

SUMMARY

S.1 SUMMARY BACKGROUND OF THE REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE

S.1.1 SETTING AND PURPOSE

The Lake Tahoe Region encompasses the Lake Tahoe Basin along with additional areas near the Lake's outlet at Tahoe City. The Basin is a watershed situated between the main crest of the Sierra Nevada and the Carson Range, bisected by the California-Nevada state line. The Region covers approximately 325,000 acres, of which 123,000 acres is Lake Tahoe itself. The total land area of the Region is more than 202,000 acres, consisting primarily of steeply sloping mountains, with peaks ranging in elevation from approximately 8,000 to nearly 11,000 feet above sea level. Located within the California portion of the Region is the incorporated City of South Lake Tahoe and portions of El Dorado County and Placer County. The Nevada portion of the Tahoe Region includes parts of Washoe County, Douglas County, and the rural area of Carson City.

The Lake Tahoe Region is home to approximately 55,000 full-time residents and is a recreational destination for more than three million visitors each year. Because of the special conditions and unique circumstances of the Region's natural ecology, development patterns, population, and human needs, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) was formed to guide orderly growth and protection of the Region's resources. The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, first signed in 1969 and significantly amended in 1980, charged TRPA with establishing Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (standards necessary to achieve certain environmental and other values) and required TRPA to prepare and implement a Regional Plan to attain and maintain those threshold standards. Guided by the 15-member TRPA Governing Board representing both states, the federal government, and local jurisdictions, TRPA is charged with adopting and maintaining environmental threshold standards, the Regional Plan, and implementing ordinances that guide development and other activities in the Tahoe Region.

The existing Regional Plan was approved in 1987, at a time when uncontrolled development of private lands and proposed highway expansions were threatening the unique and sensitive natural resources of the Lake Tahoe Region. The focus of the Regional Plan at the time was to limit runaway growth and environmentally incompatible development, protect sensitive lands and waters, and preserve the natural landscape. The Regional Plan was structured around a set of adopted threshold standards and other issues of local and regional importance. The 1987 Regional Plan largely achieved its intended purpose. Sensitive lands have been protected, growth has been controlled, and new development has been designed to be more environmentally compatible.

The challenges TRPA faces at Lake Tahoe today are centered on maintaining a sustainable balance of environmental protection, economic health, and vital communities. To address these issues, the regulatory focus in the Region has shifted to strengthen the focus on restoration of sensitive lands and environmental improvement projects that repair damage of the past, while also promoting redevelopment of Tahoe's community centers to accelerate attainment of threshold standards with more environmentally appropriate and attractive structures. As a result, the 20-year update to the existing Regional Plan provides an opportunity to refocus and refine the regulatory approach and concepts established in the 1980s to better respond to these important issues.

The priorities addressed in this Regional Plan Update focus on threshold standards that are not currently in attainment. The update of the Regional Plan is not intended to make sweeping changes to the existing growth control framework and other regulatory programs. Many components of the existing Regional Plan are achieving

their intended purpose and are not proposed for substantive change. Instead, the update of the Regional Plan will implement targeted changes that encourage environmentally beneficial redevelopment and apply adaptive management concepts to the most important and urgent emerging issues facing the Tahoe Region.

The Regional Plan consists of the Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances (Code), Land Use Maps, and plans for specific geographic areas. The Goals and Policies document identifies regional goals and provides policy direction to achieve those goals. It is organized into a series of elements and subelements to address the sensitive resources and unique environmental and community issues facing the Region. The Code is the collection of regulations and measures developed to implement the Goals and Policies. Plans for specific geographic areas guide zoning, designate allowable uses, and provide other approaches to achieving the Goals and Policies in those areas. In the existing Regional Plan, plans for specific geographic areas include Plan Area Statements (PASs), Community Plans, Master Plans, and other Specific Plans.

The purpose of this EIS is to identify and assess the anticipated environmental effects of implementing each of the Regional Plan Update alternatives, with a focus on significant and potentially significant environmental impacts. Its role is to provide sufficient environmental information to allow meaningful comment and participation by public agencies, interest groups, and the public; to allow the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission to recommend a preferred alternative to the TRPA Governing Board; and, ultimately, for the Governing Board to render a fully informed decision with regard to its approval of an updated Regional Plan.

The broad geography and long timeframe to which the Regional Plan applies, and the policy-oriented nature of its guidance, is such that the EIS environmental impact analysis is prepared at a policy level—that is, a more general analysis with a level of detail and degree of specificity commensurate with that of the plan itself. As such, the EIS focuses on the potential effects of policies, which—because they are to be implemented through as-yet-undefined projects over the duration of the Plan—are inherently less precise. The EIS is not intended to take the place of project-specific environmental documentation that will be needed to implement actions anticipated to occur following approval of the Regional Plan, nor does it contain sufficient analytical detail for TRPA to approve site-specific projects that may be proposed in the future in accordance with the Plan. All of TRPA's existing procedures requiring environmental review of projects to determine their potential for significant impacts, feasible and effective mitigation to address those impacts, findings pertaining to project effects on threshold attainment, and other environmental safeguards are still in place and will continue to ensure that proposed projects are fully evaluated prior to approval and implementation. This EIS, consistent with its policy-level purpose, includes a thorough analysis of the environmental implications of the policy directions offered by the alternatives and the information necessary to select the alternative that would best achieve TRPA's regional objectives.

S.1.2 PROCESS

This EIS has been prepared in accordance with Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Chapter 3 of the Code, and Article VI of the TRPA Rules of Procedure. The environmental review process for the Regional Plan Update EIS began with efforts to gather information to establish the breadth, or scope, of environmental review. A notice of preparation was issued on September 5, 2007, to inform agencies and the public that an EIS would be prepared for the Regional Plan Update and to solicit views of agencies and the public regarding the scope and content of the EIS.

TRPA also facilitated a variety of public outreach efforts to develop the Regional Plan Update alternatives and the EIS scope. Between 2005 and 2008, some 2,500 individuals and organizations participated in the Pathway Forum and Place-based Planning, two comprehensive public participation efforts, providing valuable input to the TRPA Governing Board and staff. TRPA also engaged stakeholders and the public through additional meetings of the Governing Board in 2009 and 2010. In addition, throughout 2010, TRPA received hundreds of written

comments and conducted more than 180 meetings with interested parties to identify additional issues and specific amendments that could be considered in the Regional Plan Update alternatives.

In January 2011, the Governing Board directed TRPA staff to focus the Regional Plan Update on the Region's most pressing issues: protection against emerging threats, such as wildfire and invasive species; response to statutory requirements with which the Region or portions of the Region must comply; and accelerated attainment of threshold standards. By focusing on these high-priority issues, a reasonable range of feasible alternatives could be developed and evaluated in the EIS, and the Governing Board could render a decision and implement the updated Regional Plan within a reasonable timeframe. In July 2011, the Governing Board formed a Regional Plan Update Committee, which met regularly to solicit additional input from the public, local jurisdictions, representatives from California and Nevada agencies, and other interested groups. The Regional Plan Update Committee worked to further refine the alternatives considered in the EIS, with an emphasis on refinements to the staff-proposed alternative.

During the public and agency consultation period, this Draft EIS is available for further consultation with these agencies and organizations. The public will also be consulted and their views sought during this public comment period, lasting not less than 60 days. Following the public and agency consultation period, substantive comments relating to the environmental analysis will be reviewed and responses will be prepared, along with appropriate changes to the document. A proposed Final EIS will be presented to the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission, which will make a recommendation to the Governing Board with respect to certification of the proposed Final EIS. The Governing Board shall provide an opportunity for comment on the proposed Final EIS at a Governing Board hearing. The Board will then consider taking action to certify the Final EIS prior to considering approval of the updated Regional Plan (Rules of Procedure 6.16).

S.1.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

The update of the Regional Plan and preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) are important and related planning efforts underway for the Tahoe Region. Both a land use plan and a transportation plan are required by Article V of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Public Law 96-551) and both are aimed at achieving the common goals of environmental improvement, sustainable development, and attainment of threshold standards.

Article V(c)(2) of the Compact requires that the Regional Plan include a "transportation plan for the integrated development of a regional system of transportation," including, but not limited to, parkways, highways, transit, waterways, public transportation, and bicycle facilities. Goals of the transportation plan shall be: (a) to reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes and public transit, and (b) to reduce, to the extent feasible, air pollution caused by motor vehicles. Where increased capacity is required, the Compact calls for a preference to be given to public transportation and public programs and projects related to transportation. The RTP serves as the required transportation plan element of the Regional Plan, and includes policies, project implementation plans, and funding strategies to improve and shape the transportation network in the Region in a way that reduces reliance on the automobile, reduces mobile sources of air pollution, and achieves other environmental goals.

For designated metropolitan areas to receive federal transportation project funding, federal law requires preparation of a long-range transportation plan that is coordinated with air quality statutory requirements that demonstrate conformity to air quality goals established by a State Implementation Plan. Federal requirements for the development of an RTP are implemented by the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO); in the Lake Tahoe Region, this is TRPA acting as the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO).

California law also requires preparation of RTPs as part of the funding process for transportation projects. With the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 69 (Chapter 1253, Statutes of 1972), RTPs are required to address transportation issues and assist local and state decision makers in shaping California's transportation infrastructure.

In addition to its role as part of the Regional Plan, the RTP serves purposes relative to the federal and California transportation planning laws and regulations mentioned above. With the designation of TRPA in 1984 by the State of California as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the California side of the Region, and in 1999 by the U.S. Congress as the MPO for the entire Lake Tahoe Region, TRPA assumed federal and state transportation planning responsibilities and authorities. TMPO is responsible for approval of the RTP, which addresses transportation strategies for the entire Region consistent with federal law. Therefore, while the RTP remains an element of the comprehensive Regional Plan, it has been produced and is periodically updated as a stand-alone plan in keeping with its multiple purposes and authorities.

Passage of recent legislation in California, Senate Bills (SBs) 375 and 575, further solidifies the linkage between land use and transportation planning for the California side of the Basin, and thus the link between the Regional Plan Update and the RTP. SB 375 requires, among other things, that RTPs prepared by California's MPOs include an SCS, designed to achieve certain targets set by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) for the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from cars and light trucks. The SCS is required to identify the general location of land uses, residential densities, and building intensities within a region and set forth a forecasted development pattern that, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce GHG emissions from cars and light trucks to levels that achieve the targets set by ARB. SB 575, Statutes of 2009, clarified SB 375 for the Lake Tahoe Region, requiring that the Regional Plan serve as its SCS to achieve the GHG reduction target. As a result, the SCS adopted by TMPO will be fully integrated with and ultimately be included in the Regional Plan approved by TRPA.

Under a conventional RTP and SCS preparation scenario in other regions of California, an MPO (which is typically not an agency with regulatory authority over land use) would prepare transportation policies, project implementation plans, and funding strategies as elements of its RTP, and would also prepare land use strategies and forecasted development patterns (the SCS) necessary to achieve GHG targets. The land use strategies would provide guidance to cities and counties in the region for future updates of their General Plans, which are required under California planning law. Land use agencies within that region would then receive certain streamlining benefits relative to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for implementing development projects consistent with the SCS.

Because the land use planning agency responsible for approval of the Regional Plan (i.e., TRPA) and the regional transportation planning agency responsible for preparation of the RTP and SCS in the Tahoe Region (i.e., TRPA, operating as TMPO with the additional board member from the U.S. Forest Service) are nearly the same entity, and because the RTP and Regional Plan Update processes are occurring simultaneously, a unique opportunity is created in which the land use scenarios of the Regional Plan Update alternatives are closely linked to, and form the basis of, the alternative RTP transportation strategies. In other words, the Regional Plan Update alternatives reflect different land use themes and levels of allowable development; because in the SCS these land use patterns and development criteria form the foundation of the transportation strategies, the RTP/SCS alternatives consist of assemblages of transportation and land use features that are consistent with the Regional Plan Update alternatives.

When the Regional Plan Update and RTP have been completed and are ready for approval, the actions by TRPA, acting as both the land use planning agency and the TMPO, will fully coordinate land use and transportation strategies. The RTP, with its transportation strategies and SCS, will be approved by TMPO. TMPO will select a transportation alternative for approval with an assumed linkage to one of the Regional Plan Update alternatives

(which creates the land use foundation for the SCS and the travel modeling supporting the selected transportation strategies); however, TMPO will not approve the land use plan, which is an action that is the responsibility of TRPA. TRPA will consider and select a land use alternative to adopt as part of the Regional Plan Update and, among other actions, will (1) adopt the RTP as the Compact-required transportation plan and (2) approve the Regional Plan Update with the selected land use alternative to implement the SCS for the California side of the Region. These coordinated approval actions will ensure that the Regional Plan Update, RTP, and SCS are mutually consistent and achieve the goals of the Compact and relevant state and federal laws and regulations.

The RTP/SCS describes three different assemblages of projects and programs, or Transportation Strategy Packages, for implementing various types of transportation improvements, and each of these is linked to one or more of the Regional Plan Update alternatives as the transportation goals and policies for that alternative:

- ▲ **Transportation Strategy Package A:** roadway improvements, community revitalization projects, construction of bicycle and pedestrian trails, and the Lake Tahoe Waterborne Transit project, with relatively few other transit service upgrades—Alternatives 1 and 5
- ▲ **Transportation Strategy Package B:** similar to Transportation Strategy Package A, but with a substantially greater number of bicycle and pedestrian improvements, inter-regional bus services, and no Waterborne Transit Project—Alternative 2
- ▲ **Transportation Strategy Package C:** the financially constrained list of projects for the RTP, including new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, corridor revitalization projects, transit service and capital enhancements, and waterborne transit, but not as many new pedestrian/bicycle facilities as included in Transportation Strategy Package B—Alternatives 3 and 4

S.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The Regional Plan Update is focused on priorities established by the TRPA Governing Board, which include accelerating water quality restoration by targeting environmental redevelopment opportunities and Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) investments, focusing TRPA's resources more on regional planning with a simplified land use framework for local governments, and simplifying and streamlining the permit review process.

The Regional Plan Update considers five alternatives as different strategies to achieve this vision. The objective of the environmental process is to consider each alternative in terms of its ability to accelerate attainment of threshold standards, address statutory requirements, and achieve TRPA's policy objectives, which include the following:

- ▲ Retain the established regional growth control system.
- ▲ Encourage property owners to transfer existing development and development rights from sensitive or outlying areas to existing community centers with the goal of restoring sensitive lands and accelerating environmental redevelopment.
- ▲ Eliminate the regulatory barriers that have slowed the pace of redevelopment of outdated or poorly maintained structures.
- ▲ Simplify burdensome regulations for homeowners while achieving environmental threshold gains.
- ▲ Integrate with the Regional Transportation Plan to address traffic congestion and support transit, pedestrian, and bike trail projects that reduce automobile dependency and increase walkability and safety.

- ▲ Continue implementation of projects under the EIP that improve water quality, restore forests and wetlands, enhance scenic quality and recreation experiences, and improve air quality through transit and trail connections.

The alternatives address the five major elements of the Regional Plan as prescribed in the Compact—land use, transportation, conservation, recreation, and public services and facilities—plus the elements required for implementation. However, many parts of the existing Regional Plan are still current or have been recently amended and therefore have not been reconsidered for substantive changes in this Regional Plan Update. Those portions of the Regional Plan that are not proposed for substantive changes because they are not a priority or because they are sufficient in their current form are the Noise and Natural Hazards Subelements of the Land Use Element; the Open Space, Scenic, Cultural, and Energy Subelements of the Conservation Element; and the Recreation Element. Because TRPA is not proposing to modify these elements of the Regional Plan, the Governing Board approval will reflect only the amended elements. The unchanged elements are not evaluated in this EIS.

Preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) are underway concurrently with this Regional Plan Update. Because of this, the Regional Plan Update alternatives are closely linked to, and form the basis of, the alternative RTP transportation strategies. These different strategies are paired with the appropriate alternatives in the Regional Plan Update, reflecting consistent land use themes and levels of allowable development.

With the exception of Alternative 1, No Project, all alternatives include proposed amendments to the threshold standards. The proposed new or amended threshold standards in Alternatives 2 – 5 include three water quality standards (deep water transparency, nearshore algae, and aquatic invasive species), two air quality standards (carbon monoxide and fine particulates), and one for wildlife (goshawk disturbance zones).

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 modify the system of land use designations that are the basis for zoning and determining allowable uses. Different approaches and different systems are mapped and described for each alternative in an attempt to evaluate a range of possibilities. These are portrayed in the maps included in Chapter 2, Regional Plan Update Alternatives.

Central to the planning approach of the Lake Tahoe Region is its marketable rights transfer program, a framework allowing landowners to buy and sell certain rights and obligations associated with development. Several types of transferable rights and entitlements pertaining to existing and new development were created by the 1987 Regional Plan, including land coverage, or the right to create or retain impervious surfaces on a parcel of land; residential development rights; residential allocations that provide the opportunity to build a residence; commercial floor area (CFA) measured in square feet; and tourist accommodation units (TAUs), which are the rights to a transient hotel, motel, or other short-term rental unit. The 1987 Regional Plan established limits on the amount of coverage and the amounts of residential, commercial, and tourist development that would be allowed in the Region. These limits are the foundation of the marketable rights transfer program and created the opportunity for landowners to buy, sell, or otherwise trade the different types of rights tied to properties.

Each alternative has a different marketable rights transfer program to promote environmentally sensitive development. These programs work by creating incentives to direct development to the most suitable areas, managing growth in a manner consistent with progress toward meeting environmental threshold standards, encouraging consolidation of development through transfer of development rights and coverage, and conditioning approvals of projects on improvements to off-site erosion, runoff control, and air quality. Transferable development rights allow public agencies to restrict otherwise allowable development in areas targeted for preservation by transferring potential and existing development to preferred development areas.

The alternatives have different incentive programs combined with regulatory programs to accomplish similar objectives. The degree to which each alternative relies on incentives or regulations is described below and in Chapter 2 for each alternative.

Five alternatives are being considered as part of the Regional Plan Update process, including the existing land use plan and policies and four sets of potential modifications. Each alternative represents different approaches to, and/or combinations of, land use planning frameworks, development potential, and environmental regulations and incentives. The land use planning framework of each alternative is detailed as a means to provide information to the public and decision makers regarding the land use outcomes of a range of alternatives. However, the five alternatives do not reflect the only potential combinations. The TRPA Governing Board may choose to implement any land use planning framework alternative with a combination of development potential and environmental regulations from other alternatives. Key features of the five alternatives are summarized below.

S.2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT

Alternative 1 is the no-project alternative. With the exception of minor revisions required to extend the Plan for an additional 20 years (e.g., allowing unused allocations that were authorized under the 1987 Regional Plan to be used over the next 20 years), Alternative 1 would make no changes to the 1987 Regional Plan. The land use planning system would continue to use the existing Plan Area Statements (PASs) and Community Plans as the system to define zoning, management strategies, and allowable uses. All existing regulations and incentives would remain in place.

Alternative 1 retains the existing Goals and Policies, land use classifications, land use maps, PASs, and Community Plans. As described in the 1987 Regional Plan, Alternative 1 contains a designation system that includes five land use classifications: conservation, recreation, residential, commercial and public service, and tourist.

Alternative 1 would authorize no additional development rights or allocations beyond those authorized in the 1987 Regional Plan. Consequently, Alternative 1 would result in a reduced rate of development as compared to the 1987 Plan because only the remaining development rights authorized under that Plan would be used. Unused development rights from the 1987 Regional Plan include 86 residential allocations, 874 residential bonus units, 383,600 square feet of CFA, and 342 TAUs. Of the unused development rights, 245 residential bonus units, 158,816 square feet of CFA and 90 TAUs have been assigned to approved but unbuilt projects. In addition to the unused development rights remaining from the 1987 Plan, all legally existing commodities, including approximately 47,392 residences, 6.5 million square feet of CFA and 12,399 TAUs, would be available for transfer subject to existing transfer requirements.

No new environmental regulations or redevelopment incentives would be introduced under Alternative 1. A number of existing transfer and allocation incentives are currently used to encourage redevelopment in Community Plan areas, and those would remain in effect under Alternative 1. This alternative would retain the existing limits on allowable coverage within Community Plan areas. Existing coverage can be transferred between parcels within the same Hydrologically Related Areas (HRAs), up to a set maximum allowable. Alternative 1 sets the transfer ratios for transfer of coverage on a sliding scale based on the land capability of the receiving sites.

S.2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: LOW DEVELOPMENT, INCREASED REGULATION

Alternative 2 would substantially reduce the rate of development as compared to the 1987 Regional Plan. It would take a regulatory and enforcement approach to attain and maintain environmental threshold standards. Some redevelopment incentives would be implemented, but to a lesser extent than Alternatives 3 and 4.

Alternative 2 retains the existing land use designations with the exception of adding Development Transfer Zones (DTZs), areas that contain existing infrastructure to support mass transit facilities and to which development may be transferred. DTZs would be limited to the commercial corridors and adjoining parcels of South Stateline (from Kingsbury Grade along U.S. Highway 50 [US 50] to Ski Run Boulevard and Pioneer Trail), the Kings Beach Community Plan, and the Tahoe City Community Plan. Transfer of coverage from any HRA into the South Stateline DTZ would be permissible, as would transfer of coverage from any HRA in Placer County into the Tahoe City or Kings Beach DTZs. Transfer of CFA and TAUs would only be allowed between DTZs and Community Plan areas, and the number of allowable TAUs would be capped at existing levels in all areas except DTZs. The South Stateline DTZ would be subject to specific incentives and regulations, including limited building heights and prohibition against TAU and CFA transfers out of the area.

Alternative 2 would include a limited number of new residential allocations (2,600 total, or an average rate of 130 per year for 20 years). An additional 200,000 square feet of CFA would be available to Community Plan areas under the existing allocation system, but only after the 1987 Regional Plan remainder is used and 70 percent commercial occupancy is achieved. Exemptions from this policy would allow a portion of the 200,000 square feet of additional CFA to be allocated to certain industrial areas or as a 1:1 match for CFA transferred out of sensitive land. No new TAU allocations would be included. Remaining unassigned residential bonus units from the 1987 Plan would be distributed in accordance with existing procedures, but no additional residential bonus units would be available. The maximum allowable coverage in Community Plan areas and DTZs would be reduced to 50 percent of the area on high-capability land that is developed or undeveloped. Transfers of coverage into Community Plan areas and DTZs would be subject to a transfer ratio based on the sensitivity of the sending parcel rather than the resulting amount of coverage on the receiving parcel, thus increasing the incentive to transfer coverage from sensitive lands.

Under Alternative 2, one sending TAU would equate to one receiving TAU on a bedroom-for-bedroom basis, limited to no more than 550 square feet per bedroom in a unit and a total unit size not to exceed four bedrooms and three baths. Existing height standards would remain the same, with the exception of the DTZs. DTZs would include height limits of four stories in the South Stateline DTZ (but not more than three stories within 1,500 feet of Lake Tahoe on the Lake side of US 50), and three stories in the Tahoe City and Kings Beach DTZs (but not more than two stories within 1,500 feet of Lake Tahoe on the Lake side of the highways).

S.2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: LOW DEVELOPMENT, HIGHLY INCENTIVIZED REDEVELOPMENT

Alternative 3 is the alternative that most closely reflects preliminary recommendations of the TRPA Governing Board's Regional Plan Update Committee. Alternative 3 focuses on environmental redevelopment of the existing built environment, including a strong emphasis on incentives to modify the location of development as a means to achieve accelerated attainment of threshold standards. It is designed to streamline regulatory processes and concentrate TRPA's resources where they can have the most benefit. Alternative 3 encourages transfer of new and existing development into identified community centers. It also introduces the concept of Area Plans, wherein local, state, or federal governments would prepare detailed plans that are consistent with and part of the Regional Plan. To that end, this alternative proposes to exempt additional activities from direct TRPA review if an Area Plan has been adopted and found in conformance with the Regional Plan. It combines a reduced rate of development with strong incentives for redevelopment, along with other regulatory changes.

Under Alternative 3, regional land use designations would be updated to include new wilderness and backcountry designations to differentiate U.S. Forest Service lands from other conservation-designated land. Mixed use is a new land use classification of Alternative 3 (replacing commercial and public service) and would identify community centers that have been designated to provide a mix of commercial, public service, light industrial, office, and residential uses to the Region. Alternative 3 also defines four special planning designations: Town Centers, Regional Center, and High Density Tourist District, which are areas targeted for redevelopment and are collectively referred to as community centers; and Stream Restoration Priority Areas, which are areas prioritized for restoration. The community center overlay districts contain most of the Region's non-residential development and have been identified as a significant source of sediments and other contaminants that continue to enter Lake Tahoe. The overlay districts are targeted for redevelopment in a manner that would improve environmental conditions, create a more sustainable and less automobile-dependent development pattern, and provide economic opportunities in the Region.

Under Alternative 3, the residential bonus unit incentive program would consist of the 874 unused residential bonus units remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan, and 600 new residential bonus units. A total of 2,600 new residential allocations, 200,000 square feet of new CFA, and no new TAUs would be included. The residential bonus units would be made available as an incentive for affordable housing and for development transfers to community centers. Residential bonus units, CFA, and TAUs would be tied to transfer ratios and earned based on the environmental sensitivity of the sending parcel; higher transfer ratios would be earned by transferring development from more sensitive sending parcels and from parcels that are most distant from support services or transit.

In addition to development transfer incentives, Alternative 3 would offer substantial incentives relative to coverage transferred into community centers. Redevelopment projects would be allowed up to 70 percent coverage on high-capability lands for both undeveloped and developed parcels. With restoration and retirement of the sending sites, Alternative 3 would permit transfer of non-conforming coverage and transfer of soft coverage from SEZs for use in community centers. The current requirement that coverage transfers occur only within the same HRA would be removed, and coverage transfer ratios would also be reduced to 1:1 when coverage is transferred from sensitive lands into these target areas.

Regulations that effectively prohibit the conversion of apartments and motels into condominiums would be removed. In combination with these incentives, Alternative 3 would define a sending TAU as one 1,200-square-foot receiving unit or 1,800-square-foot/3-bedroom receiving unit if the units make up less than 20 percent of a project. Under Alternative 3, building heights would be permitted up to four stories (56 feet) in Town Centers, six stories (95 feet) in the Regional Center, and 197 feet (the height of the highest existing casino tower) in the High Density Tourist District. In addition, building height standards would be modified to promote a stair-stepping appearance of buildings on slopes.

S.2.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: REDUCED DEVELOPMENT, INCENTIVIZED REDEVELOPMENT

Alternative 4 combines higher development, including 400,000 square feet of new CFA, 200 new TAUs, and 4,000 new residential allocations, with modest incentives for environmentally beneficial redevelopment. Alternative 4 also introduces the concept of transect zoning, with defined pedestrian- and transit-oriented development (PTOD) areas.

Under Alternative 4, land use designations would be reclassified into a transect-based zoning system, that is, a model wherein a transect defines a series of five districts that transition from wilderness and open space to the denser community core. Transect districts would allow for a mix of land uses and housing types and result in an appropriate distribution of uses across the landscape. Each transect district would include specific measures that

would regulate the physical form of the built environment to produce desired relationships between buildings and outdoor public areas, including streets.

In addition to transect-based zoning, 12 PTOD districts would be established. PTOD zoning is a sustainable community planning strategy that concentrates development in denser, relatively urban settings to create walkable areas. Redevelopment projects within PTODs would be required to contain a minimum residential density of 8 dwelling units/acre and would be allowed up to four stories in height in central areas.

Alternative 4 contains a number of provisions intended to accelerate attainment and maintenance of threshold standards by incentivizing environmental redevelopment. Coverage transfer ratios would be revised to provide incentives to transfer development from sensitive lands to lands designated for commercial, tourist accommodation, and/or mixed use by providing a greater benefit than transfers from non-sensitive lands. In addition, allocations of CFA and TAUs would only be distributed to community centers/transect districts, and as a match for transfers of development. To further promote redevelopment, transfers of coverage would be allowed across HRA boundaries if the coverage is transferred from an impaired watershed into an HRA that is not impaired.

Redevelopment projects within PTOD areas or Community Plan areas would be allowed up to 70 percent coverage on high-capability lands for both undeveloped and developed parcels. Height limits would be increased for additional land uses in the PTOD and Community Plan areas. Soft coverage within sensitive lands could be restored and transferred into PTOD areas or Community Plan areas for use in commercial or tourist projects. Regulations that prohibit subdivision would be removed for mixed-use projects in PTOD areas.

S.2.5 ALTERNATIVE 5: SIMILAR RATE OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATORY STRUCTURE TO THE 1987 REGIONAL PLAN

Alternative 5 was developed to evaluate an option that would allow continuation of the rate of development that occurred with implementation of the 1987 Regional Plan. To achieve this, Alternative 5 would include more new allocations than any other alternative and would result in more growth at a faster rate than the other alternatives. The approach to attaining threshold standards under Alternative 5 would be the same as the existing Regional Plan; the regulations of the existing Plan would remain largely unchanged, and the same balance between regulation and incentives would be retained.

Under Alternative 5, the land use structure and environmental incentive system of the 1987 Regional Plan would remain in place and land use classifications would remain the same.

Alternative 5 combines the highest levels of development, including 600,000 square feet of new CFA, 400 new TAUs, and 5,200 new residential allocations, with the same land use, zoning, and regulatory structure as the existing Regional Plan. Redevelopment incentives under Alternative 5 would be the same as those under Alternative 1. Unlike Alternative 1, however, Alternative 5 would implement some new environmental regulations addressing air quality, water quality, transportation, and SEZ.

S.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Significant areas of controversy include the amount and location of development, building height and land coverage limitations in community centers, development right and coverage transfer provisions, water quality programs, air quality and traffic congestion standards, airport noise and scenic quality policies, and the land use planning and permitting system.

S.4 COMPARATIVE FEATURES OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Chapter 2, Regional Plan Update Alternatives, provides a detailed description of each of the alternatives under consideration. Table S-1 provides a side-by-side comparison of the major features of each alternative, including development levels (number and type of proposed allocations), land use planning approach, coverage regulations, development transfer regulations and incentives and other features.

S.5 RELATIONSHIP OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS TO THE RTP/SCS EIR/EIS

The environmental impact analysis, significance determinations, and mitigation measures in the Regional Plan Update EIS and RTP/SCS EIR/EIS have many similarities as well as important differences. Consistency between the two documents is important because TRPA and TMPO have formulated the two plans using a coordinated approach. (See Sections 1.5 and 1.6 for a full discussion of the coordinated planning processes and the similarities and differences between the two environmental documents.) The Regional Plan Update EIS and RTP/SCS EIR/EIS are being circulated for public review at the same time so the public can consider environmental impacts of both plans together. The Regional Plan and RTP/SCS are different types of plans; however, and variations between the two environmental documents are appropriate and important to serve the differing purposes of the respective environmental reviews. Where helpful and relevant, cross references are provided from one analysis to impacts in the other environmental document.

S.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Chapter 3, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, of this Draft EIS describes in detail the environmental effects that would result from implementation of the Regional Plan Update alternatives. Impacts are determined to be: (1) beneficial (effects that show an improvement or favorable change in the environment); (2) less than significant (adverse or potentially adverse effects that are not substantial); (3) significant (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment, for which mitigation measures are required); and (4) significant and unavoidable (substantial or potentially substantial adverse changes in the environment that cannot be feasibly reduced to a less-than-significant levels with mitigation measures).

Table S-2 summarizes the potential environmental effects that would result from implementation of the Regional Plan Update alternatives, and mitigation measures to avoid, eliminate, minimize, or reduce significant and potentially significant environmental effects. Level of significance after mitigation is also presented.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table S-1. Regional Plan Update Alternatives Comparison					
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Land Use					
Potential new development	Least development under Alternative 1 No new development; only remaining development rights and allocations left over from 1987 Regional Plan	Low level of new development Remaining development rights and allocations, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 200,000 sq ft of new CFA › 2,600 new residential allocations New CFA available to CPs and DTZs under the existing system, but only after the 1987 remainder is used and 70 percent commercial occupancy is achieved. Exemptions for certain industrial areas or as a 1:1 match for CFA transferred out of sensitive land (LCDs 1 – 3)	Low development, but more than Alt. 2 Remaining development rights and allocations, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 200,000 sq ft of new CFA › 2,600 new residential allocations › 600 new residential bonus units 	Higher level of new development Remaining development rights and allocations, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 400,000 sq ft of new CFA › 4,000 new residential allocations › 200 new TAUs 	Greatest level of new development Remaining development rights and allocations, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › 600,000 sq ft of new CFA › 5,200 new residential allocations › 400 new TAUs
Land Use Classifications	Existing five: Conservation, Recreation, Residential, Commercial and Public Service, Tourist	Existing five: Conservation, Recreation, Residential, Commercial and Public Service, Tourist Minor boundary changes to reflect land use changes as the result of public acquisitions since last Regional Plan Designation of the Van Sickle Bi-State Park from Conservation to Recreation	Adds Wilderness and Backcountry to reflect USFS management area designations. Changes Commercial and Public Service to Mixed Use Designates new special district overlays: Town Center, Regional Center, High Density Tourist District Minor boundary changes to reflect land use changes as the result of public acquisitions since last Regional Plan Boundary changes to be consistent with USFS management areas designations Designation of the Van Sickle Bi-State Park from Conservation to Recreation Designation of private parcels adjacent to Van Sickle Park from conservation to recreation	10 transect districts: Wilderness, Backcountry, Conservation and Park Land, Recreation, Residential, Neighborhood General, Neighborhood Center, Town Center, Tourist Center and Special District Land Use land use designations would be reclassified into a transect-based zoning system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › T1: Wilderness District, Backcountry District, Conservation and Parkland District; › T2: Recreation District; › T3: Residential District; › T4: Neighborhood General District, the Neighborhood Center District; and › T5: Town Center District, Tourist District, and Special Districts Minor boundary changes to reflect land use changes as the result of public acquisitions since last Regional Plan Designation of the Van Sickle Bi-State Park from conservation to recreation	Existing five: Conservation, Recreation, Residential, Commercial and Public Service, Tourist Minor boundary changes to reflect land use changes as the result of public acquisitions since last Regional Plan Expanded recreation designation to match the USFS permit boundary for the Heavenly Ski resort.
Land use planning approach	Existing Plan Area Statements and Community Plans	Maintains existing Plan Area Statements and Community Plans and creates three new Development Transfer Zones (DTZ) that are targeted for redevelopment	Maintains existing Plan Area Statements and Community Plans until superseded by Area Plans (See rules for Area Plans at the bottom of this table.) Creates four overlay districts: Town Centers, Regional Center, High Density Tourist District that are targeted for redevelopment; and Stream Restoration Priority Areas that are targeted for restoration.	In addition to above, 12 Pedestrian- and Transit-Oriented Development (PTOD) districts would be established, to include T5, plus Neighborhood Center of T4 Transect zoning system would allow for a mix of land uses and housing types, and regulate development based on the physical form of the built environment	Existing Plan Area Statements and Community Plans
Subdivision	Existing subdivision regulations (Chapter 39)	Existing subdivision regulations (Chapter 39)	Existing subdivision regulations plus a change to allow subdivision of mixed-use condominium projects at mixed use apartment densities	Allow subdivision for mixed-use projects in PTOD areas	Existing subdivision regulations (Chapter 39)
Density	No changes proposed (See Code Chapter 31 for existing provisions)	No changes proposed (See Code Chapter 31 for existing provisions)	Allow Area Plans to increase multi-family density from 15 units per acre to 25 units per acre in community centers	Minimum density of 8 units/acre for residential and tourist accommodation uses in PTOD areas	No changes proposed (See Code Chapter 31 for existing provisions)

Table S-1. Regional Plan Update Alternatives Comparison					
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Building height	Existing height standards (Chapter 37)	Existing height standards are applied basin wide except for the DTZs. Varies from 2.5 up to 4 stories in the South Stateline DTZ, but only 3 stories within 1,500 feet of Lake, with conditions Up to 3 stories in the Tahoe City and Kings Beach DTZs, but only 2 stories within 1,500 feet of Lake, with conditions Remove special height districts Maintain existing height standards elsewhere	Allow Area Plans to permit building heights of up to 4 stories (56 feet) in Town Centers, 6 stories (95 feet) in the Regional Center, and 197 feet in the High Density Tourist District	Allow additional height in PTOD areas of up to 3 to 6 stories depending on transect district.	Existing height standards (Chapter 37)
Building height measurement on slopes	Maintains existing approach to measuring height	Maintains existing approach to measuring height	Maintains existing approach to measuring height but allows for an optional methodology for measuring height on slopes greater than 10% to promote stair-stepping of building mass	Maintains existing approach to measuring height but allows for an optional methodology for measuring height on slopes greater than 10% to promote stair-stepping of building mass	Maintains existing approach to measuring height
Non-conforming height	Not allowed with redevelopment	Not allowed with redevelopment	Not allowed with redevelopment. Increased height allowances in community centers makes some buildings conforming.	Allow redevelopment projects in the Casino Core area to maintain existing height	Not allowed with redevelopment
TAU definition	One bedroom, or a group of two or more rooms with a bedroom, with or without cooking facilities, primarily designed to be rented by the day or week and occupied on a temporary basis No specific size limit	Bedroom-for-bedroom, no more than 550 sq ft per bedroom and total unit size not to exceed 4 bedrooms, 3 baths	TAU defined as one 1,200 square foot receiving unit or 1,800 square foot/3-bedroom receiving unit if the units make up less than 20 percent of a project	TAU defined as one 1,200 square foot receiving unit or 1,800 square foot/3-bedroom receiving unit if the units make up less than 20 percent of a project	1,500 sq ft for timeshares and partial ownership 800 sq ft for hotel rooms with kitchen facilities 450 sq ft for hotel rooms without kitchen facilities
CFA and TAU transfer (location)	Existing CFA and TAUs must be transferred to a PAS or CP where the use is permitted and that have been designated as a receiving area for "Existing Development" CFA and TAUs from the TRPA pool can only be used in CPs, with a few exceptions, and require a 1:1 match transferred from sensitive land	Only between DTZs and CPs TAUs capped everywhere but DTZs; only DTZs can receive new TAUs	Allow transfer into Town Centers, Regional Center, and High Density Tourist District at ratios that depend on LCD of sending parcel.	Allocations of CFA and TAUs only to the most urban areas - transect districts designated as Town Center, Tourist Center, and Neighborhood Center 2:1 ratio for transfers of development for existing units relocated from outside PTOD to within PTOD areas	Existing CFA and TAUs must be transferred to a PAS or CP where the use is permitted and that have been designated as a receiving area for "Existing Development" CFA and TAUs from the TRPA pool can only be used in CPs, with a few exceptions, and require a 1:1 match transferred from sensitive land
Residential, CFA and TAU transfer (ratios and rules)	Existing Transfer Provisions (Code Chapter 51)	Existing Residential Transfer Provisions New TAUs and CFA are only allowed within DTZs (with the exception of CFA allowed for transfer into Preferred Industrial Areas) TAU transfers from the South Shore to the North Shore would be as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > sending unit must be within SEZ (LCD 1b) and receiving unit must be within LCDs 4-7 > TAUs would be transferred at a 2:1 ratio (sending to receiving) > sending unit must be deed-restricted from future development and restored 	For all existing development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > SEZ (LCD 1b) 1:3 > Sensitive (LCD 1a, 1c, 2, 3) 1:2 > Non-sensitive (LCD 4-7) 1:1 For residential development rights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > SEZ (LCD 1b) 1:1.5 > Sensitive (LCD 1a, 1c, 2, 3) 1:1.25 > Non-sensitive (LCD 4-7) 1:1 Additional benefit for residential with distance from target area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Less than ¼ mile or Lakeward of primary transit routes, 1:1 	Existing Residential Transfer Provisions 2:1 ratio for transfers of development for existing units relocated from outside PTOD to within PTOD areas	Existing Transfer Provisions (Code Chapter 51)

Table S-1. Regional Plan Update Alternatives Comparison					
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	
	<p>CFA transfer ratios would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > North Shore sensitive lands (LCDs 1–3) to North or South Shore non-sensitive lands (LCDs 4–7) in DTZs is 1:2 > North Shore non-sensitive lands (LCDs 4–7) to North or South Shore non-sensitive lands (LCDs 4–7) in DTZs is 1:1 > South Shore SEZ lands (LCD 1b) to North Shore non-sensitive lands (LCDs 4–7) in DTZs is 1:1 > South Shore other sensitive lands (LCDs 1–3) to South Shore non-sensitive lands (LCDs 4–7) in DTZs is 1:2 <p>South Shore non-sensitive lands (LCDs 4–7) to South Shore non-sensitive lands (LCDs 4–7) in DTZs is 1:1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > ¼ to ½ mile, 1:1.25 > ½ to 1 mile, 1:1.5 > 1 to 1½ mile, 1:1.75 > Greater than 1½ mile, 1:2 			
Air Quality					
Emissions standards	Maintain existing emission standards, with stricter state and federal standards where they apply	Apply the most stringent state or local air quality regulations to projects region-wide All new projects, programs, and plans must result in a net reduction in air pollutants that are out of attainment with air quality threshold standards	Continue to recognize emissions standards in the portions of the Region to which they are applicable	Continue to recognize emissions standards in the portions of the Region to which they are applicable	Maintain existing emission standards, with stricter state and federal standards where they apply
Wood stove emissions standards	Require that all new wood stoves and existing wood stoves in residential units that are sold meet EPA emissions standards	Update TRPA’s emissions standards for wood stoves to current EPA standards and require replacement of all non-EPA certified wood stoves by 2020	Recognize current EPA emission standards for wood stoves and develop an incentive program to replace non-compliant wood stoves by 2020 or upon transfer of title, purchase, or sale of a property that results in change in ownership, with limited exceptions	Recognize current EPA emission standards for wood stoves and develop an incentive program to replace non-compliant wood stoves by 2020 or upon transfer of title, purchase, or sale of a property that results in change in ownership, with limited exceptions	Require that all new wood stoves and existing wood stoves in residential units that are sold meet EPA emissions standards
Forest fuel reductions strategies	No changes proposed.(See Code Chapter 61 for existing provisions)	Promote low-emission, forest fuel-reduction strategies and refine smoke-management best practices	No changes proposed (See Code Chapter 61 for existing provisions)	No changes proposed (See Code Chapter 61 for existing provisions)	No changes proposed.(See Code Chapter 61 for existing provisions)
Allowable use of air quality mitigation funds	Use in the jurisdiction in which funds are generated	Allow some air quality mitigation funds to be used on the most cost-effective projects anywhere in the Region	Allow a portion of air quality mitigation funds to be used across jurisdictional boundaries for regional priorities	Allow a portion of air quality mitigation funds to be used across jurisdictional boundaries and to subsidize some wood heater replacements	Use in the jurisdiction in which funds are generated
Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage					
Maximum Land Coverage in Community Centers	For commercial facilities within Community Plans, base plus transferred: > 50% on LCD 4-7, developed > 70% on LCD 4-7, undeveloped	Allowable coverage within CPs and DTZs as follows: > 50% on LCD 4-7, developed > 50% on LCD 4-7, undeveloped	Allowable coverage within Town Centers, Regional Center, and the High Density Tourist District as follows: > 70% on LCD 4-7, developed > 70% on LCD 4-7, undeveloped	Allowable coverage on parcels in CPs and PTOD areas: > 70% on LCD 4-7, developed > 70% on LCD 4-7, undeveloped	For commercial facilities within Community Plans, base plus transferred: > 50% on LCD 4-7, developed > 70% on LCD 4-7, undeveloped
Coverage transfer ratios	General: 1:1 Commercial facilities w/in Community Plans: > 1:1 up to 50% to LCD 4-7, developed > 1:1 up to 50% to LCD 4-7, undeveloped; then sliding scale ranging from 1.05:1 to 2:1 from 51% up to 70%	Into DTZs and CPs based on the sensitivity of the sending parcel: > 1:1 from SEZ (LCD 1b); > 1.25:1 from LCDs 1a, 1c, 2, 3; > 2:1 from LCD 4 and 5; > 3:1 from LCD 6 and 7	Into Town Centers, Regional Center, or High Density Tourist District: > 1:1 from sensitive lands (LCD 1, 2, or 3) > 1:1 up to 50% to LCD 4-7, then sliding scale ranging from 1.05:1 to 2:1 from 51% up to 70%, from non-sensitive (LCDs 4-7) > 1:1 for multi-residential (>5 units), public service, and recreation facilities	Into PTOD areas or CPs based on the sensitivity of the sending parcel: > 1:1 from sensitive (LCD 1, 2, or 3) > 2:1 from non-sensitive (LCD 4-7)	General: 1:1 For commercial facilities within Community Plans: > 1:1 up to 50% to LCD 4-7, developed > 1:1 up to 50% to LCD 4-7, undeveloped; then sliding scale ranging from 1.05:1 to 2:1 from 51% up to 70% (Ratios are unchanged regardless of land capability of sending parcel.)

Table S-1. Regional Plan Update Alternatives Comparison					
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Coverage transfer rules (location)	Only within same HRA	Location: › From anywhere to South Stateline DTZ › From any Placer Co HRA to Tahoe City or Kings Beach DTZ › Other than above, only within same HRA	Allow transfer across HRA boundaries Allow non-conforming coverage to be transferred when existing development is relocated to Town Centers, Regional Center, or High Density Tourist District when the original site is restored and retired After coverage mitigation, earn one “bonus” unit of CFA (1,000 sq ft), TAU (1 unit), or residential bonus unit (1 unit) when coverage is removed and retired within Town Center, Regional Center, or High Density Tourist District, as follows: › 700 sq ft from SEZ (LCD 1b); › 1,400 sq ft from LCDs 1a, 1c, 2, 3; › 2,100 sq ft from LCDs 4, 5, 6, 7. Allow transfer of soft coverage from SEZs into town centers, regional center, and high density tourist district	Allow transfer across HRA boundaries from an impaired watershed (an HRA that exceeds, in aggregate, its allowable coverage) to an HRA that is not impaired Allow transfer of soft coverage from sensitive lands (LCD 1, 2, or 3) into CPs and PTOD areas	Only within same HRA
Coverage mitigation	Coverage removal or payment of excess coverage mitigation fee	Mitigate in the following priority order: remove a minimum of 15% of the excess coverage on-site; remove coverage off-site within the same HRA subject to the following ratios: › SEZ (LCD 1b) at 1:1, › LCD 1a, 1c, 2, and 3 at 1.25:1, › LCD 4 and 5 at 2:1, › LCD 6 and 7 at 3:1; pay excess coverage mitigation fee (excess coverage mitigation fees will be increased to represent actual cost to acquire and restore hard coverage only)	Coverage removal or payment of excess coverage mitigation fee	Mitigate in the following priority order: › implement all feasible on-site coverage reduction, › allow off-site reductions, and › allow payment of excess coverage mitigation fees after all feasible direct coverage reduction options have been exhausted.	Coverage removal or payment of excess coverage mitigation fee
Allowable use of excess coverage mitigation fees	Use for removal of existing coverage or retirement of potential coverage within same HRA	Use only for removal of existing hard coverage within same HRA; not for removal of potential coverage Prioritize removal of structures in SEZs	Allow removal of coverage across HRA boundaries.	Allow use for removal of coverage from sensitive lands (LCD 1, 2, 3) across HRA boundaries, or removal of coverage from any LCD within the same HRA.	Use for removal of existing coverage or retirement of potential coverage within same HRA
Grading season exceptions	Existing procedure	Develop objective standards based on weather conditions and other criteria	Develop objective standards based on weather conditions and other criteria	Develop objective standards based on weather conditions and other criteria	Existing procedure.
Hydrology and Water Quality					
Coverage definition and Misc. coverage rules (purpose/use)	Maintain current definition of coverage	Maintain current definition of coverage Only hard coverage transfers for commercial, tourist, and mixed-use facilities Soft coverage transfer for Class II bike trails that use pervious pavement	Exempt non-motorized public trails from coverage regulations, subject to design and maintenance requirements Provide 25% coverage exemption for pervious pavement in non-sensitive lands (not roadways), subject to design and maintenance requirements Exempt coverage for new pervious decks and temporary coverage in non-sensitive lands subject to design and maintenance requirements and size limits	Exempt non-motorized public trails from coverage regulations, subject to design and maintenance requirements Provide 25% coverage exemption for pervious pavement in non-sensitive lands (not roadways), subject to design and maintenance requirements Exempt coverage for new pervious decks and temporary coverage in non-sensitive lands subject to design requirements and size limits	Maintain current definition of coverage

Table S-1. Regional Plan Update Alternatives Comparison					
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
			Allow Area Plans to manage coverage comprehensively rather than at the parcel scale if it is more effective at reducing coverage overall and within LCDs 1 and 2 Land Capability Verification waiver for identified high land capability parcels		
BMPs and defensible space	Existing BMP requirements (See Code Chapter 60)	Existing BMP requirements (See Code Chapter 60)	Require that all property owners implement water quality BMPs that are consistent with fire defensible space requirements	Require that all property owners implement water quality BMPs that are consistent with fire defensible space requirements	Existing BMP requirements (See Code Chapter 60)
BMPs and area-wide water quality treatment	Existing BMP requirements (See Code Chapter 60)	Existing BMP requirements (See Code Chapter 60)	Allow area-wide water quality treatments in place of site specific BMPs, subject to limitations	Allow area-wide water quality treatments in place of site specific BMPs, subject to limitations	Existing BMP requirements (See Code Chapter 60)
Restore disturbed public lands	Goal is 80%	Goal is 90% All OHV roads and trails to have BMPs installed or decommission by 2015	Goal is 80%	Goal is 80%	Goal is 80%
Fertilizer use	Limit use in SEZs	Prohibit the use of fertilizers that introduce additional nitrogen and phosphorus	Phase out sale and use of phosphorus fertilizer to minimize nutrient loading to surface and ground water	Phase-out the sale and use of phosphorus fertilizer use to minimize nutrient loading to surface and ground water	Limit use in SEZs
Pesticide use	Not addressed	Prohibit outdoor pesticides	Not addressed	Not addressed	Not addressed
TMDL	No official adoption or recognition	Include TMDL load allocations, milestone schedule, and TRPA permit requirements	No official adoption or recognition	No official adoption or recognition	Include TMDL load allocations, milestone schedule, and TRPA permit requirements
Use of wastewater for wildfire	Only if it threatens destruction of Luther Pass pump station	Expand existing provision that allows limited discharges of treated municipal wastewater for catastrophic wildfire suppression efforts	Provide additional allowances for the discharge of treated municipal wastewater to assist with catastrophic wildfire suppression	Provide additional allowances for the discharge of treated municipal wastewater to assist with catastrophic wildfire suppression	Only if it threatens destruction of Luther Pass pump station
Water quality mitigation fees	Allow only 25% for O&M of water quality projects	Increase the proportion that can be used for operations and maintenance of water quality projects	Modify water quality mitigation fees and coverage mitigation fees to better reflect water quality impacts and benefits from development and redevelopment activities in different areas of the Region, and to remove barriers to redevelopment	Modify water quality mitigation fees and coverage mitigation fees to better reflect water quality impacts and benefits from development and redevelopment activities in different areas of the Region, and to remove barriers to redevelopment	Increase the proportion that can be used for O&M of water quality projects
Misc. water quality provisions	None proposed	Require that all road abrasives be resistant to pulverization and little or no phosphorus content Amend grading standards in the Code to require dust control guidelines Require point-of-sale implementation of BMPs or posting of a financial guarantee Use BMP evaluations and certifications to determine if requirements for low water use, low fertilizer use, native, and fire-resistant vegetation criteria have been met Develop a numerical measurement system to evaluate vegetation on a per-parcel basis, considering such items such as defensible space, watershed protection, privacy screening, deviation from natural vegetation condition Establish a maximum lawn area as a percentage of the non-covered area of a parcel	None proposed	None proposed	Require point-of-sale implementation of BMPs or posting of a financial guarantee Evaluate the success of land coverage removal and soil disturbance remediation projects based on qualitative or subjective evaluations

Table S-1. Regional Plan Update Alternatives Comparison					
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Water supply for fire protection	Maintain existing fire flow provisions that outline specific fire flow requirements and waiver criteria if there is no adopted fire code	Require that new development in urban areas is adequately served by fire hydrants to the satisfaction of local fire districts and the adopted fire code Revise the waiver for fire water supply on new single-family dwelling permits to allow for alternative fire protection designs that adequately comply with the intent of the adopted fire code in those areas where existing water systems have inadequate water supply, pressure, and/or hydrants, but only if approved by the applicable fire agency	Require that new development in urban areas is adequately served by fire hydrants to the satisfaction of local fire districts and the adopted fire code Revise the waiver for fire water supply on new single-family dwelling permits to allow for alternative fire protection designs that adequately comply with the intent of the adopted fire code in those areas where existing water systems have inadequate water supply, pressure, and/or hydrants, but only if approved by the applicable fire agency	Require that new development in urban areas is adequately served by fire hydrants to the satisfaction of local fire districts and the adopted fire code Revise the waiver for fire water supply on new single-family dwelling permits to allow for alternative fire protection designs that adequately comply with the intent of the adopted fire code in those areas where existing water systems have inadequate water supply, pressure, and/or hydrants, but only if approved by the applicable fire agency	Require that new development in urban areas is adequately served by fire hydrants to the satisfaction of local fire districts and the adopted fire code Revise the waiver for fire water supply on new single-family dwelling permits to allow for alternative fire protection designs that adequately comply with the intent of the adopted fire code in those areas where existing water systems have inadequate water supply, pressure, and/or hydrants, but only if approved by the applicable fire agency
Scenic Resources					
Design requirements and standards	No changes proposed to existing design standards for site and building design as described in Code Chapter 36	Implement design standards that more accurately reflect local vision, lead to scenic improvements, benefit threshold standards, and create predictable standards that encourage redevelopment and threshold standard attainment	Require that certain design requirements be included in area plans for site design, building design, landscaping, lighting, transitional height limits, and signage	Implement design standards that reflect community input and encourage environmentally beneficial redevelopment	Existing design standards for site and building design as described in Code Chapter 36
Lighting standards	No changes proposed to existing lighting standards as described in Code Chapter 36	Develop outdoor lighting standards for each land use classification that minimizes stray or unnecessary lighting	Adopt lighting standards including the use of cutoff shields to minimize light pollution and stray light to protect dark sky views	Adopt lighting standards for each transect district such as the use of low intensity lights and/or cutoff shields to minimize light pollution and stray light	No changes proposed to existing lighting standards as described in Code Chapter 36
Biological Resources					
Large trees	Achieve existing objectives	Allow the removal or pruning of large trees for projects that would benefit other threshold standards or create defensible space	Allow the pruning of large trees as an alternative to tree removal if determined necessary by a defensible space assessor	Allow the pruning of large trees as an alternative to tree removal if determined necessary by a defensible space assessor	Achieve existing objectives.
Invasive species	Existing regulations	Require that all projects in areas with infestations of aquatic invasive species reduce and remove aquatic invasive species and prepare annual monitoring reports	Explicitly prohibit and prevent the release of invasive, exotic or undesirable non-native aquatic species into the Region and control existing populations of those species	Explicitly prohibit and prevent the release of invasive, exotic or undesirable non-native aquatic species into the Region and control existing populations of those species	Existing regulations
Population and Housing, Socioeconomics					
Affordable and Moderate Income Housing	No new bonus units No housing program changes Significantly reduced residential construction rate	No new bonus units No housing program changes Reduced residential construction rate	600 new bonus units New housing needs program Reduced residential construction rate	No new bonus units New housing needs program Slightly reduced residential construction rate	No new bonus units No housing program changes Maintain current residential construction rate.
Natural Hazards and Public Safety					
Defensible Space	Achieve scenic objectives. Not required to be consistent with defensible space	Require landscape plans to be consistent with defensible space and where feasible, accommodate stormwater runoff	Require landscape plans to be consistent with defensible space, and where feasible, accommodate stormwater runoff	Require landscape plans to be consistent with defensible space requirements, and where feasible, accommodate stormwater runoff	Require landscape plans to be consistent with defensible space and where feasible, accommodate stormwater runoff

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.2 Land Use			
<p>3.2-1: Development Pattern and Land Use Compatibility. The five Regional Plan Update alternatives each propose land use planning strategies to guide how the existing land use pattern would evolve. To varying degrees, all five alternatives would retain the established growth management system (i.e., authorization of limited numbers of allocations); continue the existing land use pattern (concentration of development in defined community centers); and allow for or encourage transfer of existing and potential development to appropriate areas. All alternatives would result in continuation of generally the same land use pattern, but with varying levels of development and degrees of concentration and location.</p> <p>Areas designated for residential, commercial, and tourist uses would remain the same under all alternatives; no new land use types would be introduced such that incompatible land uses would be placed in proximity to each other. (Changes in land use classification from conservation to recreation are evaluated in Impact 3.2-2 below.) No changes are proposed to industrial zoning that could result in incompatibility with adjacent uses. Plan Area Statements, Community Plans, and Master Plans describe allowable uses, provide detailed guides for planning in specific areas of the Region, and were developed in part to ensure appropriate and compatible land uses, and these would remain in effect until superseded by Area Plans (Alternative 3) or other plan updates, which would, in turn, undergo environmental review prior to adoption. In addition, the project approval process from which the development pattern evolves is established by the Goals and Policies, the Code, and other TRPA, federal, state, and local regulations that ensure that the residential, commercial, tourist, recreation, and conservation uses allowed by the 1987 Regional Plan and carried forward in this Regional Plan Update are compatible with one another.</p>	<p>Alts. 1 and 5 – LTS Alts. 2, 3, and 4 – B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1 and 5 – LTS Alts. 2, 3, and 4 – B</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 include new policies and programs that would encourage new development and redevelopment within community centers (e.g., Town Centers, Development Transfer Zones [DTZs], Pedestrian- and Transit-Oriented Development [PTODs]) and removal of development outside these areas. Over time, a greater percentage of development would be located in community centers, with improved access to services and reduced automobile dependency. Because Alternatives 3 and 4 would allow greater density and increased building height within community centers, the intensification of use within the existing urban areas would be greater than under Alternative 2.</p> <p>Alternatives 1 and 5 would continue existing land use policies. As a result, areas designated for residential, tourist, and commercial areas would remain the same, no new land uses would be introduced, no adverse impacts relative to development pattern and land use compatibility would result, and this impact would be less than significant. Because Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 include provisions to concentrate development in community centers which would result in greater opportunity for alternative transportation, reduced VMT, reduced air pollutant emissions, increased preservation and restoration of open space, and other benefits, this impact would be beneficial for these alternatives.</p>			
<p>3.2-2: Land Use Classification Change. Implementation of Alternatives 2, 3, 4, or 5 the Regional Plan Update would result in modifications of the land use map. Alternative 1 would not include any such changes and would have no impact. Alternatives 2 through 5 would implement map revisions resulting from minor land use changes that have occurred since adoption of the 1987 Regional Plan, including acquisition of parcels by CTC, USFS, and NDSL. These revisions are such that they would change lands that are currently higher intensity land use classifications such as residential, commercial and tourist, to lower intensity land uses, including recreation and conservation. In addition, Alternatives 2,</p>	<p>Alt. 1 – NI Alts. 2, 4, and 5 – LTS Alt. 3 – PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: Revise Requirements for Development in the Recreation District. For Alternative 3, TRPA will allow additional development involving commercial uses, residential uses, tourist accommodation uses and/or subdivisions in a Recreation Area within an Area Plan or Master Plan only if the development results in a development pattern that is compatible with recreation district uses, does not induce substantial growth in the area (either directly or indirectly), and does not conflict with any environmental policies or regulations, as analyzed and demonstrated by the subsequent environmental analysis for the Area or Master Plan. To the extent that environmental analysis</p>	<p>Alt. 1 – NI Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3, 4, and 5 would re-designate Van Sickle Bi-State Park from conservation to recreation. This change would be consistent with the existing and planned recreation land uses, and consistent with the existing PAS. No other classification changes are proposed for Alternative 2. Therefore, the impact of Alternative 2 would be less than significant.</p> <p>Alternative 3 would change 250 acres of private land adjacent to the proposed High Density Tourist District from conservation to recreation. In addition, Alternative 3 proposes to amend the Code to allow the development and subdivision of tourist, commercial, and residential uses in the Recreation District by means of an Area Plan or Master Plan. Because the Code amendment could result in development of vacant lands not currently contemplated for such land uses, Alternative 3 would result in a potentially significant land use impact.</p> <p>Alternative 4 would re-designate the Douglas County Dumpsite from conservation land to a special district, which would be a new land use designation under the transect zoning system. Because the existing PAS for this area includes management policies that recognize the Douglas County Dumpsite as an existing public service area, this land use map modification would not change the intensity of existing uses at this site, and would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Alternative 5 would revise the boundary of PAS 087, Heavenly Valley California, a recreation classification, to match with the USFS permit boundary. This would result in reclassification of 1,300 acres of conservation land in PAS 095, Trout/Cold Creek, and 22 acres of residential land in PAS 085, Lakeview Heights, all owned by the USFS, to recreation. Expansion of this plan area to match the USFS permit boundary is consistent with the overall land use theme and management policies. Any additional ski facilities proposed with these classification changes would require preparation and adoption of an Area Plan or Master Plan. Thus,</p>		<p>indicates mitigation measures are required, those measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the development shall be an accessory use to a primary recreation use as defined by Code Section 21.3; 2. the development shall not increase the number of existing units of use at the site unless it is the result of transfers of existing residential and tourist units of use and existing commercial floor area from outside designated Town Centers, the Regional Center, and the High Density Tourist District; 3. the development shall transfer existing units of use at a ratio of more than 1:1 or require that units of use be transferred from sensitive lands; 4. the development shall provide transportation options such as bike trails, chairlifts, dedicated transit, sidewalk, and trails that links to community centers and recreation access opportunities in the vicinity and demonstrate a net decrease in VMT; and 5. the geographic extent of development shall be limited. 	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
under Alternative 5, this impact would be less than significant .			
<p>3.2-3: Consistency with Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations. The fundamental purpose of the Regional Plan is to implement goals, policies and ordinances that, collectively, achieve and maintain environmental threshold standards. As such, Regional Plan Update alternatives have been developed in coordination with, and/or in consideration of, other applicable plans, including the Regional Transportation Plan, Sustainability Communities Strategy, LTBMU Forest Plan, Water Quality Management Plan, EIP, Lake Tahoe TMDL, and local General Plans and Master Plans. All five alternatives would result in land use plans and urban forms that generally follow the existing land use pattern. Through land use planning frameworks and incentives, the alternatives, to varying degrees, further focus development and redevelopment within the Region’s existing urban nodes. As a result, these alternatives do not propose changes that would conflict with the Regional Plan’s designated land uses, policies, or regulations. Furthermore, established policies for cooperative planning in the Region, through MOUs and ongoing coordinated and concurrent updates, have allowed TRPA and federal, state, and local agencies to establish consistency between the Regional Plan Update and applicable regional and local plans, policies and regulations</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
3.3 Transportation			
<p>3.3-1: Roadway Segment Operations. Because implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would cause at least one roadway segment to degrade from an acceptable to an unacceptable level, and/or substantially degrade the LOS of a roadway segment that is already operating at unacceptable levels, all Alternatives (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5), would result in significant adverse impacts on roadway operations. Alternatives 1 and 2 would each result in a significant impact to four study roadways.</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - S	<p>3.3-1: Phased Release of Allocations / LOS Monitoring / Travel Demand Management. The level of service standard under evaluation for Impact 3.3-1 is oriented toward alleviating congestion during the peak hour of peak travel times in the Region. The Compact directs TRPA to focus transportation improvements on transit investments and enhancements to non-auto modes, rather than new roadway capacity. Therefore, the mitigation measures below seek first to provide additional travel</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>Alternative 3 would result in a significant impact to two study roadways, Alternative 4 would result in a significant impact to nine study roadways, and Alternative 5 would result in a significant impact to ten study roadways.</p>		<p>capacity in the form of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements, with an ongoing monitoring program. New roadway improvements beyond those already listed in the RTP, are proposed if other measures are not able to meet community needs during peak travel times.</p> <p>TRPA will develop and implement a program for the phased release of land use allocations in four-year cycles in conjunction with future updates of the Regional Plan and RTP. Two years after each release, monitoring of existing and near-term LOS will occur at intersections and roadways to evaluate compliance with applicable LOS policies. Should LOS projections indicate that applicable LOS goals and policies will not be met, actions will be undertaken through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments to maintain compliance. Actions may include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TRPA will prioritize, and cause to be implemented, if feasible, enhanced non-motorized and public transportation projects and services to accommodate the additional travel demand. 2. TRPA will modify the land use allocation releases to reduce travel demand. 3. To the extent that roadway capacity expansions do not result in significant, unavoidable environmental impacts, TRPA will investigate and cause to be implemented, if feasible, additional multi-modal corridor improvements (beyond those listed in the RTP project list). The following is an example list of potential candidate improvements based on the identified significant impacts of the RTP/SCS alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > US 50 between the South Y and South Stateline – modify US 50 to consist of enhanced access control (e.g., raised median with channelized turn lanes at selected locations, driveway consolidation to limit turning locations on the 	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		highway, etc.), to the extent that planned traffic signal coordination does not provide sufficient capacity increases. > US 50 between SR 89 and Pioneer Trail – modify US 50 to consist of enhanced access control (e.g., raised median with channelized turn lanes, driveway consolidation, etc.) to increase the capacity of the highway.	
3.3-2: Intersection Operations. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 would cause degradation of intersection operations at several intersections, but not to unacceptable (i.e., LOS D in rural areas, and LOS E for more than 4 hours or LOS F in urban areas) levels. For all alternatives, impacts to intersection operations would be less than significant .	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
3.3-3: Vehicle Miles Traveled Threshold Standard. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would generate additional VMT. However, the degree of added VMT would vary by alternative. Because the VMT generated as a result of each alternative would exceed the Visibility: Vehicle Miles Traveled Threshold Standard, the impact of increased VMT would be significant for all alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - S	3.3-3: Implement Additional VMT Reduction. Additional mitigation will be required for all alternatives to further reduce VMT to achieve the VMT Threshold Standard. The following percent reductions would be necessary for each alternative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Alternative 1: 3.4 percent reduction > Alternative 2: 1.3 percent reduction > Alternative 3: 3.0 percent reduction > Alternative 4: 7.9 percent reduction > Alternative 5: 10.9 percent reduction To ensure that the VMT Threshold Standard is achieved, TRPA will develop and implement a program for the phased release of land use allocations followed by monitoring and forecasting of actual roadway traffic counts and VMT. New CFA, TAUs, and residential allocations will be authorized for release by the TRPA Governing Board every four years, beginning with the approval of the Regional Plan. Approval of the release of allocations will be contingent upon demonstrating, through modeling and the use of actual traffic counts, that the VMT Threshold Standard will be maintained over the subsequent four-year period.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.3-4: Transit Service. Transit service enhancements are included in all five alternatives. Alternatives 1 and 5 would implement transit improvements contained in Transportation Strategy Package A, including the Waterborne Transit Project and operation and maintenance of the existing transit system. Alternatives 2 through 4 would implement Transportation Strategy Packages B and C, which include substantial transit improvements (including transit projects, programs, and efficiency strategies) that are expected to not only meet new demand, but offer substantial service improvements beyond those that exist today. Therefore, transit service impacts under all alternatives would be beneficial.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - B</p>
<p>3.3-5: Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety. All alternatives would enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety. Pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements are included in all five alternatives. Alternatives 1 and 5 would implement several pedestrian and bicycle improvements contained in Transportation Strategy Package A. Alternatives 2 through 4 would implement Transportation Strategy Packages B and C, which include substantial pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements that are expected to not only meet new demand, but offer substantial improvements beyond those that exist today. Facility improvements offer opportunities to separate pedestrian and bicycle travel from roadway travel lanes (such as separated trails or striped, designated lanes), thus reducing the potential for conflicts. Therefore, pedestrian and bicycle safety impacts under all alternatives would be beneficial</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - B</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.4 Air Quality			
<p>3.4-1: Consistency with Air Quality Plan and Transportation Conformity. All of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in mobile-source CO emissions well within the emissions budgets allocated for transportation conformity. If the transportation emissions budget is met, then the Basin is considered to be on track for maintaining attainment of the CO AAQS. Therefore, none of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in emission levels that would conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality-related plans. This impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
<p>3.4-2: Short-Term Construction Emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Construction emissions are described as “short-term” or temporary in duration and have the potential to represent a significant impact with respect to air quality. ROG and NO_x emissions are primarily associated with gas and diesel equipment exhaust and the application of architectural coatings. Fugitive dust emissions (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) are primarily associated with site preparation and vary as a function of such parameters as soil silt content, soil moisture, wind speed, acreage of disturbance area, and VMT by construction vehicles on- and off-site.</p> <p>Implementation of projects would involve construction that would result in the temporary generation of ROG and NO_x (ozone precursors), PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions from site preparation (e.g., excavation, grading, and clearing); off-road equipment, material import/export, worker commute exhaust emissions, paving, and other miscellaneous activities. Typical construction equipment associated with development and redevelopment projects includes dozers, graders, excavators, loaders, and trucks. Construction emissions of these pollutants associated with Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 have the potential to be substantial, and would result in potentially significant impact to air quality.</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - PS	<p>3.4-2: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for Construction Emissions. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate implementation of Best Construction Practices for Construction Emissions through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments that require, as a condition of project approval, implementation of feasible measures and Best Management Practices to reduce construction-generated emissions to the extent feasible. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. Where local ordinances, rules, or regulations already require Best Construction Practices for construction emissions, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances, rules, or regulations do not adequately address Best Construction Practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Construction contractors shall prepare and submit an inventory of heavy-duty equipment over 50 horsepower and used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during construction. The equipment inventory shall demonstrate 	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>that the project-wide fleet average will achieve a minimum 20 percent NOX and 45 percent particulate matter emissions reduction compared to the most recent statewide average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Fugitive dust shall not exceed 40 percent opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time during project construction. > No open burning of removed vegetation shall occur during infrastructure improvements. > Minimize idling time to 5 minutes for all diesel-power equipment. > Apply water to control dust as needed to prevent dust impacts offsite. Operational water truck(s) shall be onsite, as required, to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site. > Apply approved chemical soil stabilizers, vegetative mats, or other appropriate Best Management Practices to manufacturer’s specifications, to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours). Spread soil binders on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas and wet broom or wash streets if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. > Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean-fuel generators rather than temporary diesel power generators, wherever feasible. 	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.4-3: Long-Term Operational Emissions of ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Project-related operational emissions of the ozone precursors ROG and NO_x would be reduced over the plan implementation period under Alternatives 1 through 5, as compared with existing conditions. Each Regional Plan Update alternative may result in a slight long-term increase in emissions of PM over the plan period. This would be largely attributable to the increased number of natural gas fireplaces and EPA-certified wood stoves that would be associated with new development allocations under Alternatives 2 through 5. However, the total increase in PM emissions associated with each Plan alternative would be less than the amount considered significant by PCAPCD (82 pounds per day). In addition, TRPA will continue to implement its wood stove retrofit program, which is expected to contribute to a continuing trend of improvement in baseline PM emissions levels in the Basin. The increase in operational ozone precursors and PM emissions associated with Alternatives 1 through 5 would not be expected to result in a substantial contribution to a violation of air quality standards. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>
<p>3.4-4: Long-Term Operational Localized Exposure to Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions. Under all of the Regional Plan Update alternatives, all affected intersections would be anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS (i.e., LOS D or better). Therefore, traffic volumes would not be heavy enough to result in a CO “hot spot.” For this reason, and based on the fact that CO emission factors would be reduced substantially over the planning period, long-term operation of Regional Plan Update Alternatives 1 through 5 would not result in congestion at intersections that would result in a violation of an air quality standard (i.e., 1-hour CAAQS of 20 ppm, 8-hour TRPA standard of 6 ppm for CO), contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.4-5: Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. The Regional Plan Update alternatives would not involve the siting of sensitive receptors near any major roadways or near any major stationary sources of TAC emissions, nor would they result in the siting of any new stationary sources of TAC emissions. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations. In addition, mobile-source diesel PM would be expected to decline over the plan implementation period compared to existing conditions. However, as with implementation of any site-specific project, construction emissions may occur in proximity to sensitive receptors and may result in exposure of receptors to substantial TAC concentrations in Alternatives 1 through 5. This impact would be potentially significant.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - PS</p>	<p>3.4-5: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for TAC Emissions during Construction. Within twelve months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate implementation of Best Construction Practices for Construction Emissions through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments that requires, as a condition of project approval, implementation of feasible measures to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to construction-related TAC emissions. Until that time, TRPA will continue the existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. Where local ordinances, rules, or regulations already require Best Construction Practices for construction emissions, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances, rules, or regulations do not adequately address Best Construction Practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Limit idling time to 5 minutes maximum. › Equip heavy-duty construction equipment with diesel particulate traps. › Locate construction staging areas as far away as possible on the project site from off-site receptors. › As a condition of approval, individual project environmental review shall demonstrate that current district-recommended BMPs are implemented to ensure sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial TAC concentrations. 	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.4-6: Exposure to Excessive Odorous Emissions. None of the Regional Plan Update alternatives include goals, policies, or implementation measures that would change the nature, location, size, or operation of any odor-producing use or facility in the Tahoe Region. No changes in land use designation or zoning are proposed that would result in placement of sensitive receptors nearer any such facilities. Finally, neither construction nor operation of projects that may be developed as a result of authorization of additional allocations for residential, commercial, or tourist uses would be expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant .	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
3.4-7: Atmospheric Deposition. Substantial reductions (76-78 percent) in mobile-source NO _x emissions are anticipated over the Regional Plan build-out period under Alternatives 1 through 5. The foreseeable reductions in mobile-source NO _x are associated with increased vehicle emissions control requirements. Mobile-source emissions of NO _x are a major component of atmospheric nitrogen deposited to Lake Tahoe. Because substantial reductions in mobile-source NO _x are anticipated under Regional Plan Update Alternatives 1 through 5, the Regional Plan Update would be consistent with performance standards for atmospheric nitrogen deposition and would promote attainment of threshold standards for atmospheric deposition. This impact would be less than significant .	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
3.4-8: Implementation of Proposed Air Quality Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Amendments. Implementation of the proposed amendments to the threshold standards for CO, PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} would not result in degradation of air quality conditions or relaxation of air quality standards. These amendments would occur under Alternatives 2 through 5 and would result in closer alignment of TRPA numerical threshold standards with ambient air quality standards already applied to projects in TRPA's jurisdiction. This impact would be less than significant .	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.4-9: Extension of Time for Air Quality Mitigation Fee Basis. Alternative 4 proposes to extend the time for which an applicant could use a prior existing use as the basis for a new trip calculation from 90 days within the last 2 years to 90 days within the last 5 years. Because the change could result in the reduction of air quality mitigation fees used to implement air quality enhancement projects, this proposal could result in potentially significant effects.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, and 5 – LTS Alt. 4 - PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.4-9: Maintain Level of Air Quality Mitigation Improvements. For Alternative 4, TRPA will evaluate and adjust the Air Quality Mitigation Fee program to ensure that no decrease in the level of air quality improvements would result from the change in the eligible time period for a previous use from 2 to 5 years. Adjustments to the mitigation fee program may include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Increase Air Quality Mitigation Fees on new developments to offset the reduction in fees from the proposed change. › Implement regulatory changes that would ensure the same level of air quality improvements could occur with reduced fees. › Develop an additional Air Quality Mitigation Fee for additional uses that would offset the reduction in mitigation fees from the proposed change. 	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>
<p>3.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change</p>			
<p>3.5-1: Increase in GHG Emissions. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some level of development and population growth anticipated during the plan horizon. Although many of the sustainability- and conservation-oriented land use and transportation policies and strategies of the five plan alternatives would reduce VMT, increase transit and non-motor vehicle travel, and allow or encourage redevelopment that would improve energy efficiency, the combined influence of development and population growth occurring during the planning horizon of the Regional Plan Update would result in a substantial increase in overall GHG emissions (in contrast to GHG per capita) that would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. Among the Regional Plan Update alternatives, Alternative 5 would result in the largest increase in overall GHG emissions, followed by Alternatives 4, 2, 3, and 1. Alternative 3 would result in the most GHG-efficient land use and transportation system combination; however, this</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: Implement Sustainability Measures with Performance Standard. Within twelve months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate implementation of a GHG Emission Reduction Policy through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments addressing Best Construction Practices and ongoing operational efficiency. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. The policy will require implementation of measures for the reduction of GHG emissions generated by demolition and construction activity in the Region and by ongoing building and property operations. Where local ordinances already require GHG Emission Reductions consistent with the Policy, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances do not adequately address GHG reduction practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Such measures may</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - SU</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>significant impact from increased GHG emissions would apply to all five Regional Plan Update alternatives.</p>		<p>include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <p>Minimize Construction-Related GHG Emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Limit equipment idling time to a maximum of five (5) minutes. › Recycle or reuse construction waste and demolition material to the maximum extent feasible. › Use electrified or alternative-fueled construction equipment to the maximum extent feasible. › Use local and sustainable building materials to the extent possible. <p>Minimize Operation-Related GHG Emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Use on-site renewable energy, such as photovoltaic systems. › Exceed building code standards for energy efficiency. › Install energy efficient appliances and equipment in new buildings. › Retrofit existing buildings to exceed energy efficiency building code standards. › Construct new development to allow for electric lawn maintenance and snow removal equipment compatibility. › Require minimum passive solar design standards in new buildings. › Expand recycling opportunities and increase recycling infrastructure, including food waste diversion into a composting process. › Implement water conservation standards in new development. <p>TRPA will require through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments that GHG emissions from project-specific construction and operational activities permitted pursuant</p>	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		to and in accordance with the Regional Plan are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. As described in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, all feasible mitigation measures pertaining to mobile-source GHG emissions have been considered within the range of transportation strategies already included in the three RTP/SCS Transportation Strategy Packages. Through the grant awarded to the Lake Tahoe Region from the California Strategic Growth Council, a partnership of agencies and organizations are working on a Region-wide Sustainability Plan, which will address other primary sources of GHG emissions (i.e., energy use and efficiency, water supply and conservation, and solid waste). At such time a Sustainability Plan is completed for the Tahoe Region, TRPA will coordinate implementation measures through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments recommended in that plan along with other appropriate measures, as feasible.	
3.5-2: Consistency with SB 375 Targets and AB 32 Goals. Regional Plan Update Alternatives 1, 4, and 5 would meet TMPO’s ARB-issued SB 375 GHG reduction target for 2020, but not for 2035. Alternatives 2 and 3 would meet both 2020 and 2035 targets and would be the only Regional Plan Update Alternatives that would meet the requirements of an SCS and comply with SB 375 requirements. Alternatives 1, 4, and 5 would not comply with SB 375 requirements and would not be consistent with legislation adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions. Therefore, Alternatives 1, 4, and 5 would result in a substantial cumulative contribution to climate change impacts. This impact would be significant for Alternatives 1, 4, and 5, and less than significant for Alternatives 2 and 3.	Alts. 1, 4, and 5 – S Alts. 2 and 3 - LTS	3.5-2: Prepare Alternative Planning Strategy. For Alternatives 1, 4, and 5, TMPO shall prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) that demonstrates how the regional SB 375 GHG-reduction targets for the California portion of the Region would be achieved, in accordance with California SB 375. The APS would need to include strategies for bringing the alternative into compliance, such as additional transportation projects, development right transfer incentives, a compact land use pattern, reduced allocations, and energy efficiency measures that would result in achievement of SB 375 targets.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.6 Noise			
<p>3.6-1: Long-Term Traffic Noise Levels. Each of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would authorize different numbers of new allocations that would prescribe the levels of new development of different types that could be constructed over the planning horizon of the Regional Plan. Different policies and redevelopment incentives proposed under each of the alternatives would influence the amount and location of new development. Traffic modeling conducted for each combination of development level, distribution, and transportation improvements generated projected ADT for road segments in the Region, which were used as inputs to the traffic noise model. Long-term traffic noise levels under any of the five Regional Plan Update alternatives could exceed threshold standards established by TRPA for different land use categories and highway corridors; create a perceptible long-term increase to the ambient noise level (i.e., 3 dBA CNEL or greater) in an area where the applicable TRPA threshold standard is not exceeded; and/or result in a long-term noise level increase, of any magnitude, in an area where the applicable TRPA threshold standard is already exceeded. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - S</p>	<p>3.6-1: Establish and Implement a Region-Wide Traffic Noise Mitigation Program. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate implementation of a Region-wide traffic noise reduction program through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments that will implement measures for reducing attaining and maintaining traffic noise levels to below applicable CNEL standards. Until that time, TRPA will continue its existing practice of requiring measures to be developed on a project-specific basis. Measures may include those required as conditions of approval for development projects and those to be implemented by TRPA to address cumulative, regional noise levels. Traffic noise mitigation measures will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Construction of barriers, berms, and/or acoustical shielding—Any barriers shall blend into the overall landscape and have an aesthetically pleasing appearance that is compatible with the color and character of the general area, and not become the dominant visual element of the community. Relocation of existing vegetation and/or landscaping may also be necessary to achieve an aesthetically pleasing appearance; › Replacement of driveways that provide access from highways to individual buildings with a common access way that routes ingress and egress traffic to nearby intersections in order to reduce the number of gaps in barriers and berms; › Planting of dense vegetation in key locations where noise absorption is needed; › Use of noise-reducing pavement, including repaving existing roadways with noise-reducing pavement —All 	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>pavement must be suitable for the climate of the Tahoe Region, snow removal needs, and particulate matter standards;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Reduction of speed limits and/or implementation of traffic-calming measures that slow travel speeds, if feasible and practical; > Establishment of setback requirements for new development in specific areas exposed to highway noise; > Realignment of segments of the highway, if feasible, to reduce noise-sensitive areas to exposure of traffic noise from that highway segment; > Acquisition of additional right-of-way adjacent to specific roadway segments to remove existing noise-sensitive receptors, including existing residences; > Establishment of programs to pay for noise reduction such as low-cost loans to owners of noise-affected property or establishment of developer fees; > Noise-reducing acoustical treatment of existing buildings; and > Additional measures that would, based on substantial evidence, reduce the number of vehicle trips associated with project operations, such as an employee carpool or van pool program, shuttle bus service for residents or tourists, parking fees, and bicycle amenities. <p>Prior to adoption of the traffic noise reduction program, TRPA will continue to evaluate individual projects at the project level and enforce CNEL standards on a project-by-project basis pursuant to the noise limitations in Chapter 68 of the Code.</p> <p>For projects that do not require environmental documentation beyond a checklist, TRPA may apply general noise reduction measures in the twelve months preceding adoption of the Region-wide traffic noise reduction plan.</p>	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.6-2: Short-Term Project-Related Construction Noise Levels. Projects proposed under the Regional Plan may include development, redevelopment, commercial and tourist uses, transit and transportation, recreation, public/quasi-public facilities, and natural resources restoration. Construction activities to implement such projects could potentially expose noise-sensitive receptors to levels that exceed TRPA threshold standards and/or expose noise-sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels. This would be a significant impact for all alternatives.</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - S	<p>3.6-2: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Exposure to Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate implementation of a Best Construction Practices Policy for Minimization of Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration through TRPA-approved plans, project permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. The policy will require implementation of measures for the reduction of noise generated by demolition and construction activity in the Region. Where local ordinances already require Best Construction Practices for construction noise, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances do not adequately address Best Construction Practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Measures for minimizing exposure to construction-generated noise may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › All construction equipment shall be equipped with properly operating mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. › Equipment engine doors shall be kept closed during equipment operation. › Inactive construction equipment shall not be left idling for prolonged periods of time (i.e., more than 5 minutes). › Stationary equipment (e.g., power generators) and staging areas for other equipment shall be located at the maximum distance feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors. › Trucks hauling materials and goods to and from the construction site shall only do so during active construction periods. 	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Temporary sound barriers shall be installed along the boundaries of the construction site or surrounding stationary sources of noise (e.g. pumps or generators) to protect nearby noise-sensitive receptors, where feasible and applicable. › All construction and demolition activity using heavy-duty, off-road equipment shall be performed between 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. Construction-generated noise is exempt from TRPA noise standards during these hours by TRPA Code Section 68.9. Noise-generating construction activity may occur during other times of the day if the resultant noise levels would not exceed TRPA noise standards. TRPA will require all project applications to include a construction noise reduction plan, specific to the proposed project that fully complies with those applicable measures identified in the Region-wide Best Construction Practices Policy. 	
<p>3.6-3: Ground Vibration. Projects proposed under the Regional Plan may include development, redevelopment, commercial and tourist uses, transit and transportation, recreation, public/quasi-public facilities, and natural resources restoration. Ground vibration generated during construction of these projects could result in damage to nearby buildings and structures and/or result in a negative human response to vibration-sensitive land uses. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-3: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. The Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Construction Noise and Ground Vibration, which is required by Mitigation Measure 3.6-2, will also include measures to address vibration generated during construction and demolition activity. Measures required by the policy to reduce ground vibration may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Sonic pile driving shall be performed instead of impact pile driving, where feasible; › To further reduce pile-driving ground vibration impacts, holes shall be predrilled to the maximum feasible depth to reduce the number of blows required to seat the pile; › All construction equipment on construction sites shall be operated as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as 	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		<p>reasonably possible;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would expose an existing structure to levels of ground vibration that exceeds 0.20 in/sec PPV. The vibration control program shall include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures. Established setback requirements may be waived with a project-specific analysis conducted by a qualified specialist that indicates that no structural damage would occur at nearby buildings or structures. > No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would expose human activity in an existing building to levels of ground vibration that exceed FTA's 80 VdB standard. The vibration control program shall also include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing negative human response. Established setback requirements may be waived with a project-specific analysis by a qualified specialist that indicates that the buildings would not be exposed to ground vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB, confirmed by monitoring. <p>TRPA will only approve projects, plans, or programs that would comply with the requirements of the Best Construction Practices Policy.</p>	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.5-4: Land Use Compatibility. The development of new residential and tourist accommodation uses under all five Regional Plan Update alternatives could place new, more noise-sensitive land uses in locations where ambient noise levels are incompatible. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-4: Develop and Implement an Exterior Noise Policy for Mixed-Use Development. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate implementation through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments of an exterior noise standard, and related policies, for outdoor activity areas of mixed-use development. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. Traffic noise mitigation measures will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Development of the exterior noise standard will be based on health criteria for noise exposure and will take into account the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Pertinent guidance provided by the California Governor’s Office of Research and Planning (OPR 2003: p.253-254); › Noise exposure standards established by local jurisdictions in the Region, including Douglas County Code 20.690.030, the Placer County General Plan (Placer County 1994: p. 139, 141), and the El Dorado County General Plan (El Dorado County 2004: p.116-117); › The health-related effects of noise exposure; › Any unique characteristics of the noise environment in the Region; and › Proximity and access to quiet outdoor areas from community centers in the Region (e.g., undeveloped areas, areas zoned by TRPA for urban outdoor recreation, rural outdoor recreation, or wilderness and roadless). <p>TRPA will not approve any proposed land use development project, plan, or program that would expose outdoor activity areas of residential and tourist accommodation uses to exterior noise levels that exceed the identified standard.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.7 Geology, Soils, Land Capability, and Coverage			
<p>3.7-1: Land Coverage. Due to the potential availability of existing and proposed development rights and allocations, all Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some increase in coverage throughout the Region; however, for all alternatives, the total increase would be well within the base allowable coverage for the Region. In addition, all development projects would be required to comply with existing and proposed land coverage policies and regulations, which establish the maximum allowable coverage (base plus transferred); prohibit additional coverage in sensitive lands; establish transfer ratios; and require mitigation of excess coverage. Therefore, any projects implemented under the Regional Plan Update that would result in additional coverage would be limited such that total coverage in the Region as established by the Bailey Land Classification System is not exceeded, and/or such that existing excess coverage is reduced.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would result in the smallest coverage increase, an estimated 8 acres, because it would allow development of only the remaining 1987 Regional Plan allocations and would result in decreases in coverage on sensitive lands and increases in coverage on high-capability lands. Alternative 2 would result in a total estimated increase of 116 acres, with a decrease of 9 acres in LCD 1b (SEZ) and increases in coverage on high-capability lands. However, Alternative 2 would reduce the amount of total allowable coverage in Community Plan areas and DTZs and would increase transfer ratios, limiting the ability to transfer coverage compared to Alternative 1. Alternative 3 would result in a total estimated increase of 66 acres, with the largest decrease of coverage from SEZ (15 acres) and increases in coverage on high-capability lands, due to substantial changes to coverage policies providing incentives to transfer coverage from sensitive lands. Alternative 4, which would authorize more new development than Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, would result in an estimated coverage increase of 180 acres and an estimated decrease of 12 acres in</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>SEZ. As in Alternative 3, Alternative 4 would change coverage policies to provide increased incentives for transfer of coverage from sensitive lands to high-capability lands in PTODs. Alternative 5 would authorize the most new development and would result in an estimated coverage increase of 202 acres, with a decrease of 10 acres in SEZ and increases in coverage on high-capability lands. However, Alternative 5, similar to Alternative 1, lacks any coverage policy changes to incentivize additional transfers of coverage from sensitive lands.</p> <p>Although all alternatives would result in some increases in coverage, primarily through additional residential allocations, build-out of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in less than the total allowable coverage for the Region as determined by the Bailey System, and coverage of sensitive lands would be reduced. All alternatives would result in less-than-significant effects with regard to total coverage.</p>			
<p>3.7-2: Site Topography, Grading, and Soil Erosion. Development pursuant to the Regional Plan Update could expose soils and SEZs to adverse effects from erosion during construction activities for new residential units, tourist accommodation units, commercial, and public service facilities. Proposed projects could involve grading more than 5 feet below ground surface, requiring findings pursuant to TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 33.3.6. However, development projects implemented as part of the Regional Plan Update would be required to obtain grading and excavation permits and approvals in accordance with TRPA Code Chapter 33 as well as meet local, state and federal regulations. For all alternatives (1 through 5), the impact to soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant because all alternatives involve a continuation of existing goals, policies, and implementation measures, which are protective of water quality.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.7-3: Seismic Hazards. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some level of additional development that could expose people and property to soil hazards resulting from seismic activity. However, the Region is already subject to such hazards including strong ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure caused by unstable soils (landslides, backshore erosion, avalanches, mud slides, ground failure, liquefaction, lateral spreading, or collapse), tsunami, or seiche. Development and redevelopment projects implemented under any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would largely occur in already developed areas and not in areas known to be particularly susceptible to seismic hazards. In addition, structures would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current design requirements of UBC Seismic Zone 3. Therefore, the Regional Plan Update alternatives would not result in a substantial change in development patterns or design requirements and would not result in a substantial increase in the risk of loss, injury, or death or property damage from strong ground shaking or earthquake induced ground failure caused by unstable soils. This impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>
<p>3.7-4: Other Geologic Hazards. Additional development over the planning period of the Regional Plan Update could potentially be constructed on soils or geologic formations susceptible to lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse, thereby increasing the risk to people and facilities. Development projects implemented as part of the Regional Plan Update would be assessed on a project specific basis and would be required to conform to existing regional and local regulations and standards of design, grading, and construction practices to avoid or reduce hazards associated with other geologic hazards. Therefore, for all Regional Plan Update Alternatives (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5), there would be no substantial increased risk to people and facilities from other geologic hazards. This would be a less-than-significant impact for all Regional Plan Update alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.8 Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>3.8-1: Soil Erosion and/or Release of Pollutants to Water Bodies from Construction Activities. All five alternatives would allow for new construction through the use of remaining allocations and additional allocations authorized for each alternative. Soil disturbance associated with construction could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation and the release of other pollutants to nearby water bodies. Potential short-term impacts from construction activities in the Tahoe Region are presently mitigated through existing state, federal, local, and TRPA regulations, which require at a minimum the implementation and maintenance of temporary BMPs to protect water quality during construction. Because construction associated with any proposed project would be required to conform to all applicable state, federal, local, and TRPA regulations pertaining to protection of water quality from construction-related discharges, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>
<p>3.8-2: Nutrient Loading to Surface Water and Groundwater. Alternatives 2 through 4 include provisions to allow the use of treated municipal wastewater for wildfire suppression, which could release additional pollutants to the environment, potentially affecting water quality and environmental health. However, because this provision would only be used in response to wildfires, the frequency and size of which, though variable and dependent on specific conditions in a given year, is generally an infrequent occurrence. Because of its potential to protect property and land that might otherwise be damaged by wildfire, which if burned could create additional water quality impacts such as increased nutrient loading in streams, the impact to water quality would be less than significant. Alternatives 1 and 5 would result in continuation of existing policies and would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Alternative 2 would prohibit the use of fertilizers that introduce</p>	<p>Alts.1 through 5 – LTS for use of treated municipal wastewater for wildfire suppression</p> <p>Alts. 1 and 5 - LTS</p> <p>Alts. 2, 3, and 4 - B for fertilizer use</p> <p>Alt. 1 – LTS</p> <p>Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 – B for</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts.1 through 5 – LTS for use of treated municipal wastewater for wildfire suppression</p> <p>Alts. 1 and 5 - LTS</p> <p>Alts. 2, 3, and 4 - B for fertilizer use</p> <p>Alt. 1 – LTS</p> <p>Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 – B for</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>nitrogen and phosphorus into the Region, with limited exceptions. Alternatives 3 and 4 would take a more gradual approach, encouraging the phasing out of the sale and use of phosphorus-containing chemical fertilizers in the Region by 2017, with limited exceptions, through public education and outreach. Use of fertilizers in the Region creates the potential for increased transport of nutrients (primarily phosphorus and nitrogen) to Lake Tahoe that stimulate algal growth (TERC 2011: p. 10.7). Because fertilizer use in the Region creates the potential for increased nutrient loading of pollutants of concern for Lake clarity, and Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would reduce the use of fertilizer in the Region (with more immediate cessation of use and thus more immediate reduction of nutrients in the environment under Alternative 2), these alternatives would result in a beneficial impact with respect to nutrient loading. Alternative 1 and 5 would result in continuation of existing policies. Because existing policies restrict and control the use of fertilizers in the Tahoe Region, maintaining existing policies would not result in an increase in nutrient loading; Alternative 1 and 5 would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>With the exception of Alternative 1, all Regional Plan Update alternatives would include a new water quality threshold standard to support actions to reduce the extent and distribution of attached algae in the nearshore. Because the new threshold standard represents a new requirement to address an important and emergent water quality issue where none exists today, Alternatives 2 through 5 would have a beneficial effect on water quality. Alternative 1 would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>nearshore attached algae</p>		<p>nearshore attached algae</p>
<p>3.8-3: Sediment Loading to Surface Water. Each Regional Plan Update alternative proposes revised policies with the potential to affect sediment loading, including fine sediment particles, to Lake Tahoe and its tributaries. These include (1) requirements that all property owners implement water quality BMPs that are consistent</p>	<p>Alts. 1 through 5 – LTS for fire defensible space</p>	<p>3.8-3: Facilitate Improved Roadway Operations and Maintenance Practices that Protect Water Quality. For Alternatives 1 and 5: TRPA will adopt a policy that supports load reduction plans developed under the TMDL, including elements that improve road operations and maintenance to benefit water quality. TRPA will</p>	<p>Alts. 1 through 5 – LTS for fire defensible</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>with fire defensible space guidelines, (2) changes to policies that would affect operation and maintenance of roads for water quality, and (3) restoration of off-highway vehicle (OHV) trails.</p> <p>Because numerous resources have been developed to provide guidance on fire defensible space practices that are compatible with BMP requirements, and because TRPA, Resource Conservation Districts, and Fire Protection Districts continue to provide support to homeowners in the Tahoe Region to implement defensible practices, sediment loading from such practices would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p> <p>Because fine sediment particles generated from roadways in the Tahoe Region have been identified as the biggest source of loading of this pollutant to Lake Tahoe and the biggest threat to Lake clarity (LRWQCB and NDEP 2009), continuation of existing winter road practices under Alternatives 1 and 5 would constitute a potentially significant impact to water quality. Taken together, existing and proposed policies of Alternative 2, 3, and 4 would be beneficial for water quality by improving roadway operation and maintenance practices that currently generate high pollutant loads of sediment and fine sediment. These policies would also reduce fine sediment loading by increasing the potential for funding water quality operations and maintenance.</p> <p>Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 would not revise policies with regard to BMP requirements for OHV trails and impacts would be less than significant for these alternatives. Because Alternative 2 would require BMPs to be installed on all active OHV trails or be decommissioned by 2015, Alternative 2 would result in a beneficial impact on water quality.</p>	<p>Alts. 1 and 5 - PS Alts. 2, 3, and 4 - B for sediment loading from roadways</p> <p>Alts.1, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS Alt. 2 - B for sediment loading from OHV trails</p>	<p>coordinate implementation through TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments. As part of this policy, TRPA will require that public road operations and maintenance minimize the discharge of de-icers, FSP, traction abrasives, and other contaminants associated with roads consistent with public safety objectives. Specific actions that will be evaluated for incorporation into TRPA Code include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > developing a regional abrasive standard for the Tahoe Region that identifies source(s) of approved abrasives that are resistant to pulverization into fine sediment particles and that contain zero or very little phosphorus; > establishing regional standards for the use of best available technology to minimize the amount of abrasives that are applied for winter traffic safety and best available technology to maximize recovery of abrasives after application on roads; > updating the EIP program project list to reflect priorities in the load reduction plans, including those related to road operations and maintenance for improved water quality; and > increasing the availability of water quality mitigation fees for funding improved road operation and maintenance with water quality benefits. 	<p>space</p> <p>Alts. 1 through 5 – B for sediment loading from roadways</p> <p>Alts. 1, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS Alt. 2 – B for sediment loading from OHV trails</p>
<p>3.8-4: Stormwater Runoff and Pollutants Loads. Stormwater Runoff and Pollutant Loads. All Regional Plan Update alternatives would: (1) result in additional development and associated impervious coverage, the level of which is dependent upon the number of new authorized allocations; (2) permit higher levels of</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, and 5 – LTS</p> <p>Alts. 3 and 4 – PS for</p>	<p>3.8-4: Coverage Exemption Requirements. For Alternatives 3 and 4, as applicable, TRPA will through Code amendments, TRPA approved plans, project-permitting, or projects/programs developed in coordination with local or other governments:</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 – LTS for coverage exemption</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>allowable impervious coverage (either 50 percent or 70 percent, or a combination thereof) on high capability land within certain community centers, than on lands outside those areas; (3) allow coverage transfers within the Region under different proposed rules and transfer ratios; and (4) continue or modify requirements for BMP retrofit of existing development. Additionally, Alternatives 3 and 4 propose new policies that would allow for specific coverage exemptions.</p> <p>When policies across Alternatives 1, 2, and 5 are considered in aggregate, the alternatives present a less-than-significant impact to stormwater runoff and pollutant loading because they do not substantially change the existing policies related to: (1) the potential for proposed coverage transfer policies to reduce coverage impacts in low capability lands by transferring coverage that meets BMP requirements to high capability lands, (2) the opportunity to retrofit existing development with BMPs through existing or revised policies, and (3) the lack of policies to accelerate pollutant load reductions from redevelopment activities compared to historic rates.</p> <p>Alternative 3 proposes substantial incentives to transfer coverage, existing development, and development rights out of SEZ and other sensitive lands into community centers (see Section 2.6.3), which in and of themselves, would be more beneficial than other alternatives in terms of its potential for coverage removal, restoration, and environmentally-beneficial redevelopment. Alternatives 3 and 4 also propose exemptions of specific uses from coverage requirements, however, which have the potential to result in adverse water quality impacts. When policies across Alternatives 3 and 4 are considered in aggregate, the alternatives present a potentially significant impact to stormwater runoff and pollutant loading given that proposed coverage exemptions could allow aggregate coverage in excess of currently allowable coverage limits as defined by the Bailey land capability system, which are considered necessary in the Region to protect water</p>	<p>coverage exemption</p> <p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS for new threshold standard</p>	<p>A. Temporary Coverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Specify that the temporary coverage exemption does not apply to structures or facilities used for motorized vehicle access, parking, or storage. › Specify that only parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the temporary coverage exemption. As part of this provision, the exempted temporary coverage must also have BMPs installed and maintained to meet TRPA requirements. › Limit the temporary coverage exemption to 2 percent of the total amount of high capability land on a parcel or 120 square feet, whichever is less, provided that the temporary coverage meets BMP requirements and is located on high capability land (LCDs 4-7). <p>B. Pervious Decks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Specify that only residential parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the pervious deck exemption. › Include design characteristics that qualify a pervious deck for exemption that can be easily interpreted by both TRPA staff and homeowners in the Region. For example: “a pervious deck shall have gaps that allow water to pass freely and in a distributed fashion to deck armoring underneath the deck meeting BMP requirements in the BMP Handbook.” › Limit the pervious deck exemption to 5 percent of the total amount of high capability land on a parcel or 750 square feet, whichever is less, provided that the pervious deck meets BMP requirements and is located on high capability land (LCDs 4-7). <p>C. Pervious Coverage Exemption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Specify that only parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the 	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS for new threshold standard</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>quality and preserve environmental balance at the individual parcel scale (Bailey 1974:p. 24).</p> <p>With the exception of Alternative 1, all Regional Plan Update alternatives would include a new water quality threshold standard to Replace existing winter average Secchi depth standard with California’s annual average Secchi depth transparency standard. Because the new threshold standard would create consistency with state standards and protocols for evaluating and reporting this water quality metric and would be equally stringent as that replaced, this would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p>		<p>pervious coverage exemption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Restrict the coverage credit of pervious coverage to locations with low sediment loads (e.g., locations that don’t receive road abrasives, locations that are not tributary to runoff that may contain road abrasives, locations that are not tributary to runoff associated with erodible surfaces) unless a redundant infiltration BMP is in place. <p>D. Aggregate of Coverage Exemptions and Credits on Developed Parcels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Restrict the total exemption for temporary coverage and pervious decks; and the pervious coverage credit to be in aggregate no more than 10 percent of total amount of high capability land on a parcel. <p>E. Non-Motorized Trail Exemption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Develop and require design guidelines for non-motorized trails that address sensitivity of conditions in LCDs 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, and 3. › Limit the maximum amount of allowable exempted coverage under this policy for high capability lands to the trail networks identified in the Lake Tahoe Region Bike Trail and Pedestrian Plan (TMPO 2010) and other necessary trail connections to the trails identified in the Lake Tahoe Region Bike Trail and Pedestrian Plan. <p>F. ADA Exemption (Alternative 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Explicitly clarify in the policy that exempted coverage may not be associated with vehicle use (e.g., parking spaces). › Specify that only parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the ADA Exemption. 	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.9 Scenic Resources			
<p>3.9-1: Scenic Quality. All five alternatives would allow for changes in the built environment through the use of remaining allocations, use of newly authorized allocations, and implementation of existing and revised policies that ultimately affect the form of new development and redevelopment. While redevelopment often results in improvement in the scenic quality of roadway travel routes, changes in the built environment could have undesirable consequences on scenic quality if they adversely affect views or vistas, damage or remove scenic resources, or result in development that is incompatible with the scenic values of the Region.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would maintain existing land use designations, PASs, and Community Plans, and the system of development regulations and incentives would not change, scenic conditions would be similar to those that have resulted from the Regional Plan since 1987 and would remain largely unchanged as compared to existing conditions. Movement toward scenic threshold standards would continue, and development and redevelopment would not be incompatible with the scenic values of the Region. For these reasons, the impact of Alternative 1 would be less than significant.</p> <p>Alternative 2 would establish Development Transfer Zones (DTZs) and transfer and coverage policies that, while generally more stringent than those that currently exist, would allow redevelopment and promote more concentrated development in these areas relative to areas outside of DTZs. The impact of Alternative 2 would be less than significant.</p> <p>Alternative 3 would establish mixed use as a new land classification within 10 Town Centers, a Regional Center, and a High Density Tourist District and would include redevelopment incentives aimed at concentrating higher intensity uses in these target areas and reducing coverage and development in sensitive</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, and 5 – LTS Alt. 3 – B for redevelopment incentives, PS for height Alt. 4 – PS</p>	<p>3.9-1a: Comply with Specific Findings and Performance Standards for Additional Building Height. To mitigate for potentially significant scenic impacts resulting from three- or four-story buildings in the 10 Town Centers (Alternative 3) and 12 PTODs (Alternative 4), and from three- to six-story buildings in the Regional Center (Alternative 3), TRPA will apply the applicable TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 37, Height Standards; Section 37.7, Findings for Additional building Height; or equivalent findings established in an Area Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-1b: Permit Redevelopment of the High Density Tourist District/South Stateline Casino Core Tourist District of Existing Buildings within Existing Visual Prominence. To mitigate for potentially significant scenic impacts resulting from buildings up to 197 feet in the High Density Tourist District (Alternative 3) and redevelopment of the existing high-rise buildings in the South Stateline Casino Core Tourist District (Alternative 4), TRPA will require that any proposed development in the High Density Tourist District (Alternative 3) or the South Stateline Casino Core Tourist District (Alternative 4) achieve the following performance standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › The height and visual mass of any redeveloped existing high-rise structures projecting above the forest canopy shall not increase the visual prominence over baseline conditions as viewed and evaluated from key scenic viewpoints, including, but not limited to, views from the Van Sickle Bi-State Park, scenic roadway units, scenic shoreline units, and public recreation areas. When considering visual prominence, the following factors will be considered: building mass, contrast, location, articulation, color, materials and architectural style; and the quality of landscape features and views that are blocked or revealed. 	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 – LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>lands and lands distant from the community centers. These areas targeted for redevelopment generally correspond to travel units that need additional scenic improvements. Greater redevelopment incentives are likely to result in a greater pace and degree of redevelopment activity, resulting in beneficial scenic impacts. Alternative 3 would also modify height standards such that taller buildings could be permitted in the Town Centers, Regional Center, and High Density Tourist District. Because taller buildings could substantially increase visual mass and magnitude and result in impacts to scenic resource views, this impact of Alternative 3 would be potentially significant. Alternative 3 would also modify how maximum allowable height is measured on slopes greater than 10 percent to encourage stair-stepping of structures. The resulting increased visual mass and magnitude may result in impacts to scenic resource views. This impact of Alternative 3 would be potentially significant.</p> <p>With Alternative 4, the transect district approach would result in compact, higher-density, four-story urbanized areas in Town Centers and six stories in Tourist Centers that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian activity. While Alternative 4 would result in beneficial scenic improvements through redevelopment, Alternative 4 would also modify height standards such that additional height would be allowed for uses beyond tourist accommodation facilities in Town Centers and redevelopment of existing towers in the South Stateline Casino Core Tourist Center would be allowed to their existing height, but in other areas it would limit building height. The impact of Alternative 4 would be potentially significant.</p> <p>Because Alternative 5 would maintain existing land use designations and the system of development regulations and incentives would not change, changes in scenic conditions would be similar to those that have occurred since 1987 under the existing Regional Plan. New development and redevelopment would be required to comply with existing development</p>		<p>Mitigation Measure 3.9-1c: Reduce Ground Floor Height for Stepped Buildings on Slopes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> › For Alternative 3, for the purposes of measuring the height of proposed stepped buildings on sloping sites with a cross slope of 10 percent or greater, TRPA will amend the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 37, Height Standards, to require that the maximum height of the ground floor segment not exceed 28 feet. 	

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
standards, and design guidelines and scenic threshold standards would continue to apply. Development and redevelopment, therefore, would not be incompatible with the scenic values of the Region. Changes to the visual environment over the planning period under Alternative 5 would not be substantial, and roadway travel route ratings would continue to improve. For these reasons, the impact of Alternative 5 on scenic quality would be less than significant .			
3.9-2: Visual Character. All five alternatives allow for changes in the built environment. Such changes could adversely affect visual character if the appearance of the development that would result is not in accord with the desires of the local community. Potential impacts from development and redevelopment on visual character in the Tahoe Region are currently mitigated through environmental review and existing TRPA regulations. Because Alternatives 1 and 5 would maintain existing design standards and guidelines and limits on building height, the impact on visual character would be less than significant. Because Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 specify that local planning instruments would be updated or developed to include design and development standards that represent the vision and desire of the local community for visual character, the impact would be less than significant .	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
3.9-3: Adversely Affect Nighttime Views In the Region. Outdoor lighting in developed areas is necessary for public safety and security. If not properly controlled, it has the potential to illuminate the night sky and adversely affect nighttime views. The impact of outdoor lighting on nighttime views is considered to be less than significant under Alternatives 1 and 5 and beneficial for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 because specific measures to control stray light and minimize off-site spillage of light would be required under those alternatives.	Alts. 1 and 5 – LTS Alts. 2, 3, and 4 – B	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1 and 5 – LTS Alts. 2, 3, and 4 – B

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.10 Biological Resources			
<p>3.10-1: Sensitive Habitats. Sensitive Habitats. Sensitive habitats in the Tahoe Basin include a variety of wetland and riparian communities such as wet meadows, riparian zones along streams, marshes, seasonal wetlands, drainages, springs, fens, bogs, and deep water plant communities of Lake Tahoe. Most of these communities are also designated by TRPA as SEZ and/or habitats of special significance. Depending on the specific locations of projects under existing policy, development under all Regional Plan Update alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) could result in removal or disturbance of sensitive habitats, including SEZs and potential jurisdictional wetlands.</p> <p>Any new development or redevelopment project under any alternative would be required to comply with existing TRPA, federal, and state regulations, permitting requirements, and environmental review procedures that protect SEZs, wetlands, and other sensitive habitats. These regulations and procedures address potential construction-related impacts to SEZs and other sensitive habitats through site-specific environmental review; require development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design and permitting process; and require compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and permitting. Specifically, existing regulations and permitting requirements would minimize the loss of sensitive habitats during construction and provide habitat compensation for the loss of riparian, wetland, and other sensitive habitats through CWA Section 404, TRPA, and other permitting/review processes. Therefore, construction of approved development under Alternative 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 would have a less-than-significant impact to SEZs and other sensitive habitats in the Basin.</p> <p>Under each of the alternatives, projects would continue to be implemented that provide substantial benefit to SEZ, habitats of</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 for development – LTS Alts. 1 and 5 for SEZ –LTS Alts. 2, 3 and 4 for SEZ –B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 for development – LTS Alts. 1 and 5 for SEZ –LTS Alts. 2, 3 and 4 for SEZ –B</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
special significance, and other sensitive habitats (e.g., stream restoration and erosion control projects). In addition, under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, policy and regulatory changes would consider the land capability of sending parcels in the transfer of coverage and development rights, and would require and/or incentivize coverage transfer from sensitive lands, including SEZs and wetland habitats. These changes are expected to benefit SEZs and sensitive habitats to varying degrees, depending on how they translate into on-the-ground projects. Impacts to SEZ, habitats of special significance, and other sensitive habitats would be less than significant for Alternatives 1 and 5 and beneficial for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.			
3.10-2: Tree Removal. Under all alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5), construction of development and redevelopment projects would likely require the removal of native trees. Although the details of individual development projects cannot be known at this time, Alternative 1 would require the least amount of tree removal by virtue of its very low levels of authorized allocations, and Alternative 5 would require the most over the planning period. Development of tourist and commercial uses would be primarily concentrated in existing community centers (Community Plan areas, DTZs, Town Centers, the Regional Center, the High Density Tourist District, and PTODs) and, because these areas are largely developed or previously disturbed, would likely require less tree removal than new residential uses outside of urban areas. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 include proposed policies to allow the removal or pruning of large trees for projects that would promote the establishment of defensible space and reduction of hazardous fuels or projects that would benefit other threshold standards. In cases where old growth trees would be affected by defensible space projects, the proposed policy and implementation measures under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would allow limb removal as an alternative to tree removal. Alternative 3	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>also includes development of an Urban Forestry Program.</p> <p>For specific projects under all alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5), project-level planning, environmental analysis, and compliance with existing TRPA regulations and policies would identify potentially significant tree removal; minimize or avoid those impacts through the design, siting, and permitting process; and provide mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and permitting. TRPA’s Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure require protection of large trees, with limited exceptions; protection of late seral/old growth ecosystems; preparation and approval of tree removal plans; compensatory tree replacement or other project-level mitigation to avoid significant impacts if appropriate and needed; and other protection measures. Therefore, approved tree removal as a result of specific projects under all alternatives would be a less than significant impact.</p>			
<p>3.10-3: Fish and Aquatic Habitat. None of the Regional Plan Update alternatives propose new or revised goals, policies, or implementation measures that would affect the Shorezone or Shorezone structures, alter the manner in which fish or aquatic habitats are managed, or alter the way in which projects that affect such habitats are reviewed. (Aquatic invasive species are discussed separately in Impact 3.10-5, below.) Because all Regional Plan Update alternatives would allow some level of new development, aquatic habitats could be affected by individual project construction activities associated with development and redevelopment adjacent to or near aquatic habitats. Construction could result in temporary increases in turbidity and downstream sedimentation, small amounts of fill placed in aquatic habitats, and the release and exposure of construction-related contaminants. However, aquatic habitats would be protected during construction, and construction of any facilities within prime fish habitat would not be allowed without compensatory mitigation to ensure a net improvement of prime fish habitat.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
TRPA’s existing policies and Code provisions address potential impacts to fisheries and aquatic habitats through site-specific environmental review, require development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process, and require compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects on fish habitat as a condition of project approval. Specifically, provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances require protecting prime and other fish habitat and require mitigation to avoid significant impacts to fisheries if needed; TRPA’s Rules of Procedure require mitigation for any significant impact as a condition of project approval. Because no new goals or policies and no policy revisions related to fish or aquatic habitat are proposed, and because 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, construction-related impacts to stream and lake habitats (including prime fish habitat) would be less than significant .			
3.10-4: Special-Status and Common Plant and Wildlife Species. Under all alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5), construction of some development and other projects could affect special-status plant or animal species, depending on the specific locations, presence of suitable habitat, and the type, timing, and specific nature of the project actions. During project-level planning and evaluation, impacts on species with potential to be affected would be determined based on the species’ distribution and known occurrences relative to the project area, the presence of suitable habitat for the species in or near the project area, and preconstruction surveys. TRPA’s existing policies and Code provisions address potential impacts to special-status species through site-specific environmental review, require development and implementation of project-specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts through the design process, and require	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS for special status species Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 - B for Goshawk Alt.1 - LTS for Goshawk Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS for common species	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 - B for Goshawk Alt.1 - LTS for Goshawk Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS for common species

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>compensatory or other mitigation for any significant effects on special-status species as a condition of project approval. For any TRPA special-interest wildlife species that could be affected, compliance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires that projects or land uses within TRPA nondegradation zones will not significantly affect the habitat or cause the displacement or extirpation of the population; and TRPA will not permit a project that would degrade habitat without compensatory mitigation to avoid a significant effect. For other special-status species, 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, impacts to special-status species as a result of implementing Alternative 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the threshold standards for northern goshawk under Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 would protect the best available habitat surrounding known nest sites, rather than protecting a buffer zone of uniform width that may include unsuitable or low-value habitat as under existing policy. By protecting more of the highest quality habitat within and adjacent to goshawk territories, this threshold standard amendment would have a beneficial impact to northern goshawk in the Region.</p> <p>Common plant and wildlife species are relatively abundant locally and regionally and are not considered limited by the availability of habitat in the Region. New development under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 is not expected to substantially affect breeding productivity or population viability of any common species, or cause a change in species diversity locally or regionally. Additionally, the overall land use pattern and amount of new development would not create new barriers to wildlife movement locally or regionally. Therefore, impacts to common plant and animal species, and effects on wildlife movement, as a result of implementing Alternative 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 would be less than significant.</p>			

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.10-5: Invasive Weeds and Aquatic Invasive Species. Construction resulting from development and redevelopment projects under all alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) would involve temporary ground-disturbing activities in disturbed and native vegetation types. These activities would temporarily create areas of open ground that could be colonized by non-native, invasive weed species from inside or outside of the Tahoe Region. Invasive weeds and other species could inadvertently be introduced or spread during grading and construction activities, if nearby source populations passively colonize disturbed ground, or if construction equipment is transported to the site from an infested area. Project-specific BMPs would reduce the potential for introducing or spreading weed populations in the project area by reducing the amount of open ground during construction; however, the potential for this effect would still exist. Watercraft use of Lake Tahoe could facilitate the spread of aquatic invasive species into Lake Tahoe, if boats were exposed to those species in another water body and are not sufficiently cleaned and sanitized before entering the Lake. However, none of the Regional Plan Update alternatives propose new or revised goals, policies, or implementation measures that would affect the Shorezone, Shorezone structures, or boating activities. Also, any construction within a lake or stream (e.g., for stream restoration, dredging, bridge construction) could facilitate the spread of aquatic invasive species into water bodies.</p> <p>Implementation of any new development or redevelopment project under all Regional Plan Update alternatives would be required to comply with the TRPA Code of Ordinances (e.g., Section 61.4, Revegetation, Section 63.4, Aquatic Invasive Species) and Goals and Policies that prohibit the release of non-native species in the Tahoe Region. For each development or other project, project-level planning and environmental analysis would analyze the risk of terrestrial invasive weeds or aquatic invasive species introductions and spread, based on the type and location</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS, Alt. 2 – B for spread of invasive species</p> <p>Alt. 1 – NI, Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 – B for adoption of aquatic invasive species</p> <p>Threshold Standard</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS, Alt. 2 – B for spread of invasive species</p> <p>Alt. 1 – NI, Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 – B for adoption of aquatic invasive species</p> <p>Threshold Standard</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>of the project; minimize or avoid those impacts through the design process (e.g., including BMPs and other measures to minimize or avoid invasive species introductions); and provide mitigation for any significant effects as a condition of project approval and to demonstrate compliance with existing Code (e.g., implementing weed and aquatic invasive species management practices during construction). This impact would be less than significant for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p>Alternative 2 would amend the TRPA Code of Ordinances to specifically require that projects in areas with infestations of aquatic invasive species reduce and remove aquatic invasive species and prepare annual monitoring reports. Therefore, implementing these additional policies regarding the potential introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species for Alternative 2 would be beneficial.</p> <p>Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5 include the proposed adoption of a new threshold management standard that supports the control and reduction of existing populations of invasive species and efforts to prevent new introductions of aquatic invasive species into the waters of the Region. Specifically, the proposal would create a new management standard that would direct TRPA to prevent the introduction of new aquatic invasive species, control the abundance and distribution of known aquatic invasive species, and abate the adverse impacts of them. This management standard would guide management actions, policy, and project review to prevent the establishment of new aquatic invasive species, and control the abundance, distribution, and adverse effects of aquatic invasive species. Adoption of this threshold management standard under Alternative 2, 3, 4, or 5 would have a beneficial impact with regard to control of invasive species.</p>			

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.11 Recreation			
<p>3.11-1: Demand for Recreation Facilities and Availability of Outdoor Recreation Capacity. None of the Regional Plan Update alternatives propose changes to recreation goals, policies, or implementation measures, nor would any alternative convert recreation facilities to a non-recreation use. All of the alternatives would allow for increases in residential units and TAUs, increasing resident and tourist populations, and therefore incrementally increasing the demand for recreation facilities and uses. However, continued implementation of existing recreation goals and policies and implementation of new recreation projects from other programs (e.g., EIP) would reserve adequate capacity for recreation, and implementation of the Regional Plan Update would not reduce capacity of existing recreation facilities or opportunities. In addition, each alternative includes transportation strategies that would implement new bicycle and pedestrian trails, which would enhance recreational opportunities for residents and visitors. This impact would therefore be less than significant for all alternatives.</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
<p>3.11-2: Compatibility with Existing or Currently Proposed Recreation Uses. All Regional Plan Update alternatives would allow for new development in the Region, within areas designated for residential, commercial, and tourist accommodation uses. The alternatives would not alter the content of the existing Recreation Element Goals and Policies that provide for the appropriate type, location, and rate of development of recreational uses and facilities (Goal #2) and that protect natural resources from overuse and rectify incompatibility between uses (Goal #3). Because these goals, policies, and land use designations were developed to address existing and planned recreational uses, conflict would be avoided. This impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p>	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.12 Population, Employment, and Housing			
<p>3.12-1: Location and Distribution of Employment, Population, and Housing in the Region. Location and Distribution of Employment, Population, and Housing in the Region. Each of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some level of development and redevelopment of residential units, tourist accommodations, and commercial facilities, which could affect the location, distribution, and density of population, employment, and housing in the Region. New allocations would be lowest under Alternative 1, resulting in very little change, and highest under Alternative 5. However, Region-wide population projections and increases in employment opportunities (primarily resulting from commercial uses) under each alternative are relatively modest (ranging from approximately 2 percent to 11 percent) and the jobs-to-population ratio would remain relatively constant over the course of the planning period. Further, the proposed land use planning frameworks for each alternative would—to varying degrees—concentrate development within community centers (i.e., Community Plan areas, Development Transfer Zones [DTZs], Town Centers, Regional Center, High Density Tourist District, pedestrian- and transit-oriented developments [PTODs]) with the overall intent of reducing environmental impacts associated with more dispersed development. Provisions to relocate and concentrate development are most extensive in Alternative 3 and least extensive in Alternatives 1 and 5. Because increases of population, employment, and housing in the Region would be relatively low under all alternatives, regulated through the allocation system, and largely concentrated within existing urban areas, none of the alternatives would have the potential to significantly affect community character or functioning (including mobility), nor adversely affect jobs-housing balance. This impact would be less than significant for Alternatives 1 and 5. Because Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 include provisions to concentrate development in community centers, which would result in greater</p>	<p>Alts. 1 and 5 – LTS Alts. 2, 3, and 4 – B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1 and 5 – LTS Alts. 2, 3, and 4 – B</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>opportunity for alternative transportation, reduced VMT, reduced air pollutant emissions, increased preservation and restoration of open space, and other benefits, this impact would be beneficial for these alternatives.</p>			
<p>3.12-2: Affordable and Moderate-Income Housing. Affordable and Moderate-Income Housing. The Lake Tahoe Region has a high percentage of second-home ownership and seasonal housing (44 percent), high median home prices as compared to the out-of-Basin portions of the Region’s counties, and a high proportion of workforce residing outside of the Region. This combination of factors indicates a demand for affordable and moderate-income housing in the Tahoe Region, but few regulations specifically require its development. Although deed-restricted affordable and moderate-income housing projects are encouraged by TRPA through the bonus unit incentive program, the Region is substantially lacking in adequate workforce housing.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would not authorize any new residential allocations, which would severely constrain the opportunity to construct new housing projects. In addition, without changes to the existing affordable housing program, new housing projects would most likely be based on construction of market-rate redeveloped or expanded housing units. Because Alternative 1 would result in the lowest potential for development of workforce housing, and create additional demand for such housing with development of CFA remaining from the 1987 Plan, Alternative 1 would exacerbate the existing adverse condition and result in a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Under Alternatives 2 and 5, while new residential allocations would be made available, there would be no changes to the affordable housing program. In addition, allocation of new CFA in addition to that remaining under the 1987 Plan would increase the numbers of jobs in the Region, thereby increasing the demand for affordable and moderate-income housing. Although it is not</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2 and 5 – PS Alt. 3 – B Alt. 4 – LTS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.12-2: Prepare a Regional Housing Needs Program and Implement Recommendations. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA shall coordinate with local governments and other organizations to develop and implement a Regional Housing Needs Program. The Housing Needs Program will evaluate progress towards the adopted housing goals and recommend policy and ordinance changes necessary to achieve housing goals. Changes may include, but are not limited to, the conversion of residential allocations to bonus units that would be available only for the construction of affordable and/or moderate-income housing, the creation of new bonus units for affordable housing and modification of development standards to promote housing affordability.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 4, and 5 - LTS Alt. 3 – B</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>possible to predict the number of affordable and moderate-income units that would be developed over the plan period through residential allocations, without substantial changes to policies or programs related to affordable or moderate-income housing, the existing supply of and demand for affordable and moderate-income housing would likely be similar to or worse than existing conditions. Thus, Alternatives 2 and 5 would result in a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Of the Regional Plan Update alternatives, only Alternatives 3 and 4 would modify the existing approach to affordable and moderate-income housing. Alternatives 3 and 4 would implement a Region-wide housing needs program and increase residential density in community centers, which could allow for more cost-effective construction that could support housing affordability. Thus, Alternative 4 would result in a less-than-significant impact. Because Alternative 3 would add 600 new bonus units to the existing pool of 874, in addition to increasing the allowable housing density in community centers and implementing a Region-wide housing needs program, it would result in a beneficial impact.</p>			
3.13 Public Services and Utilities			
<p>3.13-1: Demand for Water Supply. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some increased demand for water supply for new residential units, tourist accommodation units (TAUs), and commercial and public service facilities. Although the precise location of new development and redevelopment in the Basin cannot be known, on a Region-wide basis, surface water allocation to the Tahoe Region pursuant to the TROA is 34,000 afy, and current Region-wide water demand is approximately 28,079 afy (USBR and DWR 2008). Additional demand generated by the Regional Plan Update alternatives would range from a low of 637afy for Alternative 1, to 2,308 afy for Alternative 5, at build-out of remaining and newly authorized</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
allocations. Therefore, sufficient water supplies would be available for any of the alternatives. In addition, TRPA Code Section 32.4 requires demonstration of adequate water supply with an existing water right prior to project approval. Because sufficient water supply exists on a Region-wide basis, and new development projects would be required to demonstrate sufficient supply, treatment capacity (as applicable), and conveyance capacity by the water purveyor serving a given project, this impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.			
3.13-2: Demand for Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment Facilities. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would require some additional wastewater conveyance and treatment capacity. TRPA Code Section 32.5 requires that all projects be served by facilities that provide treatment and export of wastewater from the Tahoe Region; Code Section 50.4.1(C) prohibits distribution of allocations to jurisdictions with insufficient wastewater capacity to support residential development; and TRPA Code Section 13.10.7 requires demonstration of adequate sewer capacity prior to occupancy of a transferred unit. Because new development and redevelopment projects would be required to demonstrate sufficient wastewater conveyance and treatment capacity from the district serving the given project area, this impact would be less than significant for all alte.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
3.13-3: Generation of Solid Waste. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some new development within the Region. Such development would increase the Region’s overall solid waste generation. However, the projections and planned facility expansions at Lockwood Regional Landfill and proposed strategies to reduce solid waste production in the Region would allow for sufficient capacity over the next 20 years. Thus, this impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.13-4: Demand for Electrical and Natural Gas Services and Facilities. New development under any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some increased demand for electric and natural gas services to support new residences, TAUs, and commercial uses. Nevada Energy, Liberty Utilities, and Southwest Gas Corporation use future population projections to determine the need for increased supply. Although areas that would be subject to new construction cannot be known with specificity, developable parcels and areas subject to redevelopment in the Tahoe Region are known and are geographically limited. Any new development would be located within close proximity to existing electric and gas infrastructure, and projects requiring new or modified utility installation, connections, and expansion would be subject to the requirements of the applicable utility providers. The utility companies project that, based on their forecasting and recent growth trends in the Region, their existing capacity will substantially exceed the future demand that could be generated by Alternative 5 (the alternative with the greatest potential for development) at build-out (Anderson, Matthews, and Walden, pers. comms. 2012). This impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>
<p>3.13-5: Demand for Fire Protection, Law Enforcement, and School Facilities. Implementation of any of the Regional Plan Update alternatives would result in some new development that could increase the demand for fire protection, law enforcement, and school services that, in turn, could require new or improved facilities, the construction of which could result in adverse effects to the environment. However, as with other project development, environmental review of specific public facility projects would be required to ensure that impacts are identified and mitigated. Thus, this impact would be less than significant for all alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
3.14 Hazards and Public Safety			
<p>3.14-1: Wildland Fire Hazard. Alternative 1 would not implement any new policies or changes in existing policies that would affect fire hazards. Thus, under Alternative 1, risk from fire hazards would not increase in comparison to the existing conditions in the Region and this would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Implementation of Alternatives 2 through 5 would include new policies and changes to existing policies that would increase or improve defensible space, reduce fuel loads, and allow greater flexibility in the manner in which adequate fire protection is achieved within the Region. Thus, implementation of Alternatives 2 through 5 would reduce potential risks from fire hazards and would result in a beneficial impact related to exposure to wildland fire hazards.</p>	<p>Alt. 1– LTS Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 – B</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alt. 1– LTS Alts. 2, 3, 4, and 5 – B</p>
<p>3.14-2: Flood Hazards. All five Regional Plan Update alternatives would allow for some amount of new development, redevelopment, and restoration activities. However, the 1987 Regional Plan prohibits construction, grading, and filling of lands within the 100-year flood plain and in the area of wave run-up (Natural Hazards, Goal 1, Policy 2), and no changes to this policy are proposed. This policy also requires all public utilities, transportation facilities, and other necessary public uses located in the 100-year flood plain and wave run-up areas to be constructed and maintained to prevent damage from flooding and to not cause flooding. This policy would be preserved in the Regional Plan under all proposed alternatives. Therefore, Regional Plan Update Alternatives 1 through 5 would not allow for development activities that would result in new flooding issues or allow for the exacerbation of existing flooding issues that would expose occupants and/or structures to flood hazards. For Alternatives 1 through 5, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
<p>3.14-3: Health Hazards from Vector-borne Diseases. Various environmental factors such as climate, topography, vegetation, and standing water can influence the extent and duration of available breeding habitat for mosquito populations. Mosquitoes act as vectors for West Nile virus and other illnesses, which pose potential public health hazards to people living in the Lake Tahoe Region.</p> <p>When source control efforts are not adequate to maintain mosquito populations at low levels, pesticides may be used by the vector control districts to reduce adult populations through fogging and spraying. Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 would continue to allow fogging techniques to be used for mosquito control in compliance with all applicable regulations; therefore, these alternatives would have no effect on health hazards from vector-borne diseases. However, Alternative 2 would prohibit the use of spraying and fogging techniques to distribute pesticides throughout the Region. If a West Nile virus outbreak were to occur, adult mosquito populations may not be effectively reduced without fogging and substantial adverse risks to public health could occur. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 and potentially significant for Alternative 2.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS Alt. 2 - PS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p>With regard to Alternative 2, vector control districts are already implementing all feasible methods to control mosquito populations and protect public health, including BMPs, source surveillance, source control and reduction, and public education. Without the ability to use fogging and spraying when determined necessary by vector control districts to control mosquito populations that could carry vector-borne diseases, impacts to public health would be potentially significant. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The impact would be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 3, 4, and 5 – LTS Alt. 2 - SU</p>
3.15 Cultural Resources			
<p>3.15-1: Historical Resources. Implementation of the Regional Plan Update would authorize new development, which could occur on properties that contain known historical resources, be associated with historically significant events or individuals, or result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a significant historical site, structure, object, or building. Because each Regional Plan Update alternative would result in some new construction over the planning period (ranging from very low levels of new development and redevelopment under Alternative 1 to highest levels under Alternative 5), each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or destroy historical resources through implementation of specific projects. However, federal and state regulations and TRPA Code</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.</p>	<p>Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS</p>

Table S-2. Summary of Resource Topics/Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Resource Topics/Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
address protection of historical resources and provide processes to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact for all alternatives.			
3.15-2: Archaeological Resources. Implementation of the Regional Plan Update would authorize new development, which could occur on properties that contain known or unknown archaeological resources or result in adverse physical effects to significant archaeological sites or features. Because each Regional Plan Update alternative would result in some new construction over the planning period (ranging from very low levels of new development and redevelopment under Alternative 1 to highest levels under Alternative 5), each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or destroy archeological resources through implementation of specific projects. However, federal and state regulations and TRPA Code address protection of archaeological resources and provide processes to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact for all alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS
3.15-3: Ethnic and Cultural Values. Implementation of the Regional Plan Update would authorize new development that has the potential to cause physical changes that would affect unique ethnic cultural values or restrict historic or prehistoric religious or sacred uses within the region. Because each Regional Plan Update alternative would result in some new construction over the planning period (ranging from very low levels of new development and redevelopment under Alternative 1 to highest levels under Alternative 5), each has the potential to disturb, disrupt, or restrict ethnic and cultural uses and values through implementation of specific projects. However, federal and state regulations and TRPA Code address protection of tribal resources and provide processes to avoid or minimize impacts to these resources, which could result in impacts to ethnic and cultural values. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact for all alternatives	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS	No mitigation is required for any of the alternatives.	Alts. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - LTS