring the following projects to meet a designated greenhouse gas reduction standard:
   1. New public buildings.
   2. Development outside of a Town Center that seeks an allocation of CFA or TAUs from Washoe County.
   3. Development within a Town Center that seeks to use the 56-foot maximum height standard.
g. Modifying locally adopted zoning and development standards, including the following:
   1. Providing an administrative approval process, rather than variance, for reduction of front setbacks on corner and steeply sloping lots.
   2. Allowing private garages to be constructed in the common parcel within the Tyrolian Village regulatory zone.

The IEC evaluated the adoption and implementation of the proposed WCTAP. The WCTAP will become part of the Regional Plan and will replace the four existing community plans and 23 existing plan area statements. The IEC considered replacement of these plans with the WCTAP and the potential environmental impacts associated with implementing the WCTAP over its 20-year plan horizon. The proposed land use amendments are consistent overall with the TRPA Conceptual Regional Land Use Map adopted as part of the RPU.

The IEC is a program-level document. No specific development projects are proposed at this time, nor were any specific projects analyzed with the IEC. All future projects within the WCTAP boundaries are subject to the project-specific environmental review and permitting process as prescribed in the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Project-level environmental documents will require identification of, and mitigation for, any potentially significant environmental effects.

The IEC assessed potential for impacts to the affected physical environment that may result from implementation of the WCTAP. Based on review of the evidence, the analysis and conclusion in the IS/IEC determined the implementation of the WCTAP will not have a significant impact on the environment beyond what was evaluated in the RPU EIS. All potential significant impacts will be mitigated or addressed through implementation of the RPU.

Chapter 4 Findings: The following finding must be made prior to adopting the WCTAP:

(1) Finding: The proposed Area Plan is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Community Plan / Plan Area Statements, the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and other TRPA plans and programs.

Rationale: Regional Plan Policy LU-4.6 encourages local jurisdictions to develop area plans that improve upon existing plan area statements and community plans. These area plans are intended to be more responsive to the unique needs and opportunities of the various communities in the Tahoe Region. The WCTAP includes all required elements identified in Regional Plan Policies LU-4.8, LU-4.9, and LU-4.10. This is evidenced in the Conformance Review Checklist (Attachment F).

The WCTAP was prepared in conformance with the substantive and procedural requirements of the Regional Plan, as implemented through Chapter 13, *Area Plans*, of the Code of Ordinances. The WCTAP contains all required contents in an area plan and is consistent with the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan and TRPA Code of Ordinance, as shown in the Conformance Review Checklist (Attachment C) and the IEC. When implemented, the WCTAP will have a beneficial impact on the Regional Plan's ability to achieve and maintain thresholds.

Pursuant to Code Section 4.4.2, TRPA considers, as background for making the findings required by Subparagraphs A through C of Subsection 4.4.1, the proposed project's effects on the following:

- Compliance measures, which are the implementation actions that are necessary to achieve and maintain thresholds.
- Supplemental compliance measures, which are actions that TRPA could implement if the compliance measures are inadequate to achieve and maintain thresholds.
- Threshold indicators, which are adopted measurable physical phenomena that relate to the status of threshold attainment or maintenance.
- Other factors, such as indirect measures of threshold status and funding levels for Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects.
- Interim and target dates for threshold achievement.

TRPA identifies and reports on threshold compliance measures, indicators, factors, and targets in the Threshold Evaluation Reports, which are prepared pursuant to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapter 16, *Regional Plan and Environmental Threshold Review*.

TRPA relies upon a plan's accompanying environmental documentation, staff's professional analysis, and prior plan level documentation, including findings and EISs, to reach the fundamental conclusions regarding the project's consistency with the Regional Plan and thresholds. A project that is consistent with all aspects of the Regional Plan and that does not adversely affect any threshold is, by

definition, consistent with compliance measures, indicators, and targets. In order to increase its analytical transparency, TRPA has prepared worksheets related specifically to the Subsection 4.4.2 considerations. These worksheets identify the E compliance and supplemental compliance measures, the 151 indicators and additional factors, and interim and final targets.

Based on the IEC, the RPU EIS, and the RPU and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) findings made by the TRPA Governing Board, the Section 4.4.2 staff analysis contained in Attachment E, and using applicable measurement standards consistent with the available information, the WCTAP will not adversely affect applicable compliance and supplemental compliance measures, indicators, additional factors, and attainment of targets by the dates identified in the 2015 Threshold Evaluation. The WCTAP incorporates and/or implements relevant compliance measures, and with the implementation of the measures, future development that could occur under the WCTAP would not result in adverse effects. With respect to some measures, the anticipated effects would be positive.

TRPA anticipates that implementation of the WCTAP will accelerate threshold gains as demonstrated below. Because the principal beneficial impacts of WCTAP implementation depend upon the number and size of redevelopment projects, the specific extent and timing of beneficial effects cannot be determined at this time. However, pursuant to Chapter 13, *Area Plans*, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, TRPA will monitor all development projects within the WCTAP through quarterly and annual compliance reports. These reports will be presented to the Governing Board annually for area plan recertification and used every four years to evaluate the status and trends related to thresholds.

Subparagraph 4.4.2.B also requires TRPA to disclose the impact of the proposed plan on its cumulative accounting on units of use (e.g. residential allocations, commercial floor area, etc.). The WCTAP does not affect the overall cumulative accounting of units of use, as no additional residential, commercial, tourist, or recreation allocations are proposed or allocated as part of this Regional Plan amendment. The area plan, would, however, merge five separate development rights pools into a single pool. This change furthers compliance with the Regional Plan by enabling additional commercial floor area currently available in Washoe County development rights pools to be used within the designated Town Centers, where no additional commercial floor area is currently available. For specific development projects within the WCTAP, accounting for units of use, resource utilization, and threshold attainment will occur as part of the review and approval process.

Similarly, Subparagraph 4.4.2.C requires TRPA to confirm whether the proposed plan is within the remaining capacity for development (e.g. water supply, sewage treatment capacity, etc.) identified in the environmental documentation for the Regional Plan. The WCTAP does not affect the amount of the remaining capacities available, as identified and discussed in the RPU EIS. The WCTAP does not allocate capacity or authorize any particular development. To the extent the

WCTAP enables the use of redevelopment incentives, those incentives are within the scope of the incentives analyzed by the RPU EIS.

TRPA therefore finds that the WCTAP is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable goals and policies, community plans, plan area statements, the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and other TRPA plans and programs.

(2) Finding: The proposed ordinance will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

Rationale: As demonstrated in the IEC, no significant environmental effects were identified as a result of the proposed WCTAP. The IEC did not find that any thresholds would be adversely affected or exceeded. As found above, the propose darea plan is consistent with and will help to implement the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan.

TRPA has reviewed the proposed WCTAP against the 222 compliance measures and supplemental compliance measures, the 151 indicators and additional factors that measure threshold progress, and threshold target and interim attainment dates. The WCTAP will not adversely affect applicable compliance measures, and target dates as identified in the 2015 Threshold Evaluation indicator summaries. TRPA anticipates that implementation of the WCTAP will accelerate threshold gains as demonstrated below. Because the principal beneficial impacts of the WCTAP depend upon the number and size of the redevelopment projects, the specific extent and timing of effects cannot be determined at this time. However, pursuant to Chapter 13, *Area Plans*, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, TRPA will monitor all development projects within the WCTAP through quarterly and annual reports. These reports will then be used to evaluate the status and trend of thresholds every four years.

The WCTAP does not affect the overall cumulative accounting of units of use as no additional residential, commercial, tourist, or recreation allocations are proposed or allocated as part of this Regional Plan amendment. The area plan, would, however, merge five separate development rights pools into a single pool. This change furthers compliance with the Regional Plan by enabling additional commercial floor area currently available in Washoe County development rights pools to be used within the designated Town Centers, where no additional commercial floor area is currently available. Accounting for units of use, resource utilization, and threshold attainment will occur as part of the review and approval process for individual projects.

The WCTAP does not affect the amount of the remaining capacity available, as the remaining capacity for water supply sewage collection and treatment, recreation, and vehicle miles travelled have been identified and evaluated in the RPU EIS. Therefore, TRPA finds that the WCTAP will not cause thresholds to be exceeded.

(3) Finding: Wherever federal, state, or local air and water quality standards apply for the Region, the strictest standards shall be attained, maintained, or exceeded pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

Rationale: No applicable federal, state, or local air or water quality standard will be exceeded by adoption of the WCTAP, based upon the following documents:

- WCTAP IEC
- RPU EIS
- 2015 Threshold Evaluation Report

The proposed area plan does not affect or change the federal, state, or local air or water quality standards applicable for the Region. Projects developed under the WCTAP will meet the strictest applicable air quality standards and implement water quality improvements consistent with TRPA Best Management Practices (BMPs) requirements and the Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and the Washoe County Sediment Load Reduction Plan (SLRP). Federal, state, and local air and water quality standards remain applicable for all parcels in the WCTAP, thus ensuring environmental standards will be achieved or maintained pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

(4) Finding: The Regional Plan and all of its elements, as amended, achieve and maintain the thresholds.

Rationale: **A. INTRODUCTION**

In 1980, Congress amended the Compact to accelerate the pace of environmental progress in the Tahoe Region by tasking TRPA with adopting a regional plan and implementing regulations that protect the unique national treasure that is Lake Tahoe. First Article V(b) requires that TRPA, in collaboration with Tahoe's other regulatory agencies adopt "environmental threshold carrying capacities" establishing goals for a wide array of environmental criteria including water quality, air quality, and wildlife. Second, Article V(c) directs TRPA to adopt a "regional plan" that "achieves and maintains" the thresholds, and to "continuously review and maintain" implementation of the plan.

The 1980 Compact inaugurated an era of establishing and enforcing rigorous controls on new development. In 1982, TRPA adopted the necessary thresholds for the Tahoe Region. These thresholds are a mix of both long- and short-term goals for the Tahoe Region. The region was "in attainment" of a number of these thresholds shortly after the adoption of the Regional Plan and remains in attainment today. Other thresholds address more intractable problems. For example, TRPA established numeric water quality standards that, even under best-case conditions could not be attained for decades. *See, e.g., League to Save Lake Tahoe v. Tahoe Reg'l Planning Agency,* 739 F. Supp. 2d 1260, 1265 (E. D. Cal. 2010).

The second phase in the process was establishing a regional plan that, when implemented through rules and regulations, would ultimately "achieve and

maintain" the thresholds over time. In 1987, following years of negotiation and litigation, TRPA adopted its Regional Plan. The 1987 Regional Plan employed a three-pronged approach to achieved and maintain the adopted environmental thresholds. First, the plan established a ceiling on development in Tahoe and restricted the placement, timing, and extent of new development. Second, the plan sough to prevent new harm to the environment as well as repair the environmental damage caused by existing development, particularly for projects that pre-dated TRPA's existence (i.e. correcting the "sins of the past). To this end, the plan created incentives to redevelop urbanized sites under more protective regulations and to transfer development out of sensitive areas that would then be restored. Third, TRPA adopted a capital investment program that was largely, but not exclusively, publicly funded to achieved and maintain thresholds by improving infrastructure and repairing environmental damage. In 1997, TRPA replaced this program with the "Environmental Improvement Program" ("EIP"). In subsequent years, TRPA generated investments of well over $1 billion in public and private money to restore ecosystems and improve infrastructure under the EIP. Recent litigation confirmed that the Regional Plan as established in 1987 and subsequently amended over time will achieve and maintain the adopted environmental thresholds. *See Sierra Club v. Tahoe Reg'l Planning Agency,* 916 F. Supp. 2d 1098 (E. D. Cal. 2013) [Homewood Litigation].

Regional Plan Update Process

Even though implementation of the 1987 Regional Plan would achieve and maintain the thresholds, in 2004 TRPA began public outreach and analysis of the latest science and monitoring results to identify priority areas in which the Regional Plan could be comprehensively strengthened to accelerate the rate of threshold attainment. TRPA's policymakers realized that the challenges facing the Region differ from those confronting the agency when it adopted its original Regional Plan in 1987. Uncontrolled new growth that had been the primary threat decades earlier had been brought into check by the strict growth limitations in the 1987 Regional Plan. Today's problems differed, resulting from the continuing deterioration and lack of upgrades to existing "legacy" development. In essence, to make the greatest environmental difference, the Tahoe Region needed to fix what was already in place. In addition, TRPA realized some existing land use controls could be improved to remove barriers to redevelopment that would address ongoing environmental degradation caused by sub-standard development constructed before TRPA had an adopted Regional Plan or even came into existence. Land use regulations and public and private investment remain essential to attaining the thresholds for Lake Tahoe.

Furthermore, TRPA recognized that the social and economic fabric of the Tahoe Region could not support the level of environmental investment needed. The economic foundation of gaming had fallen away. Additionally, the level of environmental investment needed could not be supported solely by an enclave of second homes for the wealthy. Businesses and the tourism sector were faltering. Affordable housing and year-round jobs were scarce. Local schools were closing, and unemployment was unusually high. In light of these realities, TRPA sponsored an ongoing outreach program to obtain input on how to advance

TRPA's environmental goals. Between 2004 and 2010, TRPA conducted over 100 public meetings, workshops, and additional outreach. More than 5,000 people provided input regarding their "vision" for TRPA's updated Regional Plan. Based on this input, TRPA identified a number of priorities to be addressed by the updated Regional Plan, including:

1. Accelerating water quality restoration and other ecological benefits by supporting environmental redevelopment opportunities and EIP investments.
2. Changing land use patterns by focusing development in compact, walkable communities with increased alternative transportation options.
3. Transitioning to more permitting by local government to create "one-stop" and "one permit" for small to medium sized projects where local governments wish to assume these duties.

On December 12, 2012, TRPA's nine-year effort culminated with the approval of the Regional Plan Update.

Regional Plan Update Amendments

The Regional Plan Update ("RPU") uses multiple strategies targeting environmental improvements to accelerate achieving and maintaining threshold standards in the Region. First, the RPU maintains both regulatory and implementation programs that have proven effective in protecting Lake Tahoe's environment. TRPA's regional growth control regulatory system, strict environmental development standards, and inter-agency partnerships for capital investment and implementation (e.g. EIP) remain in place.

Second, the RPU promotes sensitive land restoration, redevelopment, and increased availability of multi-modal transportation facilities. The implementation of the RPU will facilitate transferring existing development from outlying environmentally sensitive areas into existing urbanized town centers. The RPU provides incentives to that private capital can be deployed to speed this transformation.

Third, the RPU authorized the area plan process for communities and land management agencies in the Tahoe Region in order to eliminate duplicative and unpredictable land use regulations that deterred private improvement projects. Area plans, created pursuant to Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, also allow TRPA and local, state, federal, and tribal governments to expand the types of projects for which local, state, federal, and tribal governmental apply TRPA rules to proposed projects within the Tahoe Region. After approval of an area plan by TRPA this process allows a single government entity to review, permit, and inspect projects in their jurisdiction. All project approvals delegated to other government entities may be appealed to TRPA for final decision. In addition the performance of any government receiving delegated authority will be monitored quarterly and audited annually to ensure proper application of TRPA rules and regulations.

As noted above, a variety of strategies in the Regional Plan will work together to accelerate needed environmental gains in the categories where threshold benefits are most needed – water quality, restoration of sensitive lands, scenic quality advances in developed roadway units, and efforts to continue maintenance and attainment of air quality standards. Area plans that include "Centers" play a key role in the Regional Plan's overall strategy by activating environmental redevelopment incentives (e.g. increases in density and height) that also provide the receiving capacity for transfers of units from sensitive lands. The next section of this finding establishes how the Washoe County's Tahoe Area Plan fulfills the role anticipated by the RPU and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the expected threshold gain resulting from its implementation.

B. WASHOE COUNTY TAHOE AREA PLAN AND THRESHOLD GAIN

The WCTAP accelerates threshold gain including water quality restoration and other ecological benefits by supporting environmental redevelopment opportunities and Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) investments. The WCTAP will help to accelerate environmental redevelopment within existing developed areas by allowing increased density and height provisions within areas appropriate to be included in Town Centers that serve as an incentive for private investment in redevelopment projects. These redevelopment incentives are intended to increase the rate of redevelopment and will likewise increase the rate of threshold gain by accelerating the application of controls designed to enhance water quality, air quality, soil conservation, scenic quality, and recreational improvements to projects that wouldn't otherwise be redeveloped absent the WCTAP's provisions.

The WCTAP's establishes standards in Article 220 ("Tahoe Modifiers") and Article 220.1 ("Design Standards and Guidelines") of the Washoe County Development Code. These standards ensure pedestrian-friendly site planning and high-quality building design. Implementation of these standards as projects redevelop would result in benefits to multiple threshold areas, as described in more specific detail below.

1. Water Quality

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that the trend in reduced lake clarity has been slowed. The continued improvement is a strong indication that the actions of partners in the Region are contributing to improved clarity and helping TRPA attain one of its signature goals.

An accelerated rate of redevelopment within the WCTAP's Town Centers will result in accelerated water quality benefits. Each redevelopment project is required to comply with strict development standards including water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) and coverage mitigation requirements and will provide additional opportunities for implementing area-wide water quality systems.

2. Air Quality

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that the majority of air quality standards are in attainment and observed change suggests that conditions are improving or stable. Actions implemented to improve air quality in the Lake Tahoe Region occur at the national, state, and regional scale. The US Environmental protection Agency and state agencies, such as the California Air Resources Board, have established vehicle tail-pipe emission standards and industrial air pollution standards. These actions have resulted in substantial reductions in the emissions of harmful pollutants at the statewide level and national scales and likely have contributed to improvement in air quality at Lake Tahoe. At a regional scale, TRPA has established ordinances and policies to encourage alternative modes of transportation and to reduce vehicle idling by prohibiting the creation of new drive-through window establishments.

Facilitating projects with the approved area plans is an integral component in implementing regional air quality strategies and improvements at a community level. (TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies: Chapter 2, *Land Use*). Because the land use and transportation strategies identified in the WCTAP lead to implementation of the Regional Plan, they directly contribute to achieving and maintaining the Air Quality threshold.

One of the main objectives of the WCTAP is to encourage the redevelopment of the existing built environment within the three designated Town Centers and to provide access to recreational opportunities from walking and bike paths and improve access to transit. Replacing older buildings in Town Centers with newer, more energy-efficient buildings that take advantage of incentives offered in the area plan (e.g. additional height, cost-free allocation of commercial floor area, etc.) will also help to improve air quality and ensure the attainment of air quality standards.

TRPA's 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), *Linking Tahoe*, includes an analysis of its conformity with the California State Implementation Plan to ensure that the RTP remains consistent with state and local air quality planning work to achieve and/or maintain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). The proposed amendment does not propose substantial changes to land use assumptions and the WCTAP would continue to promote higher density residential uses within one-quarter mile of transit.

As discussed in the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) prepared for the area plan, no significant increase in daily vehicle trips is expected to occur due to similar vehicle use patterns between the allowed uses and densities in WCTAP and the corresponding 23 plan area statements and four community plans. As such, no increase in vehicle trip generation over what was estimated for Regional Plan buildout by the TRPA in the RPU EIS is anticipated.

3. Soil Conservation

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found negligible change in the total impervious cover in the Region over the prior five years and the majority of soil conservation

standards are in attainment. While the permitting process of partners has been effective in focusing development on less-sensitive lands and encouraging removal of impervious cover from sensitive areas, there is still much work to be done. Plans for large-scale SEZ restoration, recent improvements in the development rights program, and implementation of the area plans will continue to help achieve SEZ restoration goals.

The WCTAP does not propose an alternative comprehensive coverage management system as defined in Subparagraph 13.5.3.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Future development projects in the WCTAP would be subject to permitting by the county and/or TRPA, and permit applicants would be required to demonstrate that proposed compaction and land coverage would be within the limits allowed in Chapters 30 and 53 of the Code.

As described in the Water Quality section (Section 1, above), the WCTAP will help to retain soils on-site through implementation of BMPs. Additionally, the transfer of development program will enable transfer of coverage from sensitive lands onto high-capability lands in Town Centers. Therefore, the WCTAP will help to accelerate threshold gain through soil conservation.

4. Scenic Quality

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that scenic gains were achieved in developed areas along roadways and scenic resources along the lake's shoreline, the areas most in need of additional scenic improvement. Overall 93 percent of the evaluate scenic resource units met the threshold standards and no decline in scenic quality was documented in any indicator category.

Future development proposed within the WCTAP will be required to comply with the following WCTAP goals, policies, and implementing actions that contribute towards attainment of scenic thresholds:

Goal LU6

Strengthen economic activity in Incline Village and Crystal Bay by creating pedestrian-friendly environments in mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones with upgraded aesthetics, architecture, and landscaping. Reduce the visual prominence of parking lots and asphalt.

- Policy LU6-1 – Traditional Downtown
- Policy LU6-2 – New Tahoe Image
- Policy LU6-3 – Screening
- Policy LU6-4 – Utilities
- Policy LU6-5 – Crystal Bay Tourist Regulatory Zone
- Policy LU6-6 – Ponderosa Ranch Regulatory Zone
- Policy LU6-7 – Colorful Landscaping
- Action LU-7 – Design Standards and Guidelines Revisions

Goal C5
Improve and protect the scenic quality and tranquility of the planning area. Protect and enhance scenic views and vistas from public areas. Ensure noise levels remain within the established thresholds.

- Policy C5-1 – Design Standards and Guidelines
- Policy C5-2 – Scenic Quality Improvement
- Policy C5-3 – Restrict Landscape Modification
- Policy C5-4 – Scenic Quality of Entrypoints
- Policy C5-5 – Highway 28 East Shore Corridor
- Action C-6 – Overhead and Above-Ground Utilities
- Action C-7 – Crystal Bay Condominiums Screening
- Action C-8 – Community Information Signage
- Action C-9 – Sign Regulation Enforcement

5. Vegetation

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that vegetation in the Region continues to recover from the impacts of legacy land use. The majority of vegetation standards that are not currently in attainment relate to common vegetation in the Region. This finding is consistent with those of past threshold evaluations. As the landscape naturally recovers from the impacts of historic logging, grazing, and ground disturbance activities over the course of the century, many of the standards are expected to be attained.

The plan area is partially developed, with native vegetation on the undeveloped portions of the parcels. The proposed WCTAP would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to native vegetation protection during construction. Consistent with existing standards, future development would be required to comply with Section 33.6, *Vegetation Protection During Construction*, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Protective requirements include installation of temporary construction fencing, standards for tree removal and tree protection, standards for soil and vegetation protection, and revegetation of disturbed areas.

Adoption of the WCTAP would not result in tree or vegetation removal. Future projects within the WCTAP would be subject to project-level environmental review. Removal of any native, live, dead, or dying trees would be required to be consistent with Chapter 61, *Vegetation and Forest Health*, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

6. Recreation

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that land acquisition programs and the Lake Tahoe EIP have contributed to improved access and visitor and resident satisfaction with the quality and spectrum of recreational opportunities. Partner agencies have improved existing recreation facilities and created new ones, including providing additional access to lake Tahoe, hiking trailheads, and bicycle trails. Today's emerging concerns are transportation access to recreation sites and maintaining quality recreation experiences as demand grows. These

concerns may require the Region to revisit policies and goals for the recreation threshold standards.

The WCTAP contains numerous recreational opportunities within its boundaries, as described in Chapter 5, *Recreation* of the area plan. Popular recreational destinations within the WCTAP include Sand Harbor (part of Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park), the East Shore Multi-Use Trail, the Incline Flume Trail, the Mountain and Championship Golf Courses, Diamond Peak Ski Resort, and the two private beaches operated by the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID). The WCTAP includes goals and policies regarding maintaining, improving, and expanding recreational facilities. Recreation access is also enhanced through the construction of sidewalks and bike paths and by improving transit services. Development proposed within the WCTAP would be required to comply with applicable area plan policies related to improving and enhancing access to these recreational opportunities.

7. Fisheries

While the 2015 Threshold Evaluation found standards for fisheries to generally be in attainment, the standards focus on physical habitat requirements that may not reflect the status of native fish populations. Recent population surveys in Lake Tahoe suggest significant declines in native fish species in parts of the nearshore. Declines are likely the result of impacts from the presence of aquatic invasive species in the lake. While efforts to prevent new invasive species from entering the lake have been successful, mitigating the impact of previously introduced existing invasive species remains a high-priority challenge. Invasive species control projects are guided by a science-based implementation plan. Ensuring native fish can persist in the Region and the restoration of the historic trophic structure to the lake will likely require partners to explore novel methods to control invasive species and abate the pressure they are placing on native species. Climate-change-driven shifts in the timing and form of precipitation in the Region pose a longer-term threat to native fish that may need to be monitored.

BMPs required for project development would improve water quality and thus could contribute to improved riparian and lake conditions in receiving water bodies. The WCTAP will not alter the Resource Management and Protection regulations in Chapter 60 through 68 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Chapter 63, *Fish Resources*, includes provisions to ensure the projection of fish habitat and provide for the enhancement of degraded habitat. Development within the WCTAP could benefit the Fisheries Threshold through goals and policies aimed at restoration of SEZs and implementation of BMPs.

8. Wildlife

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that 12 of the 16 wildlife standards are in attainment. Over 50 percent of the land area in the Tahoe Region is designated for protection of listed special-status species. Populations of special interest species are either stable or increasing.

Future redevelopment projects in the WCTAP would be subject to project-level environmental review and permitting. At that time these projects would be required to demonstrate compliance with all federal, state, local, and TRPA regulations pertaining to the protection of animal species. (Section 62.4 of the TRPA Code). At a project level, potential effects on animal species would be determined based on the species' distribution and known occurrences relative to the project area and the presence of suitable habitat for the species in or near the project area. TRPA's existing policies and code provisions address potential impacts to special-status species through site-specific environmental review, development and implementation of project-specific measure to minimize or avoid impacts through the design process, and compensatory or other mitigation for any adverse effects on special-status species as a condition of project approval (Subsection 61.3.6 and Section 62.4 of the TRPA Code).

Implementation of the proposed WCTAP would not result in the reduction in the number of any unique, rare, or endangered species of animals, including waterfowl. Future redevelopment projects would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting at which time they would be require to demonstrate compliance with all federal, state, and TRPA regulations in Chapters 62, *Wildlife Resources*, and 63, *Fish Resources*, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. While the WCTAP allows for some alterations in land use, density, and heights, it does not propose specific new development or amendments that threaten protection of listed species or their habitat, and do not affect policies that protect biological resources.

9. Noise

The 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that ambient noise level in seven of nine land use categories are in attainment with standards. However, because of proximity of existing development to roadways, just two of seven transportation corridors are in attainment with ambient targets. Due to insufficient data, status determinations were not possible for nearly half of the single-event noise standards. Limited noise monitoring resources were prioritized towards collecting more robust information to analyze ambient noise standards, which are more conducive to influential management actions than are single-event sources. TRPA continues to update and evaluate its noise monitoring program to ensure standards are protective and realistically achievable.

The proposed WCTAP maintains existing Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) standards contained in the existing 23 plan area statements and four community plans. Therefore, an increase in CNEL would not occur as a result of the area plan.

Code of Ordinances Subsection 68.8.3 requires that all substantial transportation project in transportation corridors that are not in attainment of adopted CNEL standards to incorporate mitigating design features to achieve adopted standards. As documented in the IEC, the WCTAP would result in a small increase in vehicle travel and traffic volumes on roadways; however, the potential increase

in traffic would not result in a noticeable increase in traffic noise, particularly given the size of the amendment area and the presence of existing transit services, which would reduce individual vehicle trips associated with new development. A noticeable increase in traffic noise (i.e. 3 dB) requires a doubling of traffic in the measurement area and the potential increase in vehicle trips would be a very small percentage above the existing baseline; therefore, no noticeable increase in traffic-related noise would occur as a result of the WCTAP.

C. CONCLUSION

TRPA finds the Regional Plan and all of its elements, as amended by adopting the proposed WCTAP, achieves and maintains the thresholds, based upon the following:

- WCTAP IEC
- RPU EIS
- RTP Initial Study (IS) / Negative Declaration (ND) / IEC
- Findings for the adoption of the RPU

As described above in further detail, the WCTAP actively promotes threshold achievement and maintenance by, inter alia:

1. incentivizing environmentally beneficial redevelopment;
2. requiring the installation of BMP improvements for all projects in the area plan;
3. requiring conformance with the Development Code and Design Standards and Guidelines, as applicable, which will result in improvements to scenic quality and water quality.
4. facilitating multi-use development in proximity to alternative modes of transportation in order to reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT); and
5. incorporating projects identified in the county's Sediment Load Reduction Plan (SLRP) to guarantee the assigned reductions necessary to meet water quality objectives.

In addition, as found in Chapter 4, Findings 1 through 3 and the Chapter 13 findings, no element of the WCTAP interferes with the efficacy of any of the other elements of the Regional Plan. Thus, the Regional Plan, as amended through the adoption of the WCTAP, will continue to achieve and maintain thresholds.

Chapter 13 Findings: The following finding must be made prior to adopting the WCTAP:

(1) Finding: The proposed area plan, including all zoning and development codes that are part of the area plan, is consistent with and furthers the goals and policies of the Regional Plan.

Rationale: Regional Plan Policy LU-4.6 encourages development of area plans that supersede existing plan area statements and community plans or other TRPA regulations. This process allows area plans to be responsible to the unique needs and opportunities of communities. Overall, the proposed WCTAP land use map is

consistent with the TRPA Conceptual Regional Land Use Map adopted as part of the 2012 Regional Plan. The WCTAP includes policies and standards to address all applicable requirements in Chapter 13, *Area Plans* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, as indicated below.

(2) Finding: The WCTAP identifies all zoning designations, allowed land uses, and development standards throughout the area plan.

Rationale: The WCTAP establishes 27 regulatory zoning districts, which are based upon the boundaries of the former plan area statements (23) and community plans (4). The development code component sets the permissible uses and maximum densities for each of these zoning districts. The development code includes certain design standards. Additionally, a separate set of design standards and guidelines cover the four designated mixed-use and tourist zones. All regulations in the TRPA Code of Ordinance will continue to remain in effect unless superseded by the provisions of the WCTAP.

(3) Finding: The WCTAP is consistent with all applicable Regional Plan Policies, including but not limited to the regional growth management system, development allocations, and coverage requirements.

Rationale: The WCTAP is consistent with all Regional Plan Policies as shown in the Conformance Review Checklist (Attachment C). The WCTAP does not propose any additional growth, allocations, or coverage beyond what was already anticipated for and analyzed by the Regional Plan Update.

(4) Finding: The WCTAP demonstrates consistency with the Conceptual Regional Land Use Map.

Rationale: Washoe County is proposing to adopt the land use categories and boundaries as shown in the Conceptual Regional Land Use Map as its official Master Plan land use map. As a result, the proposed land use map is identical to the Conceptual Regional Land Use Map.

(5) Finding: The WCTAP recognizes and supports planned, new, or enhanced Environmental Improvement Projects as part of an integrated plan to comply with Regional Plan Policies and provide Threshold gain.

Rationale: Chapter 4, *Conservation*, of the WCTAP identifies currently proposed EIP projects and includes the following goals, policies, and implementing actions that support future EIP projects:

> *Action C-1 – Environmental Improvement Program*
> Actively participate in the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) and coordinate with other agencies to identify and secure funding for environmental improvement projects.

Goal C4
Actively protect and restore the natural, scenic, and cultural resources of the planning area in a manner consistent with the Regional Plan.

- Policy C4-1 – Incentivize Environmental Improvements
- Policy C4-2 – Capital Improvement Programming
- Policy C4-3 – Partnerships and Facilitation

Goal IM1
Pursue diverse funding and financing opportunities to complete needed improvements.

- Action IM-1 – Funding and Financing

Goal IM2
Establish and sustain effective cooperation among all levels of government, jurisdictions, and stakeholders to provide a comprehensive, integrated transportation and recreation system within the plan area.

- Action IM-2 – Seek Partnerships
- Action IM-3 – Public Land Management
- Action IM-4 – Transportation Planning
- Action IM-5 – Other Projects with Environmental Benefits

(6) Finding: The WCTAP promotes environmentally beneficial redevelopment and revitalization within Centers.

Rationale: The WCTAP promotes environmentally beneficial redevelopment and revitalization of the three designated Town Centers by encouraging transfers of coverage and development rights from sensitive lands. The plan further promotes redevelopment by providing Regional Plan incentives which may remove potential barriers to redevelopment. These incentives include the following:

- The ability to qualify for a maximum height of 56 feet.
- The ability to transfer additional coverage up to 70 percent of a site's area.
- Allowing additional residential density up to 25 units per acre.
- Allowing all tourist accommodation uses at 40 units per acre.

Beyond these incentives, the county plans to promote Town Center redevelopment by taking the following additional actions:

- Allowing projects in Town Centers to use additional commercial floor area allocations that are presently reserved for areas outside of the Town Centers.
- Setting a substitute density standard of 40 persons per acre for residential care and nursing and personal care uses.

As the plan is implemented, the county has further committed to identifying barriers and amending the plan to remove barriers (See Policy LU7-1, *Barriers to Redevelopment*).

(7) Finding: The WCTAP preserves the character of established residential areas outside of Centers, while seeking opportunities for environmental improvements within residential areas.

Rationale: The WCTAP includes 16 residential-designated regulatory zones. The plan preserves the character of residential areas by carrying through all existing plan area statement permissible use standards, density standards, and special policies into the new regulatory zones. Only one substantive change is proposed: changing "Recreation – Day Use" from a special ("S") use to an allowable ("A") use in the Fairway regulatory zone.

To ensure that future amendments also preserve the integrity of residential neighborhoods, the plan also includes the following policies:

Policy LU8-3 – Community Character
Amendments to land use classifications, regulatory zones, or implementing documents should not significantly alter the historical land use pattern and desired community character within the planning area.

Policy LU8-6 – Amendments Affecting Residential Regulatory Zones
Residential zoning districts should provide complementary civic and minimal commercial uses. Residential zoning districts should only be amended to further strengthen their residential character or provide environmental improvement.

(8) Finding: The WCTAP protects and directs development away from Stream Environment Zones and other sensitive areas, while seeking opportunities for environmental improvements within sensitive areas. Development in disturbed Stream Environment Zones within Centers may only be allowed if it reduces coverage and enhances natural systems.

Rationale: The plan continues to protect and direct development away from SEZs and other sensitive areas by enabling the transfer of development rights and coverage into Town Centers. Except where substitute standards are proposed, TRPA Code of Ordinances standards restricting development within SEZs would continue to apply. Additionally, the WCTAP includes the following goals, policies, and actions that promote preservation of sensitive lands:

Policy C2-2 – Coverage Reduction
Pursue opportunities for coverage reduction in all public and private redevelopment projects, with a priority towards low-capability lands. The Incline Village 5 regulatory zone is a high priority for land coverage retirement and restoration.

Policy C2-5 – Restoration of Disturbed Lands
Restoration of disturbed lands and mitigation of drainage and slope stabilization issues should be pursued. The Tunnel Creek regulatory zone is a high priority for restoring disturbed lands.

Policy C2- 6 – Shorezone and Stream Environment Zones
Restoration of the shorezone, stream environment zones, and fisheries should be encouraged. Prioritize restoration projects that have multiple benefits (e.g. water quality, fisheries, vegetation, etc.).

Policy C5-3 – Restrict Landscape Modification
Explore the establishment of codes to further restrict the unnecessary removal or alteration of trees, boulders, and natural landscape materials, except as may be required for health, safety, or welfare.

(9) Finding: TRPA has utilized the load reduction plans for all registered catchments, or TRPA default standards when there are no registered catchments, in the conformance review of the WCTAP.

Rationale: The Washoe County Sediment Load Reduction Plan (SLRP) was consulted in the preparation and review of the WCTAP. Consistent with the provisions of the SLRP and the EIP, the area plan includes a list of currently proposed water quality projects. Additionally, it include the following goals, policies, and implementing actions:

Goal C2
Achieve Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) targets related to stormwater load reduction within the planning area.

Policy C2-1 – Best Management Practices
Explore implementing additional incentive programs to encourage all property owners to install and maintain best management practices (BMPs) on their property. Coordinate with TRPA to support the private property BMP certification program. Prioritize accelerating private property BMPs in locations and for land uses that have the greatest potential for pollutant loading to Lake Tahoe.

Policy C2-3 – Lake Clarity Credit Program
Continue to participate in the TMDL Program and Lake Clarity Crediting Program (LCCP), maintain stormwater load reduction plans (SLRPs), and implement the identified stormwater load reduction measures. This area plan incorporates by reference, all monitoring, operations, maintenance, and reporting required by the county's interlocal agreement with the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District to implement the Lake Tahoe TMDL and the adopted SLRP.

Action C-2
Coordinate with TRPA to prioritize BMP certification of private properties.

The Lake Tahoe TMDL Program 2017 Performance Report showed that across the Lake Tahoe Region, water quality projects and other implementation actions have led to an overall reduction of fine sediment pollutant loading reaching Lake Tahoe by 12 percent from 2004 baseline levels, a rate higher than the 10 percent target for 2016. In addition, the quantity of phosphorous and nitrogen washed into the lake has declined by 8.5 percent and 6 percent, respectively.

(10) Finding: The WCTAP includes policies, ordinances, and other implementation measures to include building and site design standards for Town Centers that reflect the unique character of each area, respond to local design issues, and consider ridgeline and viewshed protection.

Rationale: The Design Standards and Guidelines adopted as Article 220.1 of the Washoe County Development Code apply to all development within the Town Center areas and serve as substitute standards to TRPA Code of Ordinances Chapters 34, *Driveway and Parking Standards*; 36, *Design Standards*; and 38, *Signs*. The site development and building design standards reflect the unique character of Incline Village and Crystal Bay, respond to local design issues, and consider view protection. In addition, the WCTAP includes the following goals, policies, and implementing actions:

Goal LU6
Strengthen economic activity in Incline Village and Crystal Bay by creating pedestrian-friendly environments in mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones with upgraded aesthetics, architecture, and landscaping. Reduce the visual prominence of parking lots and asphalt.

Policy LU6-1 – Traditional Downtown
Create a traditional small-town downtown in the Incline Village Commercial regulatory zone that serves residents' commercial needs. This regulatory zone should have a strong pedestrian orientation with multi-modal connections from nearby neighborhoods, reduce the visual prominence of automobiles, be aesthetically pleasing, and foster a sense of identity. Concentrated retail stores, restaurants, and offices should be included to promote the bustle and activity of a downtown.

Policy LU6-2 – New Tahoe Image
All new and remodeled projects should use architectural designs and materials which create a "New Tahoe" image, recreating traditional alpine architecture using modern technology. Examples of this style include the Incline Visitor Center and the IVGID Community Center. Projects are encouraged to provide outdoor plazas. Projects should maintain the essential elements of the community's forested setting through site design and building design. Site and building design should be oriented to the

pedestrian/bicycle path network. Pedestrian and bicycle connections between properties should be promoted.

Policy LU6-5 – Crystal Bay Tourist Regulatory Zone
Projects in the Crystal Bay Tourist regulatory zone should use architectural designs and materials which are unique to the North Stateline area and which strengthen the regulatory zone's resort image.

Action LU-7 – Design Standards and Guidelines Revisions
Conduct a review of the design standards and guidelines for the planning area to determine if amendments could be made to remove barriers, facilitate redevelopment efforts, or more efficiently implement the community's longstanding sense of place and identity. Updated design standards should fully consider how bicycle, pedestrian, and parking facilities can be fully blended and incorporated into site design standards.

Policy LU8-5 – Amendments Affecting Town Centers
Amendments to tourist and mixed-use zoning districts should ensure that regulatory zones retain their unique character and do not become overly similar.

(11) Finding: The WCTAP includes policies, ordinances, and other implementation measures to promote walking, bicycling, transit use, and shared parking in Town Centers, which at a minimum include continuous sidewalks or other pedestrian paths, bicycle facilities along both sides of all highways within Town Centers and to other major activity centers.

Rationale: Promoting walking, bicycling, transit use, and shared parking is the primary theme expressed in Chapter 3, *Transportation* of the WCTAP. The plan promotes implementation of the transportation improvements identified in various transportation plans, including the following:

- Regional Transportation Plan
- Active Transportation Plan
- Lake Take Tahoe Basin Transit Master Plan
- Mount Rose Highway Scenic Corridor Plan
- State Route 28 Corridor Plan
- Lake Tahoe Region Safety Strategy

The proposed improvements identified in the above plans are reflected in the area plan's list of transportation projects and associated maps.

As set forth in Chapter 3 of the WCTAP, implementation of the area plan would result in the following improvements:

- Nearly 10 miles of new Class I multi-use paths connecting Crystal Bay and Incline Village Town Centers with residential areas, recreational facilities, the extended East Shore trail, and proposed multi-use trails in Placer County.

- Two mobility hubs (Incline Village and South Incline) and a transit center (Diamond Peak) to be served by more frequent and diverse transit options.
- New bike lanes along Mount Rose Highway and four collector roads.
- Establishment of regular bus service to Reno and a north-shore water shuttle.

The county has also committed to work with its implementing partners to take future actions that will further help to promote completion of an active transportation network and robust transit system:

Action T-1 – Employer-Based Vehicle Trip Reduction
Work with TRPA and the Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association to develop and implement an employer-based vehicle trip reduction program targeting businesses with over 100 employees.

Action T-2 – Access Management Standards
Develop and apply access management regulations consistently throughout the plan area.

Action T-3 – Plowing of Multi-Use Trails
Develop a plan for plowing sidewalks and multi-use trails. Plowing schedules should prioritize routes within Town Centers and high-traffic multi-use trails that connect Town Centers with residential and recreation areas.

Action T-4 – Short-Range Transit Plan
Develop a short-range transit plan focused on the Incline Village and Crystal Bay areas.

Action T-5 – Parking Management Plan
Work with TRPA and the Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association to develop and implement a comprehensive approach to parking management in the planning area.

(12) Finding: The WCTAP includes policies, ordinances and other implementation measures to address the form of development within Town Centers and requiring the projects promote pedestrian activity and transit use.

Rationale: Beyond the direct transportation-related programs and projects discussed above, the area plan seeks to improve transportation efficiency by promoting compact, mixed-use development in Town Centers. This concept is reflected in the following goal and policies:

Goal LU2
Create land use patterns that are consistent with the community's vision, reduce the need to travel, and increase access to transit.

- Policy LU2-1 – Focus Development towards Town Centers

- Policy LU2-2 – Retail and Restaurant Uses
- Policy LU2-5 – Cultural Facilities
- Policy LU2-6 – Incline Village Tourist Regulatory Zone
- Policy LU2-7 – Crystal Bay Tourist Regulatory Zone
- Policy LU2-9 – Single Family Residential in the Incline Village Commercial Regulatory Zone

Design Standards and Guidelines (Article 220.1 of the Development Code) provide further direction regarding site design and accommodation of multi-modal transportation facilities.

The WCTAP carries through the permissible uses in the three existing community plans that correspond with the Town Center overlay. These community plans already permit retail commercial, tourist, and multi-family residential uses. The only change proposed is to add "residential care" and "nursing and personal care" to Incline Village Commercial's Special Area #1 as allowable ("A") uses. This change is intended to promote the development of senior housing within the Town Center in close proximity to the hospital.

(13) Finding: The WCTAP includes policies, ordinances, and other implementation measures to ensure adequate capacity for redevelopment and transfers of development rights into Town Centers.

Rationale: The WCTAP promotes environmentally beneficial redevelopment and revitalization of the three designated Town Centers, since those Town Centers serve as receiving areas for TRPA transfer incentives. The Town Center overlay includes the entirety of the Incline Village Commercial and Crystal Bay Tourist regulatory zones and a portion of the Incline Village Tourist regulatory zone. High-capability parcels within the overlay are suitable for redevelopment or infill and qualify for incentives when development is transferred from less-suitable locations within the Tahoe Region. Applicable incentives relate to transfers of land coverage (TRPA Code Subsection 30.4.2, Subparagraphs B and C), transfers of residential development rights (TRPA Code Section 51.3), and transfers of existing development (TRPA Code Section 51.5).

To encourage redevelopment, the WCTAP merges the five pre-existing development rights pools into a single countywide pool. This enables use of these rights within Town Centers.

Redevelopment within Town Center can be accomplished by using development rights already considered under the Regional Plan. These can include any combination of the following:

- Obtaining development rights as assigned by Washoe County from the merged additional development rights pools.
- Reusing or converting existing on-site residential units of use (RUUs), commercial floor area (CFA), and/or tourist accommodation units (TAUs);
- Transferring development rights from another property.

- Receiving bonus development rights from TRPA as a result of transferring rights from a less-suitable site.

(14) Finding: The WCTAP includes policies, ordinances, and other implementation measures to identify an integrated community strategy for coverage reduction and enhanced stormwater management within Town Centers.

Rationale: The WCTAP includes an integrated community strategy for coverage reduction and enhanced stormwater management. Development Code Section 110.220.40, Subsection 3 requires that coverage be reduced on-site on parcels with coverage in excess of 70 percent. The area plan does not propose an alternative stormwater quality treatment approach at this time but envisions the potential for such a program to develop in the future if assessment districts are formed. Instead, each parcel will be responsible for accommodating all necessary water quality treatment devices on-site, as is current practice.

(15) Finding: The WCTAP includes policies, ordinances, and other implementation measures to demonstrate that all development activity within Town Centers will provide for and not interfere with Threshold gain, including but not limited to measurable improvements in water quality.

Rationale: The WCTAP implements the Regional Plan regulations pertaining to land coverage and water quality without alteration. All existing standards in Chapters 60 through 68 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances will continue to apply within the planning area.

As discussed in the Chapter 4 findings, which are incorporated herein by reference, implementation of the area plan will help to achieve and maintain thresholds through a variety of mechanisms. The primary mechanism is the incentivizing of environmentally beneficial redevelopment in Town Centers, which is anticipated to result in both water quality and scenic quality improvements as legacy development is replaced with development that complies with modern design and BMP regulations.

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF ORDINANCES

TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 3. 3 – Determination of Need to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement

Finding: TRPA finds that the proposed Code amendment will not have a significant effect on the environment if certain mitigation measures are incorporated into and made a part of the project.

Rationale: An Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) has been prepared to evaluate the effects of the proposed amendments to the Code of Ordinances (see Attachment F). The IEC found that the proposed Code amendments would not have a significant effect on the environment. Based on this finding of no significant effect (FONSE), no further environmental documentation is required. See also the Chapter 3 finding for the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan (WCTAP) adoption.

TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 4. 4 – Threshold-Related Findings

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

   Rationale: The proposed amendments refer users of the WCTAP for new regulations (e.g. Design Standards and Guidelines) that pertain to development with the WCTAP boundary. The code amendments are consistent with the 2012 Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, plan area statements, and maps; the Code; and other TRPA plans and programs. See also Chapter 4 findings for the WCTAP adoption.

2. Finding: The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded; and

   Rationale: The proposed amendments are consistent with the threshold attainment strategies in the Regional Plan. As demonstrated in the EIS and findings for adoption of the 2012 Regional Plan, implementation of the Regional Plan, will not cause environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded. The proposed amendments are consistent with and will implement revised provisions of the 2012 Regional Plan and WCTAP. See also the Chapter 4 Findings made for adoption of the WCTAP.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state, or local air and water quality standards apply for the region, the strictest standards shall be attained, maintained, or exceeded pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

Rationale: The proposed amendments would not adversely affect any state, federal, or local standards. See also the Chapter 4 Findings made for adoption of the WCTAP.

TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 4. 6 – Findings Necessary to Amend or Adopt TRPA Ordinances, Rules, or Other TRPA Plans and Programs.

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

Rationale: As demonstrated in the findings for Sections 4.5 and 4.6 in the Regional Plan Update (Attachment E.2 of the December 12, 2012 Governing Board packet), the amended Regional Plan will achieve and maintain thresholds. The proposed amendments to the Code of Ordinances will implement the Regional Plan.

Based on the rationale for the foregoing findings, including the findings for adoption of the MAP, completion of the IS/IEC, and the findings made on December 12, 2012, for the RPU (all of which are incorporated herein by reference), TRPA finds the Regional Plan and all of its elements, as implemented through the code, rules, and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds. The TRPA Code of Ordinances amendments implement the WCTAP and the Goals and Policies of the Regional Plan, promote threshold gain, and do not conflict with any Regional Plan provision designed to achieve and maintain thresholds. See also the Chapter 4 Findings made for adoption of the WCTAP.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

STATEMENT OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT

Project Description: Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan

Staff Analysis: In accordance with Article IV of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, and Section 6.6 of the TRPA Rules of Procedure, TRPA staff reviewed the information submitted with the subject project.

Determination: Based on the Initial Environmental Checklist, Agency staff found that the subject project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

April 2, 2021

TRPA Executive Director/Designee Date

Attachment E

Threshold Indicators and Compliance Measures

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
1	Air Quality	AQ-1	Carbon Monoxide	Highest 1-hour Carbon Monoxide Concentration	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better than Target	Moderate Improvement	Highest annual 1-hour concentration CO	ppm	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
2	Air Quality	AQ-1	Carbon Monoxide	Highest 8-hour Carbon Monoxide Concentration	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better than Target	Moderate Improvement	Highest annual 8-hour concentration CO	ppm	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
3	Air Quality	AQ-2	Ozone	Highest 1-hour Ozone Concentration	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Moderate Improvement	Ozone Concentration - highest 1-hour	ppm	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
4	Air Quality	AQ-2	Ozone	Highest 8-hour Ozone Concentration	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Moderate Improvement	Ozone Concentration - highest 8-hour	ppm	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
5	Air Quality	AQ-3	Visibility	Annual Average PM_{10}	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Better than Target	Moderate Improvement	Annual Average Concentration of PM_{10}	micrograms/cubic meter (ug/m^3)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
6	Air Quality	AQ-3	Visibility	Highest 24 hour PM_{10} Concentrations	59 $\mu g/m^3$ by 2016	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Highest 24 hour PM_{10} concentration	microgram/cubic meter (ug/m^3)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
7	Air Quality	AQ-4	Visibility	Regional Visibility 50th percentile	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	extinction coefficient - visibility	Mm^{-1}	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
8	Air Quality	AQ-4	Visibility	Regional Visibility 90th Percentile	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	extinction coefficient - visibility	Mm^{-1}	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
9	Air Quality	AQ-4	Visibility	Sub-Regional Visibility 50th percentile	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	extinction coefficient - visibility	Mm^{-1}	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
10	Air Quality	AQ-4	Visibility	Sub-Regional Visibility 90th Percentile	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	extinction coefficient - visibility	Mm^{-1}	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
11	Air Quality	AQ-5	Carbon Monoxide	Winter Traffic Volume	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better than Target	Moderate Improvement	Volume of vehicle traffic measured on presidents weekend (Saturday) between 4pm and midnight	Number of Vehicles	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
12	Air Quality	AQ-7	Visibility	VMT	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Moderate Improvement	VMT Estimated from Peak Traffic Volumes in 2nd weekend in August	Vehicle Mile Traveled	Ratio of current year VMT estimate to Traffic Volume was used as a constant to backcast historic annual VMT values	2015 Threshold Evaluation
13	Air Quality	AQ-8	Nitrate Deposition	Reduce external and In-Basin NOx emissions	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Modeled NOx Emissions in Tons	Tons	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
14	Air Quality	Not Addressed	Odor	Diesel Engine Emission Fumes	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	Number of Evaluation Criteria Satisfied	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
15	Air Quality	Not Addressed	Ozone	3-year Average of 4th Highest Concentration	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Moderate Improvement	3-year average of the 4th highest Ozone Concentration	ppm	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
16	Air Quality	Not Addressed	Ozone	Oxides of Nitrogen Emissions	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better than Target	Moderate Improvement	Average tons of NOx per day	Average tons/day	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
17	Air Quality	Not Addressed	Visibility	3-year Average of the 98th percentile 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ Concentration	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	3-year average of the 98th percentile 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ concentration	microgram/cubic meter (ug/m^3)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
18	Air Quality	Not Addressed	Visibility	Highest 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ Concentration	Non established	Not yet evaluated	Not yet evaluated	24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ Concentration	micrograms/cubic meter (ug/m^3)	Threshold, State or Federal indicator used	Not yet evaluated
19	Air Quality	Not Addressed	Visibility	Annual Average $PM_{2.5}$	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Annual Average Concentration of $PM_{2.5}$	microgram/cubic meter (ug/m^3)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Air Quality Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) prepared for the WCTAP (see Attachment F) did not identify any significant effects on air quality. The potential effect is the same as those analyzed in the TRPA Regional Plan Update, and therefore the analysis is tiered from and consistent with the RPU EIS. The proposed targeted changes in policies and standards would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to air quality. Consistent with existing conditions, future projects would be subject to subsequent environmental review and permitting, and would be required to comply with Chapter 65 of the TRPA Code. Chapter 65 includes provisions that apply to direct sources of air pollution in the Tahoe region, including certain motor vehicles registered in the region, combustion heaters installed in the region, open burning, stationary sources of air pollution, and idling combustion engines. Because future development projects are required to implement air quality attainment measures established by the TRPA, the county, the Washoe County Health District's Air Quality Management Division, as well as those policies and standards established in the WCTAP regarding air quality, implementation of the WCTAP would not be anticipated to lead to substantial air pollutant emissions. Refer to Section 3.2, Air Quality, in the IEC.					
20	Fisheries	F-1	Lake Habitat	Littoral Substrate	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Unknown	Acres of "prime" habitat (rocky substrates in littoral zone)	Acres	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
21	Fisheries	F-2	Stream Habitat	Stream Habitat Quality	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Better than Target	Unknown	Miles of stream in “excellent” condition class	Miles	Benthic Macroinvertebrate O/E, Fish passage ratings	2015 Threshold Evaluation
22	Fisheries	F-2	Stream Habitat	Stream Habitat Quality	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Miles of stream in “good” condition class	Miles	Benthic Macroinvertebrate O/E, Fish passage ratings	2015 Threshold Evaluation
23	Fisheries	F-2	Stream Habitat	Stream Habitat Quality	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Miles of stream in “marginal” condition class	Miles	Benthic Macroinvertebrate O/E, Fish passage ratings	2015 Threshold Evaluation
24	Fisheries	F-3	Instream Flows	Stream Flow protection	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	Number of criteria Satisfied	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
25	Fisheries	F-3	Instream Flows	Water Diversions	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	Number of criteria Satisfied	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
26	Fisheries	F-4	Lahontan Cutthroat Trout	Reintroduction	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	Number of criteria Satisfied	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Fisheries Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the proposed WCTAP did not identify any significant impact on fisheries. The proposed area plan would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality. Consistent with existing conditions, future projects within the area plan could affect wildlife depending on the type, timing, and specific nature of proposed actions. However, any such projects would be subject to subsequent project-level environmental review and permitting at which time they would be required to demonstrate compliance with all federal, state, and TRPA regulations pertaining to the protection of fish and wildlife contained in Chapters 62 (Wildlife Resources) and 63 (Fish Resources) of the TRPA Code. Project-level planning and environmental analysis would identify potentially significant effects, minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process, and require mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval. Therefore, implementation of the amendments would not result in the deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity. Refer to Section 5.4.6-15 and 5.4.6-18 in the IS/IEC.					
27	Noise	N-1	Single Event Noise	Aircraft 8am to 8pm	Trend expected to flatten then remain stable	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Insufficient Data	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
28	Noise	N-1	Single Event Noise	Aircraft 8pm to 8am	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
29	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Motor Vehicles Greater Than 6,000 GVW	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
30	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Motor Vehicles Less Than 6,000 GVW	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
31	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Motorcycles	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
32	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Off-Road Vehicles	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
33	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Snowmobiles	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
34	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Watercraft - Pass by	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
35	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Watercraft - Shoreline	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
36	Noise	N-2	Single Event Noise	Watercraft - Stationary	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	dBA Level and Number of Exceedances of Standard	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
37	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Commercial Areas	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
38	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Critical Wildlife Habitat Areas	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
39	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	High Density Residential Areas	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
40	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Hotel/Motel Areas	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
41	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Industrial Areas	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
42	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Low Density Residential Areas	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
43	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Rural Outdoor Recreation Areas	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
44	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Transportation Corridors - Highway 50	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Insufficient Data	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
45	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Transportation Corridors - Highways 207	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Insufficient Data	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
46	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Transportation Corridors - Highways 267	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Insufficient Data	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
47	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Transportation Corridors - Highways 28	CNEL 62 dBA	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Insufficient Data	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
48	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Transportation Corridors - Highways 431	CNEL 56 dBA	At or Better Than Target	Insufficient Data	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
49	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Transportation Corridors - Highways 89	CNEL 59 dBA	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Insufficient Data	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
50	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Transportation Corridors - South Lake Tahoe Airport	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Insufficient Data	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
51	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Urban Outdoor Recreation	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
52	Noise	N-3	Cumulative Noise Events	Wilderness and Roadless Areas	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Moderate Improvement	Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA) in designated zone	decibels - dBA	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Noise Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the proposed WCTAP did not identify an significant impacts on Noise. The proposed area plan does not alter the CNEL standards set forth in the four existing community plans and 23 existing plan area statements. All designated CNELs meet those required under the noise thresholds. As with the current plan area statements, the area plan CNELs are stricter than what would be required by the environmental thresholds for two conservation regulatory zones: Mount Rose and Martis Peak. Therefore, an increase in the allowable CNEL would not occur within the planning area. Refer to Section 3.6 in the IEC.						
53	Recreation	R-1	High Quality Recreation Experience	High Quality Recreation Experience	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	Number of criteria Satisfied	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
54	Recreation	R-2	Fair Share	Fair Share	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	Number of criteria Satisfied	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Recreation Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the WCTAP did not identify any potential significant impacts to Recreation, because existing recreation opportunities are abundant in the area and can meet an increase in demand from redevelopment within and in the immediate vicinity of the WCTAP. In addition, the WCTAP incudes expansion of public recreation opportunities within the WCTAP boundary limits through policies and capital projects. Any increase in recreational demand is expected to be easily met by existing, as well as future, recreation facilities. In addition, recreation demand would be considered at a project-level during subsequent environmental review and permitting of individual proposed projects. Refer to Section 3.19 in the IEC.						
55	Scenic Resources	SR-1	Roadway and Shoreline Units	Roadway Travel Units	Increase the number of units meeting the minimum score by at least two by 2016	At or Better Than Target	Moderate Improvement	Average of unit composite scores	Composite Score	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
56	Scenic Resources	SR-1	Roadway and Shoreline Units	Shoreline Travel Units	increase the number of units meeting the minimum score by at least one by 2016	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Average of unit composite scores	Composite Score	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
57	Scenic Resources	SR-2	Roadway and Shoreline Units	Roadway Scenic Resources	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Average of unit composite scores	Composite Score	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
58	Scenic Resources	SR-2	Roadway and Shoreline Units	Shoreline Scenic Resources	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Average of unit composite scores	Composite Score	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
59	Scenic Resources	SR-3	Other Areas	Other Areas (Recreation Sites and Bike Trails)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Average of unit composite scores	Composite Score	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
60	Scenic Resources	SR-4	Built Environment	Built Environment	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	Number of criteria Satisfied	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Scenic Resources Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the WCTAP did not identify any potential significant impacts to Scenic Resources. The area plan would carry forward existing design standards and guidelines with only minor changes. The area plan would allow taller buildings (up to 56 feet) to be developed within the three designated Town Centers. Any such development would be required to comply with design guidelines and standards and would be subject to project-specific environmental review and permitting. In addition to the shoreline, the planning area includes designated scenic corridors along State Routes 28 and 431. The area plan includes several policies, implementation actions, and capital improvements that are designed to help achieve and maintain scenic thresholds. The plan's strategy includes such things as updated design standards, undergrounding of utilities, enhancement of community gateways, and signage enforcement. Refer to Section 3.18 of the IS/IEC.					
61	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients – Class 1a (1%)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
62	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 1b (1%)	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Moderate Improvement	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
63	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 1c (1%)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
64	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 2 (1%)	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
65	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 3	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
66	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 4	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
67	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 5	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
68	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 6	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
69	Soil Conservation	SC-1	Impervious Cover	Bailey Land Coverage Coefficients - Class 7	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Percent impervious cover in land capability class	Percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
70	Soil Conservation	SC-2	Stream Environment Zone	Stream Restoration, 1,100 acres restored	88 acres of SEZ restoration by 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target	Moderate Improvement	Acres (and percent) of SEZ Restored	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Soil Conservation Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the WCTAP did not identify any adverse potential impacts to Soils because the area plan does not include provisions to alter or revise regulations pertaining to land capability and Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES), grading, excavation, or new disturbance, deposition of beach sand, changes in siltation, deposition, or erosion, including natural littoral processes, geologic hazards, or BMPs to control soil erosion. The three designated Town Centers (Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and Crystal Bay Tourist) would be eligible for up to 70% coverage on high-capability lands as part of the area plan, up from 50% for developed parcels, as allowed by the community plans. The WCTAP would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to land capability and IPES. The land coverage limitations of the adopted Regional Plan (Chapter 30 of the TRPA Code) remain in effect. The potential effects of these changes were analyzed in the RPU EIS (TRPA 2012, page 3.7-40) and were found to be less than significant: "The additional coverage allowed in higher capability lands within Town Centers, the Regional Center, and the High Density Tourist District would be directly offset by coverage transferred from sensitive land or more than offset on an acre-by-acre basis by transfers from higher capability land, resulting in an overall reduction in coverage for the Region and, importantly, reduction in coverage from SEZs and other sensitive lands." The area plan does not propose an alternative comprehensive land coverage management system as defined in Section 13.5.3B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Future development projects in the WCTAP would be subject to permitting by the county and/or TRPA and permit applicants would be required to demonstrate that proposed compaction and land coverage would be within the limits allowed in Chapters 30 and 53 of the Code. Refer to Section 3.3 of the IEC.						
71	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Appropriate Management Practices	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
72	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Land Capability to Support Native Vegetation	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
73	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Protect and Expand Riparian Vegetation	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
74	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Vegetation Pattern - Juxtaposition	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	N/A	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
75	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Relative Abundance - Deciduous Riparian Hardwoods	Increase total acreage by 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Acres (and percent cover) of Riparian Deciduous Hardwoods	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
76	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Relative Abundance - Meadows and Wetlands	Increase total acreage by 2016	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Acres (and percent cover) of vegetation types meeting meadow and wetland classification type	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
77	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Relative Abundance - Shrub	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Acres (and percent cover) of vegetation types meeting shrub classification	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
78	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Relative Abundance - Small Diameter Red Fir	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Acres (and percent cover) of vegetation types meeting small diameter (<10.9"dbh) red fir classification	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
79	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Relative Abundance - Small Diameter Yellow Pine	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Acres (and percent cover) of vegetation types meeting small diameter (<10.9"dbh) Jeffrey pine classification	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
80	Vegetation Preservation	V-1	Common Vegetation	Vegetation Community Richness	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Number of different vegetation associated as defined in resolution 82-11	Number (#)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
81	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Deep-water plants of Lake Tahoe	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/Absence	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
82	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Freel Peak Cushion Plant community	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Rapid Decline	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/absences	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
83	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Grass Lake (sphagnum bog)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Insufficient Information	Unknown	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/absences	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
84	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Hell Hole	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Insufficient Information	Unknown	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/absences	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
85	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Osgood swamp	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Insufficient Information	Unknown	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/absences	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
86	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Pope Marsh	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	Insufficient Information	Unknown	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/absences	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
87	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Taylor Creek Marsh	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Insufficient Information	Unknown	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/absences	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
88	Vegetation Preservation	V-2	Uncommon Plant Communities	Upper Truckee Marsh	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence as determined by Qualified Botanist/Ecologist	Presence/absences	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
89	Vegetation Preservation	V-3	Sensitive Plants	Galena Rock Cress - Arabis rigidissima v. demote	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Number of occupied sites	Number	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
90	Vegetation Preservation	V-3	Sensitive Plants	Cup Lake Drabe - Draba asterophora v. macrocarpa	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Number of occupied sites	Number	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
91	Vegetation Preservation	V-3	Sensitive Plants	Long-petaled Lewisia - Lewisia pygmaea longipetala	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Number of occupied sites	Number	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
92	Vegetation Preservation	V-3	Sensitive Plants	Tahoe Draba - Draba asterophora v. asterophora	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Little or No Change	Number of occupied sites	Number	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
93	Vegetation Preservation	V-3	Sensitive Plants	Tahoe Yellow Cress - Rorippa subumbellata	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better Than Standard	Moderate	Number of occupied sites	Number	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
94	Vegetation Preservation	V-4	Late Seral/Old Growth	Late Seral/Old Growth - Montane	Increase in percent cover of large diameter dominated stands by 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Acres (and percent cover) of stands dominated by conifer trees > 24"dbh (relative abundance)	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
95	Vegetation Preservation	V-4	Late Seral/Old Growth	Late Seral/Old Growth - Sub Alpine	Increase in percent cover of large diameter dominated stands by 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Acres (and percent cover) of stands dominated by conifer trees > 24"dbh (relative abundance)	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
96	Vegetation Preservation	V-4	Late Seral/Old Growth	Late Seral/Old Growth - Upper Montane	Increase in percent cover of large diameter dominated stands by 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target	Unknown	Acres (and percent cover) of stands dominated by conifer trees > 24"dbh (relative abundance)	Acres and percent (%)	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Vegetation Preservation Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the WCTAP did not identify any potential impacts to Vegetation because the area plan does not include provisions to alter or revise regulations pertaining to native vegetation protection during construction; vegetation removal; groundwater management; new vegetation; unique, rare, or endangered species of plants; stream bank or backshore vegetation; or tree removal. Refer to Section 3.4 of the IEC.						
97	Water Quality	WQ-1	Littoral Lake Tahoe	Turbidity At Non-Stream Mouths (<1 NTU)	Insufficient data to determine interim target	At or Better Than Target	Unknown	Average turbidity measures at nearshore areas other than stream mouths	NTU	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
98	Water Quality	WQ-1	Littoral Lake Tahoe	Turbidity At Stream Mouths (<3 NTU)	Insufficient data to determine interim target	At or Better Than Target	Unknown	Average turbidity measures at nearshore at than stream mouths	NTU	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
99	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Littoral Lake Tahoe	Attached Algae		Insufficient Information	Little or No Change				2015 Threshold Evaluation
100	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Littoral Lake Tahoe	Aquatic Invasive Species		Insufficient Information	Little or No Change				2015 Threshold Evaluation
101	Water Quality	WQ-2	Pelagic Lake Tahoe	Annual Average Secchi Disk	23.8m or 78ft by 2016	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Annual Average Secchi Depth	meter and feet	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
102	Water Quality	WQ-3	Pelagic Lake Tahoe	Primary Productivity	Predicted to be approximately 221 $gC/m^2/yr$ in 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target	Rapid Decline	annual phytoplankton primary productivity	$gC/m^2/year$	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
103	Water Quality	WQ-4	Tributaries	90% Percentile Suspended Sediment Concentrations (60mg/l)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better than Target	N/A	Suspended Sediment Concentration	mg/l and number of standard exceedances	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
104	Water Quality	WQ-4	Tributaries	State Standard for DIN Concentration	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	No Target Established	Little or No Change	Proportion of samples meeting State Total Nitrogen Concentration standard.	mg/l; and number and percent of standard exceedances	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
105	Water Quality	WQ-4	Tributaries	State Standard for Dissolve Phosphorus	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	No Target Established	Little or No Change	Annual Total Phosphorus Concentration	mg/l and number of standard exceedances	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
106	Water Quality	WQ-5	Surface Runoff	Discharge to Surface Water - Grease & Oil	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	concentration of grease and oil	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
107	Water Quality	WQ-5	Surface Runoff	Discharge to Surface Water - Total Iron	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	concentration of total iron	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
108	Water Quality	WQ-5	Surface Runoff	Discharge to Surface Water - Total Nitrogen as N	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	concentration of total nitrogen	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
109	Water Quality	WQ-5	Surface Runoff	Discharge to Surface Water - Total Phosphate as P	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	concentration of total phosphate	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
110	Water Quality	WQ-5	Surface Runoff	Discharge to Surface Water - Turbidity (not to exceed 20 NTU)	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Turbidity level	NTU	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
111	Water Quality	WQ-6	Groundwater	Discharge to Ground Water - Grease & Oil	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of grease and oil	Visual Residue	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
112	Water Quality	WQ-6	Groundwater	Discharge to Ground Water - Iron	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of total iron	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
113	Water Quality	WQ-6	Groundwater	Discharge to Ground Water - Total Nitrogen as N	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of total nitrogen	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
114	Water Quality	WQ-6	Groundwater	Discharge to Ground Water - Total Phosphate	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of total phosphate	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
115	Water Quality	WQ-6	Groundwater	Discharge to Ground Water - Turbidity	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Turbidity level	NTU	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
116	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Boron	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of Boron	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
117	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Chloride	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of Chloride	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
118	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Chlorophyll-a	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of Chlorophyll-a	$gC/m^2/year$	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
119	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of Inorganic Nitrogen	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
120	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Dissolved Oxygen	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of Dissolved Oxygen	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
121	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	pH	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	pH level	pH	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
122	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Phytoplankton cell counts	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Phytoplankton cell count	Number cells	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
123	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Secchi Disk	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Depth of Secchi Disk	meters or feet	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
124	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Soluble Reactive Iron	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of Soluble Reactive Iron	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
125	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Soluble Reactive Phosphorus	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of SRP	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
126	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Sulfate	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of Sulfate	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
127	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Temperature	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Water temperature	Celsius	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
128	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Total Dissolved Solids	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of TDS	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
129	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Total Nitrogen	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of TN	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
130	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Total Phosphorus	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of TP	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
131	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Total Reactive Iron	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Concentration of TRI	mg/l	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
132	Water Quality	WQ-7	Other Lakes	Vertical Extinction Coefficient	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Vertical extinction	per meter vertical extinction coefficient	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
133	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Tributaries	Reduce Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen Load	at least one stream will attain adopted concentrations by 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target		Annual load of nitrogen (and nitrogen species)	MT/year or kg/year	Flow-weighted loads of N	2015 Threshold Evaluation
134	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Tributaries	Reduce Dissolved Phosphorus Load	3 of 10 monitored streams in compliance by 2016	Considerably Worse Than Target	Moderate Improvement	Annual load of total phosphorus (and phosphorus species)	MT/year or kg/year	Flow-weighted loads of P	2015 Threshold Evaluation
135	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Tributaries	Reduce Suspended Sediment Load	Unable to be determined due to lack of trend	No Target Established	Moderate Improvement	Annual load of suspended sediment from all monitored tributaries	MT/year or kg/year	Flow-weighted loads of Suspended Sediment	2015 Threshold Evaluation
136	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Tributaries	State Standard for Dissolve Iron Concentration	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Annual Dissolved Iron Concentration	mg/l and number of standard exceedances	Literature referenced or reviewed and professional judgment	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
137	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Littoral and Pelagic Lake Tahoe	DIN Loading - Atmospheric Source (20% Reduction) 1973 to 1981 levels	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Metric tons of nutrients loaded via rain and snow deposition ("wet deposition") at Ward Creek site per year from atmospheric sources	g/hectare/year or MT/year	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
138	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Littoral and Pelagic Lake Tahoe	DIN Loading - Groundwater Source (30% Reduction) 1973 to 1981 level	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Metric tons of DIN/year	MT/year	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
139	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Littoral and Pelagic Lake Tahoe	DIN Loading - Surface Runoff Source (50% reduction) 1973 to 1981 level	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Metric tons of DIN/year	MT/year	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
140	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Littoral and Pelagic Lake Tahoe	Reduce DIN Loading by 25% from all sources	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Annual DIN Load in metric tons/year or kg/year	kg/year	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
141	Water Quality	Not Addressed	Littoral Lake Tahoe	Reduce DIN, DP, iron from all sources to meet the 1967-71 mean values	Insufficient data to determine interim target	Unknown	Unknown	Annual DIN, DP, Iron Load in metric tons/year or kg/year	kg/year	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
Impact of Project on Water Quality Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the WCTAP did not identify any significant effects to Water Quality. The proposed area plan would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to the course or direction of water movements; surface water runoff or management; discharge to surface waters; excavations that could intercept or otherwise interfere with groundwater; Best Management Practice (BMP) standards; or floodplains. Future development under the area plan is not anticipated to change the direction of water movement. All projects must demonstrate compliance with the land capability and land coverage provisions of Chapter 30 (Land Coverage) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, which is incorporated into the WCTAP (see Development Code Section 110.220.40). Parcels within the three designated Town Centers and located on high-capability soils could qualify for maximum land coverage of 70 percent with coverage transfer, an increase from the existing limit of 50 percent for developed parcels established in the respective community plans. Although future development coverage could increase under the amendment, coverage transfer would be required as would compliance with local and state requirements regarding runoff management and water quality standards. Future development within the amendment area would be required to meet existing BMP standards to control potential increases in stormwater runoff and pollutant loading onsite. The proposed area plan would not alter or revise the regulations pertaining to floodplains in Section 35.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Floodplains) or Article 416 of the Washoe County Development Code. The WCTAP is expected to result in an increased rate of water quality improvements on private lands and a reduction of coverage in sensitive lands. These changes would reduce a variety of non-point source pollutant sources, reduce storm water runoff, and increase water quality treatment infrastructure, which would benefit a variety of threshold standards related to water quality in Lake Tahoe and its tributaries as well as groundwater quality. As a result, the WCTAP is expected to benefit Threshold Indicators and Compliance Measures. Refer to Section 3.3 of the IEC.					
142	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Disturbance Zones Management Standard	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Road Density and Recreation disturbance within protected areas	Miles road/acre	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
143	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Bald Eagle (Nesting, 1 site)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	At or Better Than Target	Little or No Change	Number of active nest sites	Number of Nests	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
144	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Bald Eagle (Winter, maintain 2 sites)	Maintain wintering sites	No Target Established	Moderate Improvement	Winter Bald Eagle Count	Number of individuals observed	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
145	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Deer (No Target)	increase in deer counts	No Target Established	Moderate Improvement	Annual NDOW deer counts	Number of individuals observed	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
146	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Golden Eagle (4 sites)	at least two active nests by 2016	Insufficient Information	Insufficient Data	Number of active nest sites/year	Number of Nests	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
147	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Northern Goshawk (12 Sites)	4-8 reproductively active territories by 2016	Insufficient Information	Insufficient Data	Number of active nest sites/year	Number of Nests	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
148	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Osprey (4 Sites)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerable Better Than Target	Rapid Improvement	Number of active nest sites/year	Number of Nests	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
149	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Peregrine (2 Sites)	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Considerably Better than Target	Rapid Improvement	Number of active nest sites/year	Number of Nests	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation

ID	Threshold Category	TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation "Threshold Indicators"	Applicable Indicator Reporting Category	Name of Threshold Standard Addressed (see Resolution 82-11 for adopted standard)	Interim Target for 2016 (See 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Status (2015)	Trend (2015)	Threshold Indicator	Unit of Measure	Addition Factors (i.e., alternative indicators used in 2015 Threshold Evaluation)	Source
150	Wildlife	W-1	Special Interest Species	Waterfowl (maintain 18 Sites)	Increase in the percentage of waterfowl relative to detrimental species	Somewhat Worse Than Target	Little or No Change	Evidence of nesting waterfowl and disturbance within protected areas	Disturbance rating	Threshold indicator Used	2015 Threshold Evaluation
151	Wildlife	W-2	Habitats of Special Significance	Riparian Habitat Protection	N/A-Indicator already in attainment with standard	Implemented	N/A	Implemented control measures and restoration effort	level of effort	Evaluation Criteria and Evidence	2015 Threshold Evaluation
Impact of Project on Wildlife Indicators/Targets/Other Factors (Y/N)			**N**	**Comments**	The IEC for the WCTAP did not identify any potential significant impacts to Wildlife. The area plan does not include provisions to alter or revise regulations pertaining to the protection of animal species, special-status or listed species of animals, introduction of new species and barriers to the migration or movement of animals, or existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality, or groundwater resources that affect critical wildlife habitat. Project-level planning and environmental analysis would identify potentially significant effects, minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process, and require mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and would therefore not result in the deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat quantity or quality. Refer to Section 3.5 in the IEC.					

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
WATER QUALITY/SEZ - IN PLACE				
1	BMP requirements, new development: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	The Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan (WCTAP) will not change existing BMP requirements in Chapter 60 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and is expected to promote redevelopment, which will increase the rate of BMP compliance. The area plan will help promote redevelopment in the three designated Town Centers, which would result in the implementation of modern water quality control measures. As such, area plan adoption is expected to help expedite compliance with the BMP requirements.
2	BMP implementation program -- existing streets and highways: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Trans, Fish**	**N**	
3	BMP implementation program -- existing urban development: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**Y**	
4	BMP implementation program -- existing urban drainage systems: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Trans, Fish**	**N**	
5	Capital Improvements Program for Erosion and Runoff Control	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Trans, Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP does not adversely affect the Capital Improvements Program for Erosion and Runoff Control. The plan recognizes existing programmed water quality improvements and encourages future improvements.
6	Excess land coverage mitigation program: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 30	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	The WCTAP will not change excess coverage mitigation requirements.
7	Effluent (Discharge) limitations: California (SWRCB, Lahontan Board) and Nevada (NDEP): *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	The effluent limitations in Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances are not being modified.
8	Limitations on new subdivisions: (See the Goals and Policies: Land Use Element)	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Rec, Scenic**	**N**	All new subdivisions will continue to be limited by the provisions in Chapter 39, Subdivision, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
9	Land use planning and controls: See the Goals and Policies: Land Use Element and Code of Ordinances Chapters 11, 12, 13, 14, and 21	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Trans, Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP has been developed to meet the requirements of Chapter 13, Area Plans, and to implement the 2012 Regional Plan. By implementing the 2012 Regional Plan, the WCTAP is expected to accelerate attainment of threshold standards affected by land use planning and control compliance measures. This area plan amendment will allow an increase in residential density within the three designated Town Centers from 15 units per acre to 25 units per acre. This furthers the goal of the Land Use Element to direct development toward Centers. The amendment also updates permissible uses in three regulatory zones. The WCTAP retains the RPU's established growth control system.
10	Residential development priorities, The Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES): Goals and Policies: Implementation Element and Code of Ordinances Chapter 53	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	Though the WCTAP will result in merging of five separate development rights pools into a single pool, it will not alter existing Growth Management regulations, Chapters 50 through 53, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Thus, TRPA's Growth Management provisions will remain in effect and unchanged.
11	Limits on land coverage for new development: Goals and Policies: Land Use Element and Code of Ordinances Chapter 30	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP utilizes the provisions in the Regional Plan and Chapter 13, Area Plans, that allow for high capability lands in Town Centers and the Regional Center to be covered up to 70%. For developed lands, this is currently 50%. The potential effects of these changes were analyzed in the RPU EIS (TRPA 2012, page 3.7-40) and were found to be less than significant: "The additional coverage allowed in higher capability lands within Town Centers, the Regional Center, and the High Density Tourist District would be directly offset by coverage transferred from sensitive land or more than offset on an acre-by-acre basis by transfers from higher capability land, resulting in an overall reduction in coverage for the Region and, importantly, reduction in coverage from SEZs and other sensitive lands."

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
12	Transfer of development: Goals and Policies: Land Use Element and Implementation Element	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	The WCTAP does not change Goals and Policies from the Land Use Element and Implementation Element of the Regional Plan regarding the transfer of development.
13	Restrictions on SEZ encroachment and vegetation alteration: *Code of Ordinances Chapters 30 and 61*	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish, Rec, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP will not alter existing restrictions on SEZ encroachment and vegetation alteration in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapters 30 and 61.
14	SEZ restoration program: Environmental Improvement Program.	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not change policies and provisions that require the protection and restoration of SEZs. The area plan recognizes and supports proposed Environmental Improvement Program projects.
15	SEZ setbacks: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 53	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	SEZ setback requirements in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 53, Individual Parcel Evaluation System, Section 53.9, will not be altered by the WCTAP.
16	Fertilizer reporting requirements: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish, Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP will not modify the Resource Management and Protection regulations, Chapters 60 through 68, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Thus, fertilizer reporting and water quality mitigation requirements will stay in effect.
17	Water quality mitigation: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
18	Restrictions on rate and/or amount of additional development	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Wildlife, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP incorporates the RPU's restrictions on the rate and amount of additional development.
19	Improved BMP implementation/ enforcement program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**Y**	See response to Compliance Measures 1 through 4.
20	Increased funding for EIP projects for erosion and runoff control	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	The WCTAP will not increase funding for EIP projects for erosion and runoff control.
21	Artificial wetlands/runoff treatment program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	There are no changes to the artificial wetlands/runoff treatment program proposed with the WCTAP.
22	Transfer of development from SEZs	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not provide any additional incentives beyond those already addressed in the Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances to hasten the transfer of development rights from sensitive lands, including SEZs, or outlying areas to Town Centers and the Regional Center. Adoption of an area plan will, however, trigger existing provisions that allow for additional coverage transfers into Town Centers.
23	Improved mass transportation	**WQ, Trans, Noise**	**Y**	The WCTAP facilitates development of an integrated multi-modal transportation system that largely relies on increased transit service serving designated mobility hubs.
24	Redevelopment and redirection of land use: Goals and Policies: Land Use Element and Code of Ordinances Chapter 13	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP encourages redevelopment within a Town Center and within close proximity to services and transit. See response to Compliance Measure 9.
25	Combustion heater rules, stationary source controls, and related rules: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	No changes are being proposed in the WCTAP that would impact these Compliance Measures. The existing TRPA Code of Ordinance provisions will remain in effect.
26	Elimination of accidental sewage releases: Goals and Policies: Land Use Element	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
27	Reduction of sewer line exfiltration: Goals and Policies: Land Use Element	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
28	Effluent limitations	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
29	Regulation of wastewater disposal at sites not connected to sewers: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
30	Prohibition on solid waste disposal: Goals and Policies: Land Use Element	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
31	Mandatory garbage pick-up: Goals and Policies: Public Service Element	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Wildlife**	**N**	
32	Hazardous material/wastes programs: Goals and Policies: Land Use Element and Code of Ordinances Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
33	BMP implementation program, Snow and ice control practices: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, AQ**	**N**	The WCTAP will not change BMP requirements. See response to Compliance Measures 1 through 4.
34	Reporting requirements, highway abrasives and deicers: Goals and Policies:, Land Use Element and Code of Ordinances Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	
35	BMP implementation program--roads, trails, skidding, logging practices: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60, Chapter 61	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	
36	BMP implementation program--outdoor recreation: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish, Rec**	**N**	
37	BMP implementation program--livestock confinement and grazing: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 21, Chapter 60, Chapter 64	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	
38	BMP implementation program--pesticides	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
39	Land use planning and controls -- timber harvesting: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 21	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, AQ, Wildlife, Fish, Scenic**	**N**	There are no changes to allowable timber harvesting in any of the regulatory zones as part of the WCTAP.
40	Land use planning and controls - outdoor recreation: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 21	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Wildlife, Noise, Rec, Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP would result in minor changes to permissible uses at the Fairway and Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zones. The Fairway change would allow day use recreation as an allowable, rather than special, use. The Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone changes are intended to transition the area away from its historic use as an amusement park and towards general commercial and specialized residential uses. As discussed in Section 3.19 of the IEC for the WCTAP, there are abundant recreational opportunities in the area which can meet an increased demand from Town Center redevelopment.
41	Land use planning and controls--ORV use: Goals and Policies: Recreation Element	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, AQ, Wildlife, Fish, Noise, Rec, Scenic**	**N**	Regional Plan Policy R-1.5 states that "Off-road vehicle (ORV) use is prohibited in the Lake Tahoe Region expect on specified roads, trails, or designated areas where the impacts can be mitigated." The WCTAP does not include the expansion of ORV use.
42	Control of encroachment and coverage in sensitive areas	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Wildlife, Rec, Scenic**	**Y**	See response to Compliance Measure 11.
43	Control on shorezone encroachment and vegetation alteration: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 83	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Scenic**	**N**	TRPA will continue to be responsible for enforcing and implementing Shorezone regulations, Chapters 80 through 85, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, as well as other code provisions applicable to projects within the Shorezone. No changes are being proposed with the WCTAP that would modify existing code provisions related to the Shorezone or impact these compliance measures.
44	BMP implementation program--shorezone areas: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
45	BMP implementation program--dredging and construction in Lake Tahoe: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
46	Restrictions and conditions on filling and dredging: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 84	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	
47	Protection of stream deltas	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Wildlife, Fish, Scenic**	**N**	
48	Marina master plans: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 14	**WQ, AQ/Trans, Fish, Scenic**	**N**	
49	Additional pump-out facilities: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
50	Controls on anti-fouling coatings: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 60	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	
51	Modifications to list of exempt activities	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	The WCTAP will not alter the list of exempt activities.
WATER QUALITY/SEZ - SUPPLEMENTAL				
52	More stringent SEZ encroachment rules	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP does not include any provisions that would impact Compliance Measures 52 though 61.
53	More stringent coverage transfer requirements	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
54	Modifications to IPES	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
55	Increased idling restrictions	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, AQ**	**N**	
56	Control of upwind pollutants	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, AQ**	**N**	
57	Additional controls on combustion heaters	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, AQ**	**N**	
58	Improved exfiltration control program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
59	Improved infiltration control program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ**	**N**	
60	Water conservation/flow reduction program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	
61	Additional land use controls	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Wildlife**	**N**	
AIR QUALITY/TRANSPORTATION - IN PLACE				
62	Fixed Route Transit - South Shore	**Trans, Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP does not impact any transit services bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, except to encourage Town Center redevelopment and the completion of identified transportation improvements.
63	Fixed Route Transit - North Shore: TART	**Trans, Rec**	**N**	
64	Demand Responsive Transit - South Shore	**Trans**	**N**	
65	Seasonal Trolley Services - North and South Shores: South Shore TMA and Truckee-North Tahoe TMA	**Trans, Rec**	**N**	
66	Social Service Transportation	**Trans**	**N**	
67	Shuttle programs	**Trans**	**N**	
68	Ski shuttle services	**Trans, Rec**	**N**	
69	Intercity bus services	**Trans**	**N**	
70	Passenger Transit Facilities: South Y Transit Center	**Trans**	**N**	
71	Bikeways, Bike Trails	**Trans, Noise, Rec, Scenic**	**N**	
72	Pedestrian facilities	**Trans, Rec, Scenic**	**N**	

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
73	Wood heater controls: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes to wood or gas heater controls, or stationary source controls.
74	Gas heater controls: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	
75	Stationary source controls: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	
76	U.S. Postal Service Mail Delivery	**Trans**	**N**	The WCTAP does not include any provisions that would impact U.S. Postal Service Delivery. The plan does, however, remove some unimplemented policies requiring postal delivery.
77	Indirect source review/air quality mitigation: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes to indirect source review/air quality mitigation requirements, or idling restrictions.
78	Idling Restrictions: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	
79	Vehicle Emission Limitations(State/Federal)	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	The WCTAP does not include any provisions related to vehicle emission limitations established by the State/Federal Government.
80	Open Burning Controls: *Code of Ordinances* Chapters 61 and Chapter 65	**WQ, AQ, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes to open burning controls.
81	BMP and Revegetation Practices	**WQ, AQ, Wildlife, Fish**	**Y**	See response to Compliance Measures 1 through 4.
82	Employer-based Trip Reduction Programs: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**Trans**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes to the employer-based trip reduction programs or vehicle rental programs described in Chapter 65.
83	Vehicle rental programs: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 65	**Trans**	**N**	
84	Parking Standards	**Trans**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes that would impact parking standards, parking management, parking fees or facilities, traffic management, signal synchronization, aviation, waterborne transit or excursions, air quality monitoring, alternative fueled vehicle fleets or infrastructure improvements, north shore transit, or the Heavenly Ski Resort Gondola. The WCTAP was shown to have an insignificant impact on total daily trips and was not required to conduct a traffic analysis. Additional development associated with the amendment is within the Regional Plan's growth management system and would not generate additional demand for waterborne transit services.
85	Parking Management Areas	**Trans**	**N**	
86	Parking Fees	**Trans**	**N**	
87	Parking Facilities	**Trans**	**N**	
88	Traffic Management Program - Tahoe City	**Trans**	**N**	
89	US 50 Traffic Signal Synchronization - South Shore	**Trans**	**N**	
90	General Aviation, The Lake Tahoe Airport	**Trans, Noise**	**N**	
91	Waterborne excursions	**WQ, Trans, Rec**	**N**	
92	Waterborne transit services	**WQ, Trans, Scenic**	**N**	
93	Air Quality Studies and Monitoring	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	
94	Alternate Fueled Vehicle - Public/Private Fleets and Infrastructure Improvements	**Trans**	**N**	
95	Demand Responsive Transit - North Shore	**Trans**	**N**	
96	Tahoe Area Regional Transit Maintenance Facility	**Trans**	**N**	
97	Heavenly Ski Resort Gondola	**Trans**	**N**	
AIR QUALITY/TRANSPORTATION - SUPPLEMENTAL				
98	Demand Responsive Transit - North Shore	**Trans**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 62 through 97, and 1-4 (Road improvements, BMPs). The WCTAP is expected to benefit Compliance Measures 99, 116 and 118. The WCTAP will facilitate Town Center redevelopment and promote the completion of transportation improvements.
99	Transit System - South Shore	**Trans**	**N**	
100	Transit Passenger Facilities	**Trans**	**N**	
101	South Shore Transit Maintenance Facility - South Shore	**Trans**	**N**	
102	Transit Service - Fallen Leaf Lake	**WQ, Trans**	**N**	

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
103	Transit Institutional Improvements	**Trans**	**N**	
104	Transit Capital and Operations Funding Acquisition	**Trans**	**N**	
105	Transit/Fixed Guideway Easements - South Shore	**Trans**	**N**	
106	Visitor Capture Program	**Trans**	**N**	
107	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities--South Shore	**Trans, Rec**	**N**	
108	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities--North Shore	**Trans, Rec**	**N**	
109	Parking Inventories and Studies Standards	**Trans**	**N**	
110	Parking Management Areas	**Trans**	**N**	
111	Parking Fees	**Trans**	**N**	
112	Establishment of Parking Task Force	**Trans**	**N**	
113	Construct parking facilities	**Trans**	**N**	
114	Intersection improvements--South Shore	**Trans, Scenic**	**N**	
115	Intersection improvements--North Shore	**Trans, Scenic**	**N**	
116	Roadway Improvements - South Shore	**Trans, Scenic**	**N**	
117	Roadway Improvements - North Shore	**Trans, Scenic**	**N**	
118	Loop Road - South Shore	**Trans, Scenic**	**N**	
119	Montreal Road Extension	**Trans**	**N**	
120	Kingsbury Connector	**Trans**	**N**	
121	Commercial Air Service: Part 132 commercial air service	**Trans**	**N**	
122	Commercial Air Service: commercial air service that does not require Part 132 certifications	**Trans**	**N**	
123	Expansion of waterborne excursion service	**WQ, Trans**	**N**	
124	Re-instate the oxygenated fuel program	**WQ, AQ**	**N**	
125	Management Programs	**Trans**	**N**	
126	Around the Lake Transit	**Trans**	**N**	
VEGETATION - IN PLACE				
127	Vegetation Protection During Construction: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 33	**WQ, AQ, Veg, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP will not alter the provisions of Chapter 33 in the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
128	Tree Removal: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**Veg, Wildlife, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not alter tree removal, prescribed burning, vegetation management or plant protection and fire hazard reduction provisions of Chapter 61 of the Code.
129	Prescribed Burning: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**WQ, AQ, Veg, Wildlife, Scenic**	**N**	
130	Remedial Vegetation Management: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**WQ, Veg, Wildlife**	**N**	
131	Sensitive and Uncommon Plant Protection and Fire Hazard Reduction: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**Veg, Wildlife, Scenic**	**N**	
132	Revegetation: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**WQ, Veg, Wildlife, Scenic**	**N**	

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
133	Remedial Action Plans: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 5	**WQ, Veg**	**N**	TRPA will continue to be responsible for preparing Remedial Action Plans, in coordination with the Washoe County, pursuant to Chapter 5, Compliance, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
134	Handbook of Best Management Practices	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg, Fish**	**N**	The Handbook of Best Management Practices will continue to be used to design and construct BMPs.
135	Shorezone protection	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 43 through 50.
136	Project Review	**WQ, Veg**	**Y**	An MOU will be negotiated subsequent to area plan adoption. The MOU may involve delegation of certain permitting activities
137	Compliance inspections	**Veg**	**Y**	
138	Development Standards in the Backshore	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg, Wildlife, Scenic**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 43 through 50.
139	Land Coverage Standards: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 30	**WQ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish, Scenic**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measure 11.
140	Grass Lake, Research Natural Area	**WQ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish, Scenic**	**N**	N/A
141	Conservation Element, Vegetation Subelement: Goals and Policies	**Veg, Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP is consistent with the 2012 Regional Plan, including the Conservation Element and Vegetation Subelement Goals and Policies.
142	Late Successional Old Growth (LSOG): *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**Veg, Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes to provisions of Lake Successional Old Growth and Stream Environment Zone Vegetation.
143	Stream Environment Zone Vegetation: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**WQ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	
144	Tahoe Yellow Cress Conservation Strategy	**Veg**	**N**	The WCTAP will not impact efforts to conserve the Tahoe Yellow Cress.
145	Control and/or Eliminate Noxious Weeds	**Veg, Wildlife**	**N**	The WCTAP will not impact efforts to control or eliminate noxious weeks.
146	Freel Peak Cushion Plant Community Protection	**Veg**	**N**	N/A
VEGETATION - SUPPLEMENTAL				
147	Deepwater Plant Protection	**WQ, Veg**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17 and 43 through 50.
WILDLIFE - IN PLACE				
148	Wildlife Resources: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 62	**Wildlife, Noise**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17.
149	Stream Restoration Program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish, Rec, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not include any changes to the Stream Restoration Program.
150	BMP and revegetation practices	**WQ, Veg, Wildlife, Fish, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not include any changes to existing BMP and revegetation requirements.
151	OHV limitations	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, AQ, Wildlife, Noise, Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP does not include any changes to OHV limitations.
152	Remedial Action Plans: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 5	**Wildlife**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measure 133.
153	Project Review	**Wildlife**	**Y**	See response to Compliance Measure 136 and 137.
FISHERIES - IN PLACE				
156	Fish Resources: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 63	**WQ, Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17.
157	Tree Removal: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP does not change tree removal provisions of Chapter 61.
158	Shorezone BMPs	**WQ, Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 43 through 50.
159	Filling and Dredging: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 84	**WQ, Fish**	**N**	

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
160	Location standards for structures in the shorezone: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 84	**WQ, Fish**	**N**	
161	Restrictions on SEZ encroachment and vegetation alteration	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17.
162	SEZ Restoration Program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measure 14.
163	Stream restoration program	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17.
164	Riparian restoration	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	
165	Livestock: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 64	**WQ, Soils/SEZ, Fish**	**N**	
166	BMP and revegetation practices	**WQ, Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 1 through 4.
167	Fish habitat study	**Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17.
168	Remedial Action Plans: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 5	**Fish**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measure 133.
169	Mitigation Fee Requirements: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 86	**Fish**	**N**	The mitigation fee requirements formerly in Chapter 86 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (now in the Rules of Procedure) are not being modified with the WCTAP.
170	Compliance inspection	**Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP is not modifying existing compliance or inspection programs or provisions.
171	Public Education Program	**Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes to the county's education and outreach efforts.
NOISE - IN PLACE				
172	Airport noise enforcement program	**Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	The WCTAP is not modifying existing enforcement programs.
173	Boat noise enforcement program	**Wildlife, Fish, Rec**	**N**	
174	Motor vehicle/motorcycle noise enforcement program: *Code of Ordinances* Chapters 5 and 23	**Wildlife, Fish**	**N**	
175	ORV restrictions	**AQ, Wildlife, Noise, Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP is not modifying existing ORV or snowmobile conditions.
176	Snowmobile Restrictions	**WQ, Wildlife, Noise, Rec**	**N**	
177	Land use planning and controls	**Wildlife, Noise**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measure 9.
178	Vehicle trip reduction programs	**Trans, Noise**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make any changes to vehicle trip reduction programs.
179	Transportation corridor design criteria	**Trans, Noise**	**Y**	The WCTAP incorporates criteria from the corridor plans for State Route 28 and Mount Rose Highway by reference.
180	Airport Master Plan South Lake Tahoe	**Trans, Noise**	**N**	N/A
181	Loudspeaker restrictions	**Wildlife, Noise**	**N**	The WCTAP is not modifying loudspeaker restrictions.
182	Project Review	**Noise**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 136 and 137.
183	Complaint system: *Code of Ordinances* Chapters 5 and 68	**Noise**	**N**	Existing complaint systems are not being modified by the WCTAP.
184	Transportation corridor compliance program	**Trans, Noise**	**N**	None of these compliance measures will be modified with the WCTAP.
185	Exemptions to noise limitations	**Noise**	**N**	
186	TRPA's Environmental Improvement Program (EIP)	**Noise**	**N**	
187	Personal watercraft noise controls	**Wildlife, Noise**	**N**	
NOISE - SUPPLEMENTAL				
188	Create an interagency noise enforcement MOU for the Tahoe Region.	**Noise**	**N**	An interagency noise enforcement MOU for the Tahoe Region is not being proposed as part of the WCTAP.
RECREATION - IN PLACE				

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
189	Allocation of Development: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 50	**Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP is not proposing any changes to the Basin's allocation of development system, or to directly draw from any allocation pools. The area plan would, however, merge five existing development rights pools into a single countywide pool. This change is being made to allow unused development rights to be used within Town Centers.
190	Master Plan Guidelines: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 14	**Rec, Scenic**	**N**	The TRPA, in coordination with the Washoe County, will continue to process Specific and Master Plan Plans pursuant to Chapter 14 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
191	Permissible recreation uses in the shorezone and lake zone: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 81	**WQ, Noise, Rec**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 43 through 50.
192	Public Outdoor recreation facilities in sensitive lands	**WQ, Rec, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP is not altering provisions regarding public outdoor recreation in sensitive lands.
193	Hiking and riding facilities	**Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP does not alter where hiking and riding facilities are permissible. See also Compliance Measure 40.
194	Scenic quality of recreation facilities	**Rec, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not propose any changes to provisions related to scenic quality of recreation facilities.
195	Density standards	**Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP complies with all applicable density standards in Chapters 13 and 31 of the Code of Ordinances. The WCTAP includes a proposal to allow residential care and nursing and personal care uses to exceed the maximum densities specified in Chapter 31, but only in Town Centers. In these areas, these uses could have densities of up to 40 persons per acre, rather than 25 persons per acre.
196	Bonus incentive program	**Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP does not alter existing bonus incentive programs.
197	Required Findings: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 4	**Rec**	**N**	All applicable TRPA Code Of Ordinance findings will continue to have to be met with the future approval of projects within the WCTAP.
198	Lake Tahoe Recreation Sign Guidelines	**Rec, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP will not impact the Lake Tahoe Recreation Sign Guidelines.
199	Annual user surveys	**Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP will not affect user surveys.
RECREATION - SUPPLEMENTAL				
200	Regional recreational plan	**Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP does not modify any portion of the Goals and Policies in the Regional Recreation Plan, which is the Recreation Element in the Regional Plan.
201	Establish fairshare resource capacity estimates	**Rec**	**N**	The WCTAP does not establish or alter fair share resource capacity estimates, alter reservations of additional resource capacity, or include economic modeling.
202	Reserve additional resource capacity	**Rec**	**N**	
203	Economic Modeling	**Rec**	**N**	
SCENIC - IN PLACE				
204	Project Review and Exempt Activities: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 2	**Scenic**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 136 and 137.
205	Land Coverage Limitations: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 30	**WQ, Scenic**	**Y**	See response to Compliance Measure 11.
206	Height Standards: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 37	**Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP would increase the height allowance for parcels within the three designated Town Centers, in accordance with Regional Plan provisions. The IEC found that there are no significant scenic impacts associated with this change.
207	Driveway and Parking Standards: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 34	**Trans, Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP does not make changes to current design standards and guidelines relating to parking and driveway design (see WCTAP Appendix B, Chapter 4) that apply in mixed-use and tourist areas. These standards meet or exceed Chapter 34 requirements. In other areas, Chapter 34 standards will continue to apply.

Tracking Number	Compliance Measure Description	Affected Threshold Categories	Affected by Action (Y/N)	Comments
208	Signs: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 38	**Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP carries forward existing design standards and guidelines pertaining to signage (See WCTAP Appendix B, Chapter 8) for mixed-use and tourist areas. These standards meet or exceed Chapter 38 standards. Outside of these areas, Chapter 38 will continue to apply.
209	Historic Resources: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 67	**Scenic**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17.
210	Design Standards: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 36	**Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP carries forward existing design standards and guidelines (See WCTAP Appendix B) for mixed-use and tourist areas. These standards meet or exceed Chapter 36 standards. Outside of these areas, Chapter 36 will continue to apply.
211	Shorezone Tolerance Districts and Development Standards: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 83	**Scenic**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 43 through 50.
212	Development Standards Lakeward of Highwater: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 84	**WQ, Scenic**	**N**	
213	Grading Standards: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 33	**WQ, Scenic**	**N**	Grading and vegetation protection during construction shall continue to meet the provisions of the Washoe County Code and TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 33, Grading and Construction.
214	Vegetation Protection During Construction: Code of Ordinances Chapter 33	**AQ, Veg, Scenic**	**N**	
215	Revegetation: *Code of Ordinances* Chapter 61	**Scenic**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measures 16 and 17.
216	Design Review Guidelines	**Scenic**	**N**	The WCTAP includes only minor changes to the design standards and guidelines which are not directly related to bringing the area into scenic threshold attainment. The area plan does anticipate future update of the design standards and guidelines
217	Scenic Quality Improvement Program(SQIP)	**Scenic**	**N**	See response to Compliance Measure 194.
218	Project Review Information Packet	**Scenic**	**N**	
219	Scenic Quality Ratings, Features Visible from Bike Paths and Outdoor Recreation Areas Open to the General Public	**Trans, Scenic**	**N**	
220	Nevada-side Utility Line Undergrounding Program	**Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP includes a future action for the establishment of assessment districts or another financing mechanism to support undergrounding of utilities.
SCENIC - SUPPLEMENTAL				
221	Real Time Monitoring Program	**Scenic**	**N**	No changes to the real time monitoring program are being proposed with the WCTAP.
222	Integrate project identified in SQIP	**Scenic**	**Y**	The WCTAP itself is expected to result in an increased rate of redevelopment, which would increase the rate of SQIP project implementation, and the redevelopment facilitated by the amendment may contribute to this increased rate of SQIP project implementation.

Attachment F

Initial Environmental Checklist

Initial Environmental Checklist

Attachment G

Summary of Public Comments

Public Comment – Major Themes

1. **The area plan and its relationship with Short-Term Rentals (STRs).**

   Nature of the Concern

   Short-term rentals are the most frequently raised issue in public input regarding the proposed area plan. Many participants in the public outreach process identified that STRs are the single biggest land use issue facing Incline Village, but they are not mentioned at all in the area plan. The primary concerns with STRs relate to public health and safety and to preservation of neighborhood character. Commenters have stated that the county's recently adopted short-term rental ordinance is insufficient, and that TRPA's intervention is necessary. They ask that the area plan be modified to address STR impacts and to include STR-related policies and standards.

   County Response*

   The area plan does not alter any standards relating to STRs. The same procedure and requirements that apply currently would continue to apply if the area plan were put into effect. The county recently adopted an ordinance to regulate short-term rentals countywide. Substantial public outreach occurred in the development of this ordinance, including two well-attended workshops in Incline Village. The ordinance is expected to address many public health and safety concerns, such as occupancy, trash, and fire safety. The ordinance will also address parking, which appears to be a large component of the neighborhood character concerns.

   The county believes that implementation of the proposed ordinance will resolve many of the issues raised by Incline Village residents. As with any new policy, there needs to be an opportunity to put the standards into effect and observe the results. Should modifications still be needed, these can be made as part of a future ordinance amendment. The county intends to review the ordinance and consider the need for changes in November 2021. Given the substantial public input and current status of the proposed STR ordinance, the county would like an opportunity to see this process through to its completion.

   TRPA Staff Response

   TRPA does not directly regulate STRs. This has historically been regarded as a local government issue, like business licensing and transient occupancy taxes. In 2019, TRPA did adopt STR neighborhood compatibility criteria into its Performance Review System. This system determines how many residential allocations may be distributed to each local jurisdiction. Jurisdictions that do not adopt standards that promote neighborhood compatibility for STRs would not be eligible to receive their full distribution. For reference, Washoe County has more than 100 unused allocations in its pool, which suggests that the loss of potential future allocations may not be as meaningful to them as it is for other jurisdictions.

   Representative Written Comments

   - Heirshberg, Diane (10/20/2019)

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

- Tycer, Ronda (10/23/2019)
- Heirshberg, Diane (1/29/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (1/30/2020)
- Black, Carole (2/4/2020)
- Tycer, Ronda (2/5/2020)
- Todoroff, Pete (2/21/2020)
- Martini, Margaret (3/3/2020)
- Heirshberg, Diane (3/9/2020)
- Black, Carole (3/10/2020)
- Heirshberg, Diane (3/10/2020)
- Tycer, Ronda (3/10/2020)
- Becker, Diane (2/9/2021)

2. **The future of the Old Incline Elementary School site.**

Nature of the Concern

The Old Incline Elementary School is located at the southwest corner of State Route 28 and Southwood Boulevard. The site is located in the Incline Village Commercial zoning district and is within a Regional Plan-designated Town Center. For the past several years, the site has been used as a park-and-ride for the East Shore Express transit service.

The Transit Master Plan calls for the establishment of two mobility hubs in Incline Village. One of the two hubs is identified as potentially being located at the site of the Old Incline Elementary School. The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) recently authorized its Executive Director to enter into a purchase agreement with the Washoe County School District to acquire the site. TTD emphasizes that their purchase does not mean a mobility hub will be located on this site. After conducting public outreach in February and March 2021, TTD committed to completing an alternative sites analysis before pursuing development of a mobility hub in Incline Village.

Residents of Incline Village have raised several concerns with the potential for a mobility hub to be located on the site. Amongst the concerns raised are the following:

- Location – Commenters feel that the location is inappropriate due to existing haphazard street parking and traffic/congestion along Southwood Boulevard. There are other locations they feel that should be considered. Rather than placing a mobility hub in the center of Incline Village, for example, TTD could focus on establishing mobility hubs to intercept traffic coming from outside the basin (e.g., at Mount Rose or Spooner Summit).

- Need – Commenters feel that the need for the mobility hub is being generated by tourists seeking to access the East Shore Trail and Sand Harbor and not by the residents or workforce of Incline Village. They feel that Incline Village should not have to house the parking for these uses and deal with their impacts. Some feel that since Sand Harbor is generating the parking demand, they should expand on-site parking.

- Desired Use – Commenters have expressed that the community does not want a parking lot and bus hub in the center of town. Instead, they note that the community would like to see the

development of workforce housing or some type of commercial or mixed-use development that would create a walkable town center.

County Response*

The area plan recognizes the potential for a mobility hub to be located at the Old Incline Elementary School. The plan, however, does not require that a mobility hub be at this location. Under the proposed zoning (Incline Village Commercial), the old elementary school could still be used for workforce housing or mixed-use development. The county is committed to collaborating with TTD on conducting further outreach to determine the future of the Old Incline Elementary School and to develop a plan for transit in Incline Village. Among the commitments that the county has made to future work are the following:

- *Action LU-4: Update Land Use Concept Plans*
  Work with the community and TRPA to update the concept plans in this area plan for the mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones. (Note: the Incline Village Commercial district includes the Old Elementary School site in its concept plan).

- *Action T-4: Short-Range Transit Plan*
  Develop a short-range transit plan focused on the Incline Village and Crystal Bay areas.

- *Action T-5: Parking Management Plan*
  Work with TRPA and the Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association to develop and implement a comprehensive approach to parking management in the planning area.

- *Action IM-6: Best Practices for Recreational Uses*
  Work with stakeholders to identify strategies to ensure that recreational uses are permitted and operated according to best practices for minimizing traffic, reducing pollution and nuisances, and improving safety and general community compatibility.

TRPA Staff Response

Mobility hubs are envisioned to be a major component of future transit improvements in the Tahoe Basin. In October 2019, the Regional Plan Implementation Committee held an informational session on the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan. At that time, they asked that the plan be revised to incorporate the mobility hub concept and ensure that mobility hubs were not precluded. Several revisions to the plan were made in response and were publicized in the January 2020 draft of the plan. As indicated above, the area plan does not require that a mobility hub be located at the Old Incline Elementary School.

Many of the community's concerns around transit, parking, and conceptual land uses in the Incline Village Commercial Town Center would be addressed through future county actions as part of implementation of the area plan. The county has expressed a commitment to take future actions to implement the area plan once it is adopted.

Under both current and proposed standards, establishing a mobility hub at the Old Incline Elementary School will require that TTD obtain a Special Use Permit from TRPA. As part of a Special Use Permit, project-specific impacts would be considered and appropriate mitigation would be developed.

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

Additionally, a noticed public hearing would be required. The Special Use Permit could only be approved if TTD can demonstrate that the mobility hub would not adversely affect compliance with threshold standards.

Representative Written Comments

- Tycer, Ronda (2/17/2020)
- Tycer, Ronda (2/18/2020)
- Becker, Diane (2/9/2021)
- Ford, Wayne (2/12/2021)

3. **Front setbacks on steeply sloping and corner lots.**

Nature of the Concern

Present Washoe County Development Code standards require a minimum 15-foot front setback for steeply sloping lots (> 20 percent slope on the front half of the lot). Corner lots are required to provide front setbacks of 10, 15, 20, or 30 feet depending on the zoning. The proposed development standards would allow front setbacks to be reduced to 0 feet, subject to certain criteria. Several commenters have identified the following concerns with this proposal:

- This approach would eliminate the current practice of holding noticed public hearings at the Board of Adjustments to approve a setback variance. Public hearings are important, because they provide the community an opportunity to weigh in on variance requests through the citizens' advisory board and at the public hearing. A variance that may be appropriate for one property may not be appropriate for another.
- The proposal may not comply with NRS 287.315, which appears to require a noticed public hearing before a public board or hearings officer to make a "special exception."
- The proposal would no longer require a landowner to demonstrate that a hardship exists to receive approval. In many cases, the only hardship is that the landowner wants to build a home that is too large for the lot. This is not adequate justification to reduce the front setback.
- Allowing 0-foot front setbacks can create parking problems, particularly where roadways are narrow. Often, the proposal is to place a garage at the front property line, leaving no place for guest parking. Reliance on street parking is problematic, especially in winter.
- Allowing 0-foot front setbacks can create a "tunnel effect," degrading a neighborhood's scenic quality.

County Response*

A variance is an exception to development code standards which is necessitated due to special circumstances on a specific property. Often, the special circumstance is a hardship related to parcel shape or topography. In these cases, a variance would be needed in order to allow a property owner to enjoy the same rights as other similarly situated properties. Because of the geography of Incline Village, virtually all remaining vacant lots are constrained by such things as steep slopes. In practice, the county regards all lots with slopes of more than 20 percent as falling within the "hardship" criteria warranting variance approval.

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

Obtaining a variance can be a substantial undertaking for a landowner. In addition to application fees that exceed $1,500, setting a hearing before the Board of Adjustments can affect the construction schedule. In some cases, variances are appealed to the Board of County Commissioners, which results in further costs and delays.

Washoe County's current ordinance standards provides setback reductions for accessory structures on steeply sloping and corner lots. The proposed ordinance would expand this provision to also cover primary structures. The proposal helps to streamline permitting by allowing landowners of corner and steeply sloping lots in Incline Village to proceed directly to the building permit stage without requiring a variance.

The county does not anticipate significant issues to result from this modified process for the following reasons:

- An engineer will review all proposals to ensure there are no issues with sight distance or effect on plans for future road widening.
- A minimum of 15 feet will still be required from the edge of pavement to the structure, which could be used for guest parking.
- As they do with all building permits for new structures, the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District will review the plans for fire safety compliance.

In response to concerns raised by local residents, the county has modified the proposed ordinance to require neighboring property owner noticing when the proposal for reduced setbacks involves a primary structure. This will ensure that property owners affected by such setback reductions would have an opportunity to register their objections and potentially cause a public hearing to occur on appeal. Washoe County presently uses this same administrative review procedure for accessory dwelling units.

The proposed code provision establishes 0-foot setbacks automatically when certain objective criteria are met. As such, this procedure is ministerial. It would not constitute the granting of "special exceptions," which are granted discretionarily on a case-by-case basis. As such, the county does not anticipate a conflict with NRS 278.315.

TRPA Staff Response

Local governments have historically determined the appropriate front, rear, and side building setbacks. Additionally, the procedure for approving waivers of these setbacks has also been solely in the purview of local governments. TRPA standards are largely silent on the issue of setbacks. The Code of Ordinances contains only the following setback provisions:

- Subsection 36.5.4, *Setback Standards*, requires a minimum 20-foot setback for development abutting a roadway in TRPA's scenic resource inventory (e.g. State Route 28 and Mount Rose Highway), unless the setback is waived following a specified procedure.

- Subsection 53.9.3, *SEZ Setbacks*, establishes minimum setbacks of between 15 and 50 feet for stream environment zones based on the characteristics of the waterbody and the condition of the slope.

The proposed reduced setback provision for sloping and corner lots would not affect either of these TRPA standards.

Representative Written Comments

- Ford, Wayne (2/5/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (2/12/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (2/13/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (2/18/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (2/23/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (2/26/2020) [1] [2]
- Conrad, Wayne (3/3/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (3/6/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (3/7/2020)
- Heirshberg, Diane (3/9/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (3/10/2020) [1] [2]

4. **Public outreach on the area plan.**

Nature of the Concern

Several community members feel that the public outreach process with the area plan was insufficient. They feel that additional community meetings should be held in Incline Village before the plan is adopted.

County Response*

The county conducted substantial public outreach since this effort was first begun nearly 14 years ago. The following is a summary of public meetings where the area plan was discussed, and feedback was provided since 2013:

- Public Workshops:
  - February 21, 2013
  - April 24, 2014
  - September 28, 2016
  - December 9, 2019
- Citizens' Advisory Board Meetings:
  - October 2016
  - March 2017
  - July 2017
  - November 2018
  - March 2019
  - September 2019†
- Incline Village General Improvement District Board of Directors – June 19, 2019
- Incline Village / Crystal Bay Visitor's Bureau – January 15, 2020

The county followed its standard approach to public outreach with this area plan, as it does for its other long-range plans. The approach complies with the requirements in the Washoe County

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.
† There was no quorum at this meeting. Nonetheless, an informal discussion on the area plan was held with those in attendance.

Development Code and the Nevada Revised Statutes. Feedback from the last workshop, held in December 2019, resulted in modifications that the county incorporated into the proposed plan.

TRPA Response

In contrast to community plans, which have a specific outreach process outlined in Chapter 12, *Community Plans,* of the Code of Ordinances, requirements for public outreach are not explicitly established in Chapter 13, *Area Plans.* Instead, Subparagraph 13.6.2.A specifies that "the lead agency shall follow its own review procedures for [master/general] plan amendments." Nonetheless, that same subparagraph lays out an expectation that the plan "be prepared in coordination with local residents, stakeholders, public agencies with jurisdictional authority within the proposed Area Plan boundaries, and TRPA staff."

Public outreach for the area plan has followed the county's standard practices for master plan and regulatory zone amendments. County staff conducted several meetings with the community focused on visioning and soliciting feedback on plan proposals. They also solicited comments from stakeholders and public agencies, which included meetings with both the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) and the Incline Village Crystal Bay Visitors' Bureau. Since August 2019, TRPA staff has been working closely with county staff to ensure that plan contents comply with Regional Plan goals and policies. Feedback from public agencies, TRPA staff, and the general public has resulted in many positive changes to the area plan.

In response to confusion about the proposal and requests for interactive maps that were raised at the December 2019 workshop, TRPA worked with Washoe County staff to establish a "story map" webpage in January 2020: http://bit.do/TahoePlan. This site helps to explain the area plan proposal and provide additional transparency.

Representative Written Comments

- Heirshberg, Diane (10/20/2019)
- Black, Carole (2/4/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (2/14/2020)
- Todoroff, Pete (2/21/2020)
- Ford, Wayne (2/25/2020)
- Heirshberg, Diane (3/9/2020)
- Black, Carole (3/10/2020)
- Becker, Diane (2/9/2021)

5. Impacts from additional height and density in Town Centers.

Nature of the Concern

Several community members are concerned that the area plan allowing additional height (up to 56 feet) and additional residential density (up to 25 units per acre) would create cumulative traffic impacts and impacts on public facilities and services. Some have also raised aesthetic concerns from the additional height.

County Response*

The county has chosen to adopt the Town Center incentives prescribed by the Regional Plan in order to encourage these areas to redevelop. Redevelopment of the Town Centers will be subject to the design standards and guidelines, which were written to ensure high-quality design that fits with the "New Tahoe" aesthetic. The standards consider such things as massing, articulation, and transitional height to ensure that building design will maintain compatibility with the community's vision. Future development will be subject to an appropriate environmental review and permitting process that will consider site conditions and compatibility on a case-by-case basis.

It's important to note that the Town Center incentives will not increase overall growth. They will just restructure how that growth occurs, by focusing it within the designated Town Centers. Existing growth management capacity limitations in the Tahoe Basin will continue to apply.

TRPA Response

While overall growth will be constrained by TRPA's growth control system, the incentives will encourage that growth to be focused in designated Town Centers. TRPA strongly supports Washoe County's desire to implement Town Center redevelopment incentives. Much of the existing development in Town Centers does not comply with modern design and stormwater management requirements. The Regional Plan envisions Town Center redevelopment as a means of achieving water quality and scenic improvements and restructuring land uses in a manner that reduces automobile dependence. When compared with "business as usual" growth scenarios, focusing growth in Town Centers provides numerous benefits, including reduced vehicle miles travelled. Vehicle miles travelled will be reduced as land use patterns are reshaped to promote walking, bicycling, and transit.

Representative Written Comments

- Heirshberg, Diane (1/29/2020)
- Todoroff, Pete (2/21/2020)
- Heirshberg, Diane (3/9/2020)
- Becker, Diane (2/9/2021)

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

Public Comment – Individual Topics

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(1) Development Rights. The merging of development rights pools may allow TAUs to be used in residential areas.	Development rights may only be used on permissible uses. A merged development rights pools does not affect which uses are permissible in each area. Because most residential areas do not allow hotels, motels, or timeshares, TAUs would not be used in those areas.	Tycer, Ronda 10/23/2019
(2) Building Height – Town Centers. A strict interpretation of the transitional building height standards could impact potential redevelopment plans for the Cal Neva site.	The transitional height standard applies to development abutting the Town Center boundary. The intent of the standard is to gradually reduce heights where Town Centers meet residential and conservation areas by stepping back the third and fourth floors. Any structures constructed along Cal Neva's eastern and southern boundaries would need to comply with the transitional height standard. Any buildings beyond these structures (i.e. further from the Town Center boundary) would not be required to meet the transitional height standard.	Exline, Nick 1/28/2020 1/30/2020
(3) Regulatory Zone Names. The regulatory zones are named after the underlying subdivisions, but the boundaries are different. This creates confusion.	The county has added some clarifying language to the area plan and has replaced the term "neighborhood" with the term "regulatory zone" to help avoid confusion. The names of the proposed regulatory zones have been carried through from TRPA's 1987 plan area statements. The area plan has no effect on the underlying subdivisions or their covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs).	Tycer, Ronda 10/23/2019 Ford, Wayne 2/14/2020 Todoroff, Pete 2/21/2020
(4) Environmental Review. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be prepared.	The county prepared an initial environmental checklist (IEC) in accordance with TRPA's requirements. The IEC concluded that the area plan will not result in significant impacts that were not already analyzed in the EIS for the Regional Plan Update. Because no significant impacts were identified, an EIS for the area plan is not required.	Black, Carole 2/4/2020 3/10/2020

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(5) **Community Character and Vision.** The character and vision described in the area plan are not accurate and should be revised.	The character and vision descriptions in Chapter 1 of the area plan were based upon input received at the workshops held between 2013 and 2016. In response to more recent feedback, these have been updated to characterize the community's struggle with balancing tourism with the needs of residents.	Tycer, Ronda 2/5/2020 Todoroff, Pete 2/21/2020
(6) **Driveway Width Standards.** Changing the driveway width standards will result in non-conformities and will impact fire safety.	The area plan is not making changes to driveway width standards. The standards currently in effect will remain in effect. As is current practice, the county will continue to refer building permits to the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District for review and approval with respect to fire safety requirements.	Ford, Wayne 2/13/2020 [1] [2]
(7) **Funding of Capital Improvements.** The plan proposes many capital improvements, but funding for these improvements is not guaranteed.	An area plan is not the vehicle for appropriating funds for capital improvements. Capital improvement programming is typically done annually by the primary implementing agencies. Capital improvement programs typically only consider the next five years. Since the area plan is sets a 20-year horizon, it can be used as a reference for future capital improvement programming.	Heirshberg, Diane 1/29/2020 Todoroff, Pete 2/21/2020
(8) **Building Height.** The plan appears to prefer calculating height limits using segmented height rather than unified height. There are circumstances where unified height is better.	Chapter 37 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances provides two ways of calculating building height – assessing height of the structure as a whole ("unified"), or dividing the building in up to three segments for the purposes of assessing height ("segmented"). This standard would continue to apply to all areas under the area plan, except for Town Centers where additional height is allowed. The standard provides an option and does not favor one way of calculating height over the other.	Ford, Wayne 2/25/2020

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(9) **Missing Plan Components.** The plan appears to be missing certain components, namely: • A map showing the area plan boundaries. • A map showing regional transit routes and stops.	These maps have been added to the latest version of the area plan.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020
(10) **Coverage Reduction and Stormwater Management.** The plan's approach to coverage reduction and stormwater management in the Town Centers is unclear.	Additional language has been provided in Chapter 2 under the "Town Centers" heading to clarify the approach. The plan requires sites with excess coverage to reduce coverage as part of a project. Additionally, TRPA's transfer program provides a mechanism to reduce coverage in stream environment zones. With respect to stormwater management, the county has chosen not to pursue an integrated stormwater management program for the Town Centers. Instead, each parcel will be responsible for meeting its stormwater control obligations on-site, as is current practice.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020
(11) **Threshold Gain.** It is unclear how the plan will result in threshold gain in the Town Centers.	Additional language has been provided in Chapter 2 under the "Town Centers" heading to clarify how threshold gain will occur. Redevelopment of Town Centers is anticipated to result in direct water quality improvements, as redeveloped sites install Best Management Practices (BMPs). Additionally, redevelopment of Town Centers should result in scenic threshold improvements as non-conforming signs and structures with non-conforming design will be replaced with structures that adhere to design standards and guidelines.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020
(12) **Residential Character.** The plan's approach to ensuring the preservation of neighborhood character is unclear.	The plan's approach to preserving residential character is to carry through existing permissible use and density standards. In accordance with Policy LU8-6, any future amendments to the area plan that affect residential areas should only be done with the interest of preserving the character of those areas.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(13) **Requests for Additional Components.** The county is encouraged to add the following to the plan: • A map showing the geographic boundaries of the 27 zones. • Expansion of the greenhouse gas reduction standard to apply to all new development. • Requiring improvements in support of multi-modal transportation as part of a development project. • Requiring bicycle parking.	• Maps for the individual regulatory zones are included in the Development Code. • The county does not wish to expand the greenhouse gas reduction standard to apply to all new development. This can result in significant development costs, and the proposal has not been discussed with the public. • In the latest revision of the plan, a new standard (Site Design Standard D) has been added to the Design Guidelines and Standards to require multi-modal improvements. • In the latest revision of the plan, a new guideline (Parking Guideline 5) has been added in reference to bicycle parking. Current Washoe County parking standards also require one bicycle parking space for every 20 required vehicle parking spaces.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020
(14) **Alignment with Transportation Plans.** Some projects were listed in the area plan but are not listed in the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) or Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).	The area plan has endeavored to line up with the ATP and RTP. However, these plans do not operate on the same timeline. The RTP focus on improvements that will occur over the next five years. In contrast the area plan envisions improvements on a 20-year planning horizon. The projects that are listed in the area plan may be considered for inclusion in a future ATP or RTP. The latest revision of the area plan should include all relevant projects currently listed in the ATP and RTP. Both the ATP and RTP will be updated over the coming year, and TRPA plans to align these plans with projects listed in the area plan.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(15) **Timing of Reno – North Tahoe Transit Service.** Establishing service between Reno and North Tahoe is important. Since it's listed for long-term implementation, there should be some consideration for doing a scaled-down project in the short-term.	The plan identifies two relevant projects: • Project T-42, *Reno -North Tahoe Transit Service* • Project C-14, *Inter-Regional Transit Service* Project T-42 is based on former community plan policies and its scheduling (6-10 years) aligns with the Long-Range Transit Plan. Washoe County's Regional Transportation Commission (WCRTC) is anticipated to be the lead for this project. Project C-14 is an EIP project and its scheduling is based on the current EIP schedule. TTD is the designated lead agency. The area plan's implementation schedule is based on the current schedules shown in the Long-Range Transit Plan and the EIP. The WCRTC has been working on a pilot version of this service for implementation in the Summer of 2021.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020
(16) **Performance Metrics.** The county should consider setting performance metrics specific to the area plan.	The county intends to rely on the area plan's performance metrics at this time. In the future, the county may consider developing plan-specific metrics as part of an area plan amendment.	League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020
(17) **Trail setback for wireless facilities.** The plan appears to delete an existing provision requiring a 1,000-foot trail setback for new cell towers.	Article 324 in the Washoe County Development Code includes a provision that requires a 1,000-foot trail setback for cellular monopoles, unless certain criteria are met. The provisions in Article 324 will continue to apply without change. The design requirements in Article 220 (the area plan's development code component) apply in addition to Article 324, not in place.	Heirshberg, Diane 3/9/2020 Black, Carole 3/10/2020

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(18) **Incline Village Commercial concept plan.** The Incline Village Commercial concept plan (Map 2.4) was added to the plan without community knowledge. This is problematic, because it shows public service use at the Old Incline Village Elementary School site, which is inconsistent with zoning and the community's wishes for the site.	The Incline Village Commercial concept plan (Map 2.4) was carried over from the existing Incline Village Commercial Community Plan. The community plan was adopted in 1996 and is currently in effect. This map appeared in drafts of the plan since October 2019. It's important to note that Washoe County's approach has been to carry over the concept plans from the community plans for the time being. These plans, however, are proposed to be updated as part of a public engagement process (see Action LU-4).	Becker, Diane 2/9/2021
(19) **Traffic and parking mitigation.** The plan includes no mitigation for additional parking and traffic that will be generated by the Town Center incentives (additional height, density, and coverage).	Each subsequent project in the Town Centers will be subject to TRPA permits and must demonstrate compliance with the area plan. Under the proposed Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) framework, each project will be responsible to quantify and mitigate VMT. Each project will also have to meet the parking requirements established in the Design Standards (Appendix B to the area plan).	Becker, Diane 2/9/2021
(20) **Involvement of Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents.** Goal IM-2 seeks to establish cooperation among stakeholders. Residents should be included as stakeholders.	The county's intention is to include Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents as part of stakeholder outreach. This is typically done through the Incline Village / Crystal Bay Citizens Advisory Board. This is the county's current process, and it will continue after adoption of the area plan.	Becker, Diane 2/9/2021
(21) **Workfoce housing.** The plan should include an action to review the zoning at the Old Incline Elementary School site to make sure it doesn't preclude workforce housing.	The current and proposed zoning of the Old Incline Village Elementary School site would allow for workforce housing.	Becker, Diane 2/9/2021

Attachment H

Public Comments Received
Public Comments

Attachment I

Disposition of Existing Community Plan and Area Plan Policies

The following tables summarize how existing community plan and plan area statement policies are carried through in the proposed Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan:

Table I-1 shows the disposition of policies in the *Incline Village Commercial Community Plan*

Table I-2 shows the disposition of policies in the *Incline Village Tourist Community Plan*

Table I-3 shows the disposition of policies in the *Nevada North Stateline Community Plan*

Table I-4 shows the disposition of policies in the *Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan*

Table I-5 shows the disposition of policies in the 23 plan area statements covering Washoe County.

Table I-6 shows new policies proposed in the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan that were not in previous community plans or plan area statements.

Table I-7 is not included in this appendix, because it duplicates **Appendix A of Attachment F**, which summarizes policies that are not being carried forward from the previous community plans and plan area statements and provides the rationale for removing these policies.

Table I-1

Incline Village Commercial Community Plan

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ITCP	NNSCP	PRCP
Land Use	Land Use Patterns	ICCP 1.1	Buffering	Goal LU1	1.2		1.1
		ICCP 1.2.1	Buffering	Policy LU1-1	1.2.1	1.2	
		ICCP 1.2	Land Use and Transportation	Goal LU2	1.3	1.4	1.3
		ICCP 1.3	*Growth Management*	**[DELETED]**	*1.5*	*1.4*	*1.4*
		ICCP 1.3.1	CFA Allocation	Policy LU4-1	1.4.1	1.5.1	1.4.1
		ICCP 1.3.2	TRPA Approval	Policy LU4-1	1.4.2	1.5.2	1.4.2
		ICCP 1.3.3	CFA Eligibility	Policy LU4-2	1.4.3	1.5.3	1.4.3
		ICCP 1.3.4	*CFA Priority*	**[DELETED]**			
		ICCP 1.4	*Resdidential Bonus Units*	**[DELETED]**	*1.5*	*1.7*	*1.5*
		ICCP 1.4.1	*RBU Eligibility*	**[DELETED]**	*1.5.1*	*1.7.1*	*1.5.1*
	Community Design	ICCP 2.1	Pedestrian-Oriented Downtown	Policy LU6-1			
		ICCP 2.1.1	Pedestrian Facilities	Policy T2-2			
		ICCP 2.1.2	Architectural Design	Policy LU6-2		2.1	
		ICCP 2.1.3	Screening of Parking	Policy LU6-3	2.1.3	2.1.2	2.1.2
		ICCP 2.1.4	Community Events Sign	Action C-8			
		ICCP 2.1.5	SR 28 Access Points	Policies T3-1 and T3-2			
		ICCP 2.1.6	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	2.1.6	2.1.3	2.1.3
		ICCP 2.1.7	Trash Screening	Policy LU6-3			
	Economic Development	ICCP 3.1	Traditional Downtown	Policy LU6-1			
		ICCP 3.1.1	Office and Service Commercial Uses	Policy LU2-3			
		ICCP 3.1.2	Retail/Restaurant Uses	Policy LU2-2			
		ICCP 3.2	Economy	Goal LU7			
	Housing	ICCP 4.1	Housing Opportunities	Goal LU5		4.1	
		ICCP 4.1.1	*Housing Study*	**[DELETED]**	*4.1.1*	*4.1.1*	*4.3.1*
		ICCP 4.1.2	Preferred Affordable Housing Designation	Policy LU5-3		4.1.2	
		ICCP 4.1.3	Integration, Harmonization	Policy LU5-1	4.1.2	4.1.3	
		ICCP 4.1.4	Single Family Dwellings	Policy LU2-9			
		ICCP 4.1.5	*Residential Bonus Units*	**[DELETED]**			
		ICCP 5.1	Automobile Use	Goal T1	5.1		5.1

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ITCP	NNSCP	PRCP
Transportation	Street and Highway Infrastructure	ICCP 5.1.1	Road Capacity	Policy T1-1	5.1.1		5.1.1
		ICCP 5.2	Level of Service	Policy T4-1	5.2	5.1	5.2
		ICCP 5.2.1	Local Traffic	Policy T3-1			
		ICCP 5.2.2	Consolidate Parking	Policy T6-2			
		ICCP 5.3	*VMT Reduction*	**[DELETED]**	*5.3*	*5.2*	*5.3*
		ICCP 5.3.1	*Postal Home Delivery*	**[DELETED]**		*5.2.1*	
	Parking Facilities	ICCP 6.1	Parking Areas	Goal T6	6.12	2.4, 5.1, 6.1.4	6.1
		ICCP 6.1.1	Parking Management Program	Action T-5			
		ICCP 6.1.2	Define Parking	Policy T6-3			
		ICCP 6.1.3	New Parking Areas	Policy T6-5			
		ICCP 6.1.4	Parking Connection - Walkways	Policy T2-3			
	Transit Services and Facilities	ICCP 7.1	Transit Service	Goal T5	7.1	7.1	7.1
		ICCP 7.1.1	Transit Shelters	Policy T5-2	7.1	7.1	7.1
		ICCP 7.1.2	TART Hours/Frequency	Policy T5-1			
		ICCP 7.1.3	Bus Pullouts	Policy T5-3	7.1.3	7.1.3	7.1.3
		ICCP 7.1.4	TMA Subcommittee	Policy T5-5	7.1.4	7.1.4	7.1.4
		ICCP 7.2	Alternative Transportation	Policy T1-2			
		ICCP 7.2.1	Jitney Service	Project T-45	7.2.1	7.2.1	7.2.1
		ICCP 7.2.2	Dial-A-Ride	Project T-47			
		ICCP 7.2.3	Employed-Based Trip Reduction	Action T-1	7.2.4	7.5	7.2.3
		ICCP 7.3	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42			
		ICCP 7.3.1	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42			
	Bicycle Facilities	ICCP 8.1	Bicycles	Goal T2		9.1	
		ICCP 8.1.1	Bicycle Lanes	Projects T-30 through T-34		9.1.1	
		ICCP 8.1.2	Reduce Driveways	Policy T3-1			
	Pedestrian Facilities	ICCP 9.1	Pedestrian Orientation	Goal LU5		8.1	
		ICCP 9.1.1	*Pedestrian Corridor*	**[DELETED]**			
		ICCP 9.1.2	Reduce Conflict	Goal T3			
		ICCP 9.1.3	Pedestrian Connections	Policy T2-3			
		ICCP 10.1	EIP and Restoration	Action C-1	9.1	10.3	9.1
		ICCP 10.2	Incentives for Community Improvements	Policy C4-1	9.2	10.4	9.2

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ITCP	NNSCP	PRCP
Conservation		ICCP 10.3	Threshold Attainment	Goals C1 and C4	9.3	10.1	9.3
		ICCP 10.3.1	*Improvement Projects*	**[DELETED]**	*9.3.1*	*10.1.1*	*9.3.1*
		ICCP 10.3.2	*Contribution*	**[DELETED]**	*9.3.2*	*10.1.2*	*9.3.2*
		ICCP 10.3.3	Implementation	Policy C4-2	9.3.3	10.1.3	9.3.3
		ICCP 10.4	Spring Flowers, Autumn Foliage	Policy LU5-7	9.4	10.5	9.4
		ICCP 10.5	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	9.5	10.6	9.5
Recreation		ICCP 11.1	Bicycle Facilities	Goal T2			
Public Services		ICCP 12.1	Reliable Services	Goal PSF1		12.1	
		ICCP 12.1.1	*New Public Buildings*	**[DELETED]**			
		ICCP 12.1.2	*Home Mail Delivery*	**[DELETED]**		*12.1.3*	
Implementation		*ICCP 13.1*	*Man-Modified Mitigation*	**[DELETED]**	*12.1*	*13.1*	*12.1*
		ICCP 13.2	Reduce On-Site Coverage	WCC 110.220.40(3)	12.2	13.2	12.2
		ICCP 13.3	*Mitigation within the CP*	**[DELETED]**	*12.3*	*13.3*	*12.3*
		ICCP 13.4	Improvements for CFA	Policy LU3-3	12.4	13.4	12.4
		ICCP 13.5	*CFA Reservation*	**[DELETED]**			
		ICCP 13.6	*ISTEA Funds*	**[DELETED]**	*12.5*		*12.5*
		ICCP 13.6.1	*CFA Release*	**[DELETED]**	*12.5.1*		*12.5.1*
		ICCP 13.7	*RBU Use*	**[DELETED]**	*12.6*	*13.7*	*12.6*

Table I-2

Incline Village Tourist Community Plan

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	NNSCP	PRCP
Land Use	Land Use Patterns	ITCP 1.1	Tourist Accommodation	Policy LU2-6			
		ITCP 1.2	Compatibility	Goal LU1	1.1		1.1
		ITCP 1.2.1	Buffering	Policy LU1-1	1.2	1.2	1.2
		ITCP 1.3	Land Use and Transportation	Goal LU2	1.2	1.4	1.3
		ITCP 1.3.1	Student Housing	Policy LU5-2			
		ITCP 1.4	*Growth Management*	**[DELETED]**	*1.3*	*1.5*	*1.4*
		ITCP 1.4.1	CFA Allocation	Policy LU4-1	1.3.1	1.5.1	1.4.1
		ITCP 1.4.2	TRPA Approval	Policy LU4-1	1.3.2	1.5.2	1.4.2
		ITCP 1.4.3	CFA Eligibility	Policy LU4-2	1.3.3	1.5.3	1.4.3
		ITCP 1.5	*Residential Bonus Units*	**[DELETED]**	*1.4*	*1.7*	*1.5*
		ITCP 1.5.1	*RBU Eligibility*	**[DELETED]**	*1.4.1*	*1.7.1*	*1.5.1*
	Community Design	ITCP 2.1	Forested Setting	Policy LU6-2			
		ITCP 2.1.1	Orientation	Policy LU6-2			
		ITCP 2.1.2	Multi-Use Paths	Policy T2-2			
		ITCP 2.1.3	Screening of Parking	Policy LU6-3	2.1.3	2.1.2	2.2.4
		ITCP 2.1.4	Equipment Screening	Policy LU6-3			2.2.5
		ITCP 2.1.5	*Non-Conforming Signs*	**[DELETED]**			
		ITCP 2.1.6	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	2.1.6	2.1.3	2.1.3
	Economic Development	ITCP 3.1	Retail Uses	Policy LU2-2			
		ITCP 3.2	Cultural Facilities	Policy LU2-5			
		ITCP 3.2.1	Performing Arts	Policy LU2-5			
		ITCP 3.3	Local Economy	Goal LU7			
		ITCP 3.3.1	College Expansion	Policy LU2-6			
	Housing	ITCP 4.1	Housing Opportunities	Goal LU5	4.1	4.1	
		ITCP 4.1.1	*Housing Study*	**[DELETED]**	*4.1.1*	*4.1.1*	*4.3.1*
		ITCP 4.1.2	Integration, Harmonization	Policy LU5-1	4.1.3	4.1.3	4.1.3
		ITCP 4.1.3	Student Housing	Policy LU5-2			
		ITCP 4.1.4	*Use of RBUs*	**[DELETED]**		*4.1.4*	*4.3.2*
		ITCP 5.1	Automobile Use	Goal T1	5.1		5.1

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	NNSCP	PRCP
Transportation	Street and Highway Infrastructure	ITCP 5.1.1	Road Expansion	Policy T1-1	5.1.1		5.1.1
		ITCP 5.2	Level of Service	Policy T4-1	5.2	5.1	5.2
		ITCP 5.2.1	Driveway Reduction	Policy T3-1		5.1.3	5.2.1
		ITCP 5.2.2	Entrances	Policy T3-1			
		ITCP 5.3	*VMT Reduction*	**[DELETED]**	*5.3*	*5.2*	*5.3*
	Parking Facilities	ITCP 6.1	Limit Parking Expansion	Policy T6-4			
		ITCP 6.1.1	Maximum Parking	Policy T6-4			
	Transit Services and Facilities	ITCP 7.1	Transit Service	Goal T5	7.1	7.1	7.1
		ITCP 7.1.1	Transit Shelters	Policy T5-2	7.1.1	7.1.1	7.1.1
		ITCP 7.1.2	TART Hours/Frequency	Policy T5-1	7.1.2	7.1.2	7.1.2
		ITCP 7.1.3	Bus Pullouts	Policy T5-3	7.1.3	7.1.3	7.1.3
		ITCP 7.1.4	TMA Subcommittee	Policy T5-4	7.1.4	7.1.4	7.1.4
		ITCP 7.2	Alternative Transportation	Policy T1-2	7.2		7.2
		ITCP 7.2.1	Jitney Service	Project T-45	7.2.1		7.2.1
		ITCP 7.2.2	Dial-A-Ride	Project T-47	7.2.2		7.2.2
		ITCP 7.2.3	Golf Cart Path	Project T-29			
		ITCP 7.2.4	Employer-Based Trip Reduction	Action T-1	7.2.3	7.5	7.2.3
		ITCP 7.2.5	Waterborne Transit	Project T-43			
		ITCP 7.3	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42	7.3	7.4	7.3
		ITCP 7.3.1	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42	7.3.1	7.4.1	7.3.1
	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	ITCP 8.1	Pedestrian/Bike Connections	Goal T2			
		ITCP 8.1.1	Class I Bike Path	Projects T-14 through T-29			
		ITCP 8.1.2	Multi-Use Paths	Projects T-14 through T-29			
Conservation		ITCP 9.1	EIP and Restoration	Action C-1	10.1	10.3	9.1
		ITCP 9.2	Incentives for Community Improvements	Policy C4-1	10.2	10.4	9.2
		ITCP 9.3	Threshold Attainment	Goals C1 and C4	10.3	10.1	9.3
		ITCP 9.3.1	*Improvement Projects*	**[DELETED]**	*10.3.1*	*10.1.1*	*9.3.1*
		ITCP 9.3.2	*Contribution*	**[DELETED]**	*10.3.2*	*10.1.2*	*9.3.2*
		ITCP 9.3.3	Implementation	Policy C4-2	10.3.3	10.1.3	9.3.3
		ITCP 9.4	Spring Flowers, Autumn Foliage	Policy LU5-7	10.4	10.5	9.4
		ITCP 9.5	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	10.5	10.6	9.5

Community Plan Chapter	Section	Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans ICCP	NNSCP	PRCP
Recreation		ITCP 10.1	Bicycle Trails	Goal T2			
		ITCP 10.1.1	Class I Bike Path	Project T-18			
		ITCP 10.3	Recreation Trails	Goal T2			
Public Services		ITCP 11.1	Public Service Uses	Policy LU2-4			11.1
		ITCP 11.2	*Mail Delivery*	**[DELETED]**			
		ITCP 11.3	Public Service Compatibility	Policy PSF2-3			
Implementation		*ITCP 12.1*	*Man-Modified Mitigation*	**[DELETED]**			
		ITCP 12.2	Excess Coverage	WCC 110.220.40(3)			
		ITCP 12.3	*Mitigation within the CP*	**[DELETED]**			
		ITCP 12.4	CFA Allocation	Policy LU3-3			
		ITCP 12.5	*CFA Eligibility*	**[DELETED]**			
		ITCP 12.5.1	*CFA Release*	**[DELETED]**			
		ITCP 12.6	*Residential Bonus Units*	**[DELETED]**	*4.1, 13.7*	*13.7*	*12.6*

Table I-3

Nevada North Stateline Community Plan

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	ITCP	PRCP
Land Use	Land Use Patterns	NNSCP 1.1	Destination Resort Area	Policy LU2-7			
		NNSCP 1.1.1	Child Care	Policy LU2-7			
		NNSCP 1.1.2	Family Oriented Entertainment	Policy LU2-7			
		NNSCP 1.2	Buffering	Goal LU1	1.2	1.2	1.2
		NNSCP 1.2.1	Buffering	Policy LU1-1	1.2.1	1.2.1	1.2.1
		NNSCP 1.3	Path System	Goal T2			
		NNSCP 1.3.1	Pedestrian Paths	Policy T2-2			
		NNSCP 1.4	Reduce Travel Demand	Goal T1	1.2	1.3	1.3
		NNSCP 1.4.1	Retail Uses	Policy LU2-2			
		NNSCP 1.4.2	Workforce Housing	Policy LU5-4			
		NNSCP 1.5	*Additional CFA*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 1.5.1	CFA Allocation	Policy LU4-1	1.3.1	1.4.1	1.4.1
		NNSCP 1.5.2	TRPA Approval	Policy LU4-1	1.3.2	1.4.2	1.4.2
		NNSCP 1.5.3	CFA Allocation	Policy LU4-2			
		NNSCP 1.6	*Bonus TAUs*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 1.6.1	*Mitigation within the CP*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 1.7	*Residential Bonus Units*	**[DELETED]**	*1.4*	*1.5*	*1.5*
		NNSCP 1.7.1	*Mitigation within the CP*	**[DELETED]**	*1.4.1*	*1.5.1*	*1.5.1*
	Community Design	NNSCP 2.1	Architectural Design	Policy LU6-2			
		NNSCP 2.1.1	Resort Image	Policy LU6-2			
		NNSCP 2.1.2	Screening of Parking	Policy LU6-3	2.1.3	2.1.3	2.2.4
		NNSCP 2.1.3	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	2.1.6		
		NNSCP 2.1.4	Monuments	Policy LU6-2			
		NNSCP 2.1.5	*Signs*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 2.1.6	Design Consistency	Policy LU6-5			
		NNSCP 2.2	Design Standards	Policy LU6-5			
		NNSCP 2.2.1	Design Consistency	Policy LU6-5			
		NNSCP 2.3	Pedestrian Friendly Environment	Goal LU6			
		NNSCP 2.4	Reduce Parking Lot Visibility	Goal LU6			

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	ITCP	PRCP
		NNSCP 2.5	Historic Structures	Policies C3-1 and C3-2			
		NNSCP 2.5.1	*Historic Structure Review*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 2.5.2	Cultural Resources Encountered	WCC 110.220.40(5)			
	Economic Development	*NNSCP 3.1*	*Increase Spending*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 3.1.1	*CFA Allocation*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 3.2	Destination Resort Area	Policy LU2-7			
		NNSCP 3.2.1	Upgrade Aesthetics	Goal LU6			
		NNSCP 3.2.2	Coordination of Improvements	Action LU-3			
		NNSCP 3.2.3	*Marketing*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 3.2.4	Uses for Family Destination	Policy LU2-7			
		NNSCP 3.2.5	Transportation Connections	Policy T1-3	4.1	4.1	
	Housing	NNSCP 4.1	Housing Opportunities	Goal LU5	4.1.1	4.1.1	4.3.1
		NNSCP 4.1.1	*Housing Study*	**[DELETED]**	*4.1.2*		
		NNSCP 4.1.2	Preferred Affordable Housing Designation	Policy LU5-3	4.1.3	4.1.2	
		NNSCP 4.1.3	Integration, Harmonization	Policy LU5-1			4.3.2
		NNSCP 4.1.4	*RBU Eligibility*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 4.1.5	Workforce Housing	Policy LU5-4			
		NNSCP 4.1.6	*Employer Contribution*	**[DELETED]**	*5.2*	*5.2*	*5.2*
	Streets and Highway Infrastructure	NNSCP 5.1	Level of Service	Policy T4-1			
		NNSCP 5.1.1	Maintain LOS	Policy T4-2			
		NNSCP 5.1.2	Left Turn Pockets	Project T-2		5.2.1	5.2.1
		NNSCP 5.1.3	Reduce Entrances	Policy T3-1			
		NNSCP 5.1.4	Wassou Road	Project T-4			
		NNSCP 5.1.5	Intersection Improvements	Project T-3			
		NNSCP 5.2	*VMT Reduction*	**[DELETED]**	*5.3*	*5.3*	*5.3*
		NNSCP 5.2.1	*Home Mail Delivery*	**[DELETED]**	*5.3.1*		
		NNSCP 5.2.2.i	Incline Village Shuttle	Project T-45			
		NNSCP 5.2.2.ii	Kings Beach Shuttle	Project T-45			
		NNSCP 5.2.2.iii	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42			
		NNSCP 5.2.2.iv	Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths	Policy T2-2			
		NNSCP 5.2.2.v	*Home Mail Delivery*	**[DELETED]**			

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	ITCP	PRCP
Transportation		NNSCP 5.2.2.vi	Workforce Housing	Policy LU5-4	6.1		6.1
	Parking Facilities	NNSCP 6.1	Parking Lot Visibility	Goal LU6			
		NNSCP 6.1.1	Parking Management Program	Action T-5			
		NNSCP 6.1.2	Maximum Parking	Policy T6-4			
		NNSCP 6.1.3	Screening of Parking	Policy LU6-3	6.1.2		
		NNSCP 6.1.4	Define Parking	Policy T6-3			
		NNSCP 6.1.5	Off-Highway Access	Policy T3-1	7.1	7.1	7.1
	Transit Services and Facilities	NNSCP 7.1	Transit Service	Goal T5	7.1.1	7.1.1	7.1.1
		NNSCP 7.1.1	Transit Shelters	Policy T5-2	7.1.2	7.1.2	7.1.2
		NNSCP 7.1.2	TART Hours/Frequency	Policy T5-1	7.1.3	7.1.3	7.1.3
		NNSCP 7.1.3	Bus Pullouts	Policy T5-3	7.1.4	7.1.4	7.1.4
		NNSCP 7.1.4	TMA Subcommittee	Policy T5-4			
		NNSCP 7.2	Visitor Shuttle	Project T-45			
		NNSCP 7.2.1	Visitor Shuttle	Project T-45			
		NNSCP 7.2.2	Project Participation	Policy LU3-2			
		NNSCP 7.3	Employee Shuttle	Project T-45			
		NNSCP 7.3.1	Project Participation	Policy LU3-2			
		NNSCP 7.4	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42			
		NNSCP 7.4.1	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42	7.2.3	7.2.4	7.2.3
		NNSCP 7.5	Employer Vehicle Trip Reduction	Action T-1	9.1		
	Pedestrian Facilities	NNSCP 8.1	Pedestrian Friendly Environment	Goal LU6			
		NNSCP 8.1.1	Pedestrian Walks	Policy T2-2			
		NNSCP 8.1.2	Outdoor Plazas	Policy LU6-2	8.1		
	Bicycle Facilities	NNSCP 9.1	Bicycle Paths	Goal T2	8.1.1		
		NNSCP 9.1.1	Bicycle Lanes	Projects T-30 through T-34			
		NNSCP 9.1.2	Bicycle Facilities	Policy T2-2	10.3	9.3	9.3
Conservation		NNSCP 10.1	Threshold Attainment	Action C-1	10.3.1	9.3.1	9.3.1
		NNSCP 10.1.1	*Past Improvements*	**[DELETED]**	*10.3.2*	*9.3.2*	*9.3.2*
		NNSCP 10.1.2	*Contribution*	**[DELETED]**	*10.3.3*	*9.3.3*	*10.3.3*
		NNSCP 10.1.3	Implementation	Policy C3-2			
		NNSCP 10.2	Scenic Views	Policy C4-2	10.1	9.1	9.1
		NNSCP 10.3	EIP and Restoration	Goals C1 and C4	10.2	9.2	9.2

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	ITCP	PRCP
		NNSCP 10.4	Incentives for Community Improvements	Policy C3-1	10.4	9.4	9.4
		NNSCP 10.5	Spring Flowers, Autumn Foliage	Policy LU6-7	10.4	9.4	9.4
		NNSCP 10.6	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	10.5	9.5	9.5
Recreation		NNSCP 11.1	Bicycle Paths	Goal T2			
		NNSCP 11.2	On-Site Recreation	Policy R2-1			
		NNSCP 11.3	Lake Access	Policy R1-2			
		NNSCP 11.3.1	Assessment District	Policy R2-2			
		NNSCP 11.4	*Landscaped Open Space*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 11.4.1	*Mini-Park*	**[DELETED]**	*12.1*		
Public Services		NNSCP 12.1	Services	Goal PSF1			
		NNSCP 12.1.1	*Fire Station Relocation*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 12.1.2	Design Compliance	Policy LU6-5	12.1.2		
		NNSCP 12.1.3	*Home Mail Delivery*	**[DELETED]**	*13.1*	*12.1*	*12.1*
Implementation		*NNSCP 13.1*	*Man-Modified Mitigation*	**[DELETED]**	*13.2*	*12.2*	*12.2*
		NNSCP 13.2	Reduce Excess Coverage	WCC 110.220.40(3)	13.3	12.3	12.3
		NNSCP 13.3	*Mitigation within the CP*	**[DELETED]**	*13.4*	*12.4*	*13.4*
		NNSCP 13.4	Contribution	Policy LU3-2			
		NNSCP 13.5	*CFA Eligibility*	**[DELETED]**			
		NNSCP 13.6	*RBU Eligibility*	**[DELETED]**	*13.7, 4.1*	*13.7*	*12.6*
		NNSCP 13.7	Workforce Housing	Policy LU5-4	1.1	1.2	1.1

Table I-4

Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	ITCP	NNSCP
Land Use	Land Use Patterns	PRCP 1.1	Compatibility	Goal LU1	1.2	1.2.1	1.2
		PRCP 1.2	Buffering	Goal LU1			
		PRCP 1.2.1	Buffering	Policy LU1-1	1.2	1.3	1.4
		PRCP 1.3	Reduce Auto Travel	Goal LU2			
		PRCP 1.3.1	Employee Housing	Policy LU5-4	1.3	1.4	1.5
		PRCP 1.4	*Additional CFA*	**[DELETED]**	*1.3.1*	*1.4.1*	*1.5.1*
		PRCP 1.4.1	CFA Allocation	Policy LU4-1	1.3.2	1.4.2	1.5.2
		PRCP 1.4.2	TRPA Approval	Policy LU4-1	1.3.3	1.4.3	1.5.3
		PRCP 1.4.3	CFA Eligibility	Policy LU4-2	1.4	1.5	1.7
		PRCP 1.5	*Residential Bonus Units*	**[DELETED]**	*1.4.1*	*1.5.1*	*1.7.1*
		PRCP 1.5.1	*RBU Eligibility*	**[DELETED]**			
	Community Design	PRCP 2.1	Improve Ponderosa Ranch	Goal LU6			
		PRCP 2.1.1	Master Plan	Policy LU2-8	2.1.3	2.1.3	2.1.2
		PRCP 2.1.2	Screening of Parking	Policy LU6-3			
		PRCP 2.1.3	*Signs*	**[DELETED]**			
		PRCP 2.1.4	Incentives for Upgrades	Policy LU6-6			
		PRCP 2.1.5	Antique Equipment	Policy LU6-6			
		PRCP 2.1.6	Scenic Mitigation	Policy C5-2			
		PRCP 2.1.7	Shared Driveways	Policy T3-1			
		PRCP 2.1.8	Frontage Landscaping	Policy LU6-6			
		PRCP 2.1.9	*Planting Area*	**[DELETED]**			
		PRCP 2.2	Warehouse Area Aesthetics	Goal LU6			
		PRCP 2.2.1	Screening of Buildings	Policy LU6-6			
		PRCP 2.2.2	Screening of Storage	Policy LU6-3	2.1.6		2.1.3
		PRCP 2.2.3	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	2.1.3	2.1.3	2.1.2
		PRCP 2.2.4	Screening of Parking	Policy LU6-3		2.1.4	
		PRCP 2.2.5	Screening of Equipment	Policy LU6-3			
		PRCP 2.2.6	*Signs*	**[DELETED]**			
	Economic	PRCP 3.1	Master Plan	Policy LU2-8			

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	ITCP	NNSCP
	Development	PRCP 3.2	General Commerce Businesses	Policy LU2-4			
	Housing	*PRCP 4.1*	*Cooperative Housing Plan*	**[DELETED]**			
		PRCP 4.2	Reduce Land Use Conflicts	Goal LU1			
		PRCP 4.2.1	Buffering	Policy LU1-1			
		PRCP 4.3	Housing Opportunities	Goal LU5	4.1.1	4.1.1	4.1.1
		PRCP 4.3.1	*Housing Study*	**[DELETED]**		*4.1.4*	*4.1.4*
		PRCP 4.3.2	*RBU Allocation*	**[DELETED]**	*5.1*	*5.1*	
Transportation	Street and Highway Infrastructure	PRCP 5.1	Reduce Ease of Auto Use	Goal T1	5.1.1	5.1.1	
		PRCP 5.1.1	Prohibit New Roads	Policy T1-1	5.2	5.2	5.1
		PRCP 5.2	Maintain LOS	Policy T4-2		5.2.1	5.1.3
		PRCP 5.2.1	Decrease Driveways	Policy T3-1		5.2.2	
		PRCP 5.2.2	Driveway Standards	Policy T3-1			
		PRCP 5.3	*VMT Reduction*	**[DELETED]**			
		PRCP 5.3.1.i	Bicycle Trail	Policy T2-4			
		PRCP 5.3.1.ii	Pedestrian Path System	Policy T2-2			
		PRCP 5.3.1.iii	Employee Housing	Policy LU5-4			
		PRCP 5.3.1.iv	TART Service	Policy T5-1	6.1		
	Parking Facilities	PRCP 6.1	Parking Efficiency	Goal T6			
		PRCP 6.1.1	Screening of Parking	Policy LU6-3			
		PRCP 6.1.2	Shared Driveways	Policy T3-1	7.1	7.1	7.1
	Transit Services and Facilities	PRCP 7.1	Transit Service	Goal T5	7.1.1	7.1.1	7.1.1
		PRCP 7.1.1	Transit Stops	Policy T5-2	7.1.2	7.1.2	7.1.2
		PRCP 7.1.2	TART Hours/Frequency	Policy T5-1	7.1.3	7.1.3	7.1.3
		PRCP 7.1.3	Bus Pullouts	Policy T5-3	7.1.4	7.1.4	7.1.4
		PRCP 7.1.4	TMA Subcommittee	Policy T5-4		7.2	
		PRCP 7.2	Alternative Transportation	Policy T1-2	7.2.1	7.2.1	
		PRCP 7.2.1	Jitney Service	Project T-45	7.2.2	7.2.2	
		PRCP 7.2.2	Dial-A-Ride	Project T-47	7.2.3	7.2.4	7.5
		PRCP 7.2.3	Employer Based Trip Reduction	Action T-1	7.3	7.3	7.4
		PRCP 7.3	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42	7.3.1	7.3.1	7.4.1
		PRCP 7.3.1	Reno-North Tahoe Transit	Project T-42			

Community Plan		Goal/Policy Number	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Alignment with Policies in Other Community Plans		
Chapter	Section				ICCP	ITCP	NNSCP
	Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	PRCP 8.1	Bicycle Paths	Policy T2-2			
		PRCP 8.2	Bicycle Paths	Policy T2-2	10.1	9.1	10.3
Conservation		PRCP 9.1	EIP and Restoration	Action C-1	10.2	9.2	10.4
		PRCP 9.2	Incentives for Community Improvements	Policy C4-1	10.3	9.3	10.1
		PRCP 9.3	Threshold Attainment	Goals C1 and C4	10.3.1	9.3.1	10.1.1
		PRCP 9.3.1	*Past Improvements*	**[DELETED]**	*10.3.2*	*9.3.2*	*10.1.2*
		PRCP 9.3.2	*Contribution*	**[DELETED]**	*10.3.3*	*9.3.3*	*10.1.3*
		PRCP 9.3.3	Implementation	Policy C3-2	10.4	9.4	10.5
		PRCP 9.4	Spring Flowers, Autumn Foliage	Policy LU6-7	10.4	9.4	10.5
		PRCP 9.5	Underground Utilities	Action C-6	10.5	9.5	10.6
Recreation		*PRCP 10.1*	*Private Recreation*	**[DELETED]**			
		PRCP 10.1.1	Master Plan	Policy LU2-7		11.1	
Public Services		PRCP 11.1	Public Service Uses	Policy PSF2-3			
		PRCP 11.2	Recycling Collection	Policy LU2-7			
		PRCP 11.3	*Business Mail Delivery*	**[DELETED]**			
		PRCP 11.4	Public Service Use Compatibility	Policy LU1-3	13.1	12.1	13.1
Implementation		*PRCP 12.1*	*Man-Modified Mitigation*	**[DELETED]**	*13.2*	*12.2*	*13.2*
		PRCP 12.2	Excess Coverage	WCC 110.220.40(3)	13.3	12.3	13.3
		PRCP 12.3	*Mitigation within the CP*	**[DELETED]**	*13.4*	*12.4*	*13.4*
		PRCP 12.4	Contribution	Policy LU3-2	13.6	12.5	
		PRCP 12.5	*ISTEA Funds*	**[DELETED]**	*13.6.1*	*12.5.1*	
		PRCP 12.5.1	*ISTEA Funds*	**[DELETED]**	*13.7, 4.1*	*12.6*	*13.7*
		PRCP 12.6	Workforce Housing	Policy LU5-4			3.2

Table I-5

Plan Area Statements

Plan Area Statement	Policy	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Classification	WCTAP Regulatory Zone
PAS 030 - Mount Rose	Special Policy 1	Resource Management	WCC 110.220.360(1)	Conservation	Mount Rose
	Special Policy 2	*Primary Use*	**[Added to narrative]**		
	Special Policy 3	Developed Facilities	WCC 110.220.360(2)		
PAS 034 - Crystal Bay	Special Policy 1	Highway Access	WCC 110.220.250(1)	Residential	Crystal Bay
	Special Policy 2	Restoration	WCC 110.220.250(2)		
	Special Policy 3	Permissible Uses	WCC 110.220.250(3)		
	Special Policy 4	Avalanche Hazard	WCC 110.220.250(4)		
PAS 035 - Crystal Bay Condominiums	*Special Policy 1*	*Neighborhood Commercial*	**[Deleted]**	Residential	Crystal Bay Condominiums
	Special Policy 2	Screening	Policy C5-2, Action C-7		
PAS 036 - Incline Village #4 / Ponderosa	Special Policy 1	Density	WCC 110.220.210(1)	Residential	Incline Village 4
PAS 037 - Lakeview	*Special Policy 1*	*Piers*	**[Deleted]**	Residential	Lakeview
	Special Policy 2	Shorezone Restoration	Policy C2-6		
	Special Policy 3	Beach Recreation	Project R-2		
	Special Policy 4	Views	WCC 110.220.270(1)		
PAS 038 - Wood Creek	Special Policy 1	County Yard	WCC 110.220.280(1)	Residential	Wood Creek
PAS 040 - Incline Village #1	Special Policy 1	Scenic Standards	WCC 110.220.180(1)	Residential	Incline Village 1
	Special Policy 2	Drainage	WCC 110.220.180(1)		
PAS 041 - Incline Village #3	Special Policy 1	SEZ and Fisheries	Policy C2-6	Residential	Incline Village 3
	Special Policy 2	Conforming Uses	WCC 110.220.200(1)		
	Special Policy 3	Density	WCC 110.220.200(2)		
	Special Policy 4	Multi-Family Dwellings	WCC 110.220.200(3)		
PAS 042 - Incline Village #5	Special Policy 1	SEZ Restoration	Policy C2-6	Residential	Incline Village 5
	Special Policy 2	Avalanche Hazard	WCC 110.220.220(1)		
PAS 043 - Chateau / Country Club	Special Policy 1	Land Capability	Action C-4	Residential	Chateau
PAS 044 - Fairway	Special Policy 1	SEZ and Fisheries	Policy C2-6	Residential	Fairway
	Special Policy 2	Community Plan	WCC 110.220.300(3)		
	Special Policy 3	Multi-Family Dwellings	WCC 110.220.300(2)		
	Special Policy 4	Commercial Facilities	WCC 110.220.300(1)		
PAS 046 - Incline Village Residential	Special Policy 1	Preferred Affordable Housing Area	Policy LU5-3	Residential	Incline Village Residential
	Special Policy 2	Recreation	Policy R1-3		
	Special Policy 3	*Community Plan*	**[Deleted]**		
PAS 047 - Tunnel Creek	*Special Policy 1*	*Primary Use*	**[Added to narrative]**	Conservation	Tunnel Creek
	Special Policy 2	Restoration	Policy C2-6		
	Special Policy 3	*Primary Use*	**[Added to narrative]**		
	Special Policy 4	*Recreation*	**[Deleted]**		
PAS 049 - Mill Creek	Special Policy 1	SEZ Restoration	Policy C2-6	Residential	Mill Creek

Plan Area Statement	Policy	Topic	Corresponding Location in the WCTAP	Classification	WCTAP Regulatory Zone
PAS 050 - Mt. Shadows	Special Policy 1	Improvements and Stabilization	WCC 110.220.320(1)	Residential	Mt. Shadows
	Special Policy 2	Subdivision Modification	WCC 110.220.320(2)		
PAS 051 - Tyrolian Village	Special Policy 1	Drainage	Policy C2-5	Residential	Tyrolian Village
	Special Policy 2	Timeshare Use	WCC 110.220.330(3)		
PAS 052 - Incline Ski	Special Policy 1	Ski Area	Policy R1-7	Recreation	Incline Ski
	Special Policy 2	*Incline Creek Diversion*	**[Deleted]**		
PAS 053 - Incline Lake	Special Policy 1	Recreation Parking	Policy T6-7, Project T-5	Recreation	Incline Meadows
	Special Policy 2	Master Plan	WCC 110.220.380(1)		
	Special Policy 3	TDR Credits	WCC 110.220.380(2)		
	Special Policy 4	Wastewater Disposal	WCC 110.220.380(3)		
	Special Policy 5	Entry View Points	Policy C5-4		
	Special Policy 6	Common Facilities	WCC 110.220.380(4)		
	Special Policy 7	*Scenic Roadway Unit*	**[Deleted]**		
PAS 055 - East Shore	Special Policy 1	Shorezone Uses	WCC 110.220.390(3)	Recreation	East Shore
	Special Policy 2	Nesting Ospreys	WCC 110.220.390(4)		
	Special Policy 3	Roadside Parking	WCC 110.220.390(6)		
	Special Policy 4	*Hidden Beach Improvements*	**[Deleted]**		
	Special Policy 5	Scenic Highway	Policy C5-5, Project T-11		
	Special Policy 6	Scenic Viewpoints	Policy C5-5, Project T-10		
	Special Policy 7	Road Cuts	Policy C5-5		
	Special Policy 8	Development Location	WCC 110.220.390(7)		
	Special Policy 9	Thunderbird Lodge	WCC 110.220.390(1)		
	Special Policy 10	Thunderbird Lodge	WCC 110.220.390(2)		
PAS 056 - Marlette Lake	Special Policy 1	Vehicle Access	WCC 110.220.340(1)	Conservation	Marlette Lake
	Special Policy 2	Water Supply	WCC 110.220.340(2)		
	Special Policy 3	*Resource Management*	**[Added to narrative]**		
	Special Policy 4	*Service Roads*	**[Added to narrative]**		
	Special Policy 5	Trailhead Facilities	WCC 110.220.340(5)		
	Special Policy 6	Campsite Capacity	WCC 110.220.340(3)		
	Special Policy 7	Pump Station	WCC 110.220.340(4)		

NOTES

(1) Where "[Added to narrative]" is used, the policy language set the tone and vision for the plan area. Rather than retaining this as a policy, this language was incorporated into the narrative in Chapter 2, *Land Use* , of the Area Plan.

Table I-6

Policy Additions

ID	Policy	Topic	Addition Requested By	Version
1	Policy LU1-2	Design Standards	TRPA	10-19
2	Policy LU1-3	Finding of Compatibility	Washoe County	08-19
3	Policy LU2-1	Focus Development towards Town Centers	Washoe County	08-19
4	Goal LU3	[Town Center Redevelopment]	TRPA	10-19
5	Action LU-2	Merged Development Rights Pools	Washoe County	10-19
6	Action LU-4	Update Land Use Concept Plans	TRPA	10-19
7	Goal LU4	[Development Rights]	TRPA	10-19
8	Policy LU5-4	Incentives for Affordable and Workforces Housing	Washoe County	08-19
9	Action LU-5	Public Outreach	Washoe County	08-19
10	Action LU-6	Workforce Housing Incentives	TRPA	01-20
11	Action LU-7	Design Guidelines	Washoe County	08-19
12	Policy LU7-1	Barriers to Redevelopment	Washoe County	08-19
13	Policy LU7-2	Special Events	Washoe County	08-19
14	Policy LU7-3	Year-Round Activities at Diamond Peak	Washoe County	08-19
15	Action LU-8	Designate Special Events Area	TRPA	10-19
16	Goal LU8	[Regional Plan Consistency]	Washoe County	08-19
17	Policy LU8-1	Regional Plan Consistency	Washoe County	08-19
18	Policy LU8-2	Consideration of Amendments	Washoe County	08-19
19	Policy LU8-3	Community Character	Washoe County	08-19
20	Policy LU8-4	Changes in Permissible Use	Washoe County	08-19
21	Policy LU8-5	Amendments Affecting Town Centers	Washoe County	08-19
22	Policy LU8-6	Amendments Affecting Residential Regulatory Zones	Washoe County	08-19
23	Action LU-9	Planning and Development Approach	Washoe County	08-19
24	Action LU-10	Amendment Procedures	TRPA	10-19
25	Action LU-11	Regional Plan Amendments	TRPA	10-19
26	Goal LU9	[Planning for Future Needs]	TRPA	10-19
27	Action LU-12	Ponderosa Ranch Planning Process	TRPA	10-19
28	Action LU-13	Permissible Uses at Ponderosa Ranch	TRPA	10-19
29	Policy T1-4	Travel Demand Management	Washoe County	08-19
30	Policy T2-1	Implement the Regional Transportation Plan	Washoe County	08-19
31	Policy T2-6	Protect and Improve Trail Access	Washoe County	08-19
32	Policy T3-2	New Curb Cuts on State Route 28	TRPA	01-20
33	Action T-2	Access Management Standards	Washoe County	08-19
34	Goal T4	[Safe, Efficient Roads]	Washoe County	08-19
35	Policy T4-2	Maintenance	Washoe County	08-19
36	Policy T4-3	Mobility Hubs and Transit Center	TRPA	01-20
37	Action T-3	Plowing of Multi-Use Trails	TRPA	01-20
38	Action T-4	Short-Range Transit Plan	TRPA	01-20
39	Policy T6-1	Parking Standards	Washoe County	08-19
40	Policy T6-6	Partnerships	Washoe County	08-19
41	Policy T6-7	Trailhead Parking	Washoe County	08-19
42	Action T-5	Parking Management Plan	TRPA	10-19

ID	Policy	Topic	Addition Requested By	Version
43	Goal C1	[Threshold Maintenance]	TRPA	10-19
44	Action C-1	Environmental Improvement Program	TRPA	10-19
45	Goal C2	[Water Quality Standards]	Washoe County	08-19
46	Policy C2-1	Best Management Practices	Washoe County	08-19
47	Policy C2-3	Lake Clarity Credit Program	Washoe County	08-19
48	Policy C2-4	Road Operation	Washoe County	08-19
49	Action C-2	BMP Certification	TRPA	10-19
50	Action C-3	Stormwater Districts	Washoe County	08-19
51	Goal C3	[Cultural Resources]	Washoe County	08-19
52	Policy C3-1	Historic Site Conservation	Washoe County	08-19
53	Policy C3-3	Cooperation	Washoe County	08-19
54	Policy C3-4	Interpretive Displays	Washoe County	08-19
55	Policy C4-3	Partnerships and Facilitation	Washoe County	08-19
56	Action C-5	Urban Forestry Strategy	Washoe County	08-19
57	Policy C5-1	Design Standards	Washoe County	08-19
58	Policy C5-3	Restrict Landscape Modification	Washoe County	08-19
59	Policy C5-6	Noise	TRPA	10-19
60	Action C-8	Community Information Signage	TRPA	01-20
61	Action C-9	Sign Regulation Enforcement	TRPA	01-20
62	Goal C6	[Air Quality]	Washoe County	08-19
63	Policy C6-1	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	Washoe County	08-19
64	Policy C6-2	Idle-Free Zones	Washoe County	08-19
65	Policy C6-3	Public Buildings	Washoe County	08-19
66	Goal C7	[Natural Hazards]	Washoe County	08-19
67	Policy C7-1	Disclosure	Washoe County	08-19
68	Policy C7-2	Risk Mitigation	Washoe County	08-19
69	Goal R1	[Recreational Opportunities]	Washoe County	08-19
70	Policy R1-1	Local Parks and Recreational Facilities	Washoe County	08-19
71	Policy R1-4	Multi-Use Facilities	TRPA	10-19
72	Policy R1-5	Sustainable Recreation Plan	Washoe County	08-19
73	Policy R1-6	Trail System	TRPA	10-19
74	Policy R1-8	Recreational Uses on Public Lands	Washoe County	08-19
75	Goal R3	[Community Events]	Washoe County	08-19
76	Policy R3-1	Special Event Areas	Washoe County	08-19
77	Policy R3-2	Parking, Access, and Safety	TRPA	10-19
78	Policy PSF1-1	Water and Wastewater Services	Washoe County	08-19
79	Policy PSF1-2	Library Services	Washoe County	08-19
80	Policy PSF1-3	Broadband Internet Services	Washoe County	08-19
81	Policy PSF1-4	Law Enforcement Services	Washoe County	08-19
82	Policy PSF1-5	Fire Protection Services	TRPA	10-19
83	Goal PSF2	[Consolidation]	TRPA	10-19
84	Policy PSF2-1	Coordination	TRPA	10-19
85	Policy PSF2-2	Dig Once	TRPA	10-19
86	Goal PSF3	[Energy Efficiency]	TRPA	01-20
87	Policy PSF3-1	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	TRPA	01-20

ID	Policy	Topic	Addition Requested By	Version
88	Policy PSF3-2	Infrastructure Location	TRPA	01-20
89	Goal IM1	[Funding]	TRPA	10-19
90	Action IM-1	Funding and Financing	Washoe County	08-19
91	Goal IM2	[Collaboration]	Washoe County	08-19
92	Action IM-2	Seek Partnerships	Washoe County	08-19
93	Action IM-3	Public Land Management	Washoe County	08-19
94	Action IM-4	Transportation Planning	Washoe County	08-19
95	Action IM-5	Other Projects with Environmental Benefits	Washoe County	08-19
96	Action IM-6	Best Practices for Recreational Uses	TRPA	01-20

Attachment J

Regulatory Zones and Permissible Uses

Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan

Plan Area Statements and Regulatory Zones

Plan Area Statement	Category	Proposed Regulatory Zone
Chateau / Country Club (043)	Residential	Chateau
Crystal Bay (034)	Residential	Crystal Bay
Crystal Bay Condominiums (035)	Residential	Crystal Bay Condominiums
East Shore (055)	Recreation	East Shore
Fairway (044)	Residential	Fairway
Incline Lake (053)	Recreation	Incline Meadows
Incline Ski (052)	Recreation	Incline Ski
Incline Village #1 (040)	Residential	Incline Village 1
Incline Village #2 (039)	Residential	Incline Village 2
Incline Village #3 (041)	Residential	Incline Village 3
Incline Village #4 / Ponderosa (036)	Residential	Incline Village 4
Incline Village #5 (042)	Residential	Incline Village 5
Incline Village Residential (046)	Residential	Incline Village Residential
Lakeview (037)	Residential	Lakeview
Marlette Lake (056)	Conservation	Marlette Lake
Martis Peak (019)	Conservation	Martis Peak
Mill Creek (049)	Residential	Mill Creek
Mount Rose (030)	Conservation	Mount Rose
Mt. Shadows (050)	Residential	Mt. Shadows
Stateline Point (033)	Residential	Stateline Point
Tunnel Creek (047)	Conservation	Tunnel Creek
Tyrolian Village (051)	Residential	Tyrolian Village
Wood Creek (038)	Residential	Wood Creek

Community Plans and Regulatory Zones

Community Plan	Category	Proposed Regulatory Zone
Incline Village Commercial Community Plan	Mixed-Use	Incline Village Commercial
Incline Village Tourist Community Plan	Tourist	Incline Village Tourist
Nevada North Stateline Community Plan	Tourist	Crystal Bay Tourist
Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan	Mixed-Use	Ponderosa Ranch

Permissible Use Changes Noted in the March 2020 Board Approval Draft

#	Neighborhood	List	Use Category	Use Subcategory	Use Classification	Current	Proposed	Change	Town Center	Regional Plan Land Use	Former Plan
1	Incline Village Commercial	Special Area #1	Residential	---	Nursing and Personal Care	[ ]	A	Addition	Yes	Mixed Use	Incline Village Commercial Community Plan
2	Incline Village Commercial	Special Area #1	Residential	---	Residential Care	[ ]	A	Addition	Yes	Mixed Use	Incline Village Commercial Community Plan
3	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Residential	---	Nursing and Personal Care	[ ]	S	Addition	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
4	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Residential	---	Residential Care	[ ]	S	Addition	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
5	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Commercial	Retail	Food and Beverage Retail Sales	A	[ ]	Deletion	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
6	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Commercial	Entertainment	Outdoor Amusement	S	[ ]	Deletion	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
7	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Commercial	Services	Animal Husbandry Services	[ ]	A	Addition	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
8	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Commercial	Services	Professional Offices	[ ]	A	Addition	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
9	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Commercial	Services	Business Support Services	[ ]	A	Addition	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
10	Ponderosa Ranch	Special Area	Commercial	Services	Financial Services	[ ]	A	Addition	No	Mixed Use	Ponderosa Ranch Community Plan
11	Fairway	General	Recreation	---	Day Use Areas	S	A	S->A	No	Residential	PAS 044 - Fairway

Attachment K

Adopting Ordinance – Area Plan

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE 2021-___

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 2019-03, AS AMENDED, TO ADOPT WASHOE COUNTY'S TAHOE AREA PLAN

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.0 Findings

1.05 The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P. L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, 1980) created the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and empowered it to set forth environmental threshold carrying capacities ("threshold standards") for the Tahoe Region.

1.10 The Compact directs TRPA to adopt and enforce a Regional Plan that, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules and regulations, will achieve and maintain such threshold standards while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such thresholds.

1.15 The Compact further requires that the Regional Plan attain and maintain federal, state, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the region for which the standards are applicable.

1.20 Compact Art. V(c) states that the TRPA Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission shall continuously review and maintain the Regional Plan.

1.25 In June 1987, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Ordinance 87-9, which established the Regional Plan and included, amongst other things, the Goals & Policies and the Code of Ordinances ("Code").

1.30 In April 2019, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Ordinance 2019-03, superseding portions of Ordinance 87-9 by collocating the environmental threshold standards with the Regional Plan Goals and Policies.

1.35 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance 2019-03, as amended, which ordinance relates to the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) by amending the Goals & Policies pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact in order to accelerate attainment and ensure maintenance of the threshold standards.

1.40 It is necessary and desirable to amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances ("Code") to effectuate the amendments to the Goals & Policies pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.45 TRPA has made the necessary findings required by Article V of the Compact, Chapter 4 of the Code, and all other applicable rules and regulations, and incorporates these findings fully herein.

1.50 The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) conducted public hearings on the amendments and recommended adoption of these amendments. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. At these hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.55 The Governing Board finds that the amendments adopted here will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.0 Amendment of the TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies

2.10 Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, is hereby amended by adopting the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan, as shown in Attachment B and fully incorporated herein.

Section 3.0 Interpretation and Severability

3.10 The provisions of this ordinance adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to affect their purpose. If any section, clause, provision, or portion thereof is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.0 Effective Date

4.10 The provisions of this ordinance shall be effective 60 days after adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held _____ by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

_____

Mark Bruce, Chair
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Governing Board

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE 2021-___

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 87-9, AS AMENDED, TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 34, 36, AND 38 OF THE TRPA CODE OF ORDINANCES TO REFLECT THE ADOPTION OF WASHOE COUNTY'S TAHOE AREA PLAN

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.0 Findings

1.05 The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P. L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, 1980) created the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and empowered it to set forth environmental threshold carrying capacities ("threshold standards") for the Tahoe Region.

1.10 The Compact directs TRPA to adopt and enforce a Regional Plan that, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules and regulations, will achieve and maintain such threshold standards while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such thresholds.

1.15 The Compact further requires that the Regional Plan attain and maintain federal, state, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the region for which the standards are applicable.

1.20 Compact Art. V(c) states that the TRPA Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission shall continuously review and maintain the Regional Plan.

1.25 In June 1987, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Ordinance 87-9, which established the Regional Plan and included, amongst other things, the Goals & Policies and the Code of Ordinances ("Code").

1.30 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance 2019-03, as amended, which ordinance relates to the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) by amending the Goals & Policies pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact in order to accelerate attainment and ensure maintenance of the threshold standards.

1.35 It is necessary and desirable to amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances ("Code") to effectuate the amendments to the Goals & Policies pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.40 TRPA has made the necessary findings required by Article V of the Compact, Chapter 4 of the Code, and all other applicable rules and regulations, and incorporates these findings fully herein.

1.45 The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) conducted public hearings on the amendments and recommended adoption of these amendments. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. At these hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.50 The Governing Board finds that the amendments adopted here will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.55 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.0 Amendment of the TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies

2.10 Ordinance 87-9, as previously amended, is hereby amended as set forth in Exhibit 1 attached hereto.

Section 3.0 Interpretation and Severability

3.10 The provisions of this ordinance adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to affect their purpose. If any section, clause, provision, or portion thereof is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.0 Effective Date

4.10 The provisions of this ordinance shall be effective 60 days after adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held _____ by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

_____

Mark Bruce, Chair
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Governing Board

EXHIBIT 1

AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 34, 36, AND 38

(1) Subsection 34.2.4, *Washoe County Substitutions,* shall be amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 34: DRIVEWAY AND PARKING STANDARDS

34.2 APPLICABILITY

34.2.4. Washoe County Substitutions

The ~~*Signage, Parking, and Design Standards and Guidelines for the Community Plans of Washoe County*~~*Tahoe Area Plan Design Standards and Guidelines*, ~~April 1996~~May 2021, shall apply to the ~~North Stateline~~Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and Ponderosa Ranch ~~Community Plans~~districts~~, until such time as they may be superseded by standards in an approved Area Plan~~.

(2) Subsection 36.2.2, Subparagraph D, shall be amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 36: DESIGN STANDARDS

36.2 APPLICABILITY

36.2.2. Substitute Standards

TRPA may adopt equal or superior substitute design standards pursuant to an Area Plan, community plan, redevelopment plan, specific plan, or master plan. Substitute design standards shall not apply to the review procedures and standards for projects in the shoreland. Appropriate provisions of TRPA's Design Review Guidelines and Scenic Quality Improvement Program may be considered as conditions of project approval. Substitute standards adopted by TRPA are listed below.

D. Washoe County Substitutions

The ~~*Signage, Parking, and Design Standards and Guidelines for the Community Plans of Washoe County*~~*Tahoe Area Plan Design Standards and Guidelines*, ~~November 1996~~May 2021, shall apply to the ~~North Stateline~~Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and Ponderosa Ranch ~~Community Plans~~districts.

(3) Subsection 38.2.3, Subparagraph D.4 shall be amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 38: SIGNS

38.2 APPLICABILITY

38.2.3. Substitution of Standards

TRPA may adopt a substitute sign ordinance that supersedes the standards of this chapter for use in a local jurisdiction or in a community plan area. Substitute standards adopted by TRPA are listed in subparagraph D below.

D. TRPA-Approved Substitutions

4. Washoe County

The ~~*Signage, Parking, and Design Standards and Guidelines for the Community Plans of Washoe County*~~*Tahoe Area Plan Design Guidelines and Standards* (~~November 1996~~May 2021) shall apply to the ~~North Stateline~~Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and Ponderosa Ranch ~~Community Plans~~districts.

Attachment L

Adopting Ordinance – Code of Ordinance Amendments

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE 2021-___

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 87-9, AS AMENDED, TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 34, 36, AND 38 OF THE TRPA CODE OF ORDINANCES TO REFLECT THE ADOPTION OF WASHOE COUNTY'S TAHOE AREA PLAN

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.0 Findings

1.05 The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P. L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, 1980) created the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and empowered it to set forth environmental threshold carrying capacities ("threshold standards") for the Tahoe Region.

1.10 The Compact directs TRPA to adopt and enforce a Regional Plan that, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules and regulations, will achieve and maintain such threshold standards while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such thresholds.

1.15 The Compact further requires that the Regional Plan attain and maintain federal, state, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the region for which the standards are applicable.

1.20 Compact Art. V(c) states that the TRPA Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission shall continuously review and maintain the Regional Plan.

1.25 In June 1987, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Ordinance 87-9, which established the Regional Plan and included, amongst other things, the Goals & Policies and the Code of Ordinances ("Code").

1.30 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance 2019-03, as amended, which ordinance relates to the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) by amending the Goals & Policies pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact in order to accelerate attainment and ensure maintenance of the threshold standards.

1.35 It is necessary and desirable to amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances ("Code") to effectuate the amendments to the Goals & Policies pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.40 TRPA has made the necessary findings required by Article V of the Compact, Chapter 4 of the Code, and all other applicable rules and regulations, and incorporates these findings fully herein.

1.45 The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) conducted public hearings on the amendments and recommended adoption of these amendments. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. At these hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.50 The Governing Board finds that the amendments adopted here will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.55 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.0 Amendment of the TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies

2.10 Ordinance 87-9, as previously amended, is hereby amended as set forth in Exhibit 1 attached hereto.

Section 3.0 Interpretation and Severability

3.10 The provisions of this ordinance adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to affect their purpose. If any section, clause, provision, or portion thereof is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.0 Effective Date

4.10 The provisions of this ordinance shall be effective 60 days after adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held _____ by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

_____

Mark Bruce, Chair
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Governing Board

EXHIBIT 1

AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 34, 36, AND 38

(1) Subsection 34.2.4, *Washoe County Substitutions,* shall be amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 34: DRIVEWAY AND PARKING STANDARDS

34.2 APPLICABILITY

34.2.4. Washoe County Substitutions

The ~~*Signage, Parking, and Design Standards and Guidelines for the Community Plans of Washoe County*~~*Tahoe Area Plan Design Standards and Guidelines*, ~~April 1996~~May 2021, shall apply to the ~~North Stateline~~Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and Ponderosa Ranch ~~Community Plans~~districts~~, until such time as they may be superseded by standards in an approved Area Plan~~.

(2) Subsection 36.2.2, Subparagraph D, shall be amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 36: DESIGN STANDARDS

36.2 APPLICABILITY

36.2.2. Substitute Standards

TRPA may adopt equal or superior substitute design standards pursuant to an Area Plan, community plan, redevelopment plan, specific plan, or master plan. Substitute design standards shall not apply to the review procedures and standards for projects in the shoreland. Appropriate provisions of TRPA's Design Review Guidelines and Scenic Quality Improvement Program may be considered as conditions of project approval. Substitute standards adopted by TRPA are listed below.

D. Washoe County Substitutions

The ~~*Signage, Parking, and Design Standards and Guidelines for the Community Plans of Washoe County*~~*Tahoe Area Plan Design Standards and Guidelines*, ~~November 1996~~May 2021, shall apply to the ~~North Stateline~~Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and Ponderosa Ranch ~~Community Plans~~districts.

(3) Subsection 38.2.3, Subparagraph D.4 shall be amended to read as follows:

CHAPTER 38: SIGNS

38.2 APPLICABILITY

38.2.3. Substitution of Standards

TRPA may adopt a substitute sign ordinance that supersedes the standards of this chapter for use in a local jurisdiction or in a community plan area. Substitute standards adopted by TRPA are listed in subparagraph D below.

D. TRPA-Approved Substitutions

4. Washoe County

The ~~*Signage, Parking, and Design Standards and Guidelines for the Community Plans of Washoe County*~~*Tahoe Area Plan Design Guidelines and Standards* (~~November 1996~~May 2021) shall apply to the ~~North Stateline~~Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, and Ponderosa Ranch ~~Community Plans~~districts.

Attachment M

Draft Future Amendment Package

The following revisions were noted after Washoe County began the adoption process for the proposed area plan in early 2020. TRPA staff recommends that these items be addressed as part of a future area plan amendment process.

REVISIONS TO THE AREA PLAN

(1) **Delete the Tyrolian Village Special Area from the list of Special Areas (Page 2-21).**

Description: Delete Tyrolian Village from the list of special areas.

Rationale: In 2004, TRPA processed a Plan Area Statement Amendment application to create a new Special Area in Tyrolian Village. This Special Area was intended to allow certain tourist accommodation uses on a single parcel. After TRPA approval, the applicant sought a Master Plan Amendment with Washoe County to allow tourist accommodation uses on that parcel. In 2006, Washoe County denied this request largely in response to neighborhood opposition. As a result, county zoning and TRPA's Plan Area Statement conflicted, resulting in tourist accommodation uses being disallowed. Under the county-adopted plan, however, such uses would be allowed, as they were authorized in the Plan Area Statement. This change was made in error. As a result, the county wishes to correct this by deleting the Special Area.

REVISIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT CODE

(2) **Identify which Regulatory Zones (Districts) have a special designation to receive Transferred Development Rights (TDRs)**

Description: Revise the Special Policies for several regulatory zones to include TDR Receiving Areas.

Section Number	District	TDR Receiving Area	
		Existing Development	Multi-Residential
110.220.140	Crystal Bay Tourist	●	●
110.220.150	Incline Village Commercial	●	●
110.220.160	Incline Village Tourist	●	●
110.220.170	Ponderosa Ranch	●	●
110.220.200	Incline Village 3		●
	Incline Village 3 (Special Area)	●	●
110.220.210	Incline Village 4		●
110.220.230	Incline Village Residential	●	●
110.220.300	Fairway	●	
	Fairway (Special Area)	●	●
110.220.390	East Shore		●*

* - For employee housing only

Rationale: Special designations for TDR Receiving Areas were inadvertently left out of the area plan. The plan should address which regulatory zones are allowed to receive TDRs. Such designations are needed in order to apply certain provisions in the Code of Ordinances.

(3) **Delete the Tyrolian Village Special Area (Section 110.220.325).**

Description: Delete the Special Area from the map and use list.

Rationale: See Change #1 above.

(4) **Allow Code of Ordinances procedures for Community Plans to apply to Ponderosa Ranch (Section 110.220.170).**

Description: Add language to the Special Policies for the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone that is functionally similar to language from the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan:

"In order to retain long-standing development standards for areas that were within Community Plans prior to adoption of the Area Plan and are not included in the Town Center, provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances that apply to Community Plans and Community Plan Areas shall continue to apply."

Rationale: The Code of Ordinances applies certain incentives to Community Plans, such as increased land coverage and building height for certain buildings. Three of the four community plans are within a designated Town Center and have access to incentives that exceed the Community Plan incentives. Ponderosa Ranch is the one Community Plan in Washoe County that is not part of a Town Center. The added special policy would clarify that Community Plan incentives continue to apply.