

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**DECEMBER
1991**

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on December 11, 1991, at the TRPA Office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

December 2, 1991


Jerry Wells
Acting Executive Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Al Tahoe, Tahoe Valley, and Tahoe City, California.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 195 U.S. Highway 50
Zephyr Cove, Nevada

December 11, 1991
9:30 a.m.

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

Page #

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Amendment of Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, Relative to 1992 Residential Allocations and Related Amendments to the Goals and Policies

1-5

B. Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality Mitigation, Relative to Update of Water Quality Mitigation Fee

6-17

C. Amendment of Maps for Delineating Water Quality Improvements in the Vicinity of the Parcel (IPES Working Map)

18-24

D. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities to Adopt MOU Between TRPA and the Tahoe-Douglas District

25-33

V PLANNING MATTERS

A. Presentation on the Regional Transportation Plan/Air Quality Plan Update

34

VI REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

D. Public Interest Comments

VII PENDING MATTERS

VIII RESOLUTIONS

A. For Former APC Members Vivian Roberts, Steve DeMello and Ken Greenwood

35-36

IX ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, NV

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

December 4, 1991

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 33, Allocation of Development,
Relative to 1992 Residential Allocations and Related
Amendments to the Goals and Policies

The staff's summary on this item will be presented under separate cover for the
December 11 APC meeting.

DZ:jf
12/4/91

AGENDA ITEM IV A.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, NV

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

November 27, 1991

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality
Mitigation, Relative to Update of Water
Quality Mitigation Fee

Proposed Action: To amend Section 82.3 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances as set forth below.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and, if appropriate, recommend that the Governing Board adopt the following Code amendment:

82.3 Fee Schedule: A fee shall be assessed at ~~\$.29~~ \$1.29 per square foot of additional land coverage. On January 1 of each year, TRPA shall adjust the fee for inflation, based on changes in the construction cost index of the Engineering News Record.

Background: Mitigation of development impacts is often financed through impact fees imposed at the time of project approval and permit issuance. Impact fees have traditionally been used to finance road improvements, sewage and water extensions, fire protection, police protection, and other services necessary to serve new development. More recently, impact fees have also been imposed to mitigate environmental impacts caused by development.

To determine appropriate impact fee levels, Frank and Rhodes (1987) recommend the application of the following three criteria:

DG:rd
11/27/91

AGENDA ITEM IV.B.

1. The rational nexus test requires that:
 - a. the occupants of the development will use the service;
 - b. the service is one the government has a legitimate authority to provide; and
 - c. there is likely to be a shortage of the service if steps aren't taken to provide it.
2. The impact fee must be proportional to the expected usage level. To meet this requirement, any generally accepted methodology can be used to establish a fee schedule.
3. The linkage between the development and the impact fee must be established by determining that:
 - a. the problem the service is intended to correct is created by the development;
 - b. the amount of the impact fee is at least roughly proportional to the share of the problem created by the development; and
 - c. the impact fee will be used to alleviate the problem created.

TRPA (1986, 1987) requires new development to offset 150 percent of its water quality impacts. This can be accomplished by implementing offsite erosion and runoff control projects and SEZ restoration projects, or by contributing to a mitigation fund established by TRPA for the implementation of these projects. As stated in TRPA's 1988 208 Water Quality Plan, development generates both onsite and offsite water quality impacts. To mitigate both new and existing developmental impacts, the 208 plan requires onsite installation of BMPs and completion of the Capital Improvements Program for Erosion and Runoff control and the SEZ Protection and Restoration Program (CIP/SEZ Program). To fulfill these requirements, project proponents are required to install BMPs on their property to mitigate onsite impacts and to contribute their share toward the completion of the CIP/SEZ programs to mitigate offsite impacts.

To determine the required offsite mitigation, the total remaining cost of the CIP/SEZ Program must be determined and existing and proposed land coverage estimated to develop a prorated cost per square foot of coverage assigned to new development.

11/27/91

AGENDA ITEM IV.B.

Cost of the CIP/SEZ Programs

CIP

TRPA developed the original CIP as part of the 208 plan which was adopted in 1981. The CIP from the 1981 208 plan estimated the total cost of the program at \$77 million (1976 dollars). TRPA, local government, and the affected state agencies have used the CIP for planning, administering, and reviewing capital improvement projects since its adoption. The current estimated cost of the CIP is based on the CIP from the 1981 208 plan, but has been revised to account for new problem areas which have been identified, for projects completed since 1977, and for updated estimates of costs of specific projects or problem areas. In the Final Environmental Impact Statement: Plan Area Statements and Implementing Ordinances of the Regional Plan, TRPA estimated the total cost of the program at \$163 million (1986 dollars), and estimated that \$148 million remained to be spent.

The Tahoe Conservancy report post-dates the TRPA's 1987 estimate, and is the basis for the revised California-side cost estimates which appear in this document. The Conservancy identified 101 project areas with a total cost of \$160 million. The average estimated project cost was about \$1.6 million.

TRPA's 1988 208 plan estimated CIP costs, excluding operations and maintenance (O&M), as follows:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Cost (\$ Millions)</u>
California side	
City of South Lake Tahoe	\$58.9
El Dorado County	49.8
Placer County	78.0
Caltrans	18.4
Nevada side	
Washoe County	19.3
Douglas County	14.6
NDOT	25.2
Total	\$264.2

Since the estimated CIP costs included in the 1988 208 plan are the most current, staff recommends using these figures in the calculations for water quality mitigation fees.

Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality
 Mitigation, Relative to Update of Water
 Quality Mitigation Fee -- Page 4

Since 1988, the seven public agencies (City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Washoe County, Douglas County, Caltrans, and NDOT) have expended \$27.57 million on 53 projects as follows:

Total Expenditures on CIP Projects
 (\$ Millions)

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Expenditures (1988-1991)</u>
California side	
City of South Lake Tahoe	\$4.92
El Dorado County	6.03
Placer County	4.90
Caltrans	3.21
Nevada side	
Washoe County	4.08
Douglas County	4.13
NDOT	0.30

This leaves a remaining cost estimate of \$236,630,000 for completion of the CIP. Jurisdictional responsibilities are as follows:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Remaining Cost (\$ Millions)</u>
California side	
City of South Lake Tahoe	\$ 53.98
El Dorado County	43.77
Placer County	73.10
Caltrans	15.19
Nevada side	
Washoe County	15.22
Douglas County	10.47
NDOT	24.90
Total	\$236.63

SEZ

To estimate the cost of the SEZ Protection and Restoration Program, estimated contract prices supplied by the United States Forest Service (USFS, 1987) were used. This report estimated the cost of restoring disturbed lands and SEZs at approximately \$23,000 per acre. In 1988, TRPA's 208 plan set a Region-wide restoration target of 1,100 acres of disturbed SEZs. Since 1988, approximately 100 acres of SEZs have been restored. This reduces the target to approximately 1,000 acres. Using the USFS restoration estimate, the cost of this restoration would be approximately \$23 million.

The total estimated cost to complete the CIP/SEZ program is:

CIP	\$236,630,000
SEZ	<u>23,000,000</u>
Total	\$259,630,000

O&M Estimated Costs

O&M costs for El Dorado County were estimated by Jim Haen, County Engineer. For 1989, these costs were estimated at \$42,000 and predicted to increase to approximately \$100,000 in 1995 with a yearly incremental increase after that. To calculate the O&M costs for the 20 year program, \$100,000 per year is considered to be a reasonable estimate. To arrive at an estimated O&M cost for the Basin, staff multiplied \$100,000 per year by 20 years to arrive at an estimated O&M cost of \$2 million per jurisdiction.

Land Coverage

Land coverage calculations have been previously determined by TRPA (1983). The estimated existing hard coverage was approximately 6,524 acres and was broken out as follows:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Coverage (Acres)</u>
California side	
El Dorado County (includes CSLT)	3,148.1
Placer County	<u>1,468.7</u>
Subtotal	4,616.8

Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality
 Mitigation, Relative to Update of Water
 Quality Mitigation Fee -- Page 6

Nevada side

Washoe County	1,113.0
Carson City	59.9
Douglas County	<u>742.1</u>
Subtotal	1,909.0
Total	6,525.8

TRPA (1988) estimated growth in the next 20 years to add an additional 331 acres of hard coverage. For the period between 1983 and 1988, an estimated 83 acres of additional hard coverage was created for an estimated total hard coverage of 6,939.8 acres at the 20 year buildout schedule as anticipated in TRPA's 208 plan. TRPA does not have the acreage by jurisdiction breakdown for the additional 414 acres of coverage created since 1983. For purposes of this analysis, this additional coverage has been equally apportioned to the four major jurisdictions (El Dorado County, Placer County, Washoe County, and Douglas County) resulting in the following coverage approximations to the year 2008:

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Coverage (Acres)</u>
California side	
El Dorado County (includes CSLT)	3,251.6
Placer County	<u>1,572.2</u>
Subtotal	4,823.8
Nevada side	
Washoe County	1,216.5
Carson City	53.9
Douglas County	<u>845.6</u>
Subtotal	2,116.0
Total	6,939.8

11/27/91

AGENDA ITEM IV.B.

Discussion

Calculation of Water Quality Mitigation Fee

Staff proposes that this fee be calculated by dividing the total cost of the CIP/SEZ program by the total estimated hard coverage to arrive at a cost per square foot of hard coverage for determining a project's mitigation needs. This calculation is outlined below:

$$\frac{\text{Total CIP/SEZ Cost}}{\text{Total Coverage}} = \frac{\$259,630,000}{6,939.8 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} = \$0.86/\text{ft.}^2$$

Then multiply this value by 150% to calculate the mitigation fee.

$$\frac{0.86}{\text{ft.}} \times 150\% = \$1.29/\text{ft.}^2$$

For an average home creating 2,500 ft.² of additional coverage, the offsite water quality mitigation fee would be \$3,225.

Other Alternatives

Four other alternatives for calculating the water quality mitigation fee were reviewed by staff and are outlined below:

1. Include O&M costs:

O&M costs are not included in the mitigation fee proposed by staff. If O&M costs for the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Washoe County, Douglas County, Caltrans and NDOT are included in the costs of the CIP/SEZ program, the calculation would be as follows:

Total CIP/SEZ cost	\$259,630,000
O&M cost	<u>14,000,000</u>
Total	\$273,630,000

$$\frac{\text{Total CIP/SEZ cost (including O&M)}}{\text{Total coverage}} = \frac{\$273,630,000}{6,939.8 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} = \$0.91/\text{ft.}^2$$

Then multiply this value by 150% to calculate mitigation fee.

$$\frac{\$0.91}{\text{Ft.}} \times 150\% = \$1.37/\text{ft.}^2$$

2. Calculate mitigation fee by county:

This alternative provides for a county by county apportionment based on the CIP/SEZ costs and coverage associated with each county. For purposes of comparison, the calculation is made with and without O&M costs.

$$\frac{\text{Cost of Jurisdiction CIP/SEZ} \times 150\%}{\text{Jurisdiction coverage}}$$

A. Without O&M Costs

El Dorado County (includes CSLT and one-half Caltrans cost)

$$\frac{111,095,000}{3251.6 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.18/\text{ft.}^2$$

Placer County (includes one-half Caltrans cost)

$$\frac{86,445,000}{1572.2 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.89/\text{ft.}^2$$

Washoe County (includes one-half NDOT costs and one-half Carson City acreage)

$$\frac{33,420,000}{1243.45 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$0.93/\text{ft.}^2$$

Douglas County (includes one-half NDOT costs and one-half Carson City acreage)

$$\frac{28,670,000}{872.55 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.13/\text{ft.}^2$$

Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality
Mitigation, Relative to Update of Water
Quality Mitigation Fee -- Page 9

B. With O&M Costs

El Dorado County (includes CSLT and one-half Caltrans cost)

$$\frac{116,095,000}{3251.6 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.23/\text{ft.}^2$$

Placer County (includes one-half Caltrans cost)

$$\frac{89,445,000}{1572.2 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.96/\text{ft.}^2$$

Washoe County (includes one-half NDOT's cost and one-half
Carson City's acreage)

$$\frac{36,420,000}{1243.45 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.01/\text{ft.}^2$$

Douglas County (includes one-half NDOT's cost and one-half
Carson City's coverage)

$$\frac{31,670,000}{872.55 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.25/\text{ft.}^2$$

3. Calculate mitigation fee by state:

This alternative provides for an apportionment to each state based on the
CIP/SEZ costs and coverage associated with each state.

A. With O&M Costs

California:

$$\frac{197,540,000}{4823.8 \text{ acre } \left(\frac{43,506 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.41/\text{ft.}^2$$

Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality
Mitigation, Relative to Update of Water
Quality Mitigation Fee -- Page 10

Nevada

$$\frac{62,090,000}{2116 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.11/\text{ft.}^2$$

B. With O&M Costs

California

$$\frac{205,540,000}{4823.8 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.47/\text{ft.}^2$$

Nevada

$$\frac{68,090,000}{2116 \text{ acres } \left(\frac{43,560 \text{ ft.}^2}{\text{acre}} \right)} \times 150\% = \$1.11/\text{ft.}^2$$

4. Update existing water quality fee to account only for inflation:

Original fee of \$0.29/ft.² was established in 1983. By using a 5% annual inflation rate, the original \$0.29/ft.² would be adjusted to \$0.47/ft.² for 1992.

References

Frank, J. E. and R. M. Rhodes, 1987. Development Exactions. Planners Press. American Planning Association. Washington D.C.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 1988. Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region, Volumes I-VII.

_____, 1987. Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Code of Ordinances, Rules of Procedure.

_____, 1986. Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin. Goals and Policies.

11/27/91

AGENDA ITEM IV.B.

_____, 1983. Environmental Impact Statement for Adoption of a Regional Plan
for the Lake Tahoe Basin.

United States Forest Service, 1987. Watershed Improvement Needs Inventory.
Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.

Findings: Prior to amending the Code, TRPA must make certain findings. Follow-
ing each finding below, is a brief rationale for making the required findings.

Chapter 6 Findings

1. Finding: The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and Maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.
Rationale: This amendment implements the Goals and Policies, the Code of Ordinances, the Regional Plan, and the 208 Water Quality Management Plan.
2. Finding: The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.
Rationale: The amendment is consistent with the Regional Plan and will help attain the environmental thresholds.
3. Finding: Wherever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.
Rationale: See Findings 1 and 2 above.
4. Finding: The Regional Plan and all its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules, and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.
Rationale: For the reason set forth in the rationale for Finding 1 above, this amendment better implements the Code and Regional Plan and will assist in the achievement and maintenance of the environmental thresholds.

Amendment of Chapter 82, Water Quality
Mitigation, Relative to Update of Water
Quality Mitigation Fee -- Page 12

Environmental Documentation: Staff proposes a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) for these proposed amendments. These amendments implement the Regional Plan.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Dan Greenlee at (702) 588-4547.

11/27/91

AGENDA ITEM IV.B.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, NV

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

November 25, 1991

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment to the Map Delineating Water
Quality Improvements in Vicinity of the
Parcel, an IPES Evaluation Criteria

Proposed Action: To amend the existing map delineating water quality improvements in vicinity of parcel as set forth below.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and, if appropriate, recommend that the Governing Board adopt the attached map amendments and their respective scores.

Background: At the October 1987 meeting, the Governing Board adopted the map delineating water quality improvements in vicinity of the parcel. Preparation of this map was based upon field data collected during the summer of 1987 pursuant to Section 37.2.G of the Code of Ordinances:

37.2.G Need for Water Quality Improvements In Vicinity of Parcel: The maximum score for need for water quality improvements in vicinity of parcel is 50 points.

- (1) Preparation of Map: TRPA shall prepare a map identifying areas within which the need for the water quality improvements listed in Table G-1 of the Technical Appendices is the same. The Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan (208 Plan) maps shall be used as a guideline for determining the level of improvements needed. Areas shall be assigned point values in accordance with Table G-1 of the Technical Appendices. The points assigned shall be equal to the mathematical difference between 50 points and the total of the negative points received due to the combination of water quality improvements needed.
- (2) Assigning Scores To Parcels: Each parcel shall receive the score assigned to the area, established under Subparagraph (1), above, in which the parcel is located.

DG:jf
11/25/91

AGENDA ITEM IV C.

G. Need For Water Quality Improvements in Vicinity of Parcel

TABLE G-1

NEEDED WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

Needed Improvement	Points
None	50
Revegetation	- 6
Rock-lined or vegetated ditches	- 8
Curb gutter or paved swales	- 8
Storm drain pipes	- 8
Retaining walls	- 4
Rock slope protection	- 4
Paved roads	- 8
Sediments basins	- 4

Since adoption of this map, numerous water quality improvement projects have been implemented within the Basin. As anticipated within the IPES system, one of the ways that a parcel's IPES score may be increased is if (37.10.A) "water quality improvements of the type considered in subsection 37.2.G. are installed in an area subsequent to TRPA preparing the maps in accordance with Subparagraph 37.2.G(1)."

Upon implementation of these projects: "TRPA shall amend the map by increasing the point values identified in Table G-1 for the improvements installed. The scores received by parcels located in areas where point values are increased in this subsection shall be increased to reflect the new point value."

Amendments proposed by staff are intended to:

1. account for water quality improvement projects implemented since 1987; and
2. increase the point scores for those parcels affected by these projects pursuant to 37.10.A. of the Code of Ordinances.

Discussion: The proposed amendments are based upon field data collected during the fall of 1991. The proposed score increases are to account for projects implemented or completed after the original IPES scoring for this element was completed. Point values were assigned according to the scoring criteria in Table G-1. Properties affected by the score increases were restricted to only those parcels immediately within the vicinity of the water quality improvement project.

To maintain the original intention of identifying and scoring areas within which the need for improvements are the same, the proposed amendments delineate only those areas directly impacted by the water quality improvement project and may be different than those identified on the original map. This reflects the fact that quite often improvements addressed only portions of the originally mapped areas.

Findings: Prior to amending the Code, TRPA must make certain findings:

Chapter 6 Findings: The required Chapter 6 findings and brief rationales are set forth below:

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

Rationale: The amendments are consistent with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances. Subsection 37.10.A anticipated the need for amendments and established the criteria for the related IPES parcel score increases.

- 2) Finding: The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: The amendments are consistent with the Regional Plan and will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

- 3) Finding: Whenever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.

Memo to the Advisory Planning Commission
Water Quality Improvements Map
11/25/91
Page Four

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

Rationale: For the reason set forth in the rationale for finding 1 above, these amendments better implement the Code and Regional Plan and will assist in the achievement and maintenance of the environmental thresholds.

Environmental Documentation: Staff proposes a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) for these proposed amendments. These amendments implement the Regional Plan.

Attachments: Proposed map amendments and proposed new scores.

If you have any questions on this agenda item, please contact Dan Greenlee at (702) 588-4547.

<u>Number</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Water Quality Improvement</u>	<u>Project Cost</u>	<u>Year Completed</u>	<u>Proposed New Score</u>	<u>Existing Score</u>	<u>Map Exhibit</u>
1	City of South Lake Tahoe	Bijou/Wildwood I		1988	44	26	1
2		Bijou/Wildwood II	\$3,361,440	1989	36	26, 34	2