

Exhibit B

Modifications to the Draft Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances

The following “crosswalk” tables identify Regional Plan and Code of Ordinance provisions that were modified in response to Governing Board actions on August 22, 2012.

All modifications were reviewed by the Technical Working Group and endorsed as being consistent with Governing Board actions.

Modifications are organized as follows:

1. Modifications Implementing Governing Board Policy Direction

A 17-page table lists each modification that was endorsed by the Governing Board for inclusion in the Final Draft Regional Plan and Code. For each action, the table identifies modified Regional Plan and Code sections and provides a brief summary of changes made in each document. This table addresses Bi-State Recommendations for non-unanimous issues, Mitigation Measures and other endorsed modifications.

Changes made pursuant to this table are highlighted in **yellow** in the “track-change” versions of the Final Draft Plan and Code.

2. List of Technical Modifications

A 9-page table lists technical modifications to the Regional Plan, Code of Ordinances, and transportation projects and funding mechanisms.

Plan and code modifications address non-regulatory “clean up” items including typographical corrections, consistent use of terms, cross references, refinement of existing development estimates, and similar matters.

Transportation modifications make minor modifications to transportation project maps and policies related to transportation funding, as recommended by the Tahoe Transportation Commission.

Changes made pursuant to these tables are highlighted in **grey** in the “track-change” versions of the Final Draft Plan and Code.

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS												
Area Plan Approval and Oversight Process																	
Level of local delegation	Bi-State Recommendation (level of delegation and appeal process paragraph I)	<p>I. ONCE AN AREA PLAN, AND ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODES WITH THE PLAN, HAVE BEEN FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH, AND INCORPORATED INTO, THE REGIONAL PLAN, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MAY ASSUME DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AUTHORITY BY MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING WITH TRPA, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING LIMITATIONS:</p> <p>A. The TRPA Governing Board shall annually review a sample of permits issued within each Area Plan, and shall certify that the Area Plans are being implemented in Conformance with the Regional Plan. If the TRPA Governing Board finds that development permitted within an Area Plan does not comply with the conforming Area Plan, TRPA may retract delegation of certain permitting authority and implement the conforming Area Plan.</p> <p>B. Approval of projects within Area Plans shall require TRPA review and approval if the project includes any of the following criteria, except for minor improvements as further specified in the code of ordinances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. All development within the High Density Tourist District; b. All development within the Shorezone of Lake Tahoe; c. All development within the Conservation District; d. All development within the Resort Recreation designation; e. All development meeting criteria on the following table: <table border="0" data-bbox="401 722 871 803"> <tr> <td>Regional Center</td> <td>Town Center</td> <td>Not in Center</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residential</td> <td>100,000 sq. ft.</td> <td>50,000 sq. ft.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Residential</td> <td>80,000 sq. ft.</td> <td>40,000 sq. ft.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>12,500 sq. ft.</td> </tr> </table> <p>The limitations specified in the Table above may be increased or decreased by the TRPA Governing Board if the Board finds that local governments, based on ongoing monitoring, reporting and performance review, are acting on projects consistent with the Area Plan and that the terms and conditions of the Area Plan are being met. After four years there will be a discussion on increased levels of delegation moving forward.</p>	Regional Center	Town Center	Not in Center	Residential	100,000 sq. ft.	50,000 sq. ft.	Non-Residential	80,000 sq. ft.	40,000 sq. ft.			12,500 sq. ft.	Update Policy LU-4.12	Update Sec. 13.7.3	Updated Policy LU-4.12 and code section 13.7.3 with specific provisions, consistent with the current level of plan/code detail.
Regional Center	Town Center	Not in Center															
Residential	100,000 sq. ft.	50,000 sq. ft.															
Non-Residential	80,000 sq. ft.	40,000 sq. ft.															
		12,500 sq. ft.															

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Appeals of local government decisions (part 1 of 2)	Bi-State Recommendation (level of delegation and appeal process paragraph II)	<p>II. Local Government decisions on delegated project applications may be appealed to the TRPA subject to the following criteria and process:</p> <p>A. Appeals shall be limited to whether the decision by a local government is in accordance with an approved Area Plan and its implementing ordinances consistent with the Regional Plan and Compact.</p> <p>B. Appeals can only be filed by an “aggrieved person” as defined in the Compact [Article VI (j) (3)].</p> <p>C. Appellants who would be subject to the Compact’s exhaustion provision (see Article VI (j) (3)) must demonstrate that they have exhausted all administrative remedies prior to appealing a decision to TRPA. It is recognized that public agencies have a specific role defined in the Compact; however, public agencies are encouraged to engage lead agencies as early as possible when projects are being processed pursuant to approved Area Plans.</p> <p>D. An appellant must file an appeal application to TRPA within 15 calendar days of the last local government decision.</p> <p>a. The application to TRPA must include:</p> <p>i. A clearly written statement explaining the grounds for appeal.</p> <p>ii. A \$1,000 TRPA appeal fee (with the local government appeal fee not to exceed the TRPA fee for appeals.)</p> <p>iii. Appellants are required to provide documentation to support their claims, and the applicant or lead agency may also augment the record.</p> <p>E. Once an application is received by TRPA, the project approved by the local government is stayed pending the outcome of the appeal.</p> <p>F. Within 60 days after receipt of an appeal, TRPA staff will make a recommendation on whether the appeal is frivolous as defined in II A, B, and C. This recommendation will serve as the basis for the TRPA Governing Board in its decision to proceed with an appeal hearing. The voting structure for appeal decisions will be the same as project votes before the Governing Board as defined in the Compact.</p> <p>G. The TRPA Governing Board may take action the first time the appeal is presented to the board or, after hearing the appeal, defer action to the next Governing Board meeting.</p> <p>a. Appeal review and action by the TRPA Governing Board is limited to whether the decision by a local government is in accordance with an approved Area Plan and its implementing ordinances consistent with the Regional Plan and Compact.</p> <p>b. If no action is taken by the TRPA Governing Board at the initial meeting at which the appeal is presented, the Governing Board must take action at the Governing Board meeting the following month.</p> <p>H. Appeals upheld by the TRPA Governing Board nullify the local government decision and the project applicant would be required to re-apply to the local government.</p> <p>I. In very limited circumstances, consistent with Goal III. C below, the TRPA Governing Board may modify a local government decision on a project to make the decision consistent with the Area Plan.</p>	Update Policy LU-4.12, IAP-1.3	New Sec. 13.9; Updated Secs. 2.2.2.A.1.R, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.N, 13.1.3, 13.7.1, 13.7.2, 13.7.3 and 13.7.4.	<p>Updated Policy LU-4.12 to establish appeal process, outline appeal goals and cite details in code. Established new code section 13.9 with specific appeal provisions.</p> <p>Updated Policy IAP-1.3 and numerous code sections with general language to reflect the change from “exempted” activities to “delegated” project review under Area Plans, including code sections 2.2.2.A.1.R, 2.3.1, 2.3.2.N, 13.1.3, 13.7.1, 13.7.2, 13.7.3 and 13.7.4.</p>
Appeals of local government decisions (part 2 of 2)	Bi-State Recommendation (level of delegation and appeal process paragraph II)	<p>III. Appeal Process Goals</p> <p>A. Eliminate frivolous appeals and appellants “laying in wait” by encouraging early and consistent engagement.</p> <p>B. Increase procedural certainty and timeliness (irrespective of outcomes).</p> <p>C. Establish that project-by-project negotiation should not be the Governing Board’s default position.</p>	See above	See above	See above

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Development Allocations and Transfers					
Commodities (aka Development Allocations)	Bi-State Recommendation (Commodities)	<p>The group supports the commodities reflected in DEIS Alternative #3, with clarifying language below in italics:</p> <p>Residential Allocations: 2600 Residential Bonus Units: 600 (to be used in centers) Commercial Floor Area: 200,000 (provided existing 383,000 available CFA square footage is first exhausted) Tourist Accommodation Units: -0-</p> <p>There is no automatic recharge of commodities; however, the group recognizes that in the event commodities are exhausted the TRPA Governing Board may consider additional allocations. +C16</p>	Update Policies LU-2.1, LU-3.6, LU-3.7 and DP-2.2	Update Secs. 50.4 and 52.3.1. Delete introduction boxes at the beginning of chapter 50 and 52.	<p>Updated Policies LU-3.6 and 3.7 to clarify that there is no automatic reloading of commodities. Updated Policy LU-2.1, DP-2.2 and Code Section 50.4 to reflect allocation limits and the restrictions on CFA and Bonus Units; and to clarify regulatory and non-regulatory aspects of allocation accounting tables. Updated section 52.3.1 to include new bonus units.</p> <p>Deleted table of alternatives and language about commodity recharges from the chapter 50 and 52 introduction sheets.</p> <p>Note that as drafted, future releases of additional CFA would be addressed during the one year evaluation of the annual release system. Additional CFA is not authorized for release in 2013 since over 300,000 sf is still available.</p>
Phased release of Allocations/LOS Monitoring	Mitigation Measure 3.3-1	3.3-1: Phased Release of Allocations / LOS Monitoring / Travel Demand Management. TRPA will develop and implement a program for the phased release of land use allocations in four-year cycles in conjunction with future updates of the Regional Plan and RTP. Two years after each release, monitoring of existing and near-term LOS will occur at intersections and roadways to evaluate compliance with applicable LOS policies. Should LOS projections indicate that applicable LOS goals and policies will not be met, actions will be undertaken to maintain compliance.	Update Policy DP-2.2	Update Sec 50.4	Updated Policy DP-2.2 and code Section 50.4 to include this provision and mitigation 3.3-3 below.
Phased release of Allocations/LOS Monitoring	Mitigation Measure 3.3-3	3.3-3: Implement Additional VMT Reduction. To ensure that the VMT Threshold Standard is achieved, TRPA will develop and implement a program for the phased release of land use allocations followed by monitoring and forecasting of actual roadway traffic counts and VMT. New CFA, TAUs, and Residential Allocations will be authorized for release by the TRPA Governing Board every four years, beginning with the approval of the Regional Plan. Approval of the release of allocations will be contingent upon demonstrating, through modeling and the use of actual traffic counts, that the VMT Threshold Standard will be maintained over the subsequent four-year period.	Update Policy DP-2.2	Update Sec 50.4	Updated Policy DP-2.2 and code Section 50.4 to include this provision and mitigation 3.3-1 above.

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Annual Distribution of Allocations	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For 2013, up to 130 residential allocations (5% of 20-year supply) should be released to local governments using the same jurisdictional split and allocation release provisions as are currently specified in Code Chapter 50. The following residential allocations would be available for each local government and would be specified in Code Section 50.4.1.C: Douglas County 7.14% - 9 allocations max El Dorado County 37.76% - 49 allocations max Placer County 22.45% - 29 allocations max City of South Lake Tahoe 15.99% - 21 allocations max Washoe County 16.67% - 22 allocations max Total 130 allocations max • For 2013, CFA that is currently held by local governments should remain with local governments and be distributed in accordance with current code provisions. CFA that is currently held by TRPA should be retained by TRPA for development transfer matches and other region-wide programs. • Extend the code provision allowing local governments to retain unused allocations each year (Code Section 50.4.1.D). The provision is currently set to expire upon adoption of the Updated Regional Plan. • Add a review and update of the performance system for allocation releases (residential and non-residential) to Regional Plan Attachment 4 (Preliminary List of Priority Projects) for completion in 2013. The Local Government Committee is tasked with reviewing the allocation release system and providing recommendations to the Governing Board. 	Update Attachment 5	Update Secs. 50.5.1.C, 50.5.1.D, 50.5.2.E and 50.6.4.E.	<p>Updated Attachment 5 (previously 4) to reflect the 2013 performance system review.</p> <p>Updated chapter 50 sections to reflect changes for 2013.</p>

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
TAU Transfer Policy	Bi-State Recommendation (TAU Transfer Policy)	<p>The group recommends the following related to TAUS:</p> <p>Transferred TAUs may be used to entitle, on a one-to-one basis, unit sizes described in subparagraph (b) below, provided the proposed project (receiving site) will be a professionally managed tourist accommodation facility containing three or more of the following on-site guest amenities or services:</p> <p>a. On-site guest amenities or services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) front desk/check-in/lobby (ii) business center (iii) spa services (iv) fitness facility (v) restaurant (vi) bar (vii) conference space (viii) concierge’s services (ix) pool or other resort recreation facilities (x) valet/below structure parking (xi) housekeeping (xii) bell desk <p>b. Providing three or more of the on-site guest amenities or services in subparagraph (a) are provided, 80% of the tourist accommodation units may be up to 1,200 square feet, with kitchens, and no more than 20% of the project’s floor area may contain units not to exceed 1,800 square feet, with kitchens.</p> <p>c. When transferred TAUs are utilized for smaller tourist accommodation facilities that are not operated as destination resorts, the facility must be professionally managed, units shall not be rented for a period longer than 29 days, and TAUs may be up to 850 square feet in size.</p> <p>d. This transfer policy applies to hotels or timeshares and fractional units within a professionally managed tourist accommodation facility.</p> <p>e. The group supports the creation of a pilot program allowing the conversion of a limited number of TAUs to ERUs for multi-unit projects. Each TAU can be used for a maximum of 1,250 sq. ft. of residential floor area on the same parcel.</p>	None	Update Sec. 51.5.2.K (TAU Transfer Limits); Expand Sec 50.9 (TAU Conversions)	<p>For the pilot project, added a new subsection to Section 50.9, which limits the pilot program to 200 units total, along with monitoring provisions.</p> <p>Updated section 51.5.2.K to reflect other provisions.</p>
Site-specific transfer ratios	Bi-State Recommendation (Site Specific Transfer Ratios) and RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 1)	<p>The group recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Add to the TRPA “to do” list a review of the efficacy of the ratios; b. Remove references to increased ratios in the area plans in proposed Code Section 13.5.3.B.4 except for Stream Restoration Plan Areas; c. Leave the designation of Meeks and Motel 6 and add the Tahoe City golf course in Stream Restoration Plan Areas. <p>RPU Committee: Delete the Tahoe City Golf Course from the list of Stream Restoration Priority Areas that may utilize alternative development transfer ratios.</p>	Update Attachment 5	Update Sec. 13.5.3.B.4	<p>Updated Attachment 5 (previously 4) to include the transfer ratio review.</p> <p>Updated Sec. 13.5.3.B.4 to limit alternative transfer ratios to stream restoration priority areas.</p>

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Affordable Housing	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 3) and Mitigation Measure 13.12-2	<p>Prioritize an evaluation of affordable housing policies on the “to-do” list for completion following adoption of the Regional Plan Update.</p> <p>3.12-2: Prepare a Regional Housing Needs Program and Implement Recommendations. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA shall coordinate with local governments and other organizations to develop and implement a Regional Housing Needs Program. The Housing Needs Program will evaluate progress towards the adopted housing goals and recommend policy and ordinance changes necessary to achieve housing goals. Changes may include, but are not limited to, the conversion of residential allocations to bonus units that would be available only for the construction of affordable and/or moderate-income housing, the creation of new bonus units for affordable housing and modification of development standards to promote housing affordability.</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; New Attachment 4, Update Attachment 5	None	Created new Policy ME-3.5 and Attachment 4 for mitigation measures that are not otherwise incorporated into Plan and/or Code. Renumbered old Attachment 4 to 5. Also updated Attachment 5 to reflect RPU Committee prioritization.
Community Character					
Maximum building height in High-Density Tourist District	Bi-State Recommendation (High Density Tourist District: Maximum Height)	A maximum of 197 feet of building height may be permitted within the high density tourist district, limited to replacement structures, provided, the structures to be demolished and replaced are an existing casino hotel, with existing structures of at least eight stories, or 85 feet of height as measured from the lowest point of natural grade.	Update CD-2.1.C.1	Update Table 13.5.3-1 in Sec. 13.5.3	Updated Policy CD-2.1.C.1 and Table 13.5.3-1 in Sec. 13.5.3 to reflect limitation.
Building Height Findings	Mitigation Measure 3.9-1	<p>3.9-1a: Comply with Specific Findings and Performance Standards for Additional Building Height. To mitigate for potentially significant scenic impacts resulting from three- or four-story buildings in the 10 Town Centers, and from three- to six-story buildings in the Regional Center, TRPA will apply the applicable TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapter 37, Height Standards; Section 37.7, Findings for Additional building Height; or equivalent findings established in an Area Plan.</p> <p>3.9-1b: Permit Redevelopment of the High Density Tourist District within Existing Visual Prominence. To mitigate for potentially significant scenic impacts resulting from buildings up to 197 feet in the High Density Tourist District, TRPA will require that any proposed development in the High Density Tourist District achieve the following performance standard: --The height and visual mass of any redeveloped existing high-rise structures projecting above the forest canopy shall not increase the visual prominence over baseline conditions as viewed and evaluated from key scenic viewpoints, including, but not limited to, views from the Van Sickle Bi-State Park, scenic roadway units, scenic shoreline units, and public recreation areas. When considering visual prominence, the following factors will be considered: building mass, contrast, location, articulation, color, materials and architectural style; and the quality of landscape features and views that are blocked or revealed.</p>	None	Update Table 13.5.3-1 in Sec. 13.5.3. New subsection 37.7.16 and 37.7.17	<p>Updated Code Table 13.5.3-1 to specify required findings.</p> <p>Updated chapter 37 with new height findings for High Density Tourist District (37.7.17) and Town/Regional centers (37.7.16).</p>

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Height for stepped buildings	Mitigation Measure 3.9-1c	Mitigation Measure 3.9-1c: Reduce Ground Floor Height for Stepped Buildings on Slopes --For the purposes of measuring the height of proposed stepped buildings on sloping sites with a cross slope of 10 percent or greater, TRPA will amend the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 37, Height Standards, to require that the maximum height of the ground floor segment not exceed 28 feet.	None	Update Sec. 37.4.2	Updated Section 37.4.2 to reflect additional limitation.
Community design requirements in Area Plans	Bi-State Recommendation (Community Character part 1A)	The group recommends the following community design standards (reference 13.5.3 D 1.): Area Plans that include the Regional Center or Town Centers shall address the following design standards: a. Existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall connect properties within Centers to transit stops and the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian network. b. Area Plans shall encourage the protection of views of Lake Tahoe. c. Within town and regional centers, building height and density should be varied with some buildings smaller and less dense than others. d. Site and building designs within Centers shall promote pedestrian activity and provide enhanced design features along public roadways. Enhanced design features to be considered include increased setbacks, stepped heights, increased building articulation, and/or higher quality building materials along public roadways. e. Area Plans shall include strategies for protecting undisturbed sensitive lands and, where feasible, establish park or open space corridors connecting undisturbed sensitive areas within Centers to undisturbed areas outside of Centers.	Update CD-2.1	New Sec. 13.5.3.D.1.b; Updated Sec. 13.6.5.C	Updated Policy CD-2.1 with a new subparagraph A and added a new code subsection 13.5.3.D.1.b to reflect additional design standards in Town Centers and the Regional Centers. Also updated Sec. 13.6.5.C to correct a related error in the April Draft. The intro should cite "subparagraphs A and B" to be consistent with the policy plan.
Modification to Center boundary	Bi-State Recommendation (Community Character part 1B)	The group also recommends the following language as an addition to the community design standards (reference the addition of an E. to 13.5.3): Town Center, Regional Center and High Density Tourist District Boundaries When Area Plans propose modifications to the boundaries of a Town Center, Regional Center, or High Density Tourist District, the modification shall comply with the following: a. Boundaries of centers shall be drawn to include only properties that have been developed. Any undeveloped parcels that are included in Centers shall have at least three sides adjacent to developed parcels. b. Properties included in a Center shall be less than 1/4 mile from existing Commercial and Public Service uses. c. Properties included in a Center shall encourage and facilitate the use of existing or planned transit stops and transit systems.	Update CD-2.1	Sec. 13. 5.3.E (new)	Updated Policy CD-2.1 with a new subparagraph G and created a new code subsection 13.5.3.E to reflect new standards for modifications to center boundaries. Clarified application of "at least three sides adjacent to developed parcels" in relation to irregular parcels and what is considered "developed".

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Maximum height density and coverage outside community centers	Bi-State Recommendation (Community Character part 1C)	The group further recommends that (reference CD2.1B.1) TAUs and affordable housing be deleted; that a footnote (reference Table 13.5.3-1 [2]) be deleted that reads: "Except Area Plans may identify higher-density areas adjacent to town centers, regional centers, and the High-Density Tourist District and in other areas permitted by the Regional Plan"; and that a statement be included that "Community Plans outside of Town Centers shall not be eligible for additional height and density."	Update LU-2.11 (B & C) and CD-2.1.C.1	Update Table 13.5.3-1, Sec. 37.4.1 and Sec 90.2	<p>Updated Policy CD-2.1.C.1 (formerly CD-2.1.B.1) to delete TAUs (1987 language) and affordable housing (2012 draft).</p> <p>Updated Table 13.5.3-1 notes to reflect and clarify endorsed language.</p> <p>Updated Sec 37.4.1 and added a definition for "Center" in Sec 90.2. to further clarify that height and density allowances in Centers do not apply in Community Plan areas outside of town centers.</p> <p>Updated Policy LU-2.11 (B & C) and Code Section 30.4.2.B to limit increases in coverage to Centers (not Community Plans).</p>
Level of Service	Bi-State Recommendation (Community Character part 2)	<p>II. Level of Service</p> <p>The group recommends language (to replace the final bullet in T-10.7) to read: These vehicle LOS (Level of Service) standards may be exceeded when provisions for multi-modal amenities and/or services (such as transit, bicycling and walking facilities) are adequate to provide mobility for users at a level that is proportional to the project generated traffic in relation to overall traffic conditions on affected roadways.</p>	Update T-10.7	None	Updated Policy T-10.7 to reflect change.

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Recreation Areas and Uses					
Development in Recreation and Resort Recreation Districts	Bi-State Recommendation (New "Resort Recreation" Designation)	The group recommends replacing the Draft RPU provisions regarding additional uses and subdivisions in recreation districts by establishing a new "Resort Recreation" designation and limiting the new development and subdivision allowances in to this new district. The group further supports mapping the Heavenly California Base parcels and the Edgewood Mountain parcels with this new "Resort Recreation" designation in which TAUs, residential and commercial development could be allowed (including appropriate accessory uses). The designation of those mapped Heavenly and Edgewood parcels is subject to the following conditions conditioned that 1) the parcels must become part of an approved area plan; 2) subdivisions will be limited to "air or condos" (no lot and block subdivisions); 3) development is transferred in from outside the designated area; and 4) transfers result in the retirement of development. All areas currently designated "Recreation" in the existing Regional Plan would remain unchanged.	Update LU-4.1 and Map 1	Update Secs. 11.6.2.A.5 and 13.5.3. Delete Sec. 14.9.5.	Updated Policy LU-4.1, Map 1, and code section 11.6.2.A to establish and define the new "Resort Recreation" district as the specific areas identified on Map 1. Updated Section 13.5.3.C.3 to reflect additional limitations. Deleted Section 14.9.5 to only permit opportunities for additional resort recreation development in Area Plans.
Recreation Mitigation	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 4 deleting mitigation measure 3.2-2)	Delete Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 (Revise Requirements for Development in the Recreation District)	None	None	Mitigation is addressed with Resort Recreation Provisions
Land Coverage					
Hydrologically Related Area provisions for excess coverage mitigation fees	Bi-State Recommendation (Land Coverage paragraph I)	I. Transfers Across Hydrologic Zones – Excess Coverage Fees The group supports a change to allow for the use of excess coverage mitigation fees outside the hydrologic zone in which the fees are collected to achieve more strategic environmental benefit.	None	Update Sec 30.6.1.B.3	Action affirms changes in Draft Plan and Code. Note that limits on the use of excess coverage mitigation fees are not in plan or code - just in MOUs with land bank agencies. Code update specifies that fees may be used across HRA boundaries.
Hydrologically Related Area provisions for coverage transfers	Bi-State Recommendation (Land Coverage paragraph II)	II. Transfers Across Hydrologic Zones – Land Coverage Transfers Add to the TRPA "to do" list a detailed review of coverage transfers across hydrologic zones. This review will include presentations from the California Tahoe Conservancy and the Nevada Land Bank/Nevada Division of State Lands.	Update LU-2.11 and Attachment 5	Update Sec 2.2.2.A.1.F and Sec 30.4.3, subsections B.2.A, E and F	Action reverses removal of HRA restrictions for coverage transfers. Updated policy LU-2.11 to reinstate HRA restriction. Updated Attachment 5 with "to-do" item. Updated code sections 2.2.2.A.1F, 30.4.3.B.2.A, 30.4.3.E and 30.4.3.F to reinstate HRA restrictions, along with existing rules and procedures for exceptions.
Hydrologically Related Area provisions for offsite coverage mitigation	Bi-State Recommendation (Land Coverage paragraph III)	III. Offsite Land Coverage Mitigation The group supports a change to allow for offsite restoration across hydrologic boundaries for excess coverage mitigation purposes, provided the restoration occurs on more sensitive lands than the project area.	None	Update Sec. 30.6.1.B.2	Action adds limitation to draft plan provision (See Sec. 30.6.1.B.2).

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Coverage credits and exemptions	Bi-State Recommendation (Land Coverage paragraph IV)	<p>IV. Land Coverage Allowances</p> <p>The group supports the coverage allowances and exemption proposed in the regional plan update for decks, sheds, and pervious coverage. The group further supports the proposed regional plan update exemptions for bike paths and ADA compliance.</p>	None	Update Sec. 30.4.6	Affirms draft plan/code provisions, and adds ADA facilities to coverage exemptions. Updated Sec. 30.4.6 to include ADA exemption. Note that limitations in the "project description" in alternative 4 of the EIS were included as requirements, along with mitigation measure provisions below.
Mitigation for coverage credits and exemptions	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.8-4 (A-D)	<p>3.8-4: Coverage Exemption Requirements. TRPA will:</p> <p>A. Temporary Coverage</p> <p>--Amend Code to specify that the temporary coverage exemption does not apply to structures or facilities used for motorized vehicle access, parking, or storage.</p> <p>--Amend Code to specify that only parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the temporary coverage exemption. As part of this provision, the exempted temporary coverage must also have BMPs installed and maintained to meet TRPA requirements.</p> <p>--Limit the temporary coverage exemption to 2 percent of the total amount of high capability land on a parcel or 120 square feet, whichever is less, provided that the temporary coverage meets BMP requirements and is located on high capability land (LCDs 4-7).</p> <p>B. Pervious Decks</p> <p>--Amend Code to specify that only residential parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the pervious deck exemption.</p> <p>--Amend Code to include design characteristics that qualify a pervious deck for exemption that can be easily interpreted by both TRPA staff and homeowners in the Region. For example: "a pervious deck shall have gaps that allow water to pass freely and in a distributed fashion to deck armoring underneath the deck meeting BMP requirements in the BMP Handbook".</p> <p>--Limit the pervious deck exemption to 5 percent of the total amount of high capability land on a parcel or 750 square feet, whichever is less, provided that the pervious deck meets BMP requirements and is located on high capability land (LCDs 4-7).</p> <p>C. Pervious Coverage Exemption</p> <p>--Amend Code to specify that only parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the pervious coverage exemption.</p> <p>--Amend Code to restrict the coverage credit of pervious coverage to locations with low sediment loads (e.g., locations that don't receive road abrasives, locations that are not tributary to runoff that may contain road abrasives, locations that are not tributary to runoff associated with erodible surfaces) unless a redundant infiltration BMP is in place.</p> <p>D. Aggregate of Coverage Exemptions and Credits on Developed Parcels</p> <p>--Amend Code to restrict the total exemption for temporary coverage and pervious decks; and the pervious coverage credit to be in aggregate no more than 10 percent of total amount of high capability land on a parcel.</p>	None	Update Sec. 30.4.6	Updated Sec. 30.4.6 to include additional restrictions.

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Mitigation for bike trail coverage exemption	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.8-4 (E)	3.8-4: Coverage Exemption Requirements. TRPA will: E. Non-Motorized Trail Exemption --Develop design guidelines for non-motorized trails that address sensitivity of conditions in LCDs 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, and 3. --Limit the maximum amount of allowable exempted coverage under this policy for high capability lands to the trail networks identified in the Lake Tahoe Region Bike Trail and Pedestrian Plan (TMPO 2010) and other necessary trail connections to the trails identified in the Lake Tahoe Region Bike Trail and Pedestrian Plan.	Update LU-2.11	Update Sec. 30.4.6	Updated Policy LU-2.11 to include trails on the list of activities eligible for exemption (clean up item). Updated Section 30.4.6 to reflect new limitations.
Mitigation for ADA coverage exemption	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.8-4 (F)	3.8-4: Coverage Exemption Requirements. TRPA will: F. ADA Exemption --Explicitly clarify in the policy that exempted coverage may not be associated with vehicle use (e.g., parking spaces). --Amend Code to specify that only parcels with installed and maintained BMPs meeting TRPA requirements shall qualify for the ADA Exemption.	None	Update Sec. 30.4.6	Updated Sec. 30.4.6 to reflect new limitations, along with the EIS "project description" for ADA coverage exemptions.
Coverage Management within 300 feet of Lake Tahoe	Bi-State Recommendation (Land Coverage paragraph V) and RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 2)	V. Area-wide Coverage Management Plans The group supports the position that the benefits of a comprehensive area wide coverage management plan shall not accrue to the areas within 300 feet from the high water mark and coverage in that zone shall be governed by the current Regional Plan. Property owners that elect not to participate in area-wide coverage management plans shall continue to be subject to the coverage provisions under the 1987 Regional Plan. RPU Committee: Make technical adjustments for coverage requirements within 300 feet of Lake Tahoe to exclude small areas on the mountain side of State Highways 89 and 28 within the Tahoe City and Kings Beach Town Centers from requirements for coverage within 300 feet of Lake Tahoe.	Update Land Use Policy LU-2.11	Update Secs. 13.5.3.B.1. and 30.4.2.B.1	Updated Policy LU-2.11, code section 13.5.3.B.1 and code section 30.4.2.B.1 to reflect new limitations.
Land Capability Verifications	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 6)	Eliminate draft code amendments that would waive requirements for Field Verification of Land Capability in certain instances (Section 30.3.3.H) and prioritizing an expanded "to-do" item in Regional Plan Attachment 4 (Preliminary List of Priority Projects) related to implementation of a certified contractor program and consideration of additional procedural improvements related to the Land Capability Verification process.	Update Attachment 5	Delete Sec. 30.3.3.H. Update Sec. 30.3.3.A	Deleted Section 30.3.3.H and reference in section 30.3.3.A, which would have authorized field verification waivers in certain cases. Expanded work program in Attachment 5.
Water Quality					
TMDL	Bi-State Recommendation (TMDL Section)	The group recommends inclusion of the following language: TRPA will utilize the water quality improvement plan for registered catchments, or TRPA default standards when there are no registered catchments, in the conformance review of area plans. The TMDL regulatory agencies will, through the TMDL adaptive management system, provide to TRPA: Annual progress reporting and analysis; Copies of all MOAs and NPDES permits; Notification of all breaches or violations of MOAs or NPDES permits. Further, the Regional Plan Update provides for annual audits of each local jurisdiction's permitting actions under its approved area plan. TRPA will use catchment data and all reporting to inform area plan re-certification every four years.	Update LU-4.12	Code Secs. 13.6.5.B, 13.8.2 and 13.8.5	Included general language citing TMDL coordination in LU-4.12 (merged with delegation and appeal provisions). Added conformance review items to Section 13.6. Added other provisions to Sections 13.8.2 and 13.8.3.

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
TMDL - Water Quality Introduction	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.1)	<p>1. The Water Quality Subelement Introduction currently describes the TMDL and the pollutants of concern. NDEP and Lahontan recommend adding clarifying language to the introduction that paraphrases how TRPA supports pollutant load reductions from each source category. Suggested language reads as follows:</p> <p>The Regional Plan supports pollutant load reductions from each source category in the following ways:</p> <p>Atmospheric Deposition: Land Use and Transportation policies support the reduction of nitrogen emissions and fine sediment particles and phosphorus that are entrained as road dust through encouraging walkable mixed use community centers and a connected bicycle and pedestrian network, which reduce automobile dependency. Furthermore, policies seek to control emissions from residential wood smoke and target other stationary dust sources by requiring application and maintenance of temporary and permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs).</p> <p>Forested Uplands: Sources of fine sediment particles from Forest Uplands include disturbed forest lands, unpaved roads and trails, and paved or impervious surfaces. Water Quality and Vegetation policies target reducing fine sediment particles from these sources by requiring application and maintenance of temporary and permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) and by promoting restoration of disturbed lands.</p> <p>Stream Channel Erosion: Vegetation policies promote protection, maintenance, and restoration of riparian plant communities and Water Quality policies promote infiltration within naturally functioning floodplains. Soils and Stream Environment Zone policies emphasize reestablishment of natural fluvial processes, limit coverage in sensitive areas, and protect, maintain and restore Stream Environment Zones.</p> <p>Urban Uplands: Water Quality policies support the Lake Tahoe Total Daily Maximum Load, reduce or eliminate point and non-point sources of pollutants and allow area-wide water quality treatment as an alternative when it can be shown to achieve equal or greater water quality improvements. Land Use and Soils policies incentivize the removal and transfer of coverage in sensitive areas and Vegetation policies promote the use of native and nutrient efficient vegetation in urban areas.</p>	Update Water Quality Introduction	None	Updated WQ introduction.
TMDL - Atmospheric Deposition	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.2)	2. To remain consistent with the Atmospheric Deposition language drafted above, NDEP and Lahontan recommend amending Water Quality Policy WQ-3.11 and Air Quality Policy AQ-1.3 to include "entrained dust".	Update Policies WQ-3.10 and AQ-1.3	None	Updated Policies WQ-3.10 (WQ-3.11 was a typo) and AQ-1.3.
TMDL - Goal Alignment	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.3)	3. Water Quality Goal 3 – Non Point Sources can be better aligned with TMDL requirements. Suggestions recommend amend adding language "in a manner consistent with the Lake Tahoe TMDL, where applicable" to the end of the Goal.	Update Goal WQ-3	None	Updated Goal WQ-3
TMDL - Consistent Maintenance Reporting	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.4)	4. TRPA Code Chapter 50 – Allocation of Development, section 50.4.2.E.3 – EIP Program Implementation presents a duplicative reporting requirement for maintenance. The suggestion recommends replacing language referencing the Maintenance Efficiency Plan (MEP) with reference to TMDL annual reporting requirements.	None	Update Sec. 50.5.2.E.3	Updated Sec. 50.5.2.E.3 (formerly 50.4.2.E.3)

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
TMDL - Consistent Reporting of Salt/Deicer Use	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.5)	5. TRPA Code Chapter 60 – Water Quality, section 60.1.5.B – Salt and Abrasive Control Reporting presents a duplicative requirement with TMDL reporting. Suggested language recommends changing the title of section 60.1.5 to Deicers and Abrasive Control, changing the first sentence in section 60.1.5.B to read “Maintain a tracking and reporting program to monitor the use of deicers and/or abrasives in their respective jurisdictions pursuant to State of CA and NV requirements”, eliminating the next two middle sentences and retaining the last sentence.	None	Update Sec. 60.1.5	Updated Sec. 60.1.5
TMDL - Consistent Criteria for Constrained Sites	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.6)	6. TRPA Code Chapter 60 – Water Quality, section 60.4.8 – Special Circumstances recommended to be edited to include the following language from the Lahontan Basin Plan that allows flexibility for constrained properties who can’t infiltrate TRPA’s 20 year 1hr storm requirement: Infiltrating runoff volumes generated by the 20 year, 1-hour storm may not be possible in some locations due to shallow depth to seasonal groundwater levels, unfavorable soil conditions, or other site constraints such as existing infrastructure or rock outcroppings. For new development or redevelopment projects, site constraints do not include the existing built environment. In the event that site conditions do not provide opportunities to infiltrate the runoff volume generated by a 20 year, 1-hour storm, project proponents must either (1) meet the numeric effluent limits in outlined in TRPA Code Section 60.1.3 for the 20year 1 hour storm, or (2) Coordinate with the local municipality or state highway department to document that shared stormwater treatment facilities treating private property discharges and public right-of-way stormwater sufficiently contribute to meeting the jurisdiction’s average annual fine sediment particle and nutrient load reduction requirements.	None	Update Sec. 60.4.8.B	Updated Sec. 60.4.8.B
TMDL - Consistent Discharge Standards	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.7)	7. TRPA Code Chapter 60 – Water Quality, section 60.1.3 – Discharge Limits differ from Lahontan discharge standards. Because discharge standards were not evaluated in the EIS, it is recommended to add Discharge Standards to the Preliminary List of Priority Projects to evaluate and resolve any inconsistencies.	Update Attachment 5	None	Updated Attachment 5
TMDL - BMP Priority Areas	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.8)	8. TRPA Code Chapter 60 – Water Quality, section 60.4.4 - Priority Watersheds are no longer relevant because priority watershed deadlines have passed and do not reflect TMDL load reduction priorities. Suggestions recommend replacing existing priority watershed language with “BMP installation and maintenance shall be prioritized in areas that achieve the greatest load reduction consistent with local jurisdiction load reduction plans.”	None	None	The Working Group decided not to modify any language because TRPA does not enforce TMDL priorities. (Updates to Sec. 60.4.4. had been proposed)
TMDL - BMP Priority Areas	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 7.9)	9. The Water Quality Subelement Summary of Coordinated Water Quality Policies, Programs, Laws, & Monitoring/Tracking Table is recommended to be deleted from the Regional Plan and included instead as part of the updated 208 Water Quality Management Plan roles and responsibilities matrix.	Update Water Quality Introduction	None	Updated Water Quality Introduction
Air Quality					
General: Air quality	Bi-State Recommendation (Air Quality)	"The group recommends, and affirms its support, for the proposed RPU in relation to 8 hour ozone standards, disbursement of air quality mitigation fees, and the prohibition of biomass facilities as described."	None	None	Action affirms changes in Draft Plan and Code. No amendments are needed.
Air quality mitigation fees	RPU Committee 8/14/12 (Item 8)	Include Alternative 4 amendments related to air quality mitigation fees into the final Draft Code. Amendments to Code Section 65.2.3.F would modify the time period that businesses must remain open before having to having to pay new air quality mitigation fees upon re-opening from 90 consecutive days in a two year period to 90 consecutive days in a five year period.	None	Update Sec. 65.2.3.F	Updated Sec. 65.2.3.F
Air quality fee - mitigation	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.4-9	Mitigation Measure 3.4-8: Maintain Level of Air Quality Mitigation Improvements. TRPA will evaluate and adjust the Air Quality Mitigation Fee program to ensure that no decrease in the level of air quality improvements would result from the change in the eligible time period for a previous use from 2 to 5 years.	None	None	Addressed with other air quality amendments.

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Construction Emissions	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.4-2	<p>3.4-2: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for Construction Emissions. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate with local governments to develop and effectuate the implementation of Best Construction Practices for Construction Emissions that require, as a condition of project approval, implementation of feasible measures and Best Management Practices to reduce construction-generated emissions to the extent feasible. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. Where local ordinances, rules, or regulations already require Best Construction Practices for construction emissions, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances, rules, or regulations do not adequately address Best Construction Practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 4	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 4
TAC Emissions	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.4-5	<p>3.4-5: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for TAC Emissions during Construction. Within twelve months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate with local governments to develop and effectuate the implementation of Best Construction Practices for Construction Emissions that requires, as a condition of project approval, implementation of feasible measures to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to construction-related TAC emissions. Until that time, TRPA will continue the existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. Where local ordinances, rules, or regulations already require Best Construction Practices for construction emissions, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances, rules, or regulations do not adequately address Best Construction Practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 4	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 4
GHG Emission Reduction	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.5-1	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.5-1: Implement Sustainability Measures with Performance Standard. Within twelve months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate with local governments to develop and effectuate the implementation of a GHG Emission Reduction Policy addressing Best Construction Practices and ongoing operational efficiency. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. The policy will require implementation of measures for the reduction of GHG emissions generated by demolition and construction activity in the Region and by ongoing building and property operations. Where local ordinances already require GHG Emission Reductions consistent with the Policy, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances do not adequately address GHG reduction practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, measures identified in the final EIS for this plan.</p> <p>TRPA will require that GHG emissions from project-specific construction and operational activities permitted pursuant to and in accordance with the Regional Plan are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. As described in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, all feasible mitigation measures pertaining to mobile-source GHG emissions have been considered within the range of transportation strategies already included in the three RTP/SCS Transportation Strategy Packages. Through the grant awarded to the Lake Tahoe Region from the California Strategic Growth Council, a partnership of agencies and organizations are working on a Region-wide Sustainability Plan, which will address other primary sources of GHG emissions (i.e., energy use and efficiency, water supply and conservation, and solid waste). At such time a Sustainability Plan is completed for the Tahoe Region, TRPA will recognize and implement measures recommended in that plan along with other appropriate measures, as feasible.</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 4	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 4

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Noise					
Traffic Noise Mitigation	EIS Mitigation Measures 3.6-1	<p>3.6-1: Establish and Implement a Region-Wide Traffic Noise Mitigation Program. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate with local governments to develop and effectuate the implementation of a Region-wide traffic noise reduction program that will implement measures for reducing attaining and maintaining traffic noise levels to below applicable CNEL standards. Until that time, TRPA will continue its existing practice of requiring measures to be developed on a project-specific basis. Measures may include those required as conditions of approval for development projects and those to be implemented by TRPA to address cumulative, regional noise levels. Traffic noise mitigation measures will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, measures identified in the Final EIS for this plan.</p> <p>For projects that do not require environmental documentation beyond a checklist, TRPA may apply general noise reduction measures in the twelve months proceeding adoption of the Region-wide traffic noise reduction plan.</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 4	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 4
Construction Noise Mitigation	EIS Mitigation Measures 3.6-2	<p>3.6-2: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Exposure to Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate with local governments to develop and effectuate the implementation of a Best Construction Practices Policy for Minimization of Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. The policy will require implementation of measures for the reduction of noise generated by demolition and construction activity in the Region. Where local ordinances already require Best Construction Practices for construction noise, no further action is necessary. Where local government ordinances do not adequately address Best Construction Practices, those practices will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Measures for minimizing exposure to construction-generated noise may include, but are not limited to, measures identified in the final EIS for this plan.</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 4	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 4

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Construction Noise Mitigation	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.6-3	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-3: Develop and Implement a Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Construction-Generated Noise and Ground Vibration. The Best Construction Practices Policy for the Minimization of Construction Noise and Ground Vibration, which is required by Mitigation Measure 3.6-2, will also include measures to address vibration generated during construction and demolition activity. Measures required by the policy to reduce ground vibration may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☑ Sonic pile driving shall be performed instead of impact pile driving, where feasible; ☑ To further reduce pile-driving ground vibration impacts, holes shall be predrilled to the maximum feasible depth to reduce the number of blows required to seat the pile; ☑ All construction equipment on construction sites shall be operated as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as reasonably possible; ☑ No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would expose an existing structure to levels of ground vibration that exceeds 0.20 in/sec PPV. The vibration control program shall include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures. Established setback requirements may be waived with a project-specific analysis conducted by a qualified specialist that indicates that no structural damage would occur at nearby buildings or structures. ☑ No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would expose human activity in an existing building to levels of ground vibration that exceed FTA's 80 VdB standard. The vibration control program shall also include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing negative human response. Established setback requirements may be waived with a project-specific analysis by a qualified specialist that indicates that the buildings would not be exposed to ground vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB, confirmed by monitoring. <p>TRPA will only approve projects that would comply with the requirements of the Best Construction Practices Policy.</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 4	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 4

PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS TABLE

TOPIC	SOURCE OF CHANGE	ENDORSED TEXT	REGIONAL PLAN MODIFICATIONS	CODE MODIFICATIONS	COMMENTS
Exterior Noise Mitigation	EIS Mitigation Measure 3.6-4	<p>Mitigation Measure 3.6-4: Develop and Implement an Exterior Noise Policy for Mixed-Use Development. Within 12 months of adoption of an updated Regional Plan, TRPA will coordinate with local governments to develop and effectuate the implementation of an exterior noise standard, and related policies, for outdoor activity areas of mixed-use development. Until that time, TRPA will continue existing practice to require measures developed on a project-specific basis. Traffic noise mitigation measures will be implemented through local government and/or TRPA permitting activities. Development of the exterior noise standard will be based on health criteria for noise exposure and will take into account the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Pertinent guidance provided by the California Governor's Office of Research and Planning (OPR 2003: p.253-254); --Noise exposure standards established by local jurisdictions in the Region, including Douglas County Code 20.690.030, the Placer County General Plan (Placer County 1994: p. 139, 141), and the El Dorado County General Plan (El Dorado County 2004: p.116-117); --The health-related effects of noise exposure; --Any unique characteristics of the noise environment in the Region; and --Proximity and access to quiet outdoor areas from community centers in the Region (e.g., undeveloped areas, areas zoned by TRPA for urban outdoor recreation, rural outdoor recreation, or wilderness and roadless). <p>TRPA will not approve any proposed land use development project that would expose outdoor activity areas of residential and tourist accommodation uses to exterior noise levels that exceed the identified standard.</p>	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 4	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 4
Other					
BMP Compliance Options	Bi-State Recommendation (Additional Recommendation 1)	The group recommends that TRPA create a subcommittee of the TRPA Governing Board, along with interested parties, to explore options related to BMP compliance.	New Policy ME-3.5; Update Attachment 5	None	Referenced mitigations in Policy ME-3.5; Updated Attachment 5
Drive-up Pharmacy Pilot Program	Bi-State Recommendation (Additional Recommendation 2)	The group recommends TRPA develop and adopt a pilot program for drive-up pharmacy windows in the City of South Lake Tahoe, to be monitored for environmental impacts and evaluated for further opportunities in the Basin.	None	Update Sec 65.1.8.B	Updated Section 65.1.8.B to permit up to 2 new drive-up pharmacy windows for pilot program with monitoring provisions.
Development right acquisition and sustainable transportation	RPU Committee 08/14/12 (Item 9)	Develop a policy to support a development rights acquisition and land restoration program to the extent it would not impose a recirculation or burden on the EIS and to do an analysis of the environmental and community benefits for the development and implementation of a sustainable transportation infrastructure and operations program.	New Policies - LU-3.8 and T-1.5	None	Created New Policies - LU-3.8 and T-1.5 - to reflect support for programs.

GOAL and POLICY MODIFICATIONS

Item	Section/Element	Description	Recommendation	Rationale
1	Policy LU-2.1/ Land Use	Reflect Banked Development Rights	Update Development Rights Inventory table to reflect the CTC has 147 banked development rights, NDSL has 2 banked development rights and Placer County has 3 banked development rights. See attached table.	Non-regulatory provision - modified to reflect more accurate data.
2	Policy DP-2.2/ Implementation	Number of unused allocations remaining from 1987 plan.	Revise remaining allocations from 1987 Plan from 86 to 114 to reflect allocations that were rolled over from allocation years 2009 and 2010. Residential allocations used 1987-2012 is	Non-regulatory provision - modified to reflect more accurate data. Local jurisdictions informed staff that they had 28 unused allocations that they rolled over from pre-2011. Revise table consistent with Code Ch. 50.
3	CD-2.1	Grammatical error	Replace "substitution" with "substitute" in the introductory	Grammar
4	LU-4.11	Fix typo	LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AND TRIABAL GOVERNMENTS MAY ADOPT DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCES THAT SUPERSEDE TRPA ORDINANCES IF THE AREA PLAN AND ASSOCIATED ORDINANCES ARE FOUND IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE	Plan Cleanup
5	Attachment 1, page 9	Replace "Aerial" with "areal"	Attached Algae MANAGEMENT STANDARD Implement policy and management actions to reduce the aerial areal extent and density of periphyton (attached)	Correct grammar
6	New	Acknowledgements Page	Create plan Acknowledgements page and identify what organizations/individual will be	Final Document formatting
7	Glossary	Incorrect Code References	Correct Regional Plan Glossary references to reorganized Code sections. Add "Conforming Area Plan" to Glossary (Attachment 6) and define as " An Area Plan that has been found in conformance with the Regional Plan in accordance with Chapter 13 of the Code of	Plan Cleanup
8	LU-4.1	Correct text	With Resort Recreation, there are eight, not seven, Land Use Districts. In the Policy introduction, replace "seven" with	Plan Cleanup
9	CD-2.1.D.1	Undefined language	Remove capitalization from "Fire Defensible Space Requirements"	"fire defensible space requirements" is a general requirement, not a defined term, and should not be capitalized.
10	WQ-3.11		At the beginning of the last paragraph, replace "this" with "the" to read "In all aspects of the	Section relates to all BMPs
11	Throughout	Capitalization	Capitalize Regional Plan throughout the document.	Plan Cleanup
12	Throughout	Consistent terms	Refer to the code as the Code of Ordinances to be consistent with how it is referred to in the Regional Plan. Consistently use "Conforming Area Plan", instead of "Area Plan that has been found in	Plan Cleanup

Technical Regional Plan Modifications

13	Noise Element Introduction	Retain existing policy statement	Retain existing text in the Noise Element Introduction related to cumulative noise events on Transportation Corridors.	<p>This technical correction is needed to avoid an unintended change to the adopted "cumulative noise event levels (CNEL)" for transportation corridors. The language modification will result in no change to existing noise requirements.</p> <p>During final review of the Regional Plan, it was found that the Noise Element in the 1987 Plan included the "policy statement for CNEL levels along transportation corridors" in the listing of threshold standards with a footnote indicating the corridor standards as recommendations. These limitations were adopted as part of the 1987 Regional Plan but were never adopted as threshold standards. The other noise limitations that were also listed as threshold standards in the Noise Element introduction are adopted in Resolution 82-11. In practice, TRPA implements both the limitations in the Regional Plan and Resolution 82-11.</p> <p>The April Draft Plan deleted repetitive threshold standards from the Goal and Policy Plan, instead incorporating Resolution 82-11 by reference. The "policy statement for CNEL levels along transportation corridors" was deleted in the April Draft Plan in accordance with the overall approach for not repeating threshold standards to avoid duplication and inconsistency. The Draft IES did not analyze any changes to adopted Noise Standards.</p> <p>With this technical correction, the "policy statement for CNEL levels along transportation corridors" will be retained from the 1987 Regional Plan without changes.</p>
----	----------------------------	----------------------------------	--	---

CONSISTENT TERMS

Item	Section	Description	Recommendation	Rationale
1	Throughout	Consistent use of % vs. percent (spelled out).	Use "%" in tables. Spell out "percent in text.	Document Consistency
2	Throughout	Consistent use of acronyms.	Add master list of acronyms as new appendix to Code.	Document Consistency
3	Throughout	Memorandum of Understanding vs. Memoranda of Understanding.	Memorandum singular. Memoranda plural.	Document Consistency
3	Throughout	Capitalization	Consistent capitalization of districts, uses, and defined terms.	Document Consistency
4	Throughout	Only one Regional Center.	Regional Center should always be singular (not pluralized).	Document Consistency
5	Throughout	Relationship of community plans to Centers	Reference "and Centers" where community plans are referenced in code for allocation receiving areas and other topics.	Clarify that the benefits of community plans also apply in Centers.
6	Throughout	Centers	Replace references to "Town Centers, Regional Center, and High Density Tourist District" with	Brevity and Consistency - Note that "Center" is a defined term.

TECHNICAL CODE MODIFICATIONS

Item	Section	Description	Recommendation	Rationale
7	6.5.6	For basic project application and account information, identify if the project area is located within a conforming area plan.	Add new 6.5.8 <u>Area Plan</u> <u>If applicable, identification of the Area Plan in which the parcel is located.</u>	Consistency with existing application requirements that require identification of specific plan in which the parcel is located (e.g. PAS, community plan, master plan).
8	6.8	TRPA shall maintain current allocation reports for area plans, consistent with existing procedures to track allocations (e.g., residential, CFA, TAU, PAOT) assigned to local jurisdictions and plans.	Revise first sentence. TRPA shall maintain current allocation accounts and issue annual allocation account reports for each local jurisdiction, plan area statement, community plan, <u>area plan</u> , and specific or master plan.	Consistency with existing standards and procedures for regional tracking and accounting of allocations.
9	10.3.2	Regional Plan Overlay Maps	A. Plan Area Overlay The plan area overlay maps relate to the Plan Area Statements <u>and Area Plans</u> and indicate plan area boundaries, special area boundaries, community plan boundaries, redevelopment and master plan boundaries, hydrologic related areas boundaries, and other relevant information.	Consistency with recognition of official TRPA Maps.
10	13.5.3.B.3.f	Clarify that property owners with BMPs installed that are within an approved area-wide BMP plan are required to conform to current standards.	Consideration shall be given to properties that have already installed and maintained parcel-level BMPs, and financing components of area-wide BMP plans shall reflect prior BMP installation in terms of the charges levied against projects that already complied with BMP requirements with systems that are in place and operational <u>in accordance with applicable BMP standards.</u>	Clarifies that property owners must install <u>and maintain</u> BMPs in accordance with applicable standards.

Technical Code Modifications

11	13.6.4	Corrected grammar	"For Area Plans initiated and approved by a lead agency other than TRPA, the Area Plan shall be submitted to and reviewed by the TRPA Governing Board at a public hearing. Public comment shall be limited to consideration of issues raised by the public before the Advisory Planning Commission and issues raised by the Governing Board. The TRPA Governing Board shall make a finding that the Area Plan, including all zoning and development codes that are part of the Area Plan, is consistent with and furthers the goals and policies of the Regional Plan. This finding shall be referred to as a finding of conformance and shall be subject to the same voting requirements as approval of a Regional Plan amendment."	Improved grammar without changing intent of ordinance.
12	30.4.3.B.2 30.4.3.B.3	Clarify coverage rules for mixed use projects to treat mixed use projects the same as commercial projects.	Soft land coverage may be transferred in all cases; however, transfers to Commercial, Mixed-Use , or Tourist accommodation uses or facilities shall not be permitted, except for the following: Unused allowable base land coverage (i.e., potential coverage) referred to in subsection 30.4.1 may be transferred in all cases, except for transfers relating to commercial, mixed-use , or tourist accommodation uses or facilities. Land coverage transferred as mitigation for excess coverage associated with Commercial, Mixed-Use , and Tourist accommodation projects shall be existing hard coverage except as provided in subparagraph 2 above.	Mixed-Use projects should have the same limitations as Commercial and Tourist for types of coverage that can be transferred.
13	30.4.3.B.2.b 30.4.6.D.3.b.2 Table 30.6.3-1	Consistent reference to Land Capability Class 1b (SEZ).	Soft coverage may be transferred from Land Capability Class 1b (Stream Environment Zones) to community plans and Centers for all use types. Other areas in Land Capability District 1b (Stream Environment Zones) : Land Capability District 1b (SEZ)	In the identified Code references, new language used "Stream Environment Zone (Class 1b)". Proposed changes reverse references to Land Capability Class 1b (SEZ) consistent with existing Code language. SEZ is always Class 1b but Class 1B is not always SEZ. Class 1b includes SEZs, along with setbacks from SEZs.

Technical Code Modifications

14	30.4.6.D.3.b(5)	Define what constitutes a "large tree".	Trail Route Design Trail routes shall be designed to minimize disturbance of sensitive lands and removal of large trees and riparian vegetation. Particular areas to minimize disturbance of in the routing of trails are (in order of preference): (1) Federal jurisdictional wetlands as mapped by the Army Corps of Engineers; (2) Other Stream Environment Zones (land capability district 1b); (3) Other areas in land capability districts 1 and 2; (4) Areas in land capability district 3;	For trail routing considerations, define "large trees" as larger than 14 inches DBH to be consistent with other tree protection standards.
15	37.4.2	Add graphic representing the new ordinance for determining maximum height for buildings on slopes.	Add graphic to Section 37.4.2	More user-friendly Code.
16	50.3.1.A	Parcels assigned a development right.	Parcels which are located in Land Capability Districts 4, 5, 6, or 7, are within a community plan area, and are eligible for Tourist accommodation or Commercial uses, shall not have a development right. <u>Parcels that are removed from community plan areas and included in Area Plans shall not receive a development right with the change.</u>	Clarifies that as area plans replace community plans, parcels located within Centers are subject to the existing development right limitations and would not be granted a new development right. Does not change regional allocation count.
17	Table 50.4.1-1	Correct estimated number of unused allocations remaining from 1987 plan.	Revise remaining allocations from 1987 Plan from 86 to 114 to reflect allocations that were rolled over from allocation years 2009 and 2010. Residential allocations used 1987-2012 is changed to 5,973 remaining.	Non-regulatory provision - modified to reflect more accurate data. Local jurisdictions informed staff that they had 28 unused allocations that they rolled over from pre-2011. Revise table consistent with Code Ch. 50.
18	65.3.1	Add "Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan" to the statement "The requirements in this section are intended to implement Map 5 of the Regional Plan (Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities).	<u>Purpose</u> The requirements in this section are intended to implement Map 5 of the Regional Plan (Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities) <u>and the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</u>	Implements the Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
19	65.3.2.B	Not all of the facilities in the regional Bicycle and Pedestrian plan require easement dedication.	Instead of granting an easement, the land may be donated to a <u>public agency for public use, or the bicycle or pedestrian facility may be constructed and maintained by a public agency for public use</u> when the standards of Section 65.3.3 are met.	Clarifies that bicycle facilities on public roadways may be constructed, owned, and maintained by public agencies, rather than provided through an easement.
20	90	Existing Definition - Adjacent Parcels	Adjacent Parcels Parcels <u>that are separated by a lot line, or are</u> near or close to each other but separated by a right-of-way in such a manner that, if the right-of-way was removed, the boundaries would touch.	Existing definition doesn't include parcels with adjoining lot lines. Corrected definition is consistent with longstanding implementation.
21	90	Definition - Retired	Delete new definition of retired.	Avoid unintended consequences where term has different meanings in existing language.

Technical Code Modifications

22	90	Definition - Urban Areas	Those areas designated as residential, tourist, or commercial/public service, <u>or mixed-use</u> by the plan area statements.	Mixed-Use designation replaces Commercial and Public Service Land Use Classifications in a conforming area plan. Consistent with the existing definition of Urban Areas, Mixed-Use should be designated an urban area.
----	----	--------------------------	---	--

REFERENCE ERRORS IN CODE DOCUMENT

Item	Section	Description	Recommendation	Rationale
23	13.5.3.B.1	Reference error	Delete final sentence - <i>See also Section 1.1.1: Land Coverage Requirements for Conforming Area Plans.</i>	There is no section called Land Coverage Requirements for Conforming Area Plans.
24	30.4.1.C.2.b(i)3	Reference error	Highways, streets, and roads referred to in subsection 30.4.2.A.3.	References correct Code section.
25	30.4.3.B.5	Reference error	Land coverage transferred for water quality control facilities pursuant to subsection 30.4.2.A.5 shall be in accordance with 1 through 3 above, or shall be mitigated through restoration in accordance with subsection 30.5.3, in the amount of 1.5 times the area of land covered or disturbed fro the project beyond that permitted by the coefficients in Table 30.4.1-1	References correct Code section for coverage transfers for water quality control facilities.
26	31.4.2	Incorrect chapter reference	A timeshare use (residential design) in an adopted community plan area may increase the permitted density by a factor of two, or a timeshare use (residential design) in an adopted TRPA Redevelopment Plan Area (Chapter 13) may increase the permitted density by a factor of 2.5, provided TRPA makes the following findings:	Deletion of incorrect chapter reference does not change the existing timeshare density multiplier for adopted Redevelopment Plan Areas. The only adopted Redevelopment Plan Area is located in South Lake Tahoe. Until an area plan is adopted for those areas within the adopted Redevelopment Plan the existing plan remains in affect.
27	61.3.3.B.1	Reference error	Manipulation or management of SEZ vegetation may be permitted in accordance with the Code for purposes of SEZ vegetation may be permitted in accordance with the Code for purposes of SEZ vegetation health or wildlife or fish habitat improvements, and after approval or a vegetation management plan pursuant to subparagraph 61.3.5.B, or as provided in Section 30.5, subsection 30.4.4, subparagraph 30.4.6.D.3. Section 63.3, or Sections 61.1 or 61.2.	References correct Code section regarding non-motorized coverage exemptions and trail design standards.
28	82.4.4.A.2	references 83.10, Shorezone Design Standards	Correct reference is 83.11.	
29	82.4.4.A.3	references 61.4.3, BMP installation	Correct reference is 60.4.3.	

PUNCTUATION

Item	Section	Description	Recommendation	Rationale
30	2.2.2.E.1.a	remove space after "3,500"		Code Cleanup

Technical Code Modifications

31	2.2.2.F.e & f	delete "and" following line e, and replace period following f		Code Cleanup
32	2.3.7.A.2	Insert semicolon after c.(ii)		Code Cleanup
33	2.3.7.A.3	place period after vii		Code Cleanup
34	2.3.7.B.6	Refer directly to the Rules of Procedure, not subparagraph 65.2.4.D.	Changes in operation resulting in the generation of less than 100 additional vehicle trips are exempt provided the resulting use is an allowed use and the applicant pays an air quality mitigation fee in accordance with <u>the TRPA Rules of Procedure.</u>	Code Cleanup
35	4.4.2.A.4	Place period after 4.		Code Cleanup
36	11.6.2.5.c	insert and after c		Code Cleanup
37	13.6.5.C.6		add "for" after "provide" in the second	Code Cleanup
38	13.8.2	Delete "area" after "Area Plan" in the first sentence and insert "a" after "At" in the second sentence.		Code Cleanup
39	13.9.6	delete the "and" after line A and insert an "and" after line B.		Code Cleanup
40	15.6.4..E	insert space between of and 70		Code Cleanup
41	16.8.2.B	insert and after capacity		Code Cleanup
42	22.7.6	The reference to South Wye needs to be changed to South Y		Code Cleanup
43	30.4.6	Also, an "and" needs to be inserted after "requirement;" in line 1.		Code Cleanup
44	30.4.6.C.a	insert and after a		Code Cleanup
45	30.4.6.D.1.a	replace semicolon with period		Code Cleanup
46	31.4.3	Section references "density analysis report as defined in Section 90.2", however there is no definition for density analysis report		Code Cleanup
47	33.2.2	insert space between and33.3.7		Code Cleanup
48	33.3.6.A.2.i	remove extra space after groundwater		Code Cleanup
49	33.3.6.B.1	delete and after 1.		Code Cleanup
50	33.4.1.A.12	Insert) after located		Code Cleanup
51	37.7.17	add and "s" after performance standard because there is more than one standard.		Code Cleanup
52	65.2.5.E.2	delete or following sentence		Code Cleanup
53	38.2.3.D.6.	El Dorado not Eldorado		Code Cleanup
54	83.8.1.A 83.8.1.B	insert space between 30percent		Code Cleanup
55	83.9.1	insert spaces 15to 30percent		Code Cleanup
56		2. Code Page 30-22 – Insert "and" after South Y Industrial Tract Community Plan and delete the second "within" in 2.a.		Code Cleanup

REGIONAL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN (MAP 5) EDITS

Item	Section	Description	Recommendation	Rationale
1	Map 5		Change the dashed green line (Class I/Shared Use Path) around Emerald Bay to a dashed yellow line (Class III/Bike Route).	No entity is planning to construct a bicycle path here.
2	Map 5		Add a Class I connection crossing the Upper Truckee River in the area north of the Lake Tahoe Airport, roughly three-quarters of a mile south of the U.S. Highway 50 Bridge near Motel 6. This segment should connect to the planned South Tahoe Greenway Multi-Use Trail between Meyers and Stateline.	This segment was part of the Greenway Alternatives analysis over a decade ago but it was not included in the Bike Plan because the property owner was not interested in granting an easement for this connection at the time. However, the California Tahoe Conservancy is now in negotiations with this property owner for an easement here. This is considered a critical link providing access to bike trail users from Meyers and Stateline to the South Tahoe "Y." The property owner and the CTC support adding the connection.
3	Map 5		Show the existing Class II from Dollar Hill to SR 267.	Improve Map legibility.
4	Map 5		Make the Class III along 267 from SR 28 to Commonwealth Drive more visible.	Improve Map legibility.

GOAL and POLICY MODIFICATIONS

Item	Section/Element	Description	Recommendation	Rationale
5	Policy T-1.5/ Transportation	Consistent Grammar	TRPA s Supports sustainable transportation infrastructure and operational programs that provide environmental and community benefits.	Consistent policy language in existing section (i.e., start with "Support..." instead of "TRPA supports...".
6	Policy T-5.1/ Transportation	Support Transportation funding efforts.	Participate in state and local transportation planning efforts to ensure coordination and consistency amongst various planning agencies in inside and outside the Region.	Connotes increased emphasis to coordinate at a multi-regional level, bringing new funds and improving inter-regional access.
7	Goal T-13/ Transportation	Support Transportation funding efforts.	Develop on-going sources of regional revenue to fund the local share of transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and roadway other non-auto transportation improvements, operations and maintenance.	This is the Transportation funding goal. Supports effort to strengthen revenue generation for transportation projects, beyond just local revenues.
8	Policy T-13.1/ Transportation Policy T-13.2/ Transportation	Support Transportation funding efforts.	Research and pursue sources of local and Regional revenue to support the investments, vision and goals outlined in this plan. <u>Collaborate with local, state, regional, federal, and private partners to develop dedicated funding and implementation programs for Lake Tahoe and the surrounding regions.</u> <u>Integrate transportation improvement programs into the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP).</u>	Policies 13.1 and 13.2 strengthen the Transportation Funding goal, tying in different mechanisms for increasing revenue generation options.

Item #9 Goals and Policy Amendments.

Policy LU-2.1 - Update Development Rights Inventory table to reflect the CTC has 147 banked development rights, NDSL has 2 banked development rights and Placer County has 3 banked development rights.

<u>Development Rights Inventory (as of March 6, 2012)*</u>	
<u>Residences Developed before 1987</u>	<u>40,865</u>
<u>Total Development Rights in 1987</u>	<u>18,690</u>
<u>Development Rights Acquired 1987-2011</u>	<u>8,360</u>
<u>Development Rights Developed or Allocated to Jurisdictions 1987-2011</u>	<u>6,087</u>
<u>Total Development Rights Remaining</u>	<u>4,243</u>
<u>Remaining on Buildable Parcels</u>	<u>2,791</u>
<u>Remaining on Marginal Parcels</u>	<u>765</u>
<u>Remaining on Unbuildable Parcels</u>	<u>535</u>
<u>Remaining in Land Banks</u>	<u>149</u>
<u>*Note: All statistics are estimates and are not regulatory</u>	