

**TRPA
GOVERNING BOARD
PACKETS**

**FEBRUARY
1984**

David Greer

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
NOTICE OF MEETINGS**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on February 22 and 23, 1984, commencing at 9:30 a.m. each day at the hearing room of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South Lake Tahoe, California, the Governing Body of said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on Wednesday, February 22, 1984, commencing at 8:30 a.m. in the same location, the TRPA Finance Committee will meet to discuss the Agency's budget and work program.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on Thursday, February 23, 1984, commencing at 8:15 a.m. in the same location, the Litigation Committee will meet to discuss pending litigation involving Hunton and Anderson.

Date: February 6, 1984

By: *Gary D. Midkiff*
Gary D. Midkiff
Acting Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

NOTE: Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BODY

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

February 22, 1984 9:30 a.m.
February 23, 1984 9:30 a.m.

NOTE: There will be a meeting of the Finance Committee at the TRPA office at 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 22, to discuss the Agency's budget and work program.

There will be a meeting of the Litigation Committee at the TRPA office at 8:15 a.m. on Thursday, February 23. The purpose of said meeting is to discuss pending litigation involving Hunton and Anderson.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Review of Final Draft Goals and Policy Plan

B. Certification of the Environmental Impact
Statement for Amendments to the Regional Plan

V PUBLIC HEARING

Ordinance Adopting and Implementing the Amended Regional Plan

VI ORDINANCE

First Reading of Ordinance Adopting and
Implementing the Amended Regional Plan

VII APPEALS

Edgar Scharruhn, Appeal of Staff Decision Regarding Status of the
Kingsbury Terrace Subdivision Pursuant to Ordinance 81-5,
Douglas County, TRPA File #80016

VIII SPECIAL DETERMINATIONS

A. Tom Watson, Third Creek Inn, Determination of Vested Right,
Washoe County APN 124-100-06, TRPA File #84002

Continued

B. Dillingham Development Company, Interpretation of Permit Conditions,
Clearinghouse Review of 30 Acre Donation to the U.S. Forest Service,
City of South Lake Tahoe

IX ENFORCEMENT

A. Show Cause Hearings

1. Tahoe Paradise Executive Golf Course, Unauthorized Structure in a Stream Environment Zone, El Dorado County
2. Huttenmayer, Tree Cutting Violation, Zephyr Heights Subdivision, Douglas County
3. Donald Marken, Unauthorized Construction of Rock Jetties, Violation of TRPA Approved Slope Stabilization Project, Douglas County APN 01-020-07, TRPA File #81141

Continued

B. Reports

X REPORTS

- A. Litigation Committee
- B. Finance Committee
- C. Executive Session
- D. Acting Executive Director Report
- E. Legal Counsel Report
- F. Governing Body Members
- G. Public Interest Comments

XI CORRESPONDENCE

XII RESOLUTIONS

XIII PENDING MATTERS

XIV ADJOURNMENT

Four of the members of the governing body from each State constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the agency. The voting procedures shall be as follows:

- (1) For adopting, amending or repealing environmental threshold carrying capacities, the regional plan, and ordinances, rules and regulations, and for granting variances from the ordinances, rules and regulations, the vote of at least four of the members of each State agreeing with the vote of at least four members of the other State shall be required to take action. If there is no vote of at least four of the members from one State agreeing with the vote of at least four of the members of the other State on the actions specified in this paragraph, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.
- (2) For approving a project, the affirmative vote of at least five members from the State in which the project is located and the affirmative vote of at least nine members of the governing body are required. If at least five members of the governing body from the State in which the project is located and at least nine members of the entire governing body do not vote in favor of the project, upon a motion for approval, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken. A decision by the agency to approve a project shall be supported by a statement of findings, adopted by the agency, which indicates that the project complies with the regional plan and with applicable ordinances, rules and regulations of the agency.
- (3) For routine business and for directing the agency's staff on litigation and enforcement actions, at least eight members of the governing body must agree to take action. If at least eight votes in favor of such action are not cast, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

P.O. Box 8896
South Lake Tahoe, California 95731

2155 South Avenue

(916) 541-0246

MEMORANDUM

February 14, 1984

To: The TRPA Governing Board
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Review of Final Draft Goals and Policy Plan

For the subject agenda item, please bring to the meeting the Final Draft of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, November 1983 (green cover) mailed to the Board members in December.

Upon completing the final draft of the Goals and Policies Plan, Agency staff has the following recommended changes to the Plan. These changes are the same as those presented but not discussed in December and January. These changes and the reasons for the changes are as follows:

Change #1: Clarify the Soils Subelement, Goal 1, Policy 1

This policy sets forth the five year prohibition of development on 1-3 land capability districts. Staff's recommended language includes all types of uses with the noted exceptions that exist through previous Governing Board direction. Also the new language keys new development to new land coverage. The prohibition on residential development is limited to the same five year period as other types of development. (Draft Language Attachment #1).

Change #2: Clarify the Land Use Subelement, Goal 4, Policy 1, Section F

This policy sets forth the land coverage limitations for regional public facilities. The Governing Body action to allow up to 50% land coverage for public service was not consistent with the stricter land coverage limitations for regional public facilities. The new language recognizes coverage associated with existing linear-type public regional public facilities as conforming. New coverage must conform to the 50% limit or be transferred in to account for additional land coverage. (Draft language Attachment #2)

GWB:jf
2/14/84

AGENDA ITEM IV A.

Memo to the Governing Board
Review of Final Draft Plan
February 14, 1984
Page Two

Change #3: Clarify the Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement,
Goal 1, Policy 1

This policy sets forth the development priorities for Phase I and Phase II. Agency staff proposes new clean-up language with the substantive change being that public service development is not limited to 4-7 land capability districts in existing urban areas as are the residential and commercial developments during Phase I. (Draft language Attachment #3)

Change #4: Transportation-Related Subelement, Goal #3, Policy #2

The narrative is necessary to clarify the intent of the policy. In this case, it is the intent of the TRPA to coordinate with all applicable agencies during the preparation of any programs or plans affecting transportation. Accordingly, it is TRPA's desire to review transportation plans and programs of other agencies as necessary to demonstrate compliance with the direction of the Regional Plan.

Along with these proposed modifications, Agency staff would request Governing Board direction on the following issue:

Does the prohibition of residential development in land capability districts apply to new land coverage for additions on lots receiving a passing score under the evaluation system?

The inconsistency is that 100 new residences may be constructed on lots receiving a passing score each year; however, an identical lot with a house would be ineligible for construction that would create new land coverage. Past case-by-case review allowed consideration of additions; however, there were no allocation limits under that system nor did that system relate to the other limitations of the Regional Plan.

2/14/84

AGENDA ITEM IV A.

ATTACHMENT 1

Change #1: Soils Subelement, Goal 1, Policy 1

Policies

1. NO NEW RESIDENTIAL, TOURIST, PUBLIC SERVICE, RECREATION, OR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE PERMITTED ON LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICTS 1-3 DURING THE FIRST 5 YEAR PHASE OF THE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION, EXCEPT AS NOTED IN THE FOLLOWING POLICIES.

Development of environmentally sensitive lands in capability classes 1, 2, and 3 will not be permitted for five years after the regional plan is adopted. New development for purposes of this policy is development that creates additional land coverage. During this period, TRPA will conduct a thorough evaluation of the environmental consequences of development in these areas, and of the options available to land owners, before deciding what policies should apply during later phases of the plan implementation.

- x A. NO NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE PERMITTED ON LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICTS 1-3 EXCEPT THAT DURING THE FIRST 3 YEARS OF THE PLAN 100 NEW SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS RECEIVING A PASSING SCORE UNDER THE EVALUATION SYSTEM MAY BE PERMITTED.

The exception to this prohibition allows that no more than 100 new single family units receiving a passing score under the single family evaluation system (25 in California and 75 in Nevada), of the yearly residential allocation, shall be for residential permits outside areas mapped as land capability districts 4-7.

- x B. PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES ARE PERMISSIBLE USES IN LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICTS 1-3 IF: (1) THE PROJECT IS A NECESSARY PART OF A PUBLIC AGENCY'S LONG RANGE PLANS FOR PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION; (2) THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE RECREATION ELEMENT OF THE REGIONAL PLAN; (3) THE PROJECT, BY ITS VERY NATURE MUST BE SITED IN A LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICT 1-3; (4) THERE IS NO FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE WHICH WOULD REDUCE THE EXTENT OF ENCROACHMENT IN A LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICT 1-3; (5) THE IMPACTS ARE FULLY MITIGATED; AND (6) LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICT 1-3 LANDS ARE RESTORED IN THE AMOUNT OF 1.5 TIMES THE AREA LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICT 1-3 WHICH IS DISTURBED OR DEVELOPED BY THE PROJECT.

To the fullest extent possible, recreation facilities must be sited outside of land capability districts 1-3. However, the six part test established by this policy allows encroachment of these lands where such encroachment is essential for public outdoor recreation, and precautions are taken to ensure that such lands are protected to the fullest extent possible.

- C. PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS ARE PERMISSIBLE USES IN LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICTS 1-3 IF: (1) THE PROJECT IS NECESSARY FOR PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY OR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION; (2) THERE IS NO REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE,

WHICH AVOIDS OR REDUCES THE EXTENT OF ENCROACHMENT IN LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICTS 1-3; (3) THE IMPACTS ARE FULLY MITIGATED; AND (4) LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICTS 1-3 LANDS ARE RESTORED IN THE AMOUNT OF 1.5 TIMES THE AREA OF LAND CAPABILITY DISTRICT 1-3 WHICH IS DISTURBED OR DEVELOPED BY THE PROJECT.

Development within land capability district 1-3 is not consistent with the goals to manage high hazard lands for their natural qualities and shall generally be prohibited except under extraordinary circumstances involving public works. Each circumstance shall be evaluated based on the 4-prong test of this policy.

ATTACHMENT 2

Change #2: Land Use Subelement, Goal 4, Policy 1, Section F

G. REGIONAL PUBLIC FACILITIES WHOSE LINEAR CONFIGURATION MAKES IT IMPRACTICAL TO COMPLY WITH THE APPLICABLE LAND COVERAGE LIMITATIONS SHALL ALLOCATE LAND COVERAGE AS FOLLOWS:

- (1) EXISTING LAND COVERAGE ASSOCIATED WITH REGIONAL PUBLIC FACILITIES SHALL BE CONSIDERED CONFORMING LAND COVERAGE.
- (2) NEW LAND COVERAGE SHALL BE LIMITED BY THE PROVISIONS OF "F" ABOVE, HOWEVER IF ADDITIONAL LAND COVERAGE BEYOND THE LIMITS OF "F" ARE REQUIRED, ADDITIONAL LAND COVERAGE MAY BE PERMITTED THROUGH THE TRANSFER OF LAND COVERAGE.

*expand to include all regional public facilities
up to 70%*

ATTACHMENT 3

Change #3: Development and Implementation Priorities Subelement, Goal 1, Policy 1

PHASE I DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

The following types of new development may be considered upon adoption of the Regional Plan:

- A. PROJECTS IN AREAS DESIGNATED FOR REDIRECTION WITH AN APPROVED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.
- B. PROJECTS WITHOUT AN APPROVED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN WHICH INCLUDE:
 - 1) NEW PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES CONSISTENT WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN AND A GOVERNING BOARD APPROVED FIVE YEAR RECREATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
 - 2) NEW RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS IN EXISTING URBAN AREAS WHICH INCLUDES:
 - a. NEW SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DEVELOPMENT IN AREAS WITH THE CHARACTERISTICS OF LAND CAPABILITY CLASS 4-7 AS SELECTED WITH THE EVALUATION SYSTEM AS SET FORTH IN POLICY #2 OF THIS GOAL. ←
 - b. AFFORDABLE OR GOVERNMENT ASSISTED HOUSING FOR LOWER AND VERY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS. ?
 - 3) NEW COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ON LAND CAPABILITIES 4-7 ^{in existing urban areas} NECESSARY TO SERVICE RESIDENTIAL GROWTH AND WHERE IMPACTS ARE FULLY MITIGATED. ?
 - 4) NEW PUBLIC FACILITIES NECESSARY TO SUPPORT NEW RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND RECREATIONAL GROWTH PERMITTED BY THIS PLAN. ?
- C. PROJECTS DEPENDENT ON TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS AS PERMITTED BY GOAL #3 OF THIS SUBELEMENT. ?

PHASE II PRIORITIES -- To commence no earlier than five years after the adoption of the Plan and upon a finding that the required fair share of the financial resources required to implement the Plan have been borne by each of the entities or groups with interests in the Region, including the State of California, the State of Nevada, the United States Government, entities of local sector and verification that Phase I targets have been achieved or monitoring data supports further development. In addition, as provided in TRPA Resolution 82-11 adopting environmental threshold carrying capacities, August 26, 1982: "The environmental threshold carrying capacities shall be reviewed by the staff and the Governing Body at the time of adoption of the Regional Plan to assure that said Plan and environmental threshold carrying capacities are consistent, and shall be reviewed at least every five years thereafter by the most appropriate means. After such review, the pertinent

environmental threshold standards shall be amended where the scientific evidence and technical information indicate: (a) two or more threshold standards are mutually exclusive; or (b) substantial evidence to provide a basis for a threshold standard does not exist; or (c) a threshold standard cannot be achieved; or (d) a threshold standard is not sufficient to maintain a significant value of th Region or additional threshold standards are required to maintain a significant value."

PHASE II DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

The following types of new development may be considered upon adoption of the Regional Plan:

- A. PROJECTS IN AREAS DESIGNATED FOR REDIRECTION WITH AN APPROVED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.
- B. PROJECTS WITHOUT AN APPROVED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN WHICH INCLUDE:
 - 1) NEW PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES CONSISTENT WITH THE REGIONAL PLAN AND A GOVERNING BOARD APPROVED FIVE YEAR RECREATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN.
 - 2) NEW RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS IN EXISTING URBAN AREAS WHICH INCLUDES:
 - a) NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH A DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION SYSTEM SET FORTH IN POLICY 2, BELOW. THE TRPA SHALL ADOPT A POLICY ESTABLISHING WHICH AREAS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR EVALUATION, BASED ON ITS CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF DEVELOPMENT IN THOSE AREAS AND OF THE OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO LANDOWNERS
 - b) AFFORDABLE OR GOVERNMENT ASSISTED HOUSING FOR LOWER AND VERY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
 - 3) NEW COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ON LAND CAPABILITIES 4-7 NECESSARY TO SERVICE RESIDENTIAL GROWTH AND WHERE IMPACTS ARE FULLY MITIGATED.
 - 4) NEW PUBLIC FACILITIES NECESSARY TO SUPPORT NEW RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND RECREATIONAL GROWTH PERMITTED BY THIS PLAN.
 - 5) MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING AND RELATED COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC FACILITIES IN EXISTING URBAN AREAS:
 - a) MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND OTHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING WHERE NODAL DEVELOPMENT IS EMPHASIZED;
 - b) NEW COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT ON LAND CAPABILITIES 4-7 NECESSARY TO SERVICE MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL GROWTH WHERE NODAL DEVELOPMENT IS UTILIZED; OR
 - c) PUBLIC FACILITIES NECESSARY TO SUPPORT MULTI-RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL FACILITIES.

- 6) PROJECTS DEPENDENT ON TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS ARE PERMITTED BY GOAL #3 OF THIS SUBELEMENT.
- 7)* NEW TOURIST ACCOMMODATIONS IN EXISTING URBAN AREAS, NOT PART OF A TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS PROGRAM;
- 8)* SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR EVALUATION UNDER PHASE II PRIORITY B2a; OR
- 9)* NON-SERVICE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN EXISTING URBAN AREAS NOT REQUIRED TO SUPPORT RECREATION AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT UNDER THIS PLAN.

*NOTE: PHASE II DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES A AND B 1-4 MUST BE SUBSTANTIALLY SATISFIED PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF PRIORITIES 7-9, AND THRESHOLDS FOR AIR AND WATER QUALITY PERTAINING TO POLLUTION LOAD AND VMT REDUCTIONS MUST BE MET.

In carrying out the provisions of this Plan, the TRPA will make development decisions in accordance with these development priorities. Phase II development priorities will be initiated after five years, assuming availability of adequate funding for Phase II of the capital improvements program. If the criteria needed to implement Phase II are not met, Phase I shall continue if permitted or changed by the TRPA Governing Body. These development priorities will be reviewed every five years at a minimum to ensure that the development is being synchronized with the capital improvements program and other remedial programs required to meet environmental thresholds.

In administering each phase of the development priority system, the TRPA may allow lower priorities to be initiated prior to satisfying all higher development priorities, with the exception of Phase II priorities 7-9, which shall not be considered until all higher priorities are satisfied and thresholds for air and water quality pertaining to pollutant load and VMT reductions are met.

ATTACHMENT 4

Change #4: Transportation Related, Goal 3, Policy 2

2. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS AND PLANS SHALL BE COORDINATED AND DEVELOPED IN COOPERATION WITH ALL REGULATORY AND TRANSPORTATION AGENCIES.

All transportation plans and programs developed by the TRPA shall include review by all affected agencies and jurisdictions.

All transportation plans and programs developed by local, county, regional, state, and federal agencies shall be submitted to review by the TRPA to evaluate consistencies with the Regional Plan.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 84- 3

RESOLUTION CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT ON AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL PLAN

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended, sets forth in Article I findings with regard to Lake Tahoe's environment; and

WHEREAS, amendments to the regional plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency are required to be adopted by Article V of the Compact; and

WHEREAS, prior to adoption of amendments to such regional plan, an environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared pursuant to Article VII of said Compact; and

WHEREAS, the EIS certified hereby is necessary and desirable to promote, and is reasonably related to, the public health, safety and general welfare of the Lake Tahoe Region; and

WHEREAS, the EIS was prepared utilizing a systematic, interdisciplinary approach and all available resources and information; and

WHEREAS, the EIS was prepared, considered, circulated, certified and otherwise processed, reviewed and approved by the TRPA in accordance with the substantive and procedural provisions of Article VII of the Compact and the applicable provisions of TRPA's Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Governing Body further finds that said EIS contained, among other things, the following information required by Article VII(a)(2) of the Compact: (a) the significant environmental impacts of the proposed amendments to said plan; (b) any significant adverse environmental effects, which cannot be avoided should said amendments be implemented; (c) alternatives to the proposed plan amendments, the number, description and types of which are hereby found to be appropriate and adequate for purposes of said Article VII of the Compact, which alternatives included, but were not limited to, the regional plan of the TRPA presently in effect; (d) mitigation measures which must be implemented to assure meeting standards of the Lake Tahoe region; (e) the relationship between local short-term use of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; (f) any significant irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed amendments, should they be implemented; and (g) the growth-inducing impact of the proposed amendments. The Governing Body further finds that said EIS adequately addressed the proposed amendments to TRPA's regional plan and provided the Governing Body substantial, detailed information and a proper disclosure, upon which it could base a reasoned, sufficient and deliberate review and evaluation of the environmental impacts and commitments of said plan amendments, as well as the various alternatives thereto set forth in said EIS; and

WHEREAS, the EIS was duly circulated to and reviewed by the public and interested public and private agencies and organizations, and was the subject of duly-noticed public hearings and other public meetings; and

WHEREAS, the EIS complies in all respects with the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and the regional plan, ordinances, rules, regulations and policies of the TRPA, and is necessary to effectuate and implement same; and

WHEREAS, the EIS provides a reasonable and sufficient basis upon which the Governing Body can be informed of and review the potential environmental impacts and commitments of the proposed regional plan and its alternatives; and

WHEREAS, there is substantial evidence in the record upon which to base the foregoing findings;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Body hereby certifies the environmental impact statement upon the proposed amendments to the regional plan.

PASSED and ADOPTED this _____ day of February, nineteen hundred and eighty-four by the Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

Norman C. Woods, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

ORDINANCE NO. 84-

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE REGIONAL PLAN OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY; PRESCRIBING AMENDMENTS TO SAID REGIONAL PLAN, AS AMENDED TO DATE, PURSUANT TO ARTICLE V(c) OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT, AS AMENDED, SO THAT, AT A MINIMUM, THE PLAN AND ALL OF ITS ELEMENTS, AS IMPLEMENTED THROUGH AGENCY ORDINANCES, RULES AND REGULATIONS, ACHIEVES AND MAINTAINS THE ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES; MAKING FINDINGS REGARDING THE BACKGROUND FOR AND BASES OF THE AMENDMENTS TO SAID REGIONAL PLAN ADOPTED HEREBY; PRESCRIBING SPECIFIC WRITTEN FINDINGS PURSUANT TO ARTICLE V(g) OF SAID COMPACT ASSURING THAT APPROVAL OF A PROJECT WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN, AS AMENDED HEREBY, AND NOT CAUSE THE ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES OF THE REGION TO BE EXCEEDED; PRESCRIBING PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION; PRESCRIBING PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR PROJECTS ON FILE PRIOR TO THE ADOPTION OF THIS ORDINANCE; REQUIRING PLAN ENFORCEMENT AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

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

Section 1.00 Findings

- 1.10 On December 19, 1980, the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact ("Compact") was amended, requiring, among other things, that the Agency adopt environmental threshold carrying capacities for the Lake Tahoe region. The Compact further provided that, within one (1) year after the adoption of the environmental threshold carrying capacities, the Agency shall amend its regional plan so that, at a minimum, the plan and all of its elements, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules and regulations, achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities.
- 1.11 The Compact finds, among other things, that: (a) the waters of Lake Tahoe and other resources of the Lake Tahoe region are threatened with deterioration or degeneration, which endangers the natural beauty and economic productivity of the region; (b) the public and private interests and investments in the region are substantial; (c) the region exhibits unique environmental and ecological values which are irreplaceable; (d) said region is experiencing problems of resource use and deficiencies of environmental control; (e) increasing urbanization is threatening the ecological values of the region and threatening the public opportunities for use of the public lands; (f) maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural and public health values provided by said region; (g) there is a public interest in protecting, preserving and enhancing such values for the residents of the region and for visitors to the