

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
Land Use	<p>The current Plan Area Statement zoning system is not fine-grained enough to protect community character. In Kings Beach, for example, there is Commercial zoning that could potentially allow a 4-story building on any parcel along a 1.4-mile strip of Rte. 28. The current zoning also does not regulate form; this can create uncertainty during the project approval process, as developers struggle to understand the style that the community desires and deal with opposition from community members. Overall, today's system is not specific enough to deliver widely accepted projects and the water quality and other environmental benefits they bring.</p>	<p>Implement a zoning system that is tailored to achievement of TMDL and desired community character –The proposal is to work with our partners and the community-at-large to implement a Transect and Form-Based Zoning system that accurately reflects each local jurisdiction's land use vision consistent with TRPA's environmental sideboards. This would create a framework of predictability based in good design. It would encourage projects to transfer development from sensitive lands, promote community character, and deliver environmental gain through redevelopment that can accelerate attainment of the Water Quality and other Thresholds.</p>	Same as Alt. 1	

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
Land Use	According to recent studies, the most sustainable land use pattern is Pedestrian- and Transit-Oriented Development (PTOD), which allows people to “live, work, and play” without excessive reliance on the private car. In fact, the studies have shown that the most inefficient PTOD beats the most efficient conventional development pattern when it comes to saving all forms of energy. The 1987 land use plan lacks recognition of PTOD planning principles and the importance that mixed-use patterns can play in creating vibrant Town, Tourist, and Neighborhood Centers.	Promote PTOD and mixed-use development patterns – The proposal would create incentives and regulation to foster the relocation of “legacy” development out of sensitive lands and into compact, vibrant town centers. Mixed-use development and PTOD would create opportunities to live, work, and play within close proximity to alternative modes of transportation, which can reduce vehicle trips and accelerate attainment of the Air and Water Quality Thresholds. Through transfer of development, multiple environmental benefits can be realized without increasing development potential.	Same as Alt. 1	
Land Use	Most of the parcels in CPs were developed before the	Use new land coverage standards to focus and	Same as Alt. 1	Establish an across-the-board maximum allowable

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>1987 Regional Plan and have an excess of land coverage. Because a project proponent may transfer in up to 70% coverage for a new development project on a vacant lot in a CP – <i>but only 50% for a redevelopment project on a developed lot</i> – the plan actually <u>dis-incentivizes</u> environmental redevelopment projects and the transfer of coverage from lower-density areas into Town, Tourist and Neighborhood Centers.</p>	<p>incentivize environmental redevelopment in Town, Tourist, and Neighborhood Centers - The proposal would level the playing field, treating vacant and developed parcels equally (allowing up to 70% coverage to be transferred in to support projects in Town, Tourist and Neighborhood Centers). This would promote PTOD, environmental redevelopment, coverage transfer from off of sensitive lands, and acceleration of attainment of the Scenic, Community Design, and Air and Water Quality Thresholds.</p>		<p>coverage limit of 50% for commercial, tourist accommodation, multi-family, and mixed-use facilities within adopted CPs and Development Transfer Zones (DTZ).</p>
Land Use	<p>Because of “legacy development” that was built before Thresholds were in place, both sensitive lands and CP areas generally suffer from too</p>	<p>Prioritize transfer of coverage from sensitive lands and incentivize coverage reduction in Town, Tourist, and Neighborhood Centers -</p>	Same as Alt. 1	<p>Amend ratios for transfer in excess of the base allowable for commercial, tourist accommodation, multi-family, and/or mixed-use facilities within adopted</p>

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>much land coverage. Coverage needs to be reduced and state-of-the-art water quality improvements must be installed if we are to achieve attainment of the Water Quality and Soils Thresholds. The current plan does not prioritize transfers from sensitive lands and does not adequately incentivize coverage reduction in CPs.</p>	<p>The proposal would amend the transfer ratio provisions, creating the largest incentives for coverage transfer from sensitive lands to Town, Tourist, and Neighborhood Centers. (Studies are ongoing to confirm the optimal transfer ratios needed to make environmentally-based incentives feasible.) Projects utilizing transferred coverage would be required to install state-of-the-art water quality improvements, which would benefit water quality in the TMDL's most crucial areas for improvement.</p>		<p>CPs and DTZs subject to the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer only permitted within the same Hydrologically Related Area (HRA) – except the South Shore DTZ may receive coverage transfer from any HRA and the Tahoe City and Kings Beach DTZs may receive transferred coverage from any HRA within Placer County. • Transfers ratios would be a tool to reduce land coverage overall, with a transfer from Class 6-7 lands requiring a 3:1 ratio (sending:receiving), Class 4-5 at 2:1, Class 1-3 at 1.25:1, and only SEZ at an even 1:1.
Land Use	<p>Under the current plan, soft coverage may only be transferred to single-family projects and linear public facilities. Because there are limited opportunities for</p>	<p>Update land coverage standards to incentivize the removal of soft coverage from SEZs – The proposal would create an incentive to transfer legally-</p>	<p>Same as Alt. 1</p>	<p>Prohibit the transfer of soft or potential coverage to tourist, multi-family, commercial, or public service facilities. Exceptions would be</p>

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>this, we are not seeing a rapid rate of removal of soft coverage in SEZs. Removal and restoration of soft coverage in SEZs can remove a sediment source, reduce erosion, and accelerate attainment of the Water Quality and Soils Thresholds.</p>	<p>existing, verified soft coverage from SEZs to commercial, tourist, and mixed-use facilities located within Town, Tourist and Neighborhood Centers. This would serve several purposes: create opportunity to restore SEZs, incentivize revitalization of the built environment, and accelerate attainment of the Water Quality and Soils Thresholds.</p>		<p>allowed for bike trails/paths that use pervious pavement only.</p>
Land Use	<p>Under the current plan, coverage transfer may only occur within the same HRA. By not allowing transfer from one HRA to another, this restriction perpetuates over-coverage in certain HRAs. It prevents beneficial projects that would remove coverage in areas of greatest need of restoration and hampers our ability to achieve the</p>	<p>Update land coverage standards to incentivize the transfer of coverage from “Impaired Watersheds” – The proposal would allow transfer of coverage across HRA boundaries (provided that the coverage comes from a watershed that is designated as “impaired” and transferred to a “non-impaired” watershed and</p>	Same as Alt. 1	<p>Allow the transfer of hard coverage from any HRA to the South Shore DTZ and from any HRA in Placer County to the Kings Beach and Tahoe City DTZs.</p>

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	Water Quality and Soils Thresholds.	therefore does not exacerbate the problem). This would allow restoration in areas of greatest need and accelerate attainment of the Water Quality and Soils Thresholds.		
Land Use	Under the current plan, all projects with excess coverage must mitigate it either on-site, off-site, or pay a fee in-lieu of physical mitigation. (The in-lieu fees are used by the state land banks to purchase and retire coverage). Mitigation fees must be spent in the HRA in which they were collected. Because opportunities to retire coverage in some HRAs are limited or non-existent – land banks are having difficulty spending the fees and are not able to apply them to the highest-priority	Allow in-lieu coverage mitigation fees to be used across HRA boundaries – The proposal would remove the prohibition against the land banks use of in-lieu fees for coverage retirement across HRA boundaries. This would allow them to retire coverage and restore lands in high-priority areas, accelerating attainment of the Water Quality and Soils Thresholds.	Same as Alt. 1	Parcels with existing coverage in excess of the Bailey Coefficients are subject to the following requirements for reduction and retirement of coverage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on-site – from 15 to 25% (sliding scale) • off-site – must be within an HRA, with a transfer from Class 6-7 lands requiring a 3:1 ratio (sending:receiving), Class 4-5 at 2:1, Class 1-3 at 1.25:1, and only SEZ at an even 1:1.

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	projects, delaying environmental gain.			
Land Use	Today, existing "Casino Core area" development is considered non-conforming for height. Under existing regulations, redevelopment efforts would require conformance with a height standard well below existing conditions. This is a barrier to redevelopment. The South Shore Vision (with participation from stakeholders and local jurisdiction representatives) indicates that serving tourism and promoting economic viability will require limited locations where existing height should be allowed.	Incentivize Casino Core area redevelopment by recognizing existing non-conforming height – The proposal would establish Casino Core area-only maximum heights based on existing, non-conforming conditions. This would encourage environmental redevelopment resulting in improvements to the built environment and accelerated attainment of Air and Water Quality Thresholds.	Same as Alt. 1	Amend Code to delete the special height districts and limit height to the existing 1987 height ordinances with exceptions for DTZs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow up to 3 stories in the commercial core sections of the South Stateline DTZ, with a two-story limit in proximity of the lakeshore. • Allow up to 4 stories in the commercial core sections of South Stateline only, with a three-story limit in proximity of the lakeshore.
Land Use	In some cases, small motel units are being transferred into Tourist Accommodation Unit (TAU) projects with much larger	Set standards for TAU size – The proposal would update the definition of a TAU, establishing a maximum size of 1,200	Limit TAU size for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timeshares and partial-ownership units to 1,500 square feet of floor area. • hotel rooms with 	Limit TAUs to 550 square feet, one bedroom, and one bathroom available for transfer purposes. TAUs may be combined with a

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>unit sizes. Some argue that these transfers result in negative environmental impacts and result in more development than was envisioned when the 1987 plan created the TAU transfer provisions. Others argue that, because all projects must fully mitigate their impacts, there is no difference.</p>	<p>square feet for units with two bedrooms or less and 1,800 square feet for units with 3 or more bedrooms. This would create predictability during the approval process, foster good design, and promote TAU transfer, resulting in accelerated removal of old, harmful development, environmental redevelopment, and accelerated multi-Threshold attainment.</p>	<p>kitchen facilities to 800 square feet of floor area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • hotel rooms without kitchen facilities to 450 square feet of floor area. 	<p>maximum of 4 bedrooms/3 bathrooms. The additional bathroom is not transferrable.</p>
Housing	<p>The incentives promoting affordable housing in the existing plan have not worked to deliver an adequate supply of affordable units. They offer density bonuses only to housing projects made up of 100% affordable units; this scenario is typically infeasible for developers. Without an adequate</p>	<p>Create incentives for mixed-income housing – To accelerate the provision of all types of housing for all income levels, the proposal would allow mixed-income housing projects to also qualify for bonus density and other incentives. New and redevelopment projects to provide mixed-income housing in our</p>	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	supply of affordable units, the region's labor force will continue to live in substandard housing or commute from outside the basin, compromising attainment of Scenic, Community Design, and Air Quality Thresholds.	Town and Neighborhood centers would accelerate multi-Threshold attainment and create conformity with CA's Sustainable Communities Strategy legislation, which requires housing in proximity to transit.		
Housing	Existing regulations do not promote the use of existing single family residential units as affordable or moderate income units.	Create incentives to use existing houses as affordable and moderate units –The proposal would allow a residential bonus unit to be substituted for an existing residential unit of use that can be banked and transferred upon deed restriction as an affordable or moderate rental unit.	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2
Housing	Under the current plan, only deed-restricted, 100% affordable housing projects are exempted from allocation requirements. This has been a disincentive to the development of	Exempt moderate income housing from allocation requirements – Exempting moderate income projects from allocation requirements would promote housing for	Same as Alt. 1	

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	moderate income projects – there has only been one to date.	people to work and live at Tahoe, reduce reliance on the private automobile, and support the achievement of Air and Water Quality Thresholds.		
Air Quality	Though the largest single source of wood smoke emissions is forest fuel reduction projects, emissions from wood stoves have a negative impact on both air and water quality. Under the current plan, there is no mechanism to ensure that all existing wood stoves are brought into compliance with emissions standards, and TRPA's wood stove emissions standards are outdated.	Reduce wood stove emissions – The proposal would update emissions standards to meet current EPA regulations and ensure that all wood stoves are eventually brought into compliance with these standards. This would not only result in accelerated attainment of the Air and Water Quality Thresholds, but it represents an opportunity for TRPA to assist local jurisdictions in achieving their TMDL load reduction targets.	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2
Air Quality	Fuel reduction is necessary to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire. Reducing this threat will	Reduce conflict between air quality regulations and forest fuel reduction needs – The proposal would	Same as Alt. 1	Adopt the most stringent state or local air quality regulations region-wide.

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	protect life, property, air quality, and water quality. Current air quality regulations may unnecessarily prohibit forest fuels reduction projects from occurring on given days.	promote low emission fuel reduction strategies, refine smoke management best practices, and allow flexibility in permitting fuel reduction projects to assist land managers and local jurisdictions in achieving their TMDL load reduction targets.		
Air Quality	The existing plan limits where Air Quality Mitigation Funds may be used. Very cost-effective projects that could deliver superior environmental and Threshold gains cannot always be prioritized, because the plan requires all mitigation funds to be expended within the jurisdiction where they are collected.	Allow some Air Quality Mitigation Funds to be used on the most cost-effective projects basin-wide – The proposal would improve the efficiency of the Air Quality Mitigation Program by allowing a portion of the funds to be directed to the best projects, regardless of where they are located. This would accelerate attainment of the Air and Water Quality Thresholds.	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2, with the additional requirement that all new projects, programs, and plans must result in a net reduction in all air pollutants that are not attaining Air Quality Threshold Standards.
Water Quality	Today's Regional Plan does not fully incorporate the	Incorporate the TMDL into the Regional Plan – The proposal would incorporate TMDL achievement strategies		Same as Alt. 2, with additional requirements

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>standards and practices needed to achieve the Clarity Challenge (10 feet in 15 years) and implement the Lake Tahoe TMDL. The current approach to achieving the Water Quality Thresholds requires projects to capture and infiltrate the runoff from the "20-year, 1-hr storm." This requirement, while helpful in many locations, cannot be directly and scientifically correlated to achievement of the Clarity Challenge, TMDL load reductions, or Threshold attainment.</p>	<p>across multiple elements of the Regional Plan. The TMDL is the result of significant scientific research. It takes a regional-scale approach to reducing total loads of the known pollutants of concern to lake clarity. It correlates water quality improvements directly to expected improvements in lake clarity over time. The effort to incorporate TMDL into the Regional Plan would involve taking an approach consistent to the approach of NDEP and the California State Water Board, while working with all of the local jurisdictions on feasible implementation strategies.</p>		<p>that prohibit fertilizer use, increase excess coverage mitigation fees, require pollutant load reduction plans in non-urban areas, and increase the targeted amount of restored lands from 80% to 90%.</p>
Water Quality	<p>Under today's Regional Plan, the approach to implementation of individual parcel BMPs is primarily to accelerate enforcement in "priority watersheds." This approach does not always</p>	<p>Implement a focused BMP enforcement, implementation, inspection, and maintenance strategy – The proposal would prioritize BMP installations to areas with the greatest</p>	<p>Same as Alt. 2, with the additional requirement that BMP's at point-of-sale have the option to post a financial guarantee.</p>	<p>Same as Alt. 2, with the additional requirement that BMPs be installed at point-of-sale.</p>

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>result in BMP installation where it is most needed to help achieve each local jurisdiction's TMDL pollutant load reduction goals.</p>	<p>pollutant load reduction potential based on TMDL science. It would create neighborhood-scale solutions for BMP compliance where individual-parcel BMPs are not effective. The priority areas and neighborhood-scale solutions would be consistent with local jurisdictions' plans and assist them in achieving load reduction targets.</p>		
Water Quality	<p>Defensible space is necessary to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire. Reducing this threat will protect life, property, air quality, and water quality. Until recently, however, employing defensible space practices were often seen as incompatible with installing BMPs. Though progress has been made</p>	<p>Ensure BMPs are consistent with defensible space guidelines – The proposal would result in updated Policy language and Code provisions requiring BMPs to be compatible with defensible space requirements.</p>		

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	among basin agencies to integrate these requirements, the Water Quality Subelement and Code lack policy to support this effort.			
Community Design	Defensible space is necessary to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire and protect life, property, air quality, and water quality. However, the Code may hamper practices to create fire defensible space (e.g., thinning and cutting of vegetation close to structures), as they can result in negative impacts to the Scenic Threshold.	Create consistency between defensible space criteria and good landscape design – The proposal is to facilitate removal of fire hazards while establishing standards that maintain the region’s natural landscape character. Fire defensible space practices have been facilitated since the Angora Fire of 2007. Standards would be updated to integrate both objectives.		
Community Design	Today, the way building height is measured has resulted in buildings with more visual mass than is desirable from a scenic standpoint. It allows buildings on sloped sites to	Create height standards that promote appropriate development – The proposal is to change the way building height is measured to be sensitive to sloped sites. This would	Same as Alt. 1	Height would be limited to two stories basin-wide (except for certain yet-to-be-defined special areas).

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>be taller if their height is concentrated in one area – usually next to the public right-of-way. This results in projects that do not provide the highest level of scenic benefit. It also results in projects that meet the letter of the Code but are opposed strongly by community members (and sometimes litigated); this can dissuade project proponents from investing at Tahoe and can hinder environmental redevelopment efforts.</p>	<p>encourage development that follows natural contours and blends in better with the landscape. It would result in less scenic impact and less community opposition to legal projects, which would help developers realize environmental redevelopment projects to revitalize Town, Tourist, and Neighborhood Centers and accelerate attainment of the Water Quality Threshold.</p>		
Community Design	<p>The current system of CPs and PASs lacks sufficiently predictable standards to preserve the desired character in some communities. This has discouraged environmental redevelopment efforts due to the unpredictable nature of the approval process. It</p>	<p>Express desired community character in new design standards – The proposal would promote place-based community planning that more accurately reflects local vision, creating predictable development standards that would encourage redevelopment</p>	Same as Alt. 1	

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	has also resulted in some legal projects becoming the subject of much community opposition.	and environmental gain, including accelerated attainment of the Water Quality Threshold. The new standards would protect community character, for example, by limiting height on the lakeshore side of major transportation routes.		
Transportation	The current plan does not support multi-modal street design. Such design is a necessary component of mixed-use centers and neighborhoods, which create the potential for alternative transportation use and reduce reliance on the private automobile, which is a Compact mandate.	Emphasize pedestrian- and transit-oriented development (PTOD) in street design – The proposal promotes mixed-mode street design to reduce dependence on the private automobile and accelerate attainment of Air and Water Quality Thresholds.	Same as Alt. 1	
Transportation	The pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks contain significant gaps that require use of the private automobile to get across.	Require projects to make accommodation for alternative transportation modes – The proposal would require alternative	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2, without “waterborne” as a transit category and with the additional requirement that transit projects produce

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	The current plan does not require alternative transportation modes, such as walking, bicycling, and transit, to be included in project plans.	transportation modes to be included in project plans (where feasible). Accommodating non-automobile modes of travel through development of complete pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks would reduce dependency on the private automobile and accelerate attainment of Air and Water Quality Thresholds.		greater emissions reductions than the private automobile when measured "per person per mile."
Transportation	The current plan does not comply with recent California law, which requires that the Regional Plan be the "Sustainable Communities Strategy" for the (CA side of the) Tahoe basin.	<p>Create a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in compliance with California law – The proposal would result in development of an integrated transportation, land use, and economic development strategy to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions from cars and light trucks for the California part of the Tahoe basin. The SCS's main requirements are summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of regional targets for GHG emissions reduction tied to land use. • Regional planning agencies must create a plan to meet GHG targets. • Regional transportation funding decisions must be consistent with the SCS. • Regional transportation planning and housing efforts must be tethered together. <p>Some California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemptions will be available to streamline projects that conform to new regional plans and SCSs.</p>		
Vegetation	Defensible space is necessary to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire and protect life,	Creating consistency with fire defensible space criteria – The proposal expands the ability to	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2, with additional protection for old growth trees during fire defensible space

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	property, air quality, and water quality. Under the current plan, vegetation protection requirements limit the ability to maintain fire defensible space, thus increasing the risk of catastrophic wildfire.	manage vegetation consistent with defensible space criteria, thereby improving public health and safety and protecting air and water quality.		treatments.
Vegetation	The current plan does not address non-native aquatic invasive plant species, which have been proven to reduce nearshore water quality.	Prevent the spread of aquatic invasive plant species – The proposal would require management measures to eradicate and prevent the spread of these species, which would protect native species, improve the recreational experience for residents and visitors, and accelerate achievement of the Water Quality Threshold.	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2
Wildlife and Fisheries	Though TRPA is leading efforts to prevent the introduction and spread of aquatic invasive species (AIS) and has adopted Code provisions to direct these	Prevent introduction of new AIS and control or eradicate those that currently exist – The proposal will result in updated Goals and Policies	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2, with the additional Code requirement that projects reduce and remove aquatic invasive species and prepare annual monitoring

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	efforts, it has not updated the Regional Plan's Goals & Policies to express the need to manage this threat.	that lend vision and support to actions being taken today to manage the AIS threat.		reports.
Soil Conservation	Today's procedure for allowing grading season exceptions is time consuming and inefficient. This can needlessly delay the start, or completion, of important public health and safety, environmental improvement, and other projects important to the vitality of the community and the health of the environment.	<p>Create predictable guidelines for granting grading season exceptions</p> <p>–The proposal would standardize criteria for determining the suitability of soil conditions for allowing grading outside of the normal grading season. This is particularly important for reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire, given that some of the best times to perform fuel reduction projects fall outside of the grading season but would qualify for exemptions due to often-favorable soil conditions.</p>	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 2
Stream Environment Zone	Currently, the Code does not differentiate between types of SEZ, though the	<p>Update the SEZ Program to ensure protection of value and functions of SEZs – The proposal is to update the SEZ Program to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more accurate SEZ mapping 		

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	<p>different types provide different values and functions. Mitigating disturbance of a woody riparian SEZ by restoring a dry meadow SEZ, for example, is legal under Code but would be inadequate and/or inequitable mitigation and result in net loss of SEZ value and function. Moreover, there are no criteria to differentiate between types of projects (i.e., SEZ restoration, enhancement, and creation) or make a determination as to when a mitigation or restoration project is complete. Overall, Code does not provide a means to prove that a project has met its mitigation requirement to prevent any net loss of SEZs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a definition and classification system that can be used to equitably compare disturbed and mitigation sites as well as mitigation methods • more predictable requirements for mitigation of project impacts • no net loss of SEZ value and function 		

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
Stream Environment Zone	Floodplains are not always located in SEZs, but they often provide similar benefits to water quality and habitat. Development in floodplains identified as risks for stream channel erosion can result in more damaging floods and greater negative impacts to lake clarity. The 1987 plan does not have regulations or incentives for removal of existing floodplain development, which limits the plan's ability to restore floodplains and achieve the Water Quality Threshold.	Provide incentives to relocate structures out of the 100-year floodplain – The proposal is to make transfer bonuses available to developed parcels in SEZs, other sensitive lands, and floodplains with high stream channel erosion. Studies are ongoing to confirm the optimal transfer ratios needed to make environmentally-based incentives feasible. Incentivizing relocation would spur restoration and result in improved water quality.	Same as Alt. 1	Develop a program to relocate existing facilities from all natural hazard areas.
Public Services and Facilities	Under the current plan, new single-family residences are required to make a finding that adequate water supply exists to meet minimum fire flow requirements or be within the five mile response distance of a fire	Update public safety standards to be consistent with state and local fire standards – The proposal defers fire protection waiver requirements to the state and local fire districts. It would limit single-family residential development to areas that are either adequately serviced by fire hydrants or that meet waiver requirements established by the state and local fire districts. This would provide flexibility in implementing adequate fire protection, reducing both the threat of catastrophic wildfire and regulatory conflict.		

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	engine. This regulation is outdated and not consistent with Fire Code.			
Performance Review & Implementation Scheduling	Under the current plan, most residential allocations, CFA, and TAUs are either exhausted or already allocated to local jurisdictions. This hampers TRPA's ability to use allocations as incentives for projects to achieve environmental gain through restoration, good design, and/or transfer of development from sensitive lands.	Update the allocation pool for Residential, CFA, and TAUs for the next planning horizon – The proposal is to make available 4,000 residential allocations under the existing 1987 development cap and create 400,000 square feet of bonus CFA and 200 bonus TAUs to allow for continued orderly growth and provide incentives for environmental gain.	Make available 5,200 residential allocations; create 600,000 square feet of bonus CFA and 400 bonus TAUs.	Make available 2,600 residential allocations and create 200,000 square feet of bonus CFA.
Performance Review & Implementation Scheduling	Today, Commercial Floor Area (CFA) is allocated to local jurisdictions, which generally distribute it on a "first-come, first-served" basis. It is not used to incentivize restoration of sensitive land. Restored sensitive lands serve an important function as a	Use CFA to incentivize environmental redevelopment – The proposal is to use bonus CFA as a match incentive for projects that transfer development from sensitive lands into Town, Tourist, and Neighborhood Centers. Environmental	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 1, except that new bonus CFA would only be allocated after the remaining CFA from the 1987 plan is utilized and 70% of vacant CFA is occupied.

Element/Subelement	Alternative Issue 1 (same as 1987 Regional Plan)	Alternative 2 proposal	Alternative 3 proposal	Alternative 4 proposal
	natural filtration system to reduce nutrient and sediment loads to the lake, resulting in improved water quality and clarity.	redevelopment is one of the chief ways that TRPA can help implement the TMDL and reduce the negative impacts of legacy development on water quality and the health of the ecosystem.		