

1.8 Land Use Element

Article V of the Compact calls for a “land use plan for the integrated arrangement and general location and extent of, and the criteria and standards for, the uses of land, water, air, space and other natural resources within the Region, including but not limited to indication or allocation of maximum densities and permitted uses.” In general, the Land Use Element sets forth the fundamental land use philosophies of the Regional Plan, including the direction of development to the most suitable locations in the Region; the maintenance of environmental, social, physical, and economic well-being of the Region; and the coordination of the Regional Plan with local, state, and federal requirements.

The Land Use Element consists of Subelements for Land Use, Noise, Air Quality, Water Quality, Housing, Natural Hazards, and Community Design. These Subelements have been grouped together into the Land Use Element because each of these topics affects and is affected by development decisions relating to land use patterns.

1.8.1 Land Use Subelement

Overview

Land use is not a Threshold program area. Nevertheless, this Subelement’s goals and policies provide direction to ensure that land use patterns, additional development, and redevelopment conform to TRPA’s Thresholds. Land use regulations guide population growth by establishing densities, traffic volumes, urban boundaries, and other factors that indirectly determine population. All of these factors have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental Thresholds.

The goals of this Subelement are related to issues of general land use. They are intended to direct the amount, type, and location of land use and land coverage; balance land uses with the social, environmental, and economic well-being of the Tahoe Region; and coordinate regional land uses with land uses in surrounding areas. The supporting policies and implementation measures define land use patterns, permissible land uses, planning systems, land coverage, and the amount of potential new development under the Regional Plan (referred to as “allocations” of residential units, tourist accommodation units, commercial floor area, and recreation units). The planning and zoning systems, land coverage regulations, and amount of potential development allowed under the 1987 Regional Plan are described below. These would remain essentially unchanged for Alternative 1 and would be modified as indicated for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.

Land-Use Classification System

All land in the Tahoe Basin is assigned one of five use classifications: *Conservation, Recreation, Residential, Commercial and Public Service, and Tourist*. Table LU-1 provides a breakdown by acreage and land use classification; Basin land use is depicted in Figure LU-1 Land Use Classification and Plan Area Boundaries. The classifications are a gross summarization of major land uses that exist in the Basin and are further

supplemented by the Plan Area Statements (which are discussed in detail below).

Conservation. Nonurban lands classified as Conservation areas are valued for their primitive or natural qualities. They usually have strong environmental limitations on use and a potential for dispersed recreation or low-intensity resource management.

Recreation. Nonurban lands classified as Recreation are areas that have good potential for developed outdoor recreation, park use, or concentrated recreation use.

Residential. Urban lands classified as Residential are areas that have good potential to provide housing for the residents of the Region. These lands are primarily developed with residential uses, have moderate to good land capability, and are within the urban boundary, serviced by utilities, and centrally located in close proximity to commercial and public facilities.

Commercial and Public Service. Urban lands classified as Commercial and Public Service areas have been designated to provide commercial and public services or have the potential to provide these services in the future. The intent of this classification is to concentrate such services for public convenience, separate incompatible uses, and include other noncommercial uses that are compatible with the purpose of this classification and other goals of the Regional Plan.

Tourist. Urban lands classified as Tourist areas have the potential to provide intensive tourist accommodations and services or intensive recreation. The purpose of this classification is to concentrate such services for public convenience, separate incompatible uses, and include other non-tourist uses that are compatible with the purpose of this classification and other goals of the Regional Plan. This classification also includes areas recognized by the Compact as suitable for gaming.

**Table LU-1
Land Use Classification by Acreage**

Land Use Classification	Acreage	Percentage
Conservation (CONS)	131,774	65.41
Recreation (REC)	45,775	22.72
Residential (RES)	20,621	10.24
Commercial & Public Service (COM)	2329	1.16
Tourist (TOR)	967	0.48

Plan Area Statements (PAS)

PASs provide a more detailed guide for planning decision-making in the 181 designated Plan Areas (subareas) within the Region (see *Figure LU-1: Land Use Classification and Plan Area Boundaries*). Each PAS is assigned a single land use classification. One of three management strategies – development with mitigation, redirection of development, or maximum regulation – is assigned to each PAS (*these designations are explained in detail in Chapter 13 of the Code*). Some PASs are specially designated as Community Plan (CP) Areas, receiving areas for transfer of development rights (TDR), or areas targeted for scenic restoration and affordable housing provision. Additionally, PASs provide planning considerations, special policies, maximum densities for residential and tourist accommodation uses, community noise equivalent levels (CNEL), allowable and

special uses, and the amount of additional recreation capacity permissible.

Community Plans

The 1987 Regional Plan designated 22 areas as eligible to be CPs. As of December 31, 2008, 16 CP areas have adopted plans. These plans supersede the PASs and are designed to be more responsive to the needs and opportunities of their communities. The original intent of the CPs was to concentrate commercial uses to reduce the negative effects of “strip” development and to provide incentives to renovate, revitalize, and remove blighted commercial development.

CP areas are made up of one or more PASs and contain commercial, tourist, and public service land uses. CPs describe land use vision, development and coverage incentives, and environmental targets

Master Plans and Specific Plans

TRPA’s Goals and Policies permit the adoption of areawide Specific Plans or project-oriented Master Plans to augment PASs or CPs. Through more detailed planning, they ensure that projects and activities are consistent with the Goals and Policies, the PASs or adopted CPs, and the Code. In addition, they allow for phasing of development, systematic environmental and project review, and implementation of environmental control measures. All areas of the Region are eligible for Specific and Master Plans.

Pursuant to the Goals and Policies and the Code, certain areas (e.g., airports, ski areas, and marinas) are required to pursue a Master Plan if expansion is proposed. TRPA has seven adopted Master Plans: Tahoe City Marina, Ski Run Marina, Elks Point Marina, Heavenly Ski Resort, Ski Incline, Lake Tahoe Community College, and Bijou Community Park. Currently, the Homewood Mountain Resort is developing a Master Plan.

Redevelopment Plans

The existing policy for Redevelopment Plans in the Land Use Subelement encourages improved environmental quality and community character through relocation of development and redevelopment of existing blighted areas. It encourages public-private partnerships by providing incentives, such as height and density bonuses. TRPA currently has one adopted Redevelopment Plan in the City of South Lake Tahoe within the Stateline/Ski Run CP area.

Subdivisions

The existing subdivision policy in the Land Use Subelement prohibits the subdivision of lands in the Tahoe Region, with exceptions in very specific circumstances.

Nonconformity and Calamity

The existing policies in the Land Use Subelement allow structures destroyed in a fire or other calamity to be rebuilt within 18 months without coming into compliance with existing coverage or height standards. Structures legally existing before the adoption of the 1987 Regional Plan are allowed to be maintained and repaired.

Land Coverage

The land coverage strategies and regulations in place under the 1987 Regional Plan are summarized below.

Base Allowable Coverage. Implements land coverage limitations based on the seven Land Capability Districts established by Bailey (1974). These districts are planning-level delineations that require field verification; they may be challenged and revised based on certain site-specific land capability data.

Maximum Allowable Coverage. Implements limitations on maximum allowable land coverage (base allowable plus transferred) based on land use type and designation. The maximum allowable coverage limitations are depicted in Table LU-2 below:

Land Use Type	Within Community Plans*	Outside Community Plans
Commercial Facilities on an existing developed Parcel	50%	
Commercial Facilities on a legal vacant lot of record at time of 1982 Plan adoption	70%	Bailey Base Allowable Coverage
Tourist Accommodation Facilities		
Multi-Residential (five or more units)	50%	
Public Service Facilities		
Recreation Facilities		
Linear Public Facilities and Public Health and Safety Facilities	Minimum amount necessary to achieve their public purpose	

* Maximum Allowable Coverage = Bailey Based Allowable Coverage + Transferred Coverage

Eligible Coverage Transfers. Allows unused allowable base coverage (i.e., potential coverage), soft coverage, and hard coverage to be transferred within hydrologically related areas. (Note: potential and soft coverage may not be transferred to commercial facilities and tourist accommodation uses located in CPs.)

Coverage Transfer Ratios. Implements a 1:1 ratio for land coverage transfers for all land use types, except for commercial uses in CPs. For such uses, areas with 30 to 50% coverage have a transfer ratio of 1:1, while areas with 50 to 70% land coverage have a progressive transfer ratio that rises proportionally from 1:1 to 2:1.

Coverage Transfer Requirements. Requires that a parcel or project area receiving a transfer of land coverage be located in the same hydrologically related area (i.e., hydrologic transfer area) as the sending parcel.

Permissible Uses on Sensitive Lands. Limits uses on sensitive lands (Land Capability Districts 1–3) to public outdoor recreation projects, public service facility projects, and single-family dwellings that meet certain conditional use requirements.

Sensitive Land Mitigation. Implements a sensitive land mitigation program that requires new coverage in Land Capability Districts 1a, 1c, 2, and 3 exceeding

allowable base coverage to be mitigated by restoring existing hard or soft coverage on sensitive lands at a mitigation-to-impact ratio of 1.5:1, and that requires all new coverage and disturbance in Land Capability District 1b to be mitigated by restoring or enhancing these lands at a mitigation-to-impact ratio of 1.5:1.

Excess-Coverage Mitigation. Implements an excess-coverage mitigation program that requires the removal of on-site or off-site coverage, or payment of an in-lieu mitigation fee, for projects involving new development on parcels with existing coverage that exceeds TRPA's limitations for maximum allowable land coverage.

Allocations

The 1987 Regional Plan identifies allocations for various types of development (residential, tourist accommodation, commercial, and recreation). Allocations are used as a growth management tool to ensure that development is consistent with progress toward meeting environmental Thresholds. TRPA awards residential allocations to local jurisdictions annually. The number awarded is based on each jurisdiction's performance in implementing water quality and air quality projects, monitoring project permit conditions, and increasing transit operations. Commercial Floor Area and Tourist Accommodation Units are allocated to jurisdictions on a five-year cycle and are tied to the Threshold evaluation and each jurisdiction's performance in implementing environmental improvement projects.

Residential. The current program for distributing and allocating residential development is an interim system that began on January 1, 2007, when the 20-year allocation timeline established in the 1987 Regional Plan expired. Under this system, a maximum of 294 allocations are to be distributed each year. Code Chapter 33 describes the methods of distributing allocations, including total allocations that can be distributed to each jurisdiction annually.

Each year, unused allocations are retained and rolled over to a pool of allocations available to the sensitive-lot retirement and moderate-income housing programs. A sensitive lot (any lot located within Land Capability Districts 1, 2, or 3 or the backshore) can be retired from any future development in exchange for an allocation on a first-come, first-served basis. An allocation may be awarded from the allocation pool for moderate-income housing (i.e., housing that is affordable to a family earning no more than 120% of the Median Family Income) if the local jurisdiction has adopted a moderate-income housing program. To date, the City of South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, and Douglas County have adopted such a program.

As of July 1, 2009, approximately 110 residential allocations remain from the 1987 Regional Plan. Under the interim allocation system, distribution is based on existing performance criteria in accordance with Code Chapter 33. A July 2009 Code amendment will allow local jurisdictions to retain and carry over any unused allocations beginning in 2010.

Residential Bonus Units. Residential Bonus Units are used as an incentive for the construction of affordable (i.e., housing that is affordable to a family earning no more than 80% of the Median Family Income) and moderate-income housing but can also be used for market rate units. Each Bonus Unit relieves the developer of the need to obtain a development right *but not an allocation*. Allocations are still required with the exception of affordable units, which are exempted from this requirement. Bonus

Units are distributed by TRPA to the various jurisdictions based on need and a point system related to project criteria. At present, approximately 1,000 unused Bonus Units remain from the 1987 Regional Plan (see Table LU-3).

Of those 1,000 Bonus Units, 255 have been reserved for Community Enhancement Program (CEP) projects. The deadline for approval of CEP projects is March 2010, and the units reserved for implementation of these projects are expected to be used before 2015.

Table LU-3 Residential Bonus Units Remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan	
BBLC CEP Project	126
Homewood Resort CEP Project	12
Boulder Bay CEP Project	48
City of South Lake Tahoe CEP Projects	69
Unallocated	745
TOTAL	1,000
<i>Source: TRPA 2009</i>	

Commercial Floor Area (CFA). The 1987 Regional Plan established 800,000 square feet of CFA to be distributed to the local jurisdictions for allocation within CP areas. Code Chapter 33 sets forth the methods of distributing CFA, including total allocations that can be distributed to each jurisdiction. At present, 347,000 of the original 800,000 square feet of CFA remain (see Table LU-4).

Table LU-4 Existing Allocations of Commercial Floor Area	
Source	Commercial Floor Area (sq. ft.)
Community Plans	160,000
Special Projects (CEP)	187,000*
<i>Total</i>	<i>347,000</i>
Notes: CEP = Community Enhancement Program; sq. ft. = square feet * 13,038 square feet currently not allocated or reserved <i>Source: TRPA 2009</i>	

Of the remaining CFA, 160,000 square feet may be distributed to specific projects approved within CP areas that have met their irrevocable commitment to implement an environmental improvement project (see Table LU-5). Irrevocable commitment means both an irrevocable commitment to fund, as defined by Subsection 15.2.F of the Code, and receipt of all project approvals pursuant to subparagraph 15.10.G(3) of the Code. The other 187,000 square feet has been reserved for distribution to CEP projects. Thus far, the TRPA Governing Board has reserved 173,962 of the 187,000 square feet for nine CEP projects, and the unallocated or unreserved 13,038 square feet would be available for distribution to projects approved under the Special Projects Program (see Table LU-5).

The CFA reserved for the implementation of CEP projects expires in March 2010. If

not used before that time (or if the deadline is not extended by the Governing Board), this CFA would be returned to the Special Project pool and potentially made available for use in another round of Special Projects solicitation.

Table LU-5 Estimated Commercial Floor Area Remaining in the 1987 Regional Plan			
Community Plan CFA*	Amount (sq. ft.)	Special Projects CFA	Amount (sq. ft.)
El Dorado County	34,500	Placer County	–
City of South Lake Tahoe	34,000	Kings Beach	91,052
Douglas County	41,000	Homewood	23,237
Placer County	47,500	City of South Lake Tahoe	–
Washoe County	2,000	South Y	59,673
Unallocated CFA**	15,000	Unallocated CFA	13,038
TOTAL	160,000	TOTAL	187,000
Notes: CFA = commercial floor area; sq. ft. = square feet *Rounded off to the nearest five hundred **CFA is reserved but has not been allocated to the City of South Lake Tahoe for the Tahoe Valley Community Plan Source: TRPA 2009			

Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs). Facilities for overnight stay as part of local tourism can be expanded through the distribution of TAUs. The 1987 Regional Plan established a pool of 400 TAUs for use in tourist accommodation projects. Code Chapter 33 sets forth the methods for distributing allocations, including total allocations that can be distributed to each jurisdiction. Under the interim allocation system adopted in 2007, the use of any remaining TAUs is limited to special projects that meet specific criteria, including the transfer of TAUs from sensitive lands. It also allows TAUs to be allocated to CP areas that include tourist accommodation facilities as an allowable use. At present, 342 TAUs remain, of which 90 have been reserved for CEP projects. (Like the CFA reserved for these projects, the TAUs expire in March 2010 and potentially would be made available to other projects). Another 170 TAUs are available for use within CPs and 82 are available for use on special projects in conjunction with transfers of development from sensitive land (see *Table LU-6*).

Table LU-6 Tourist Accommodation Units Remaining in the 1987 Regional Plan	
Location	Units
Community Plan Pool	25
Distributed to Community Plans	145
Placer County—Homewood Community Enhancement Program	50
Washoe County—Boulder Bay Community Enhancement Program	40
Special Project Transfer	82
TOTAL	342

Source: TRPA 2009

Persons at One Time (PAOTs). Used as a measure of recreation capacity, PAOTs are the number of people that a recreation use can accommodate at a given time. Allocations of PAOTs are used to both promote and control recreation facility development. Though certain recreation facilities have a design capacity for a given number of people at a time (e.g., developed campgrounds), PAOTs are not a management tool and do not indicate the overall use of a site. PAOTs are intended to ensure that a “fair share” of the Basin’s remaining resource capacity (e.g., water and sewer services) is available for outdoor recreation areas and is allocated to projects that would result in an increase in the number of people that certain types of recreation sites can accommodate. If a recreation project would result in additional vehicle trips at a rate that would trigger a traffic analysis, or if the project would create the need for additional CFA, PAOTs are needed in an amount commensurate with the intensity of new development.

Three categories of PAOTs are utilized under this system:

- 1) Winter day-use PAOTs are necessary for winter recreation facilities such as ski areas or snowmobile courses.
- 2) Summer day-use PAOTs are necessary for summer day-use recreation facilities such as beaches or trailhead parking.
- 3) Overnight-use PAOTs are necessary for a new campground or existing campground expansion.

Unused PAOTs remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan would be available for new developed outdoor recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Currently, 7,133 winter day-use PAOTs, 5,676 summer day-use PAOTs, and 5,720 overnight PAOTs (Table Rec-1) remain. These are available to be incorporated into the updated Regional Plan (see Table LU-7). The Recreation Subelement contains additional discussion on PAOTs.

Table LU-7			
Persons at One Time Allocations Remaining in the 1987 Regional Plan			
PAOT Type	1987 Regional Plan PAOT Target Number	PAOTS used to date	PAOTs remaining in 1987 Regional Plan
Overnight-Use	6,114	394	5,720
Summer Day Use	6,761	1,085	5,676
Winter Day Use	12,400	5,267	7,133
Total	25,275	6,746	18,529

Source: TRPA 2009

Public Service Facilities. The 1987 Regional Plan regulates the rate and distribution of additional Public Service Facilities. Though these facilities are exempt from CFA requirements, they are subject to the land coverage system. There is no cap on the amount and distribution of additional public service facilities, but a finding of need must be demonstrated for development of new facilities and expansion of existing facilities.

Alternative 1—Continuation of Existing Regional Plan

Summary

Alternative 1, the “No Project” Alternative, assumes the continuation of the goals, policies, regulations and programs of the 1987 Regional Plan, including those for land use. This alternative maintains the existing land use system and continues to promote the concentration of development within the existing CP areas through CFA incentives and the redirection and relocation of existing development. Programs for residential allocation, CFA, TAUs, and Residential Bonus Units would continue until exhausted. No additional allocations would be designated beyond those assigned in the 1987 Regional Plan, resulting in an eventual halt to these types of development. The 1987 Regional Plan goals, policies, and ordinances will continue to be implemented to reduce impervious coverage, restore natural environments, improve the efficiency of mass transit and circulation, and achieve environmental standards while providing higher quality facilities for residents and visitors.

Goals and Policies

There are no changes proposed for this Subelement under Alternative 1.

Implementation Measures

There are no changes proposed for this Subelement under Alternative 1.

Alternative 2

Summary

Alternative 2 promotes land use planning through a combination of regulation, transfer of development, and incentives. It aims to shift the existing development patterns toward more compact, walkable communities that are linked through alternative transportation modes to reduce reliance on the private automobile while providing opportunities for significant water quality improvements in urban areas. The Goals and Policies of the 1987 Regional Plan would be amended to incorporate recommendations derived through the Pathway planning process and be reorganized and amended for clarity and intent.

This land use pattern would be advanced through the following policies:

- Promote Pedestrian Transit-Oriented Development (PTOD) through the concentration of existing development within sub-areas of the CPs.
- Promote mixed-use land use patterns in areas that are served by transit, commercial, and public services.
- Provide allocation incentives for the transfer of development from sensitive land, from outside CPs, and from lands deemed to benefit a Threshold category.
- Provide design incentives to create compact building and land use forms.

Goals and Policies

Under Alternative 2, Land Use goals and policies would be amended as summarized below:

Direct Land Use

New policies are proposed in concert with existing policies that would support the existing goal of directing land use in conformance with the Thresholds and the Compact. One policy would direct land use and growth to appropriate areas where infrastructure capacity and facilities exist. Alternative 2 would focus the concentration of additional development and redevelopment in transect districts designated as Town Centers, Tourist Centers, and Neighborhood Centers. Under Alternative 2, all of the CP areas would continue to exist; nine selected CPs would contain smaller areas designated as priority districts for PTOD. In these CP areas (*see bulleted list below*), new development and redevelopment would be focused in the priority districts through transfer of development and CFA incentives (*see Figure LU-2*).

- Tahoe Valley
- Meyers
- South Stateline
- North Stateline
- Incline Village
- King's Beach
- Tahoe City
- Kingsbury
- Stateline/Ski Run

Transect-Based Zoning.

A new policy would implement a transect-based zoning system for the Tahoe Region (*see "Implementation Measures" below for a more detailed description of this system*). This policy would simplify the current Code sections relating to zoning. The 1987 Regional Plan defines allowable land uses through the five existing land use classifications – Conservation, Recreation, Residential, Commercial and Public Service, and Tourist – and numerous overlapping general uses identified in the PASs and the CPs. To implement a transect-based zoning system, those designations would be converted into 10 broader but equivalent categories.

Pedestrian Transit-Oriented Development (PTOD)

A new goal would address the Pathway-identified desired condition of creating pedestrian- and transit-friendly mixed-use communities. Eleven policies to support this goal would:

- Promote compact development designs and patterns;
- Designate PTOD districts;
- Promote mixed-use development;
- Promote a variety of transportation options, including transit, bicycling, and walking;
- Set minimum density standards;
- Provide the opportunity to build structures with additional height;
- Promote development of a variety of housing types and a range of affordability; and
- Promote development and redevelopment that reflects the pedestrian scale, orientation, and character of Lake Tahoe and its natural surroundings.

Five existing policies related to PASs would be modified to implement a transect-based planning system developed through the Place-Based Planning process (*described briefly above and in more detail below*). The existing policy related to additional coverage would be amended to allow the transfer of coverage from impaired watersheds to any hydrologic unit..

Implementation Measures

Alternative 2 would include the following new measures to implement the new land use-related policies described above:

- Implement a Transect-Based Zoning and Planning System. Alternative 2 proposes to replace update the PASs in the 1987 Regional Plan with a hybrid land-use classification/transect zoning system to implement specific land-use policies. The goal is to direct the amount and location of land uses in conformance with the Thresholds, community vision, and other goals of the Compact.

A transect-based planning system, including a form-based code for building and streetscape design, would be based on the existing PASs. The nine districts identified as Town Centers, Tourist Centers, and Neighborhood Centers would be areas where PTOD could be most readily achieved. Incentives such as increased height and density would apply in PTOD areas. Regional minimum and maximum height and density standards would be specified and tailored for each district and could be further refined through the CP update process. (Note: prior to the updating of any CP, the incentives in the updated Regional Plan would not be available, and existing CP provisions would remain in effect.)

General land use policies would continue to be implemented through the use of an overall land use classification system, as in Alternative 1. Areas of similar use, form, and character would be mapped and categorized within one of the five existing land-use classifications (see *Figure LU-3 for the Alternative 2 land use map*). Defined as in Alternative 1, these classifications would guide allowable land uses within each of the 130 transect planning areas (see *Figure LU-4*).

Table LU-8 provides a summary of land use classification by alternative. For non-urban lands (i.e., Conservation and Recreation classifications) in Alternative 2, the land use classification boundaries are modified to reflect recent acquisitions by public agencies and to match the management areas for the United States Forest Service and the Departments of Parks and Recreation for the two states.

**Table LU-8
Area in Each Land Use Classification by Alternative
(acres)**

	<i>Alternative 1</i>	<i>Alternative 2**</i>	<i>Alternative 3[€]</i>	<i>Alternative 4[£]</i>
Conservation	131,443	149,172	139,773	150,382
Recreation	44,032	26,518	35,927	25,316
Residential	20,621	20,340	20,400	20,400
Commercial and Public Service	2,329	2,390	2,329	2,329
Tourist	967	973	964	964
Total	199,393	199,393	199,393	199,393
Urban ¹	23,917	23,703	23,693	23,693

* Urban is the sum of Residential, Commercial and Public Service, and Tourist.

** Alternative 2 reflects land use classification changes as a result of discussions with partner public agencies. The increase in conservation lands reflects the acquisition of lands by the USFS that were classified as residential, the addition of a Wilderness area located in the Mt. Rose area, and reclassification of state lands in Nevada that were formerly classified as Recreation. The increase in Commercial/Public Service is the result of reclassifying the parking lot located at the base of Homewood Mt. Resort which is currently classified as Recreation

€ Alternative 3 reflects the same land use classification changes as Alternative 2. However, the current Heavenly Resort plan area Recreation classification is expanded to match the USFS permit boundary.

£ Alternative 4 reflects the same land use classification changes as Alternative 2.

The policy direction provided by the existing classification districts would be further specified within each transect planning area through a transect-based zoning system, described below, which would be customized to fit the planning needs of each area. Development of more detailed CPs could continue for designated mixed-use areas. The definition of “urban area” would not change, and designation of urban areas would continue to be limited to areas designated as Residential, Commercial and Public Service, and Tourist. The urban boundary would be adjusted to remove public lands that have been purchased for conservation purposes. The result of this for Alternative 2 would be a decrease in urban area from 23,918 to 23,457 acres.

With the exception of recreation uses, the development permitted under the Regional Plan is limited to areas within the existing urban boundaries in which uses have already been established. Under Alternative 2, development would be directed toward infill and redevelopment within the urban boundary, using smart-growth principles found in form-based design and transect systems. These systems promote the following concepts:

- development of compact, pedestrian-oriented town centers consisting of a high-intensity employment center, diverse mixed-use areas, and residential living environments that provide a broad range of housing types for a wide range of housing needs;
- diversity of residential, business, commercial, office, institutional, educational, and cultural and entertainment activities for workers, visitors, and residents;
- pedestrian-oriented development within walking distance of transit opportunities, at densities and intensities that support town center businesses and transit usage;
- improved health and well-being of residents through development patterns that encourage physical activity, use of alternative transportation, and greater social interaction;
- a sense of place that represents a unique, attractive, and memorable destination for visitors and residents; and
- enhancement of the unique character of the natural environment and the community's character through the promotion of high-quality urban design.

Alternative 2 is designed to improve the social, built, and economic environments in the Tahoe Basin by concentrating land use patterns, redirecting existing development patterns to achieve the Pathway Desired Conditions and the vision of the Place-Based planning efforts, providing flexibility when dealing with existing uses, and promoting the mixing of uses.

- Establish a set of Transect Districts. The general policy direction for each land use classification (see *Figure LU-3*) would be implemented through a transect-based zoning system. Lands would be assigned to the following districts:
 1. Wilderness District
 2. Backcountry District
 3. General Conservation and Parklands District
 4. Recreation District
 5. Residential District
 6. Neighborhood General District
 7. Neighborhood Center District
 8. Town Center District
 9. Tourist Center District
 10. Special District

These ten transect districts are also illustrated in the transect zoning map (see *Figure LU-4*). They specify intensity, types, and forms of use. Each of these districts is defined as follows:

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

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

General Conservation and Parklands District. General Conservation and Parklands Districts are valued for their natural qualities and benefit from strong

environmentally protective limitations on use. They provide an interface between primitive and urban areas, with potential for dispersed recreation or low-intensity resource management. These districts comprise lands that are:

- 1) public and already set aside for this purpose;
- 2) located within high-hazard areas, SEZs, or otherwise fragile areas and lacking substantial existing improvements;
- 3) isolated and lacking the necessary infrastructure for development;
- 4) capable of sustaining passive recreation with unique recreational resources that may serve public needs, such as beaches and access to dispersed recreation opportunities; and
- 5) suitable for low to moderate resource management.

Recreation District. Recreation Districts are lands with good potential for intensive outdoor recreation. Such intensive-recreation areas can be harmonious with the surrounding natural environment if managed well. These areas are designed to balance users' comfort and convenience with protection of the natural environment. They are accessible through a variety of transportation options. These districts comprise lands that are:

- 1) currently used or proposed for public or private intensive outdoor recreation;
- 2) designated as federal, state, and local recreation facilities; and
- 3) without overriding environmental constraints on resource management or recreational purposes.

Residential District. Residential Districts areas have potential to provide residential housing consisting primarily of detached single-family dwellings. Additionally, this classification identifies density patterns related to both the natural and built characteristics of the land and allows accessory and nonresidential uses that complement a Low Density Residential neighborhood. These districts comprise lands that are:

- 1) already developed for single-family residential purposes;
- 2) of moderate to good land capability;
- 3) located within urban boundaries that are serviced by utilities; and
- 4) located in areas with existing or potential density of one to eight units per acre and structures one to two stories high.

Neighborhood General District. Neighborhood General District areas have potential to provide residential housing consisting primarily of high-density single-family and multi-family units in a transit-oriented development form. These districts comprise lands that are:

- 1) already developed for multifamily residential purposes;
- 2) located in areas with existing or potential density of 8 to 15 units per acre and structures one to three stories high;
- 3) of moderate to good land capability;
- 4) located within urban boundaries that are serviced by utilities; and
- 5) centrally located near commercial services, employment centers, public services and facilities, transit facilities, pedestrian paths, and bicycle connections.

Neighborhood Center District. Neighborhood Center Districts are composed primarily of commercial and tourist uses supported by neighborhood residential development in

a transit-oriented development form. These areas are intended to accommodate additional commercial development with opportunities for vertical and horizontal residential mixed-use infill. These districts comprise lands that are:

- 1) already developed for commercial and tourist purposes;
- 2) located in areas with existing or potential residential and tourist density patterns of 8 to 20 units per acre and structures one to three stories high;
- 3) of moderate to good land capability;
- 4) located in areas with existing excess land coverage;
- 5) located within urban boundaries that are serviced by utilities; and
- 6) centrally located near commercial services, employment centers, public services and facilities, transit facilities, pedestrian paths, and bicycle connections.

Town Center District. Town Center Districts are core areas generally designated in CP areas. They have characteristics consistent with town form. They provide for a mixture of uses, such as tourist accommodations, commercial services, intensive recreation, and mixed-use buildings with residential and commercial uses serving the needs of the surrounding region. These districts comprise lands that are:

- 1) already developed with high concentrations of commercial services, employment centers, public services, tourist accommodations, and related uses;
- 2) located in areas where gaming is a permitted and recognized use;
- 3) of good to moderate land capability;
- 4) located in areas where moderate amounts of existing excess land coverage should be retained;
- 5) located in areas with existing or potential residential and tourist density patterns of 8 to 40 units per acre and structures one to four stories high; and
- 6) located near commercial services, employment centers, public services and facilities, transit facilities, pedestrian paths, and bicycle connections.

Tourist Center District. Tourist Center Districts are more intense urban-form areas generally designated in CP areas. These districts are characterized as having the greatest development intensity in the Region. They are visitor destination areas that have been designated as providing commercial and public services or having the potential to provide such services, along with mixed-use development, in the future. These districts comprise lands that are:

- 1) already developed with high concentrations of visitor services, visitor accommodations, and related uses;
- 2) located in areas where gaming is a permitted and recognized use;
- 3) of good to moderate land capability;
- 4) located in areas with existing excess land coverage;
- 5) located in areas with existing or potential residential and tourist density patterns exceeding 8 to 40 units per acre and structures two to six stories high; and
- 6) located near commercial services, employment centers, public services and facilities, transit facilities, pedestrian paths, and bicycle connections.

Special District. Special Districts are areas that have unique land-use characteristics (e.g., industrial districts and airports) and do not lend themselves to mixed uses. The form of these districts depends on their purpose. This classification is designed to concentrate services for public convenience, separate incompatible uses, and allow

other noncommercial uses if they are compatible with the purpose of this classification.

- Modify and consolidate existing Plan Area Statements. PASs would continue to provide a more detailed guide for planning decisions than the existing designated subareas in the Regional Plan (see *Figure LU-1: Land Use Classification and Plan Area Boundaries*). Each PAS would be assigned a land use designation from one of the five existing classifications and one or more of the 10 transect districts. Management strategies would be provided for each Plan Area and include strategies for development with mitigation, redirection of development, or maximum regulation. These designations are explained in detail in Code Chapter 13. The PASs also provide planning considerations, special policies, maximum densities for residential and tourist accommodation uses, maximum community noise equivalent levels (CNEL), and a cap on additional recreation capacity.

Alternative 2 proposes to expand the existing PASs to include additional elements tailored to the natural setting and desired community character/form of each area. To supplement the PASs, TRPA may set forth special policy direction and design standards to respond to the particular needs, problems, and future development of a specific area consistent with its land-use classification. Each PAS may vary in detail or built form depending on the nature of the Plan Area and the specific details of related plans by local jurisdictions or by CPs. This policy would allow the Regional Plan to respond to the individual needs of any particular area.

The foregoing requirements would be depicted on Regional Plan maps, which would designate areas available for development according to the various land use classifications. Areas depicted on these maps would reflect a reasonable projection of the amount of land available for the specific uses allowed in that area for the life of the Regional Plan. These maps would be coordinated with other Regional Plan Overlays outlined in Code Chapter 2 to permit ready determination of the following constraints on development, preconditions for development, and their locations.

- Adopt a new overlay map in Code to recognize the Wildland-Urban Interface. The wildland-urban interface (WUI) would be defined by the Wildland-Urban Interface and 10-Year Fuel Reduction and Wildfire Prevention Strategy Maps. The vegetation management strategy in these areas would be to ensure public safety and healthy forest conditions.
- Streamline the community planning process and amend Community Plans so that they reflect implementation of the transect-based zoning system. Provisions for updated standards to promote compact, mixed-use development are proposed and would be available as incentives in CP sub-areas. Incentives and allocations proposed in Alternative 2 would not be available until an area's CP is either adopted or updated consistent with the updated Regional Plan.
- Streamline the master planning process and amend the Code to include a new category: *multi-season resort*. Amend Chapter 16 to add multi-season resort as a new use category that requires an adoption of a master plan prior to expansion of any facilities that creates additional capacity.
- Amend Code Chapter 15 to address Placer County's desire to designate certain

areas outside of CP boundaries as eligible for a Redevelopment Plan.

- Amend the Code to allow the subdivision of units that are part of vertical mixed-use projects that meet PTOD standards for location and design.
- Implement Pedestrian Transit-Oriented Development (PTOD). The revised land-use system under Alternative 2 would be intended to revitalize CP areas by implementing smart-growth principles such as PTOD. Several of these principles (e.g., transportation choices, mixed-use development, compact development, housing choices, use of existing assets, and quality design) would be implemented.

PTOD/Mixed-Use Development. Projects would be required to incorporate smart-growth principles (as described above) while ensuring that site design, height, bulk, scale, landscaping, lighting, and signage are compatible with the natural environment and the desired community character. Specific implementation strategies that represent changes to design, height, and density standards are proposed as follows:

- Amend existing design standards and guidelines such as density and height to promote mixed-use projects, compact vertical mixed-use development, and walkability within defined CP areas.
- Designate high-density residential areas, Neighborhood Centers, Town Centers, and Tourist Centers as preferred areas for PTOD (see *Figure LU-2, Pedestrian Transit Oriented Districts*).
- Designate PTOD areas as preferred areas for infill development and as preferred receiving areas for transfer of development rights.
- Amend residential density standards to require a minimum of eight dwelling units per acre in PTOD-designated areas.
- Establish a minimum density for mixed-use projects within PTOD areas.
- Update permissible-use tables to encourage the development of transit-oriented and mixed-use development in PTOD areas.
- Permit additional height for compact, vertical mixed-use projects in PTOD areas, while ensuring that additional height is in scale and is compatible with the desired community character.

Land Coverage

Under Alternative 2, the land coverage management practices and regulations would be changed as described below. TRPA would adopt an updated, planning-level land capability map of the Lake Tahoe Basin that is based on the 2007 soil survey update prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. In addition, the Code would be amended to require site-specific soil and land capability mapping and discretionary field verification of soil and land capability map units.

The following implementation strategies, taken together, represent changes to the land coverage system and are proposed under Alternative 2:

- *Base Allowable Coverage.* Same as for Alternative 1
- *Maximum Allowable Coverage.* The same as for Alternative 1 except for the following modification. Amend Code Chapter 22, Coverage to raise the maximum allowable coverage (base allowable plus transferred) permitted to 70% for commercial facilities and mixed-use facilities on existing developed parcels within CP areas.
- *Eligible Coverage Transfers.* Same as for Alternative 1, except that soft coverage transfers would be allowed for commercial, tourist accommodation, and/or mixed-use facilities located within adopted community plans when transferred from sensitive lands (land capability districts 1-3)
- *Coverage Transfer Ratios.* Same as for Alternative 1, except (i) the coverage transfer ratio would be reduced to 1:1 (sending:receiving) for all transfers in excess of allowable base coverage when transferring coverage from sensitive lands (land capability districts 1-3) to commercial, tourist accommodation and/or mixed-use facilities, (ii) the coverage transfer ratio would be increased to 2:1 (sending:receiving) for all transfers in excess of allowable base coverage for transfers of coverage from non-sensitive lands (land capability districts 4-7) to commercial, tourist accommodation and/or mixed-use facilities
- *Coverage Transfer Requirements.* Same as for Alternative 1, except that land coverage from sending parcels located within TRPA-designated impaired watersheds could be transferred across Hydrologic Transfer Area Boundaries (i.e., anywhere in the Tahoe Basin)
- *Permissible Uses on Sensitive Lands.* Same as for Alternative 1
- *Sensitive-Land Mitigation Program.* Current sensitive land mitigation regulations require that all new land coverage and permanent disturbance in land capability district 1b must be mitigated at a mitigation-to-impact ratio of 1.5:1. This requirement would be revised to allow up to the base allowable land coverage (1%) on class 1b lands without requiring land coverage mitigation. All coverage in excess of 1% would require land coverage mitigation at a mitigation-to-impact ratio of 1.5:1, as is currently the requirement for all other sensitive land capability districts (i.e., land capability districts 1a, 1c, 2, and 3). Additional mitigation requirements would apply to 1b lands that also qualify as SEZs (see SEZ Subelement).
- *Excess Coverage Mitigation.* The excess land coverage mitigation program regulations would be revised to substantially restrict access to the *in lieu* mitigation fee option. Only projects with relatively small amounts of excess land coverage would be eligible to pay a fee *in lieu* of removing excess land coverage on or off site.
- *Coverage Relocation:* Same as for Alternative 1.

Allocations

Allocation of additional CFA and TAU quantities would depend on reuse and conversion of existing development. Residential allocations would resemble historic distributions. Up to 4,500 residential allocations, up to 400,000 square feet of CFA, 200 TAUs, and up to 1,000 Residential Bonus Units would be available.

Under Alternative 2, residential allocations would continue to be distributed using the existing Performance Review System, which links residential allocations of additional development to investments made by local jurisdictions toward achieving the goals of the EIP. The annual base is 150 allocations, but jurisdictions can earn up to a Basin-wide total of 294 allocations per year based on performance. Unused annual allocations would be returned to TRPA and placed in a pool to be used for moderate-income housing, retirement of sensitive lots, and the Resident Occupancy Program.

TAUs would continue to be distributed under the existing system that matches transfers of tourist units from sensitive lands.

CFA would be distributed through the expansion of the annual allocation process included in the Special Project programs. A maximum of 160,000 square feet of CFA would be designated for Special Projects; a maximum of 160,000 square feet would be allocated as part of a transfer program in which CFA could be transferred from outside CPs and from sensitive lands. The CFA in the transfer program would be matched at a 1:1 ratio up to a maximum 3:1 ratio with transferred CFA. The remaining 80,000 square feet would be used to reload existing, adopted CPs.

Under this Alternative, a charter agreement setting forth the strategy to achieve revenue targets in EIP Phase II would be signed by all EIP participants before distributions of CFA for the first five years. Distribution of the remaining CFA after the first five years would be linked to achieving the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) milestones for reducing fine sediments established by the Lahontan Water Quality Control District (Lahontan). The Performance Review System would be amended to include achievement of TMDL milestones as a factor in determining allocation bonuses per jurisdiction (*see the Water Quality Subelement for further explication of TMDL and its relationship to the Regional Plan Update*). This implementation measure would also include the following provisions:

Commercial Floor Area. The CFA system would be amended to focus allocations based on the Special Projects Program, transfers, and reuse of existing commodities (Code Chapter 33, Allocations). An additional 400,000 square feet of CFA would be created, and TRPA would designate the majority for land use districts designated as Town Center, Tourist Center, and Neighborhood Center (see Table LU-9). Existing requirements for local jurisdictions to meet their irrevocable commitment to implement environmental improvement projects prior to release of CFA will remain in effect. The Town Center and Tourist Center districts that would be the focus of additional allocations for Alternative 2 are as follows:

- Tahoe City
- Kings Beach
- North Stateline
- Incline Village
- Kingsbury Grade
- South Stateline

- Stateline/Ski Run
- Meyers
- Tahoe Valley (plan is in development and not yet adopted)

Table LU-9 Proposed Allocation of Commercial Floor Area	
Source	CFA (sq. ft.)
Special Projects CFA	160,000
Transfer of Development Match	160,000
For Community Plan Reload	80,000
Total	400,000
Notes: CFA = Commercial Floor Area; sq. ft. = square feet Source: TRPA 2009	

Tourist Accommodation Units. The number of TAUs available would be the 252 TAUs remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan plus 200 new TAUs to be distributed as Bonus Units. These units would be distributed under the same system and regulatory structure as under Alternative 1.

Residential Allocations. Residential Allocations would continue to be allocated under the existing system and regulatory structure with the following changes:

- Approximately 4,500 new residential allocations would be made available.
- Allocations from the Allocation Pool can be used for the Resident Occupancy Program.⁹ Chapter 33 would be amended to allow up to 200 allocations from TRPA's Allocation Pool to be used for the development of deed-restricted, owner-occupied residential units.
- Moderate Income Housing units will be exempted from the allocation requirement.

Residential Bonus Units. Assignment of the 1,000 bonus units remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan would be restricted to districts designated as Town Centers and Tourist Centers.

Recreation Uses and Persons-at-One-Time. Additional recreation uses would be

⁹ This program would be modeled after a similar program in effect in Pitkin County, Colorado. It would provide allocations as an incentive for development of owner-occupied residential units. The Resident Occupied (RO) zoning district in Pitkin County requires that developers show intent to provide a "middle-tier" housing option to local professionals. Unit size is limited to a maximum of 2,200sf. Applicants who wish to purchase or lease must demonstrate they are qualified employees with four years of consecutive full-time employment (75% in Pitkin). There are no income requirements, but an applicant's total net assets cannot exceed \$900,000. Initial sales price is set on case by case basis, and maximum resale price equals purchase price plus 3% or Consumer Price Index appreciation, whichever is less for each year the unit is owned.

permitted as specified within transect-based PASs, CP areas, or other Specific Plan areas (Chapter 33). PAOTs remaining in the 1987 Regional Plan would be allocated to new projects. For the developed outdoor recreational facilities requiring PAOTs, the total capacity of additional developed outdoor recreational facilities for the region is not to exceed 5,720 PAOTs for overnight facilities, 5,814 PAOTs for summer day-use facilities, and 7,273 PAOTs for winter day-use facilities. Additional recreation development not designated as developed outdoor recreation would be limited to those projects needed to serve the other development permitted or anticipated by the Regional Plan Update (*see the Recreation Element for more detail*).

Public-Service Facilities. No changes are proposed to the existing regulations for public service facilities. Additional floor area would be allowed for public-service facilities and would be allocated based on findings of need.

- Implement new development standards as described in the Community Design Subelement. Alternative 2 would include minimum and maximum height and density standards. Additional height and density would be permitted for projects located within CPs and use districts designated as Town Center, Tourist Center, and Neighborhood Center.

Alternative 3

Summary

Continued development would be allowed as under the 1987 Regional Plan through new allocations; restoration, banking, and transfer of existing development; or redevelopment. Development of non-allocated projects, such as public-service uses, would be allowable if a finding of need were made. Threshold attainment would continue to be advanced through mitigation of environmental impacts of new development or redevelopment and through the EIP.

This land use pattern would remain the same as Alternative 1 and would be advanced through existing policies such as:

- Promoting the concentration of commercial, tourist, and public services uses within the existing community plans.
- Focus additional development potential (i.e., CFA and TAUs) in the adopted CPs.

Goals and Policies

Under Alternative 3, Land Use goals and policies would be amended as summarized below.

Community Character and Threshold Attainment.

As in Alternative 2, a new policy, supporting the goal of restoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the Tahoe Region, would promote development that improves community character and improves progress toward threshold attainment by mitigating the direct and indirect adverse environmental impacts of development.

Directed Land Use.

New policies are proposed in concert with existing policies that would support the existing

goal of directing land use in conformance with the Thresholds and the Compact. One policy would direct land use and growth to appropriate areas where infrastructure capacity and facilities exist. As with the 1987 Regional Plan, Alternative 3 would continue to focus the concentration of additional development and redevelopment (i.e., CFA, TAUs, public services uses) into the existing adopted community plans. In these CP areas (*see bulleted list below*), new development and redevelopment would be focused:

- Tahoe City
- Carnelian Bay
- Tahoe Vista
- Kings Beach Industrial
- Kings Beach Commercial
- North Stateline
- Incline Village Commercial
- Incline Village Tourist
- Round Hill
- Kingsbury Grade
- South Stateline
- Stateline/Ski Run
- Bijou/Al Tahoe
- City of South Lake Tahoe Industrial
- Tahoe Valley
- Meyers

Implementation Measures

Alternative 3 would include the following measures to implement the land use-related policies described below:

- Land Use Planning and Regulatory System. Alternative 3 proposes to retain the existing Plan Areas Statements (PAS) to implement specific land-use policies in the Tahoe Basin, rather than using the transect system proposed in Alternative 2. The goal is to direct the amount and location of land uses in conformance with the thresholds, community vision, and other goals of the Compact. The existing PAS would be modified to account for land use changes that have occurred since the adoption of the 1987 Regional Plan such as acquisition of lands by public agencies and to conform TRPA's land use classification to the USFS management areas.
- Land Use Classifications. Changes to the land use classification under Alternative 3 primarily (Figure LU-3 and Table LU-7) reflect land use classification changes as a result of discussions with partner public agencies. The increase in conservation lands reflects the acquisition of lands by the USFS that were classified as residential, the addition of a Wilderness area located in the Mt. Rose area, and reclassification of state lands in Nevada that were formerly classified as Recreation. The increase in Commercial/Public Service is the result of reclassifying the parking lot located at the base of Homewood Ski Resort (which is currently classified as Recreation).
- Plan Area Statements. Specific changes to plan area boundaries are proposed to create consistency between TRPA's plan and local and federal land use plans. They include the consolidation of the Heavenly recreation plan areas into one Plan Area and expanding the boundaries to match the USFS permit boundary. Adopt new

recreation plan for the recently approved Van Sickle State Park and a new Plan Area for the Mt. Rose Wilderness area. Expand the Homewood Community Plan boundary to incorporate the parking located at the based of the Homewood Ski Resort.

- Community Plans. New additional allocations would be created. Distribution would occur under the existing system (1987 Regional Plan), and development would be focused on adopted CPs and Plan Areas designated by the 1987 Regional Plan. The following 15 CP areas would be the focus of the majority of the additional allocations:
 - Tahoe City
 - Carnelian Bay
 - Tahoe Vista
 - Kings Beach Commercial
 - Kings Beach Industrial
 - North Stateline
 - Incline Village Commercial
 - Incline Village Tourist
 - Round Hill
 - Kingsbury Grade
 - South Stateline
 - Stateline/Ski Run
 - Bijou/Al Tahoe
 - Meyers
 - Tahoe Valley (plan is in development and not yet adopted)
- Master Plans. Same as for Alternative 1.
- Redevelopment Plans. Same as for Alternative 1.
- Subdivisions. Same as for Alternative 1.
- Land Coverage System. Same as under Alternative 1.
- Allocations. Greater amounts of CFA and TAUs would be available under Alternative 3 than under Alternative 2. These would be available to facilitate development and redevelopment of projects. Up to 5,200 residential allocations, 1,000 residential bonus units, up to 600,000 square feet of CFA, and 400 TAUs would be available. Residential allocations would be distributed using a method similar to the existing process. The method of distributing CFA under Alternative 3 would be the same as under Alternative 1, with CFA assigned to CPs via the existing performance evaluation system for implementing environmental improvement projects and to special projects. Transfer of development would occur in the same manner as under Alternative 1. The remaining number of PAOTs and their distribution method would be the same as under Alternative 1 (*see Recreation Subelement for more detail*).
- CFA would be released for the first five years for distribution to adopted CPs and would be linked to the performance of each jurisdiction in EIP project implementation within the CPs. Release of the remaining CFA after the first five years would be linked to achieving the TMDL milestones established by Lahontan.
- This implementation measure would also include the following provisions:

Commercial Floor Area. CFA would be distributed to Special Projects and to adopted CPs using the existing distribution and allocation system. A total of 600,000 square feet of CFA would be available in this alternative (see Table LU-10).

Table LU-10	
Proposed Allocation of Commercial Floor Area	
Source	CFA (sq. ft.)
Special Projects CFA	300,000
For Community Plan Reload	300,000
Total	600,000
Notes: CFA = Commercial Floor Area; sq. ft. = square feet Source: TRPA 2009	

Tourist Accommodation Units. The number of TAUs available would be the 252 TAUs remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan plus 400 new TAUs to be distributed as Bonus Units. These units would be distributed under the same system and regulatory structure as under Alternative 1.

Residential Allocations. These would continue to be allocated under the current system. Approximately 5,200 new residential allocations would be made available.

Residential Bonus Units. Assignment of the 1,000 bonus units remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan would be restricted to districts designated as PTOD areas.

Public-Service Facilities. No changes are proposed. Additional floor area for public service facilities would be allowed and would be allocated based on findings of need.

Recreation Uses and Persons-at-One-Time. Same as for Alternative 2.

- Implement New Development Standards. No changes are proposed for this alternative, which include the same development and design standards as Alternative 1. See Community Design Subelement for additional discussion.

Alternative 4

Summary

Through minimal new allocations, easier conversions, more transfers, and reduction in the amount of potential developable lands, Alternative 4 would focus on improving the existing built environment, rather than expanding additional development. Threshold attainment would be advanced by concentrating existing development within sub-areas of the Community Plans, providing incentives for the transfer of development from sensitive land and from outside CPs, and reducing future potential development.

Goals and Policies

Under Alternative 4, Land Use goals and policies would be amended as summarized below.

Community Character and Threshold Attainment

As in Alternatives 2 and 3, a new policy supporting the goal of restoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the Region would promote development that improves community character and improves progress toward threshold attainment by mitigating the direct and indirect adverse environmental impacts of development.

Directed Land Use

New policies are proposed in concert with existing policies that would support the existing goal of directing land use in conformance with the Thresholds and the Compact. One policy would direct land use and growth to appropriate areas where infrastructure capacity and facilities exist. Under Alternative 4, the additional development would be limited to a few urban areas. Under this alternative, the 20 community plan areas would continue to exist, but five of these areas would be designated as priority areas where new development and redevelopment would be focused. They are:

- Kings Beach
- North Stateline
- Kingsbury Grade
- South Stateline - Stateline/Ski Run
- Tahoe Valley

Pedestrian Transit-Oriented Development

A new goal and 11 associated policies would be added to address the desired condition, developed during the Pathway process, of creating pedestrian and transit-friendly mixed-use communities as proposed for Alternative 2.

Modified policies would be the same as proposed for Alternative 3. The policy related to development of Community Plans would be amended to incorporate PTOD concepts. The policy related to additional coverage would be amended to prioritize areas from which coverage should be removed for activities related to transfer of land coverage and mitigation of excess land coverage. Removal of coverage from impaired watersheds would be the first priority followed by filled SEZs, and lastly, high-capability lands.

Implementation Measures

Alternative 4 would include the following new measures to implement the new land use–related policies described above:

- Land Use Planning and Regulatory System. Alternative 4 proposes to retain the existing Plan Areas Statements (PAS) to implement specific land-use policies in the Tahoe Basin, rather than using the transect system proposed in Alternative 2. The goal is to direct the amount and location of land uses in conformance with the thresholds, community vision, and other goals of the Compact. The existing PAS would be modified to account for land use changes that have occurred since the adoption of the 1987 Regional Plan, such as acquisition of lands by public agencies, and to conform TRPA's land use classification to the USFS management areas.
- Land Use Classifications. Changes to the land use classification under Alternative 4 primarily (Figure LU-XX and Table LU-7) reflect land use changes as a result of discussions with partner public agencies. The increase in conservation lands reflects the acquisition of land by the USFS that was classified as residential, the addition of

a Wilderness area located in the Mt. Rose area, and reclassification of state lands in Nevada that were formerly classified as Recreation.

- Plan Area Statements. Specific changes to Plan Area boundaries are proposed to create consistency between TRPA's plan and local and federal land use plans. They include the consolidation of the Heavenly recreation plan areas into one Plan Area. Unlike Alternative 3, the Plan Area does not expand to match the USFS permit boundary. Other changes are a new recreation plan for the recently-approved Van Sickle State Park and the creation of a new Mt. Rose Wilderness Plan Area.
- Implement Smart Growth Principles and PTOD. Under Alternative 4, proposed land use policies would focus on concentrating development in plan areas with new allocations and commodities, although quantities would be less than under Alternatives 2 and 3. New allocations would be used in conjunction with transfers of development and would focus on five areas within existing urban areas with the greatest potential for redevelopment that would enhance community character, environmental quality, and walkability. More concentrated development would take place within a portion of the following five designated Plan Areas:
 - South Y
 - South Stateline
 - North Stateline
 - Lower Kingsbury
 - Kings Beach
- Master Plans. No changes are proposed in this Alternative.
- Redevelopment Plan. No changes are proposed in this Alternative.
- Subdivisions. Code amendments are proposed to allow subdivision of units within vertical mixed-use projects that meet PTOD standards for location and design.
- Non-conformity and Calamity. No changes are proposed in this Alternative.
- Land Coverage System. The land coverage system changes implemented under Alternative 4 would be the same as in Alternative 2, with the following exceptions:
 - *Maximum Allowable Coverage*. Same as Alternative 1 except for the following modification: Amend Code Chapter 22, Coverage to limit the maximum allowable coverage (base allowable plus transferred) to 50% for commercial facilities on vacant parcels.
 - *Eligible Coverage Transfers*. Same as for Alternative 2 except that soft coverage transfers from sensitive and non-sensitive lands would be allowed for commercial, tourist accommodation, and/or mixed-use facilities located within adopted CPs.
 - *Coverage Transfer Ratios*. Same as for Alternative 2 except that (i) a coverage transfer ratio of 2:1 (sending: receiving) would apply to all transfers in excess of allowable base coverage when transferring coverage from sensitive lands, (ii) a coverage transfer ratio of 3:1 (sending: receiving) would apply to all transfers in excess of allowable base coverage when transferring coverage from non-sensitive lands..

- *Excess Coverage Mitigation.* Same as for Alternative 2, except that the Code would be amended to require that in lieu excess coverage mitigation fees be used for the acquisition and restoration off existing coverage only, and not for the acquisition and retirement of potential land coverage.
- Allocations. Alternative 4 contains the least available allocations among the “action” alternatives. Up to 2,000 residential allocations (@ 100/yr.), 1,000 residential bonus units, up to 200,000 square feet of CFA, and no TAUs would be available. PAOTs and their distribution would be the same as under Alternative 2. Alternative 4 provides substantially more incentive and opportunity for transfer and retirement.

Distribution of residential allocations would be the same as under Alternative 1. CFA would be distributed as a match for the transfer of existing development from outside CPs and from sensitive lands. Existing development that is transferred would be matched at a 1:1 ratio up to a maximum of 3:1 ratio with CFA from the pool.

CFA would be released for the first five years for distribution to the designated CPs and would be linked to the performance of each jurisdiction in implementing EIP projects in the adopted CPs. Release of the remaining CFA after the first five years would be linked to achieving the TMDL milestones established by Lahontan.

This implementation measure would also include the following provisions:

Commercial Floor Area. The CFA remaining in the 1987 Regional Plan (see *Alternative 1*) would be available plus 200,000 additional square feet reserved for transfer of development only. CFA would be distributed with incentives¹⁰ as a matching reward to projects proposing transfer of CFA from sensitive lands to districts designated as Town Centers and Tourist Centers.

Tourist Accommodation Units. The number of TAUs available would be the 252 TAUs remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan. There would be no new TAUs.

Residential Allocations. Allocations would continue to be allocated under the existing system and regulatory structure with the following changes:

- 10% of annual allocations would be reserved for a Resident Occupancy Program .
- Approximately 2,600 new residential allocations would be made available.

Residential Bonus Units. Assignment of the 1,000 bonus units remaining from the 1987 Regional Plan would be available only in districts designated as PTOD areas.

Public-Service Facilities. No changes are proposed for this alternative. Additional square feet of floor area for public service facilities would be allowed and would be allocated based on findings of need.

Recreation Uses and Persons-at-One-Time. Same as for Alternative 2.

¹⁰ Additional height and density would be permitted with special findings within Town and Tourist Centers (see *Community Design Subelement for more details*).

- Implement New Development Standards. Changes are proposed for this alternative and would include the same development and design standards as Alternative 2, but would only be provided as an incentive when combined with a transfer of development. See Community Design Subelement for additional discussion.