TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

M E M O R A N D U M

Date: June 16, 2010

To: TRPA Governing Board

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Regional Plan Update Milestone Discussion and Direction to Staff on Transportation, Noise, and Energy & Climate Change Milestone Issues

---

Requested Action: Governing Board direction to staff on the attached Milestone issues related to Transportation (see Attachment A).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Governing Board review the attached FactSheet, hold a public hearing on the Milestone issues summarized and identified in Attachment A, and provide direction to staff on how to proceed with each issue.

Requested Motion: To provide direction to staff, the Governing Board is requested to make a motion directing staff on how to proceed with resolving each of the major issues raised in the Transportation FactSheet. The issues are categorized by topic area and summarized and identified in Attachment A.

A majority straw vote of the Governing Board is requested to provide staff with direction.

Background: There is a document called a "FactSheet" that has been provided to the Board as an attachment to this memorandum. It is the fourth in the series of FactSheets that will constitute the "FactBook." The FactBook will contain the background material that will define the direction of the Regional Plan Update.

The attached FactSheet outlines the major topic areas and issues identified by staff and stakeholders. It provides a framework for the Board in making decisions and providing policy direction. It focuses on the following Element and Subelements of the Regional Plan:

- Transportation Element
- Noise Subelement
- Energy & Climate Change Subelement

The stakeholder process for this particular Milestone raised major issues in the Transportation Element that require Board direction. Staff has proposed a course of action for the resolution of each issue. In some cases, the proposal involves changes to the plan alternatives. In other cases, no changes are proposed.

In all case, the staff-proposed course of action is prefaced by a statement such as "*Staff proposes to…,"* which is shown in *italics*. To make staff's proposals stand out, there is no other italicized language in the body of the text.

In addition to the major issues, the stakeholder process helped identify a number of minor amendments to the Project Description and Implementation Matrix. These changes were not significant enough to elevate to the discussion of the major issues, and they are contained in the "Stakeholder Comments and Responses" section of the attached FactSheet (see the Appendix). Staff would like to make the minor amendments based on the comments received and a desire for accuracy and consistency.

Where these minor amendments are proposed, they are also shown in *italics* and prefaced by a statement such as *Staff proposes to…."* They are lumped together at the top of each stakeholder meeting's comments to make reviewing easier. The Board should peruse the proposed amendments in the Appendix and advise staff if there are any desired changes in direction.

Please contact Harmon Zuckerman, Director, Regional Plan Update, at hzuckerman@trpa.org or (775) 589-5236, or Lyn Barnett, RPU Team Lead, at lbarnett@trpa.org or (775) 589-5239 if your have any questions.

Attachment A

Summary of Major Issues for Governing Board Direction:
Transportation

TRANS Issue #1: Should bicycle lanes be constructed along all major travel routes?

Staff proposes to amend Policy T-2.2 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-7 as follows:

> Policy T-2.2 Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities along major travel routes. ~~*Provide for the needs of different non-motorized user groups by providing separate facilities where feasible. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible.*~~
>
> T.IMP-7 Pedestrian and Class II bicycle facilities (bike lanes) *meeting AASHTO standards* must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained *where feasible* along major travel routes when the edge of roadway is altered or improved. *Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible for safe bicycle passage.*

TRANS Issue #2: How should TRPA facilitate maintenance of bicycle paths and sidewalks?

Staff proposes to modify proposed Policy T-2.8 as follows:

> ~~*All jurisdictions must m*~~*M*aintain the use and condition of all sidewalks and bike facilities *over time*, including snow removal for facilities in urbanized areas or along transportation routes with high use year-round.

Staff proposes to add the following new Implementation Measures in Alternatives 2 and 4:

> *T.IMP-17: TRPA will require a maintenance plan before issuing a permit or funding for any bicycle and pedestrian facility. Maintenance plans shall specify dedicated long- and short-term funding for the life of the project.*

T.IMP-18: Up to 25 percent of Air Quality Mitigation Funds may be set aside for operations and maintenance of completed or future EIP projects.

TRANS Issue #3: Should TRPA encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel in the region?

Staff proposes to amend Policy T-5.8 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-8 within Alternative 2 (as shown below) and remove them altogether from Alternatives 3 and 4.

Policy T-5.8: Encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the region using Best Available Technology to minimize air quality impacts ~~*to the maximum extent feasible. Coordinate waterborne services with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.*~~

T.IMP-8: Provide North-South waterborne connections *and connections between communities at Lake Tahoe. Coordinate waterborne services with and provide access to other public and private transportation systems.*

TRANS Issue #4: What parking management policies are needed to dovetail with environmental improvement and PTOD goals?

Staff proposes to amend a Policy and two Implementation Measures.

Proposed amendment to Policy T-7.2:

Encourage parking management strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD.~~*that recognizes: minimum and maximum parking standards, payment in lieu strategies, shared parking between uses, on-street parking, parking along major regional travel routes, handicapped disabled parking, bicycle parking and the implementation of localized parking management programs that focus on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements.*~~

Staff proposes to remove Implementation Measure T.IMP-1 from Alternative 2 and retain it in Alternative 4. Measure T.IMP-1 states: "Eliminate parking minimums, establish parking maximums region-wide, and set minimum standards for bicycle parking facilities."

Proposed amendment to Implementation Measure T.IMP-2:

~~*Generate revenue from private vehicle use, and/or parking management plans as described in Mobility 2030. While each Community Plan or individual jurisdiction may develop its own set of parking management plans,*~~ *Work with local jurisdictions and communities to develop area-wide parking strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD.* ~~*s*~~*Strategies could include:*

- *reduction or elimination of minimum parking standards*
- *creation of maximum parking standards*
- *shared parking between uses*
- *in-lieu payment to meet parking requirements*
- *on-street parking*
- *parking along major regional travel routes*
- *handicapped–disabled parking*
- *creation of bicycle parking standards*
- *free transit or discount passes*
- *deep discount transit passes for community residents*
- *market-rate parking charges (including parking charges based on congestion levels)*

~~*shared lots in central areas; incentives to visitors to arrive without a car (such as reduced hotel room rates and/or overnight parking charges, free transit or discount passes, and deep discount transit passes for community residents. Market-rate parking charges, parking charges based on congestion levels, or in-lieu parking fees in accordance with Urban Land Institute standards would be required.*~~

Regional Plan Update FactSheet #4:
Transportation, Noise, and Energy & Climate Change

INTRODUCTION
To update the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Regional Plan, staff has prepared a schedule of Milestones. Each **Milestone** deals with a part of the Plan, and each is preceded by a Stakeholder Process to vet the proposed policy alternatives with Agency partners and constituents.

Each Milestone will be accompanied by a **FactSheet.** A FactSheet is a summary of the Stakeholder Process. For policymakers, it provides a decision framework. It outlines the major issues identified by staff and stakeholders; it is how each Milestone's policy discussions will be memorialized.

Each FactSheet will go into a binder called the **FactBook**. The FactBook will serve as the seminal piece of background material in defining the policy direction of the Plan. FactSheet #1 included a compact disk containing:

- The **Project Description (PD)**, which summarizes (in narrative form) the four alternatives to be analyzed with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Regional Plan Update.
- The **"Matrix"** containing all of the Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures in the four alternatives.

This CD was meant for general reference and can be kept with the FactBook. For the most recently updated versions of the PD and Matrix, go to http://www.trpa.org and click on "Regional Plan."

This FactSheet is the fourth in the series. It focuses on the policy issues surrounding Transportation, namely, the **Transportation Element and the Noise and Energy & Climate Change Subelements** in the TRPA Goals and Policies.

Of the above parts of the Goals and Policies, Transportation and Noise are directly associated with Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, or "Thresholds," which are environmental quality standards for the Tahoe Region. Nine Threshold categories were created pursuant to the Bi-State Compact that gave birth to TRPA. They are:

- Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Scenic Resources
- Soil Conservation
- Fisheries
- Vegetation
- Wildlife
- Noise
- Recreation

PURPOSE OF THIS FACTSHEET

The purpose of the FactSheet is to outline why TRPA plans and regulates for Transportation, Noise, and Energy & Climate Change. It also discusses the staff-proposed alternative as a better future for Lake Tahoe than the current Plan and the other action alternatives to be analyzed with the EIS.

In analyzing the major issues, the FactSheet includes the staff recommendation, stakeholder reaction, the policy pros and cons associated with staff and stakeholder interests, and new ideas and best practices. These are the key areas that need to be understood by policymakers in order to make informed decisions. **Staff's proposed course of action for each major issue, which takes stakeholder interests into account, is denoted by *italicized text*.**

At the end of the analysis section, there is a page or pages on which each major issue is listed along with staff's recommended resolution of the issue. Below the summary are a few blank lines for the reader's own thoughts on the matter. You are invited to use these lines for note-taking and memorializing of your thoughts, thus personalizing your own FactSheet.

Besides providing background and recommendations on all of the major issues, the FactSheet will also include:

- **"Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses"** (these are based on the most salient issues brought up at the stakeholder meetings)
- stakeholder written comments and letters
- a list of Stakeholder meetings, meeting dates, and participants

When reading the notes from the stakeholder meetings (see the Appendices), pay careful attention to the "TRPA Responses" that are in *italics*. These represent changes to the PD and Matrix that staff is proposing based on stakeholder comments and concerns. All of the comments that elicited a proposed change are grouped at the top of each stakeholder meeting notes to simplify the reader's task of reviewing.

These notes, lists, and documents will memorialize the stakeholder process and provide evidence of the background materials that influenced staff's proposals.

Contents

INTRODUCTION **..... 1**
Transportation 5
WHY DOES TRPA PLAN AND REGULATE FOR TRANSPORTATION? 5
WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE? 6
WHICH MAJOR STAKEHOLDER ISSUES RESULTED IN STAFF PROPOSING CHANGES TO THE PLAN ALTERNATIVES? 7
TRANS Issue #1: Should bicycle lanes be constructed along all major travel routes? 7
TRANS Issue #2: How should TRPA facilitate maintenance of bicycle paths and sidewalks 10
TRANS Issue #3: Should TRPA encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel in the region?. 11
TRANS Issue #4: What parking management policies are needed to dovetail with environmental improvement and PTOD goals?. 13
Noise 21
WHY DOES TRPA PLAN AND REGULATE FOR NOISE? 21
WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE? 21
Energy & Climate Change 23
WHY DOES TRPA PLAN AND REGULATE FOR ENERGY & CLIMATE CHANGE? 23
WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE? 23

Appendix ..... Appendix Page 1

Appendix A Summary of Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses from the **Transportation** Element Stakeholder Meetings 2
Appendix B Summary of Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses from the **Noise** Subelement Stakeholder Meetings 17
Appendix C Summary of Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses from the **Energy & Climate Change** Subelement Stakeholder Meetings 24
Appendix D Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **APC Member John Upton** 27
Appendix E Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **U.S. Forest Service** 28
Appendix F Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **California Tahoe Conservancy** 29
Appendix G Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **League to Save Lake Tahoe and Tahoe Area Sierra Club** 31
Appendix H Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **Placer County Planning Department** 39
Appendix I Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **Jerome Evans** 47
Appendix J Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **Heavenly Lake Tahoe** 49
Appendix K Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **City of South Lake Tahoe** 52
Appendix L List of Transportation, Noise and Energy & Climate Change Stakeholder Meetings, Meeting Dates, and Participants 55

Transportation

WHY DOES TRPA PLAN AND REGULATE FOR TRANSPORTATION?

Since its inception, TRPA has recognized the importance of planning for transportation in order to protect the environment. Article V (c) (2) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact calls for:

> A transportation plan for the integrated development of a regional system of transportation, including but not limited to parkways, highways, transportation facilities, transit routes, waterways, navigation facilities, public transportation facilities, bicycle facilities and appurtenant terminals and facilities for the movement of people and goods within the region. The goal of transportation planning shall be:
>
> (A) To reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes and of public transit to move people and goods within the region
>
> (B) To reduce to the extent feasible air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles.

The Transportation Element of the Regional Plan fulfills the Compact mandate to develop a transportation plan. In addition, it serves as a foundation for fulfilling other state and federal requirements.

TRPA has been charged with various state and federal transportation planning roles. In California, for example, TRPA is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency.[1] In this role, TRPA is responsible for creating a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The most recent version of this document, known as Mobility 2030, was adopted in August, 2008. Mobility 2030 is distinct from but must be coordinated and consistent with the Regional Plan.

TRPA is also the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Lake Tahoe region.[2] In this role, TRPA (plus a representative from the U.S. Forest Service) operates as the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO). The TMPO has authority to direct federal transportation funding to projects within the region in accordance with a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Mobility 2030 serves as both the California RTP and the federal LRTP.

In addition to the planning authority granted to the TRPA in Article V of the Bi-State Compact, the Compact also created an implementing agency. Article IX of

[1] California Government Code Section 29532
[2] Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations 450

the Compact created the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). The TTD has the authority to own and operate transit services and facilities and is responsible for implementing key transportation improvements, including complex projects that may cross state and county boundaries. The TTD works closely with the TRPA in its capacities described above to implement the projects and programs specified in the RTP.

As the link between sustainable communities and climate change has risen in importance at the federal and state levels, new and pending legislation will require regions to show how their land use and transportation plans meet regional Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction targets. The U.S. Departments of Transportation (DOT) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD), joined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), have formed an "Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities," which focuses on improving access to affordable housing, providing more transportation options, and lowering transportation costs while protecting the environment in communities nationwide. New federal policy will likely respond to recommendations from this partnership. TRPA, in its role as the TMPO, will be responsible for meeting the requirements of any new federal and corresponding state legislation.

California has already responded to this new policy direction. Under California Senate Bill (SB) 375, each MPO region is required to create a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that contains targets set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for GHG emissions reduction. Each SCS must describe land use scenarios and transportation investments that will allow the MPO region to meet its GHG emissions abatement targets – provided the MPO determines that it is feasible to do so. Through a second law, California SB 575, TRPA has special permission to use the Regional Plan as the Tahoe SCS, since the Regional Plan ties land use, housing, and transportation to environmental performance. TRPA and the TMPO are working jointly to create the SCS for the California portion of the Tahoe region.

WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE?

Among the alternatives to be studied in the EIS for the Regional Plan Update, Alternative 2 best embodies the visions expressed during the Place-Based and Pathway planning processes. During these processes, stakeholders clearly expressed a desire for a multi-modal transportation system that provides transportation choices, supports communities and the economy, and gives priority to non-automobile transportation modes.

The Transportation Vision from the Pathway report reads:

> An innovative multimodal transportation system is in place that gives priority to viable alternatives to the private automobile, appeals to users and serves mobility needs, while improving the environmental and socioeconomic health of the Basin.

The Transportation Vision from the Place-Based report reads:

> Paramount is a future of individual communities anchored by pleasant, walkable, mixed-use town centers functioning as public gathering places and served by reliable and convenient public transit.

In recent years, TRPA Governing Board members have given staff consistent direction to work with project implementers to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are considered early in the project design process. (This early consideration is discussed in ***Transportation Issue #1: Should bicycle lanes be constructed along all major travel routes?***)

Alternative 2 combines regulatory and incentive-based approaches to meeting the Pathway and Place-Based Visions. Proposed measures require that bicyclist and pedestrian needs are considered in development, re-development, and roadway improvement projects. Other measures encourage pedestrian- and transit-oriented development (PTOD) by removing obstacles to these projects.

The two major changes proposed in Alternative 2 are implementation of area-wide parking management strategies and new level of service (LOS) exemptions that would encourage the use of multi-modal techniques and systems to manage traffic demand during peak periods. The second major change is particularly supported by the Compact, which states: "Where increases in capacity are required, the agency shall give preference to providing such capacity through public transportation and public programs and projects related to transportation."[3]

WHICH MAJOR STAKEHOLDER ISSUES RESULTED IN STAFF PROPOSING CHANGES TO THE PLAN ALTERNATIVES?

TRANS Issue #1: Should bicycle lanes be constructed along all major travel routes? In Alternative 2, the original proposal was to require bicycle lanes to be constructed along major travel routes. However, the language in the proposal, which was rather inflexible, drew concern from stakeholders. Therefore, *staff proposes to amend Policy T-2.2 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-7 as follows:*

[3] *Tahoe Regional Planning Compact*, Article V (c) (2)

> Policy T-2.2 Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities along major travel routes. ~~*Provide for the needs of different non-motorized user groups by providing separate facilities where feasible. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible.*~~
>
> T.IMP-7 Pedestrian and Class II bicycle facilities (bike lanes) *meeting AASHTO standards* must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained *where feasible* along major travel routes when the edge of roadway is altered or improved. *Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible for safe bicycle passage.*

Here's why:

The reason for the amendment to proposed Policy T-2.2 is that TRPA Policies are meant to "establish the strategies necessary to achieve the goals" of the Regional Plan.[4] They should be general statements to provide guidance. As originally proposed, the Policy recognized that sidewalks and bicycle lanes may not be feasible in all locations, such as around Emerald Bay. Appropriately, that language has been moved to the Implementation Measure.

The reason for the amendment to proposed Implementation Measure T.IMP-7 is that bike lanes are not always feasible to construct. Sometimes, providing lanes can be as simple as signing and striping existing pavement. In extremely constrained areas, such as around Emerald Bay, widening the road can be so costly (fiscally and environmentally) as to render them infeasible. However, in most locations, sufficient right-of-way exists.

In 2003, TRPA adopted a comprehensive, Basin-wide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. This plan provided for an integrated, multi-modal mobility system. Along with the RTP, it is one of the essential foundations for managing traffic issues and providing additional mobility, particularly at peak use periods. The bicycle and pedestrian plan includes American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHTO) standards for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.[5] Where it is infeasible to meet the AASHTO lane standards, the new language proposed in T.IMP-7 would require that as wide a shoulder as possible be provided.

At Lake Tahoe, construction of bicycle lanes usually occurs concurrently with roadway improvement projects. Class II bicycle lanes (which are on the street),

[4] *TRPA – Goals and Policies*, page I-5
[5] Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, *Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan*, amended October 2006, page 5

in addition to Class I lanes (which are separated, off-street, shared-use paths), provide additional transportation options and support a strong multi-modal transportation system to serve multiple user needs.

While shared-use paths serve many different trip types, including commuting, errands, and recreation, they can be crowded, slow, and dangerous to the bicycle commuter. Bicyclists who seek direct routes with fewer user conflicts usually prefer the speed offered by Class II lanes.

TRPA recognizes that there are factors that may cause the State highway agencies to resist installing Class II bicycle facilities. However, both Caltrans and NDOT have policies requiring them to consider local plans and to incorporate non-automobile facilities into their roadway projects as long as the cost is not disproportionate to the need or probable use.[6] (Federal guidance exists on how to determine when the cost is disproportionate.[7])

The changes to the proposed measure were driven by the following specific stakeholder concerns:

- While AASHTO specifies widths, signage, and stenciling of the bicycle symbol as necessary to meet the "bicycle lane" standard, TRPA may consider a striped, un-signed shoulder as meeting the definition of a "bike lane."

- Caltrans was concerned that the language "where feasible," which was included in Policy T-2.2, had not carried over to the Implementation Measure. Caltrans also stated that its own policy is to not construct bicycle lanes where an adjacent Class I path exists, but instead to provide "shared roadway" (Class III) markings.

- Placer County was concerned that, in some cases, funding for major roadway projects may not be used for bicycle facilities. Requiring bicycle facilities could potentially stop some major projects. This could also stop the development of the environmental improvements, such as erosion control facilities, associated with these projects. The development of required bicycle facilities could also lead to scenic and other environmental impacts.

Pros of TRPA staff position: The Policy and Implementation Measure modifications indicate that sidewalks and bicycle lanes are to be incorporated early in the planning of projects. The proposed new language in T.IMP-7 would align TRPA's Goals and Policies with the U.S. Department of Transportation's

[6] Caltrans Deputy Directive 64R-1; Nevada State Bicycle Plan, Goal 3
[7] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, "Design Guidance -- Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach," Policy Statement

policy (see footnote #7). Also, moving detailed implementation language out of the Policy helps clarify direction.

Cons of TRPA staff position: The proposed modifications could increase the short-term cost of roadway improvements by reinforcing that transportation agencies are required to include non-automobile facilities in their project plans. Adding bike lanes to roads adds land coverage to the roadway system, which must be addressed by water quality treatment systems.

TRANS Issue #2: How should TRPA facilitate maintenance of bicycle paths and sidewalks?

Staff proposes to modify proposed Policy T-2.8 as follows:

> ~~*All jurisdictions must m*~~*M*aintain the use and condition of all sidewalks and bike facilities *over time*, including snow removal for facilities in urbanized areas or along transportation routes with high use year-round.

Maintenance assurances should be in place before projects are permitted. To support the proposed Policy by ensuring that there are adequate maintenance plans for projects and identifying a funding source to help project implementers maintain their projects, *staff proposes to add the following new Implementation Measures in Alternatives 2 and 4:*

> *T.IMP-17: TRPA will require a maintenance plan before issuing a permit or funding for any bicycle and pedestrian facility. Maintenance plans shall specify dedicated long- and short-term funding for the life of the project.*
>
> *T.IMP-18: Up to 25 percent of Air Quality Mitigation Funds may be set aside for operations and maintenance of completed or future EIP projects.*

Here's why:

Local agencies have made a significant investment in the construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, providing valuable recreation and transportation benefits to local residents and visitors. Many shared-use paths and sidewalks, however, are difficult to maintain at standards that meet user needs.

Obstacles to proper maintenance include lack of dedicated funding, lack of maintenance equipment, and confusion or conflicts regarding maintenance responsibility. The result is that many sidewalks and paths are not being

sufficiently maintained – long-term maintenance, such as crack repair and re-striping, is not occurring on a regular basis. Lack of consistent snow removal during the winter months sometimes forces users into the street.

TRPA is a regional planning agency charged with creating a multi-modal transportation system.[8] As such, it has a role to play in ensuring that the system is maintained over time and is usable throughout the year. (Maintaining passable sidewalks in commercial and tourist areas is particularly important.)

Project implementers (i.e., public agencies and private landowners) are responsible for design, construction, and day-to-day maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. These facilities are key pieces of the multi-modal system TRPA is charged with creating. Therefore, TRPA and the implementers are partners.

Pros of TRPA staff position: Facilities that are properly maintained are more likely to be used by the public and help justify future new investment in public infrastructure. The amended Policy and two new Implementation Measures proposed emphasize the importance of maintaining facilities while focusing on actions that TRPA can take to help its partners.

Cons of TRPA staff position: From the perspective of some stakeholders, primarily users of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the staff proposals may not go far enough in providing incentives for responsible agencies to maintain facilities. Also, if some Air Quality Mitigation Funds are to be reprogrammed to operations and maintenance, there may no longer be as much money available for construction of new transportation improvement projects.

TRANS Issue #3: Should TRPA encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel in the region?

Waterborne transportation – as part of an intra-regional, connected transportation system – is being studied by the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). Alternative 2 reflects this. However, all of the action alternatives currently include a waterborne transportation option. *Staff proposes to amend Policy T-5.8 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-8 within Alternative 2 (as shown below) and remove them altogether from Alternatives 3 and 4.*

> Policy T-5.8: Encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the region using Best Available Technology to minimize air quality impacts ~~*to the maximum extent feasible. Coordinate waterborne services with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.*~~

[8] *Tahoe Regional Planning Compact*, Article V (c) (2)

> T.IMP-8: Provide North-South waterborne connections *and connections between communities at Lake Tahoe. Coordinate waterborne services with and provide access to other public and private transportation systems.*

Here's why:

Since Policy language ought to emphasize general statements that provide guidance, the detailed language in Policy T-5.8 would be moved into Implementation Measure T.IMP-8.

While some stakeholders expressed the opinion that waterborne transit should not be encouraged at this time, TRPA is proposing to evaluate and encourage it. The argument against waterborne transit is that – even with today's best available technology – it is more polluting than private or public land transportation. However, the relative amount of pollution produced on a per-mile basis by boats versus cars and buses is not the whole story.

Boats can be used to provide a direct, north-south transit link across the length of Lake Tahoe. No other mode of transportation can bypass existing roadway traffic so effectively. Also, users would most likely walk, bike, or use public transit when arriving at their destinations. Establishing boat routes to popular destinations would support a transportation system that fits with the PTOD concepts proposed in the Land Use section of the Regional Plan Update (RPU). Also, it would provide a recreational experience for residents and visitors alike.

The TTD is conducting a transit systems analysis, including a passenger ferry alternative, as part of the eligibility determination process for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Small Starts Program for new transit systems.[9] This analysis is necessary to access the funding authorized for a passenger ferry transit project in the current federal transportation bill.[10]

The TTD is also evaluating the implementation of small-scale waterborne transit as a pilot project. One of the results of the analysis could be that small, low-emission boats are recommended for certain routes. Like land-based fleets, marine low-emissions engine technology is rapidly improving and should continue to do so.

The transit systems analysis and pilot evaluation are expected to be completed this calendar year. They will provide the best available long-range forecast

[9] A requirement of Small Starts is an alternatives analysis that will examine different waterborne route options and compare water to road connections in terms of environmental impact.
[10] Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users, 2005 (SAFETEA-LU)

information on how to connect the north and south shores and individual communities with viable transit service and infrastructure.

Pros of TRPA staff position: Keeping the waterborne transportation concept in Alternative 2 would allow its impacts to be analyzed as part of the EIS. The FTA Small Starts authorization will provide funding to study the impacts and feasibility of waterborne transit even more thoroughly than would the EIS. The availability of waterborne options could reduce dependency on the automobile, increase transportation capacity, and improve residents' and visitors' experiences.

Cons of TRPA staff position: Some stakeholders consider waterborne transit to be an unnecessary, expensive, and highly polluting transportation option. Additional parking and local transit solutions would be required to serve waterborne transit destinations, and these solutions have yet to be planned.

TRANS Issue #4: What parking management policies are needed to dovetail with environmental improvement and PTOD goals?

While TRPA staff and most stakeholders are in favor of creating innovative, new strategies to meet parking demand, the measures that staff had originally proposed were criticized as being inflexible. *Staff proposes to amend a Policy and two Implementation Measures.*

Proposed amendment to Policy T-7.2:

> *Encourage parking management strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD.~~that recognizes: minimum and maximum parking standards, payment in lieu strategies, shared parking between uses, on-street parking, parking along major regional travel routes, handicapped disabled parking, bicycle parking and the implementation of localized parking management programs that focus on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements.~~*

Staff proposes to remove Implementation Measure T.IMP-1 from Alternative 2 and retain it in Alternative 4. Measure T.IMP-1 states: "Eliminate parking minimums, establish parking maximums region-wide, and set minimum standards for bicycle parking facilities."

Proposed amendment to Implementation Measure T.IMP-2:

> *~~Generate revenue from private vehicle use, and/or parking management plans as described in Mobility 2030. While each Community Plan or individual jurisdiction may develop its own set of parking management plans,~~ Work with local jurisdictions and*

communities to develop area-wide parking strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD. ~~s~~Strategies could include:

- *reduction or elimination of minimum parking standards*
- *creation of maximum parking standards*
- *shared parking between uses*
- *in-lieu payment to meet parking requirements*
- *on-street parking*
- *parking along major regional travel routes*
- *handicapped–disabled parking*
- *creation of bicycle parking standards*
- *free transit or discount passes*
- *deep discount transit passes for community residents*
- *market-rate parking charges (including parking charges based on congestion levels)*

~~shared lots in central areas; incentives to visitors to arrive without a car (such as reduced hotel room rates and/or overnight parking charges, free transit or discount passes, and deep discount transit passes for community residents. Market-rate parking charges, parking charges based on congestion levels, or in-lieu parking fees in accordance with Urban Land Institute standards would be required.~~

Here's why:

Policy T-7.2 provides the foundation for measures T.IMP-1 and -2, but it contains several specific strategies. These strategies are proposed to be moved into T.IMP-2 (as indicated above), thus allowing the Policy to act as a general, guiding statement. However, the Policy would be amended to include a specific reference to the achievement of PTOD, as that is a major goal of the RPU and a particular area of consistency between transportation and land use.[11]

T.IMP-1 is proposed to be removed from Alternative 2 because requiring region-wide parking maximums fails to respect the needs of individual communities and would decrease flexibility for business owners. This leaves the door open, in Alternative 2, for communities to decide if they want a parking maximum, and if so, at what level it should be set. Also, the other provisions in T.IMP-1 are included in T.IMP-2 as potential strategies, so they would remain in Alternative 2.

T.IMP-2, as amended, would encourage collaboration between TRPA and local jurisdictions to create innovative parking solutions to community-wide problems. Area-wide strategies that do not rely on strict minimums could allow communities to realize parking economies of scale resulting in new open space, improved site design, and reductions in cost for unneeded parking. These strategies could also

[11] See Land Use Policies LU-2.8, -3.2, and -3.3 in the Matrix.

support the land-use concepts being proposed in Alternative 2, including walkable and vibrant communities, mixed-use development, land coverage reduction, and PTOD.

The following provides more background information on this issue:

Local jurisdictions are the primary implementers of parking standards, which are codified in local zoning ordinances and some Community Plans (CP). All local parking regulations in Tahoe include "minimum standards." The minimums are set to ensure that all destinations have enough parking available to meet demand for free parking at all times; they are based on the parking need of each individual parcel and its use during the times of highest demand, such as before holiday weekends. This often results in excessive on-site parking.

There is a growing movement to base parking standards on actual market conditions instead of strict regulatory minimum formulae. Parking that is designed to accommodate typical daily needs can benefit private developers, property owners, communities, and the natural environment. Removing minimum standards in favor of area-wide parking solutions can reduce development costs, provide restoration and water treatment opportunities, and lead to building design that supports bicycling, walking, transit use, and PTOD.

Staff acknowledges the uniqueness of each of Tahoe's communities. The differences in building design, uses, available parking, and residents' visions necessitate different parking strategies that honor this diversity. Allowing for flexibility that today's strict minimums prohibit also respects the needs of individuals. Area-wide parking solutions would allow some projects to be built with less parking and more environmentally beneficial features, but they would not necessarily keep developers from building more parking if they so choose.

Some emergency service provider stakeholders were concerned that area-wide parking solutions would cause access problems for emergency vehicles. Again, the area-wide solutions concept is based on flexibility, not strict minimums. Part of this flexibility would be to continue to include emergency service providers in reviewing the design of all proposed projects. In this way, first responders would maintain their current ability to ensure safe building and site design.

Area-wide parking solutions are an effective tool in the environmental redevelopment "toolbox." They would provide flexibility for developers and increased opportunity for environmental gain. Staff would collaborate with local jurisdictions and stakeholders, especially during the CP update process, to devise strategies that are tailored to community needs and protect neighborhoods against illegal parking and parking "spillover" from adjacent commercial areas. The following are examples of program proposals that could be incorporated in area-wide parking management solutions:

1. **Reduce or eliminate minimum on-site parking requirements.** Parking requirements for projects would be determined by factors such as type of business, surrounding land-uses, and available transportation – rather than a standard minimum formula. Elimination of on-site minimum parking requirements does not mean that businesses could entirely decide for themselves how much parking to supply; businesses would still have to provide adequate parking to serve the vehicle trips they generate.

2. **Encourage shared parking for commercial uses.** Different businesses attract customers at different times. Shared parking can provide efficiencies, allowing pedestrian-oriented building designs, more entrances along sidewalks, and parking that is screened from scenic corridors.

3. **Allow in-lieu payment to meet parking requirements.** Businesses can contribute to shared, off-site parking through in-lieu fees for concurrent or future construction of parking.

4. **Use demand-responsive parking prices.** Appropriate prices that change according to time of day or level of visitation can encourage shopping during slow times and increase turnover during busy times.

5. **Use parking revenue to construct downtown improvements, including transportation, parking, scenic, and water quality projects.** Staff recognizes that parking pricing might not work for all communities. It can, however, be an effective tool in the "toolbox" of parking solutions. Generally, parking pricing has proven to be either revenue-neutral or revenue-positive for local jurisdictions. Revenues generated can be used to construct public improvements.

Pros of TRPA staff position: Parking reform and flexibility for local communities would be encouraged. The strategies embodied in T.IMP-2, along with the examples of the five program proposals listed above, could be incorporated in area-wide parking management solutions. These solutions could result in vibrant and walkable downtown communities consistent with the proposed land use policies and measures that favor PTOD. Moreover, they could provide opportunities for scenic and other environmental improvements.

Cons of TRPA staff position: If jurisdictions eliminated their minimum parking standards, they would be decentralizing their authority. Area-wide parking solutions may run contrary to some corporate parking requirements for large chain merchandisers. Illegal parking in commercial areas and spillover of commercial parking in residential areas could result from decreased parking availability during peak times. Some businesses could continue to support excessive on-site parking to reduce competition with other businesses.

Transportation: YOUR THOUGHTS

TRANS Issue #1: Should bicycle lanes be constructed along all major travel routes?

Staff proposes to amend Policy T-2.2 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-7 as follows:

> Policy T-2.2 Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities along major travel routes. ~~*Provide for the needs of different non-motorized user groups by providing separate facilities where feasible. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible.*~~
>
> T.IMP-7 Pedestrian and Class II bicycle facilities (bike lanes) *meeting AASHTO standards* must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained *where feasible* along major travel routes when the edge of roadway is altered or improved. *Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible for safe bicycle passage.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

TRANS Issue #2: How should TRPA facilitate maintenance of bicycle paths and sidewalks?

Staff proposes to modify proposed Policy T-2.8 as follows:

> ~~*All jurisdictions must m*~~*M*aintain the use and condition of all sidewalks and bike facilities *over time,* including snow removal for facilities in urbanized areas or along transportation routes with high use year-round.

Staff proposes to add the following new Implementation Measures in Alternatives 2 and 4:

> *T.IMP-17: TRPA will require a maintenance plan before issuing a permit or funding for any bicycle and pedestrian facility. Maintenance plans shall specify dedicated long- and short-term funding for the life of the project.*
>
> *T.IMP-18: Up to 25 percent of Air Quality Mitigation Funds may be set aside for operations and maintenance of completed or future EIP projects.*

TRANS Issue #3: Should TRPA encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel in the region?

Staff proposes to amend Policy T-5.8 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-8 within Alternative 2 (as shown below) and remove them altogether from Alternatives 3 and 4.

> Policy T-5.8: Encourage waterborne transportation systems as an alternative to automobile travel within the region using Best Available Technology to minimize air quality impacts ~~*to the maximum extent feasible*~~. ~~*Coordinate waterborne services with, and provide access to, other public and private transportation systems.*~~
>
> T.IMP-8: Provide North-South waterborne connection*s and connections between communities at Lake Tahoe. Coordinate waterborne services with and provide access to other public and private transportation systems*.

TRANS Issue #4: What parking management policies are needed to dovetail with environmental improvement and PTOD goals?

Staff proposes to amend a Policy and two Implementation Measures.

Proposed amendment to Policy T-7.2:

> *Encourage parking management strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD.~~that recognizes: minimum and maximum parking standards, payment in lieu strategies, shared parking between uses, on-street parking, parking along major regional travel routes, handicapped-disabled parking, bicycle parking and the implementation of localized parking management programs that focus on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements.~~*

Staff proposes to remove Implementation Measure T.IMP-1 from Alternative 2 and retain it in Alternative 4. Measure T.IMP-1 states: "Eliminate parking minimums, establish parking maximums region-wide, and set minimum standards for bicycle parking facilities."

Proposed amendment to Implementation Measure T.IMP-2:

> *~~Generate revenue from private vehicle use, and/or parking management plans as described in Mobility 2030. While each Community Plan or individual jurisdiction may develop its own set of parking management plans,~~ Work with local jurisdictions and communities to develop area-wide parking strategies that are tailored to the needs of each Community Plan area and consistent with achievement of PTOD. ~~s~~Strategies could include:*
>
> - *reduction or elimination of minimum parking standards*
> - *creation of maximum parking standards*
> - *shared parking between uses*
> - *in-lieu payment to meet parking requirements*
> - *on-street parking*
> - *parking along major regional travel routes*
> - *handicapped–disabled parking*
> - *creation of bicycle parking standards*
> - *free transit or discount passes*
> - *deep discount transit passes for community residents*
> - *market-rate parking charges (including parking charges based on congestion levels)*
>
> *~~shared lots in central areas; incentives to visitors to arrive without a car (such as reduced hotel room rates and/or overnight parking charges, free transit or discount passes, and deep discount transit~~*

~~*passes for community residents. Market-rate parking charges, parking charges based on congestion levels, or in-lieu parking fees in accordance with Urban Land Institute standards would be required.*~~

Noise

WHY DOES TRPA PLAN AND REGULATE FOR NOISE?

The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact requires that Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, or Thresholds, be established for Noise. The Compact requires that the Regional Plan its Elements achieve and maintain all Thresholds.

WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE?

Staff believes the proposed action alternatives portend a better future for Lake Tahoe than does the current plan. The Alternative 2 approach best represents changing conditions in the region and technology improvements that have taken place since adoption of the 1987 Regional Plan.

Alternative 2 is also based on the concerns and ideas expressed by the public during the Pathway and Stakeholder processes. For this reasons, the Goals and Policies in Alternative 2 received general support from stakeholders.

The Implementation Measures, however, were criticized as being overly prescriptive, unnecessary, and poorly connected to Threshold attainment. One example of this is Noise Implementation Measure N.Imp-25:

> Seaplanes -- No seaplane bases or docking facilities are allowed in the Basin. Seaplanes shall be prohibited within 1-mile of the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. Define seaplanes- make sure they include float planes and anything that flies and can land on water. 23.6.B Seaplane Bases:

Stakeholders read the measure and rightly pointed out the obvious: if a seaplane is prohibited within one mile of the shoreline, it can never dock under its own power. Staff determined that the measure was completely unnecessary for the following reasons:

- TRPA has no jurisdiction over flights of seaplanes, as airplanes in flight are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- Once a seaplane touches down on Lake Tahoe, jurisdiction shifts from FAA regulation to TRPA Code
- TRPA has traditionally treated seaplanes moving on the water as boats.

- TRPA Code[12] treats seaplanes on the water as if they are boats.
- The Shorezone Ordinances contain strong protections against noise impacts through its own set of noise regulations, including a 600-foot "no-wake zone" along the shoreline[13]
- The no-wake zone, de facto, prohibits seaplane landings close to shore and limits the speed and noise associated with taxiing seaplanes in the nearshore.

In other words, the Code already addresses the issue of noise created by seaplanes. No Implementation Measure is necessary.

Within the Noise Subelement, there were several other Alternative 2 measures that were handled similarly[14] to the seaplane measure above. In each case, staff heard from stakeholders and is proposing to modify or remove measures that are overly prescriptive, unnecessary, or poorly connected to Threshold attainment.

The reason no Noise proposal was raised to the status of a "major issue" is that none required Board direction, and none required resolution of disagreement between staff and stakeholders. Each minor issue related to a questionable Implementation Measure resulted in a staff-proposed solution that was accepted by stakeholders. Appendix B of this FactSheet contains Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses that memorialize these solutions.

[12] The Shorezone Ordinances were amended in May, 2010.
[13] The no-wake zone, which predates the current Shorezone Ordinances in TRPA Code, was developed to protect public safety, reduce erosion, and limit noise in the nearshore and the backshore.
[14] In all, staff is proposing to delete seven Noise Implementation Measures, amend four others, and remove two Subparagraphs of existing Code based on stakeholder comments and staff's concurrence that the provisions are unnecessary (see Appendix B).

Energy & Climate Change

WHY DOES TRPA PLAN AND REGULATE FOR ENERGY & CLIMATE CHANGE?

The 1987 Regional Plan does not include Goals, Policies, or Implementation Measures specifically aimed at reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or adapting to potential effects of climate change. The idea that global climate change is linked to energy use, land development patterns, and GHG emissions was not yet in wide circulation in 1987. So while the current plan contains only an Energy Subelement, the RPU is proposed to contain an Energy & Climate Change Subelement.

The TRPA Compact does not directly reference energy conservation or climate change. However, the proposed Energy & Climate Change Subelement includes measures that would complement other Compact-mandated resource conservation efforts and result in a net benefit to Thresholds. Conserving energy can reduce air pollution and capital expenditure; conservation can contribute to reduction in federally-recognized, climate-modifying GHGs[15] and improve air quality.

Energy conservation, in particular, is effective in reducing or eliminating the need for future electrical infrastructure expansions such as new power transmission lines, poles and towers, roads, substations, and related facilities that can result in large-scale landscape changes. Adding Climate Change to the Energy Subelement aligns TRPA with state and federal mandates to prevent or ameliorate deleterious anthropogenic climate changes.

WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE?

Staff believes the proposed action alternatives portend a better future for Lake Tahoe than does the current plan. The Alternative 2 approach best represents the direction given by the states of California[16] and Nevada[17] on the need to reduce GHG emissions. It best recognizes the U.S. Environmental Protection

[15] hydrocarbons, NO_X, methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFC), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6)
[16] Assembly Bill 32: Global Warming Solutions Act and Senate Bill 375, Sustainable Communities Strategy
[17] Governor Jim Gibbons' Nevada Climate Change Advisory Committee Final Report

Agency finding that GHGs in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.

While Alternatives 1 and 3 would rely solely on the energy conservation, transportation, and land use measures of the 1987 Regional Plan to meet pollution reductions mandated at the state or federal level, Alternative 2 is more comprehensive and up-to-date. It is also the alternative that comports with new and pending state and federal GHG reduction mandates and PTOD concepts.

Under California Senate Bill (SB) 375, TRPA and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) are responsible for developing a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS will describe land use scenarios and transportation investments that will allow the California side of the TMPO region to meet the GHG emissions abatement targets set by the state of California.

The SCS would also be considered in the development of a "Regional Sustainability Plan." Under Alternative 2, TRPA would be a participant in the development of this plan, which would set GHG reduction targets by sector and identify implementation strategies over and above those proposed in the RPU (and deemed necessary to achieve GHG reductions and adapt to the potential effects of climate change). The Regional Sustainability Plan is currently under development by a Basin-wide collaboration led by the California Tahoe Conservancy. Partners consist of representatives of federal, state, local, and tribal governments, as well as academic institutions, businesses, non-profits, and the general public.

Alternative 4 is largely the same as Alternative 2. However, it contains additional Policies and Implementation Measures that are more prescriptive and point to stricter regulation. An example of this is Policy EC-1.11, which would require the Regional Plan and its implementing plans to achieve and maintain LEED neighborhood (ND) certification.

Appendix

A. Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses on Transportation issues
B. Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses on Noise issues
C. Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses on Energy & Climate Change issues
D. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from John Upton
E. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from U.S. Forest Service
F. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from California Tahoe Conservancy
G. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from League to Save Lake Tahoe and Tahoe Area Sierra Club
H. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from Placer County Planning Department
I. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from Jerome Evans
J. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from Heavenly Lake Tahoe
K. Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from City of South Lake Tahoe
L. List of Transportation, Noise, and Energy & Climate Change Stakeholder meeting, meeting dates, and participants

Appendix A

Summary of Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses from the **Transportation** Element Stakeholder Meetings

Local Jurisdictions

1. **Stakeholder Comment**: Any new level of service (LOS) standard should only allow more vehicle congestion if there are good alternatives to the private automobile and if the overall project result is a reduction in air quality impacts.

   TRPA Response: The above stakeholder comment represents common responses to proposed Implementation Measure T.IMP-9, which deals with LOS assessment of traffic impacts. Throughout the stakeholder process, this measure engendered little controversy.

   T.IMP-9 addresses the first part of the comment: more vehicle congestion is proposed to be allowed provided that there are good alternatives to the private automobile. It intentionally does not address the second part – the air quality impacts of traffic congestion – for two reasons: 1) staff believes that emissions from increased idling will eventually be offset by improvement to the automobile fleet and reductions in overall vehicle trips resulting from PTOD and 2) T.IMP-9 is meant to deal solely with the impacts of a project on the quality of the transportation system; under TRPA Code, project impacts on air quality are assessed by the number of new vehicle trips generated – not LOS.

   The Regional Plan currently contains the LOS criteria for the highway system.[18] One of the goals of the RPU is to move specific regulatory language out of the Plan and into the Code. In the plan alternatives, the policy that contains the specific LOS criteria is proposed to be deleted. Proposed Implementation Measure T.IMP-9 dictates that "Vehicle LOS would remain the same as in the current Regional Plan" but fails to specify where in Code the standards would reside.

   Staff is not proposing to change the essential meaning of T.IMP-9. Because the Implementation Measure is overly prescriptive in some areas and not specific enough in others, however, *staff proposes to amend T.IMP-9 as follows:*

   > *Amend Code Chapter 93 to include level of service (LOS) criteria for the highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods. LOS criteria shall be: "C" on rural recreational/scenic roads; "D" on rural developed area roads; "D" on urban developed area roads; "D" for signalized intersections. LOS "E" may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, not to exceed four hours per day.*~~Update Level-of-Service (LOS) measurement~~

[18] *TRPA Goals and Policies*, Transportation Policy 7.G, page III-6

~~protocols for Town Centers/Tourist Centers in accordance with those under consideration for the National Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010. In addition to measuring and setting standards for vehicle LOS, measure and set standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit LOS using the measurement protocols described in NCHRP Web-Only Document 128. At this time, we propose evaluating a requirement of level of service C for pedestrians and bicyclists, and level of service D for transit.~~ *A project may be allowed to exceed ~~V~~vehicle LOS standards*~~would remain the same as in the current Regional Plan, however, it could be exceeded on a case-by-case basis~~ *when it includes multi-modal amenities (such as transit, bicycling, and walking facilities) that are adequate to provide mobility for users.*~~when necessary to attain the minimum LOS noted above for the other modes. In order to fully develop this implementation measure, the following timeline is proposed: January 1 – Develop descriptive definitions for each LOS for each mode, so that a lay-person can visualize what this condition would look like on the ground; February 1 – Develop a draft table showing which LOS levels may be traded off (i.e., conduct more research to confirm that the proposal above is sound); Summer 2010 – pilot test the proposed methodology and standards in the field.~~

The concept embodied in this measure, both as originally proposed and as amended, is that TRPA should not be designing a highway system capable of handling peak vehicle use with little or no congestion. Because the highway network at Tahoe is composed mostly of two-lane roads, peak periods of visitation will create congestion. Expanding the highway network would compromise the character of the Basin. Therefore, TRPA should be designing transportation and land use systems that work hand-in-hand to encourage the use and development of multi-modal transportation options. Staff believes that there is more value in preserving and enhancing the built and natural environments in the Basin than in ensuring free-flowing vehicle traffic at all times of the day and year.

Staff acknowledges the general nature of the following statement in the amended measure: “A project may be allowed to exceed vehicle LOS standards when it includes multi-modal amenities (such as transit, bicycling, and walking facilities) that are adequate to provide mobility for users.” The standards for adequacy would be developed during the second (Code revision) phase of the Milestone process associated with the RPU.

The proposed Policy that T.IMP-9 was written to support reads more like an Implementation Measure; it is overly prescriptive, and it contains implementation language that is already contained in T.IMP-9. *Staff proposes to amend Policy T-9.6 as follows:*

Consider quality of service for transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists in addition to motor vehicles when analyzing development impacts on the transportation system.~~Traffic operational criteria for the~~

~~Region's signalized and unsignalized intersections shall be a measure of person-delay or a multi-modal level of service indicator in Town Centers/Tourist Centers. Traditional level-of-service indicators may be used on rural roads.~~

2. **Stakeholder Comment**: It is sometimes difficult to find enough land coverage for projects specified in the "Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan" (measure T.IMP-6). In some Hydrologically Related Areas there is inadequate land coverage to transfer to projects.

   TRPA Response: For many projects, sidewalks and bicycle paths are located off-site or in the public right-of-way, and land coverage for these facilities is not counted against a project for this reason. *Staff proposed, as part of the Land Use Milestone, to amend Land Use Implementation Measure LU.IMP-20 to read: "Amend Chapter 20, Coverage, to allow land coverage from sending parcels located within TRPA-designated impaired watersheds to be transferred across Hydrologically Related ~~Hydrologic Transfer~~ Area boundaries, ~~(i.e., anywhere in the Tahoe Basin)~~ as long as the receiving area is in a TRPA-designated non-impaired watershed."*

3. **Stakeholder Comment**: Placer County noted that the Project Descriptions (PD) document "…speaks to providing mixed mode streets including bike paths/trails and walkways. Placer County coverage for such features should not be deducted from land development projects when they are for public benefit."

   TRPA Response: The County's point is that land coverage used to develop bike paths and sidewalks should not be counted in project permitting. In most cases, paths and sidewalks are in the public right-of-way, not on the project parcel, and therefore they do not count against a project's coverage anyway. In some cases, however, paths and sidewalks may need to be built on a project parcel.

   When jurisdictions require these facilities, there is a nexus between the project and the required facilities. Therefore, the land coverage required to construct these facilities is part of a project's design. In addition, there are several options available to project proponents to lessen the impact of coverage requirements (e.g., removing the area of the public facility from the project parcel and including it in the public right-of-way). TRPA staff believes it is not appropriate to change Code to prevent land coverage for bike paths and sidewalks from being counted against projects.

4. **Stakeholder Comment**: Many people go out of their way to avoid using paid parking. If one location has paid parking, and another nearby doesn't, everyone will park in the free area.

   TRPA Response: Paid parking, to be effective, must be implemented as part of an area-wide strategy. Pricing strategies should only be used in areas of high parking demand where there is high value associated with access. Decisions on whether pricing strategies should be implemented and how would be determined at the local level. Also see the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #4: What parking management policies are needed to dovetail with environmental improvement and PTOD goals?***

State and Federal Agencies

5. **Stakeholder Comment**: How will the acquisition of dedicated transit rights-of-way in Community Plans (CP) occur (Implementation Measure T.IMP-4)?

   TRPA Response: Acquisition of rights-of-way would occur in accordance with applicable state law when a transit route is identified in a CP area. *Staff proposes to modify T.IMP-4 as follows: "Update ~~Provide dedicated transit right-of-way in~~ Community Plans ~~and~~ and Plan Area maps to show potential transit rights-of-way and specify target transit frequencies (headways)."*

6. **Stakeholder Comment**: Delete Implementation Measure T.IMP-5 in Alternative 2 and Implementation Measure T.IMP-10 in Alternative 4 regarding transit frequencies. These are not really Implementation Measures, they are goals.

   TRPA Response: The ability of local jurisdictions to provide frequent transit will depend upon a number of factors, including funding and local land use patterns. Staff acknowledges that the Implementation Measures cited by the stakeholder are overly prescriptive. Tying transit frequencies to land use, which is important for supporting PTOD goals, is accomplished by T.IMP-4 (above) as proposed to be modified. *Therefore, staff proposes to delete the following measures:*

   > ~~*T.IMP-5 Increase fixed-route transit frequency on the North Shore between land use districts designated as Town Center/Tourist Center to 20 minutes, and extend service to evening hours where not currently available. On the South Shore, the goal would be to increase fixed-route transit frequency between land use districts designated as Town Center/Tourist Center to 10-15 minutes, extend transit into neighborhoods and recreation sites, and provide free transit on all fixed routes.*~~
   >
   > ~~*T.IMP-10. Increase fixed-route transit frequency on the North Shore and South Shore between land use districts designated as Town Center/Tourist Center to 15 minutes or better, extend service to evening hours where not currently available, extend transit into neighborhoods and recreation sites, and provide free transit on all fixed-routes.*~~

   To provide more support for the nexus between successful PTOD and frequent transit, *staff proposes to amend Policy T-4.1 as follows: "Encourage, and support as appropriate, improvements to existing transit systems such as increases in frequency that support local land-use patterns, preferential signal controls, expansion of service area, or extension of service hours."*

7. **Stakeholder Comment**: The Forest Service asked why it was singled-out as being required to provide transit to recreation areas in Policy T-4.5.

   TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to amend Policy T-4.5 as follows, for consistency with Mobility 2030: "~~Transit service shall be provided~~ Provide transit service to major summer and winter recreational areas~~, with assistance from the Forest Service~~."*

8. **Stakeholder Comment**: Policy T-9.B in the *TRPA Goals and Policies*, "Waterborne excursion services are encouraged," is proposed for deletion. The California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) noted that "the rationale given in the Matrix for deleting this Policy relates to transit. Waterborne excursion services are not transit; they're another way to have a recreation experience without being in your car (as described by the existing goal). Does TRPA really want to delete this?"

   TRPA Response: Policy T-9.B is proposed for deletion because it is unnecessary. Though TRPA supports private enterprise, it is not the Agency's role to call out individual market sectors for special support. To clarify why staff recommended this Policy for deletion, *staff proposes to change the "rationale" in the Matrix to reflect this argument.*

9. **Stakeholder Comment**: Please define "bicycle storage capacity" in Policy T-2.5.

   TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to change Policy T-2.5 as follows:* "*Increase ~~B~~bicycle storage capacity by promoting bike-share programs and including bicycle racks and bicycle lockers ~~shall be increased~~ at commercial and recreational areas, transit centers, lodging properties, and government buildings."*

10. **Stakeholder Comment**: Will new view turn-outs be required (Policy T-9.4)?

    TRPA Response: New view turn-outs are not proposed. *Staff proposes to clarify this by modifying T-9.4 as follows: "~~View turn-outs should be provided~~ Preserve existing view turn-outs along scenic highways to maintain traffic flow and ~~improve~~ safety."*

11. **Stakeholder Comment**: Please add "where feasible" to requirements that traffic and air quality mitigation projects be within a quarter-mile of the use they are mitigating (measure T.IMP-16, in Alternative 4).

    TRPA Response: Note that this measure deals with physical mitigation projects and not the use of mitigation fees. *Staff proposes to change T.IMP-16 as follows: "Require projects that are used as traffic and air quality mitigation to be within a quarter-mile of the projects they are mitigating, where feasible."*

12. **Stakeholder Comment**: CTC noted that measure T.IMP-7 states: "Pedestrian and Class II bicycle facilities (bike lanes) must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained along major travel routes when the edge of roadway is altered or improved." If a new encroachment permit for a driveway alters the edge of a roadway, what would be required for the private property owner? What is the definition of "altered or improved" as opposed to maintained?

    TRPA Response: Under T.IMP-7, any new encroachment into the public right-of-way would require the construction, upgrade, and maintenance of pedestrian and Class II bike facilities (where feasible, as proposed to be modified as indicated in ***TRANS Issue #1: Should bicycle lanes be constructed along major travel routes?***). The property owner would be required to either construct the facilities or pay an in-lieu fee. *Staff proposes to define "altered", "improved",*

and "maintained" in the second (Code revision) phase of the Milestone process associated with the RPU.

Private Sector

13. **Stakeholder Comment**: An Implementation Measure is needed that encourages public transit to serve Basin trailheads and marinas.

    TRPA Response: TRPA would encourage public transit to trailheads and marinas through *Policy T-4.5, which is proposed to be amended as follows: "~~Transit service shall be provided~~ Provide transit service* to major summer and winter recreational areas*~~, with assistance from the Forest Service~~"* (see TRPA response to Stakeholder Comment #7).

    TRPA is not, however, a public transit implementer. Transportation Goal #1 in the 1987 Regional Plan, which is proposed to be reworded and moved to Policy T-5.1 in the RPU, directs the Agency to "participate in state and local transportation planning efforts." TRPA regularly consults with local transit agencies and the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) to encourage transit service within "gap" areas.

14. **Stakeholder Comment**: Tahoe needs hubs where low-emission vehicles are available for rent. Please support Zero-Emission Vehicles (ZEVs).

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to amend Policy T-8.4 as follows: "Discourage ~~Automobile~~* rental*~~s~~ of vehicles that are not low- or zero-emission ~~should be discouraged~~* within the Tahoe region*. ~~Traffic mitigation fees shall be assessed on vehicles rented in the region.~~"*

    In addition, staff proposes to create a new Implementation Measure to support this Policy as follows: "T.IMP-19 Amend Code Chapter 95 to exempt rental of zero-, partial zero-, or ultra low-emission vehicles from payment of Rental Car Mitigation Fees."

15. **Stakeholder Comment**: "Enlarge the tent." Work with the Chambers of Commerce to bring rental car agencies to the table for ideas on encouraging more rentals of ZEVs.

    TRPA Response: Comment noted. Rental agencies would be encouraged to rent ZEVs by the fee exemption proposed in the new measure, T.IMP-19 (indicated above).

16. **Stakeholder Comment**: Experiments with paid parking at Tahoe have not been successful. If new projects must implement paid parking, they may not be able to get financing. We want to remove barriers to redevelopment, not set up new barriers. Shared parking and metered street parking could be acceptable.

TRPA Response: See the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #4.*** Decisions on whether pricing strategies should be implemented and how would be determined at the local level.

17. **Stakeholder Comment**: Concerning Implementation Measure T.IMP-2, instead of using paid parking as a disincentive to private vehicle use, make an incentive for people to get out of their cars by creating an efficient transit and bicycle path system. Funding for the transit system could be available if the Tahoe region becomes eligible for urban area formula funds.[19] Pursuing these funds should be a top priority.

    TRPA Response: Section 5307 operating assistance has yet to be secured for Tahoe; however staff agrees it is a high priority which the TRPA and TMPO will continue to pursue. (Note: pursuit of these funds does not modify the land use strategies proposed in the Land Use Milestone.)

    Paid parking is not proposed as a disincentive to driving but as a way for property owners and communities to place their own value on space. An efficient transit, bicycle, and pedestrian system, when integrated with well-designed parking management strategies, can shift people out of cars. In some communities, paid parking may be appropriate as a partial funding source for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Decisions on whether pricing strategies should be implemented and how would be determined at the local level. Also see the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #4.***

18. **Stakeholder Comment**: Rather than legislating sidewalk snow removal (Policy T-2.8), TRPA could encourage jurisdictions to work with the private sector on snow removal. Take a "menu approach" and suggest a suite of options that jurisdictions could use to improve and incentivize maintenance. Look at the Town of Mammoth Lakes for examples of successful maintenance options.

    TRPA Response: TRPA is proposing to take a more facilitative role regarding sidewalk maintenance. See the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #2: How should TRPA facilitate maintenance of bicycle paths and sidewalks?***

19. **Stakeholder Comment**: Air Quality Mitigation Fees should not be increased and no new fees should be added. If fees go up, businesses won't invest. Additional fees will stifle the economy.

    TRPA Response: Comment noted. TRPA should set fees that are reasonable in the context of the Lake Tahoe economy and that provide sufficient funding to mitigate new vehicle trips.

20. **Stakeholder Comment**: Please explore establishing a Basin-wide gasoline tax to support public transit.

    TRPA Response: The TTD is the agency that could implement this suggestion, if it were to be supported. TRPA has no taxing authority. However, the mechanics of establishing a gas tax at Tahoe have been explored in a past

[19] Federal Transit Administration, Section 5307, "Transit Operating Assistance Program"

report.[20] The result of the report, which looked at seven regional revenue funding options including a gasoline tax, was that there was no appetite for such a tax.

League to Save Lake Tahoe and Tahoe Area Sierra Club

21. **Stakeholder Comment**: Transportation Policy 8.F in the 1987 Regional Plan reads:

> The Airport Master Plan/Settlement Agreement shall be updated. This update shall be predicated on a study evaluating:
> (1) the potential for both aviation and non-aviation uses of the site;
> (2) the role of the proposed uses in Tahoe's transit system; and
> (3) the appropriate scale of facilities related thereto.
> Any update that includes regional commercial service shall additionally require a comprehensive feasibility study of the viability of regional commercial air service.

In Alternative 2, this policy was replaced with Transportation Policy T-11.1, which reads, "Maintain an updated Airport Master Plan/Settlement Agreement." If a policy about the airport is kept, the prior language should be reinstated, because it specifies a level of detail which is not currently in the Airport Master Plan. Also, references to the Settlement Agreement should probably be deleted, because the Settlement Agreement only dealt with noise issues.

TRPA Response: The prior language is too detailed for a Policy; staff does not propose to reinstate the specifics from existing Policy 8.F. Removing language related to the Settlement Agreement is, however, a good idea. *Staff proposes to amend T-11.1 as follows: "Maintain an updated Airport Master Plan~~/Settlement Agreement~~."*

22. **Stakeholder Comment**: It appears counterproductive to offer reduced parking requirements (T-1.4) as an incentive for creating PTOD areas, as the intent of PTOD is to create walkable (not drivable) communities.

TRPA Response: Staff believes that the commenter misunderstood the meaning of "reduced parking requirements." Reducing parking would help to create walkable communities. If the intent was to create drivable communities, increasing parking would be the proposal.

In order to create policy language that provides general guidance, however, *staff proposes to amend Policy T-1.4 as follows: "Provide incentives to redevelopment areas encouraging mixed-use development, transit, walking, and bicycling. ~~These incentives include, but are not limited to: reduced parking requirements, and height exceptions.~~"*

[20] Jones & Stokes, *Revised Feasibility Analysis of Funding Mechanisms for the Regional Share of the Lake Tahoe Region's Environmental Improvement Program*, 2000.

23. **Stakeholder Comment**: Policy T-1.8 needs to recognize all communities, not just the North and South Shore. Please clarify what "sensitivity to the local context" means.

    TRPA Response: Because this Policy is redundant to language in the Land Use Element and does not belong in Transportation, *staff proposes to delete Policy T-1.8: "~~PTOD sites are recommended to be designed with sensitivity to the local context and honoring the difference in scale between the North Shore and South Shore.~~"*

24. **Stakeholder Comment**: The League to Save Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe Area Sierra Club support proposed policy T-2.4, which states, "New development in proximity to major pedestrian or bicycle routes shall include pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access." However, this should read, "New development and redevelopment…"

    TRPA Response: To address the stakeholders' comment and introduce the active voice, *staff proposes to amend Policy T-2.4 as follows: "Include pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access as a feature of n~~N~~ew development and redevelopment projects proposed* in proximity to major pedestrian or bicycle routes *~~shall include pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access~~."*

25. **Stakeholder Comment**: Proposed Goal T-4 refers to "environmentally conscious" mass transit. It is important when using value terms such this to provide criteria by which to assess the actual definition. Without criteria, this term has little meaning.

    TRPA Response: To address the comment and make Goal T-4 into a true, general statement of the Agency's aspiration, *staff proposes to amend Goal T-4 as follows:* "Actively encourage *~~the development and implementation of services and programs to expand~~ expansion of* the operation and use of *~~environmentally conscious~~* public transit *~~in the Lake Tahoe region~~."*

26. **Stakeholder Comment**: The "rationales" for Goal T-6 and Policies T-6.1 and T-6.3 (re: developing measures for tracking economic vitality) state: "Ensure that transportation's focus on alternative modes does not cause economy to suffer." Presumably an effective, efficient multi-modal transportation system would either be a stimulus (see "rationale" for Policy T-6.2) or neutral to the economy.

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to amend the "rationale" for Goal T-6 as follows: "~~Ensure that transportation's focus on alternative modes does not cause economy to suffer~~ Reflects federal goals for regional transportation planning" and the "rationales" for Policies T-6.1 and T-6.3 as follows: "~~Ensure that transportation's focus on alternative modes does not cause economy to suffer~~ Strengthens database of knowledge to inform transportation planning."*

27. **Stakeholder Comment**: Make Policy T-12.3 (related to local and regional funding mechanisms) sound more positive, and insert text about working with the

local jurisdictions. Otherwise, the Policy seems to give jurisdictions an excuse not to look for local funding sources.

TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to amend Policy T-12.3 as follows: "Work with local jurisdictions to transcend ~~Acknowledge that appropriate local/regional funding mechanisms are bound by~~ legislative and legal constraints on local funding mechanisms ~~that are solved at the local jurisdictional level~~."*

28. **Stakeholder Comment**: T.IMP-7 refers to "Class II bicycle facilities," requiring them to be constructed along "major travel routes" when roadways are "altered or improved." None of these terms are defined in TRPA Code.

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to define all three of these terms in the second (Code revision) phase of the Milestone process associated with the RPU.*

29. **Stakeholder Comment**: The League and the Sierra Club are opposed to the complete deletion of 1987 Regional Plan Transportation Policy 7.A. Although they agree with the deletion of the portion of the policy about grading, they do not support the deletion of portion of the policy that states: "The construction of roadways to freeway design standards is inappropriate in the Tahoe region."

    TRPA Response*:* Staff concurs. *Staff proposes to create a new Policy that reads: "The construction of roadways to freeway design standards is inappropriate in the Tahoe region."*

30. **Stakeholder Comment**: Change "compromising" to "violating" in Goal T-11.

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to edit Goal T-11 as follows: "Aviation: Maintain and encourage air service to the extent that it increases mobility and public safety without ~~compromising~~ violating environmental Thresholds."*

31. **Stakeholder Comment**: Although the League and the Sierra Club proposed a change to Goal T-11 (see comment above), they generally do not support the proposed Goal. This is due to the fact that air service inherently impacts the Air Quality and Noise Thresholds, which are both not in attainment.

    TRPA Response: Staff recognizes that air travel to Tahoe is controversial and can result in environmental impacts. Goal T-11 as amended, however, includes the phrase "without violating environmental Thresholds." Therefore, it adequately captures the idea that air travel may have a place in providing inter-regional travel options when Thresholds are in attainment.

    Aircraft technology has the potential to improve over time; it would be unwise to automatically discount this travel mode. Future air travel to Tahoe will be required to demonstrate compliance with TRPA environmental regulations, including Thresholds.

32. **Stakeholder Comment**: Transportation Policy 6.E in the 1987 Regional Plan states: "New on-street parking shall be prohibited along major regional travel routes and existing parking should be discouraged along major regional travel

routes and local roads." Staff's proposal to delete this Policy does not take into consideration that new parking in rural areas should still be discouraged.

TRPA Response: Staff is not proposing new parking, and the discouragement of existing parking along major regional travel routes and local roads is the jurisdiction of state police, state highway agencies, and local jurisdictions. Moreover, erosion control projects and plans for particularly impacted highways (such as Nevada State Route 28 along the East Shore) are already eliminating numerous dispersed recreation pull-outs.

33. **Stakeholder Comment**: Air Quality Mitigation Funds should not be used for transportation programs. A distinct traffic mitigation fund should be created for projects that impact transportation. Does Policy T-8.4 indicate that there will be separate Air Quality and Transportation mitigation programs?

    TRPA Response: Code requires that the use of Air Quality Mitigation Funds be consistent with the RTP or the 1992 Air Quality Plan.[21] Therefore, they can be used for both transportation and air quality improvement projects. As indicated in TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #14, Policy T-8.4 is proposed to be amended to remove reference to "traffic mitigation fees."

34. **Stakeholder Comment**: The League and the Sierra Club noted: "It is imperative that Class II bike lanes are given a higher priority over Class I bike lanes. Class II bike lanes are most often used by cyclists who are commuting and are using their bikes as a substitute for the private automobile, whereas Class I bike lanes are most often used for recreation, not transportation. Often users will drive to the staging area with their bikes which does not reduce traffic. Furthermore, Class I bike lanes should be routed on the least sensitive land, for example, routing a trail through a forested upland instead of a Stream Environment Zone."

    TRPA Response: For clarification, Class I bicycle "paths" (not "lanes") are shared-use paths separated from roadways, and Class II bicycle lanes are striped and signed shoulders on a roadway with a designated width.

    Lake Tahoe Basin Bike Trail Surveys (conducted in 2007 by the TRPA and the Tahoe Coalition of Recreation Providers) showed that of the 365 people surveyed on the shared-use path system, over 63 percent of path users were using the path for commuting, errands, shopping, or biking to a recreation destination. TRPA Code prohibits paths through sensitive areas when viable alternatives exist. Staff does not propose any changes based on this comment.

35. **Stakeholder Comment**: Add evaluation of projects through a new "emissions per person per mile" standard as an Implementation Measure.

    TRPA Response: Air Quality measure AQ.IMP-64 states that "TRPA shall develop a conformity process that determines the air quality impacts of transportation improvements on TRPA Air Quality Thresholds, similar to federal MPO air quality requirements." TRPA has proposed to measure "emissions per

[21] TRPA – *Code of Ordinances*, Section 93.5

person per mile" when assessing transportation's impacts on air quality as part of this "conformity process."

36. **Stakeholder Comment**: The League and the Sierra Club are concerned that proposed changes that allow vehicle LOS to worsen might lead to increased emissions from vehicle idling.

    TRPA Response: Staff believes that emissions from increased idling caused by traffic congestion will eventually be offset by improvement to the automobile fleet and reductions in overall vehicle trips resulting from PTOD. See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

37. **Stakeholder Comment**: Seasonal traffic patterns should be considered in revising any LOS standards.

    TRPA Response: Staff concurs with this statement. See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

Fire Officials

38. **Stakeholder Comment**: Allowing bicycles and pedestrians to have priority over vehicles, as stated in Policy T-2.6, would defeat the purpose of planned future signal synchronization and would cause traffic to slow.

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to amend Policy T-2.6 as follows:*
    *"*Intersections and driveways shall be designed and sited to minimize impacts on public transportation, adjacent roadways and intersections, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. ~~*Give priority to bicyclists and pedestrians at signalized intersections.*~~*"*

    Staff proposes to add a new Implementation Measure as follows:

    > *T.IMP-20 Give priority to bicyclists and pedestrians at signalized intersections where interruptions to signal synchronization will not result.*

39. **Stakeholder Comment**: Regarding Policy T-2.7, it may not be appropriate for all projects to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians. In some cases, construction of only a small segment of bike path may not be very effective, and collection of in-lieu fees or bonding for later construction would be preferred.

    TRPA Response: Policy T-2.4, as proposed to be amended above (see TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #24), would read: "Include pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access as a feature of new development and redevelopment projects proposed in proximity to major pedestrian or bicycle routes."

    Staff proposes to delete Policy T-2.7:

> ~~*Require that projects include measures to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in the earliest stages of project development. The TRPA will not approve projects that do not show accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian needs.*~~

Staff proposes to add a new Implementation Measure as follows:

> *T.IMP-21 New and redeveloped commercial, tourist, multi-family, public service, and recreation projects shall incorporate segments of the bicycle and pedestrian network which are adjacent to, or within the project parcel boundaries consistent with the Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Implementation of the facilities will be through construction, easements, or in-lieu fees as appropriate to the scale of project.*

40. **Stakeholder Comment**: Reducing traffic conflicts by limiting driveway access to major travel routes (see Policy T-9.5) can cause problems with emergency evacuation or emergency vehicle access. Explain what "limiting access to major travel routes" means.

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to amend Policy T-9.5 as follows: "*Traffic conflicts shall be reduced by limiting or controlling *turning movements from multiple parking lot access points onto*~~*access to*~~ major regional travel routes and major local roadways. Driveways shall be designed and sited to minimize impacts to regional traffic flow and safety."

41. **Stakeholder Comment**: Eliminating parking minimums and setting parking maximums, as discussed in measure T.IMP-1, might lead to spillover parking on local roadways and impede fire access in some areas. Please consider how parking regulations might impact narrow roadways, enforcement issues, and how snow storage may affect available parking.

    TRPA Response: Staff is no longer proposing to require parking maximums. See the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #4.***

42. **Stakeholder Comment**: Emergency services should be exempt from requirements to reduce vehicle trips (see Policy T-8.1).

    TRPA Response: This policy is not meant to apply to emergency services.

43. **Stakeholder Comment**: Deleting Transportation Policy 6.E in the 1987 Regional Plan, which prohibits new on-street parking along major travel routes, could lead to reduced emergency vehicle access. This could be especially problematic in areas with older buildings whose designs do not incorporate appropriate emergency access.

    TRPA Response: Local fire departments must approve project plans before they are submitted to TRPA. The fire departments can influence project design, requiring emergency vehicle access as a condition of approval.

Boards and Commissions

Tahoe Transportation District (TTD)

44. **Stakeholder Comment**: Measure T.IMP-2 relates to "shared parking concepts." What happens if needs change, and more parking is needed over time?

    TRPA Response: Area-wide parking solutions are adaptive over time, unlike inflexible on-site minimum parking requirements. As needs change, businesses can negotiate and draw from a larger pool of shared parking. Jurisdictions can collect in-lieu fees for new parking needs and construct additional shared-use parking as needed. It should be noted that, even with flexible parking arrangements, not every proposed business will be able to be accommodated, much like the situation today. Also see the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #4.***

45. **Stakeholder Comment**: Take "free transit" out of Alternatives 2 and 4 (see measures T.IMP-5 and -10) or identify a logical source funding.

    TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #6. Staff has proposed to remove these measures.

46. **Stakeholder Comment**: Add a Policy about California AB 32 and how to evaluate projects in light of the new GHG reduction requirements. Also, add a Policy about the opportunities offered by the federal HUD-DOT-EPA Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities.

    TRPA Response: GHG reduction requirements, such as those discussed in California AB 32 and SB 375, will be described in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) of the Regional Plan. The SCS will also discuss overlapping connections with other state and federal agency programs.

TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC)

47. **Stakeholder Comment**: Consider the funding restrictions that road agencies have when requiring Class II facilities along major roadways (see measure T.IMP-7). Often, their funding cannot be used for bicycle facilities.

    TRPA Response: See the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #1.***

48. **Stakeholder Comment**: What happens when bike paths and sidewalks required by measure T.IMP-7 lead to wildlife issues and scenic issues such as road cuts?

    TRPA Response: These issues, if they arise, have the potential to render a bike path or sidewalk infeasible for environmental reasons. Also see the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #1.***

49. **Stakeholder Comment**: Keep pedestrian- and transit-oriented development (presumably sidewalks) open year-round.

    TRPA Response: See the discussion in ***TRANS Issue #2.***

50. **Stakeholder Comment**: Transit LOS cannot be "D" when vehicle LOS is "E" (see measure T.IMP-9).

    TRPA Response: Staff is no longer proposing to establish a baseline for transit LOS. See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

51. **Stakeholder Comment**: Consider removing LOS standards. Having traffic back up is not that big of a problem.

    TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

52. **Stakeholder Comment**: The Transportation Element should look at how transportation policies can address nitrogen loading. The RPU should include a discussion that the Regional Plan is relied upon for reduction in nitrogen loading.

    TRPA Response: Transportation Policies and Implementation Measures address pollution reduction. One component of pollution is nitrogen loading.

Appendix B

Summary of Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses from the **Noise** Subelement Stakeholder Meetings

Local Jurisdictions

1. **Stakeholder Comment**: The proposed noise mitigation fees may add additional cost to projects.

   TRPA Response: The concept of an across-the-board noise mitigation fee arose during the Pathway process. However, Pathway participants were not unanimously in favor of it, and after careful consideration during the RPU stakeholder process, staff has concluded that such a fee is not the best approach to mitigating most noise sources.

   The prominent noise sources in the region are the existing transportation corridors. Subsection 23.7.C of the TRPA Code contains language addressing noise from these sources. *Therefore, staff proposes to delete N.IMP-6, N.IMP-15, and N.IMP-20, which read:*

   > ~~*N.IMP-6 Mitigation Fees -- Noise mitigation fees are required for all projects that cause increased noise in the Region. Direct mitigation will be used whenever practicable.*~~
   > ~~*N.IMP-15 Mitigation Fund -- TRPA will develop a noise mitigation fund to address unmitigated on- and off-site noise impacts associated with a project or program. This fee will be applicable to private and public entities for their programs and projects. Potential mitigation shall include, but not be limited to sound insulation of affected structures, acquisition of noise sensitive sites, low noise pavement, noise barriers, etc.*~~
   > ~~*N.IMP-20 Mitigation -- Projects will be required to mitigate all noise associated with their project, including noise generated within their project area as well as off-site traffic noise associated with the project. If actual mitigation is not feasible for the project proponent to implement, payment into a noise mitigation fund may be utilized to offset the impact at a 1.5 to 1.0 cost ratio.*~~

2. **Stakeholder Comment**: What resources will be necessary to enforce existing and proposed noise ordinances?

   TRPA Response: Staff is not proposing changes regarding the enforcement of noise regulations. As is the case today, TRPA will continue enforce its noise ordinance as necessary, and local jurisdictions are responsible for enforcing their own noise ordinances plus any state regulations that they are obliged to enforce.

State and Federal Jurisdictions

3. **Stakeholder Comment**: Will future forest fuels management projects need to comply with the noise standards as stated in N.IMP-2? The Forest Service is concerned that the proposed noise measures may inadvertently limit operation periods and activities, especially for projects such as mechanical fuels reduction near residential neighborhoods and the wildland urban interface (WUI). The Forest Service recommends that TRPA exempt forest and fuels management projects from its proposed noise regulations.

   TRPA Response: Fuels management projects should be treated the same as TRPA-approved construction and maintenance projects. The standard practice at TRPA is to do so. However, this is not codified in Code Chapter 23 or specified in N.IMP-7.

   In fact, N.IMP-7, as originally proposed, is a mild re-write of Code Section 23.8 "Exemptions to Noise Limitations." The main differences between the measure and existing Code are that the measure proposes removing the exemption for TRPA-approved demolition, adding a 60dBA 1-hour L_{EQ} limit,[22] and restricting the exemption to Monday through Saturday between 8 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (the existing Code allows the exemption on all days between 8 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.).

   As originally proposed, N.IMP-7 fails to mention the Code section that is proposed for amendment and any exemption for forest and fuels management. It is overly prescriptive regarding hours and days of operation and removes the exemption for TRPA-approved demolition of structures for no apparent reason. Staff does believe, however, that the 60dBA 1-hour L_{EQ} limit ought to remain. *Therefore, staff proposes to amend N.IMP-7 as follows:*

   > *Amend Code Section 23.8 as follows:* Exemptions to Noise Limitations: The standards of this chapter shall not apply to noise from TRPA-approved construction or maintenance projects*, forest and fuels management projects, or the demolition of structures, provided such activities are limited to the hours between 8 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.* ~~*occurring Monday through Saturday between 8 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Construction a*~~Activities outside this period are limited to 60dBA 1-hour L_{EQ}. The standards of this chapter shall not apply to safety signals, warning devices, or emergency pressure relief valves and other similar devices. Emergency work to protect life or property and fireworks used in accordance with a state or local permit are exempt from noise standards.

4. **Stakeholder Comment**: The Forest Service stated they cannot enforce TRPA-specific noise ordinances per N.IMP-10. Their procedures only allow them to enforce California and Nevada State Vehicle Codes.

[22] L_{EQ} is the abbreviation for "Equivalent Continuous Sound Level," or the notional sound pressure level which, if maintained constant over a given time, delivers the same amount of acoustic energy at some point as the time-varying sound pressure level would deliver at the same point and over the same period of time.

TRPA Response: N.IMP-10, which is contained in Alternative 4 only, would require local, state, and federal jurisdictions to maintain noise monitoring and enforcement programs. These jurisdictions, however, are already tasked with enforcing state and federal noise regulations. Therefore, *staff proposes to delete the measure: "~~N.IMP-10 Local Jurisdiction Enforcement - Local, state and federal jurisdictions shall maintain a program to monitor and enforce noise standards.~~"*

Staff proposes to delete the following, related Noise measures:

> *~~N.IMP-35 Motorcycles – For motorcycles traveling less than or equal to 35 MPH, 77.0 dBA when measured at 50 feet. For motorcycles traveling greater than 35 MPH, 86.0dBA when measured at 50 feet. On-road motorcycles shall be limited to 96 dB using SAE J-1287 test.~~*
>
> *~~N.IMP-19 OHV Noise - Off-road vehicles shall be limited to 96 dB using SAE J-1287 test.~~*

Staff also proposes to streamline TRPA Code by deleting two provisions under 23.2.A "Maximum Allowable Noise Levels (dBA)." The Subparagraphs below are redundant to regulations that are enforced by state and local government:

> *~~(6) Off-Road Vehicles: For off-road vehicles traveling less than or equal to 35 MPH, 72.0 dBA when measured at 50 feet. For off-road vehicles traveling greater than 35 MPH, 86.0 dBA when measured at 50 feet.~~*
>
> *~~(7) Over-Snow Vehicles: For over-snow vehicles, 82.0 dBA when measured at 50 feet.~~*

5. **Stakeholder Comment**: It is difficult to assess the effects of N.IMP-2, especially concerning the interpretation of the word "serenity."

   TRPA Response: N.IMP-2 states:

   > The TRPA will only allow projects and uses that comply with noise standards and do not adversely affect the serenity of the community, neighborhoods, or wildlife. Sound proofing shall be required on all structures containing uses that have the potential to cause an exceedance of any noise standards or adversely impacts the surrounding area.

   The word "serenity" was added during the Pathway process as part of the community's vision for Tahoe. "Serenity" is not a defined term in TRPA Code. Obviously, TRPA cannot enforce "serenity." It can and does, however, enforce the standards in the Code. For the purposes of N.IMP-2, staff interprets "serenity" as meaning "complying with TRPA noise standards."

6. **Stakeholder Comment**: The Forest Service stated they could only post noise ordinance signs (as required in N.IMP-37 and -38) if funding is available.

TRPA Response: The sign requirement pertaining to the Forest Service is already stipulated in Code.[23]

7. **Stakeholder Comment**: What is the future impact to resource management projects if the noise mitigation fees in N.IMP-6 are implemented?

   TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

8. **Stakeholder Comment**: Noise monitoring cannot be required if funding is not available (N.IMP-10).

   TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #4.

Private Sector

9. **Stakeholder Comment**: All the private sector stakeholders attending the Noise stakeholder meetings support N.IMP-21.

   TRPA Response: Staff believes that it is important to note that the private sector supports the requirement that state transportation agencies install low-noise pavement or other mitigation to reduce noise from transportation corridors. However, because staff is proposing to delete the measures that deal with creating a noise mitigation fund (see TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1) *staff proposes to amend N.IMP-21 as follows:*

   > Transportation Noise -- Non-attainment transportation noise corridors shall be brought into attainment at the earliest practicable date or upon refurbishing, resurfacing, and when any major work within the transportation noise corridor is conducted. Low noise pavement or other mitigation shall be used on transportation corridors and roadways that are out-of-attainment with noise standards or that contribute to noise issues in the surrounding community or neighborhoods~~. *Payment into a noise mitigation fund will not be permitted as a substitute for providing low-noise pavement on highway paving projects.*~~

10. **Stakeholder Comment**: Seaplane stakeholders stated that N.IMP-25 is unnecessary and asked TRPA to remove the measure.

    TRPA Response: This issue is discussed under the heading "*WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE?*" in the Noise portion of the FactSheet narrative. *Staff concurs with stakeholders regarding N.IMP-25 and proposes to remove the measure:*

[23] TRPA Code of Ordinances Subsections 23.6.E and F require that marinas, boat launching facilities, and public agencies responsible for the administration of public lands and recreation areas post notices of noise standards in conspicuous locations.

~~*Seaplanes - No seaplane bases or docking facilities are allowed in the Basin. Seaplanes shall be prohibited within 1-mile of the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. Define seaplanes- make sure they include float planes and anything that flies and can land on water.*~~

11. **Stakeholder Comment**: All the private sector stakeholders attending the Noise stakeholder meetings were opposed to the noise mitigation fee due to the financial impact on businesses.

    TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

League to Save Lake Tahoe and Tahoe Area Sierra Club

12. **Stakeholder Comment**: The League and the Sierra Club would like to see one-hour noise standards implemented as suggested by the Pathway process.

    TRPA Response: Alternative 2 includes a measure that would require development of one-hour noise standards. N.IMP-27 states "1-Hr Standards -- Develop and implement 1-hour noise standards to address human/ecosystem health issues for unnecessary noise."

13. **Stakeholder Comment**: The League and the Sierra Club would like to see TRPA regulate noise associated with helicopter tours based in the region.

    TRPA Response: Comment noted.

14. **Stakeholder Comment**: The League and the Sierra Club stated the current noise monitoring program is insufficient to provide information on trend analysis and Threshold attainment status.

    TRPA Response: TRPA recently purchased new noise monitoring equipment to provide information on trend analysis and Threshold attainment status.

Fire Officials

15. **Stakeholder Comment**: One fire official expressed concern about safety issues with prohibiting engine braking except in cases of emergency. He proposed that N.IMP-23 be revised to only require advisory signage.

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to modify N.IMP-23 as follows: "Engine Brakes -- Discourage unnecessary ~~U~~use of engine brakes ~~shall be prohibited in the Region, except for emergencies.~~ through installation of public information signs along highways."*

16. **Stakeholder Comment**: Emergency services and forest fuels reduction efforts should be exempt from the noise ordinances.

TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #3.

17. **Stakeholder Comment**: There ought to be an emergency exception to the proposed helipad restrictions for fire-related services.

    TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #3.

Boards and Commissions

Noise Technical Advisory Committee

18. **Stakeholder Comment**: Strongly support implementing noise reduction projects for the transportation sector. These projects should be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), TRPA's Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Noise reduction measures should also be included in permit conditions for any future project with a transportation component.

    TRPA Response: *Staff proposes to modify N.IMP-22 as follows:*

    > *N.IMP-22: Transportation Measures – Design, implement, and incorporate into the RTP and EIP appropriately-scaled ~~T~~transportation measures ~~designed and implemented~~ to ensure that noise standards are attained and maintained at levels that preserve the serenity of the community and neighborhood and provide quiet recreation areas ~~shall be incorporated into the RTP~~.*

19. **Stakeholder Comment**: Strengthen language regarding requirements for monitoring and enforcement contained in N.IMP-9.

    TRPA Response: N.IMP-9 Noise Monitoring states: "TRPA will maintain adequate noise monitoring, enforcement programs, and routinely monitor noise associated with motor vehicles, motorcycles, over-the-snow vehicles, and aircraft use to ensure the serenity of the community and neighborhood is preserved." Staff believes that the measure, as proposed, contains language strong enough to promote the strengthening of the noise monitoring and enforcement program.

20. **Stakeholder Comment**: One-hour noise standards should be implemented.

    TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #12.

21. **Stakeholder Comment**: Language should be added to strictly prohibit projects that cause a Noise Threshold standard to be exceeded or worsen one that is out-of-attainment.

    TRPA Response: Code Subsection 23.7.A already prohibits approval of "a project which causes a community noise standard (CNEL) to be exceeded." Also see TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #12 for discussion of adding a one-hour standard.

22. **Stakeholder Comment:** A noise mitigation fund should be created. The fund should be overseen by professional noise personnel and be eligible for compliance use.

    TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

23. **Stakeholder Comment**: The Chair of TRPA's Advisory Planning Commission (APC) stated there is a deficiency in noise monitoring at the South Lake Tahoe Airport. He requested staff provide the airport's standing and recent monitoring information regarding noise compliance.

    TRPA Response: The Airport installed a new noise monitoring system in 2007. This system verified 123 non-exempt aircraft noise violations in 2008, 417 in 2009, and 65 year-to-date as of March 31, 2010. The single-event (aircraft) noise standard was listed as unknown for the period between 2001 and 2006; the monitoring equipment was non-functional during most of this time.

24. **Stakeholder Comment**: Is there a guarantee that low-noise pavement would be installed in areas that fees are paid?

    TRPA Response: See TRPA Response to Stakeholder Comment #1.

25. **Stakeholder comment**: Watercraft noise testing is impractical. As an alternative, TRPA should maintain a list of after-market manifolds which are known to be in non-compliance and inspect for these components.

    TRPA Response: Staff does not concur with this comment. The noise produced by the installation of aftermarket manifolds not only varies by the engine on which they are installed, but maintaining a list of aftermarket accessories in a market that constantly introduces new products is too burdensome. This is why noise levels associated with aftermarket manifolds and exhaust systems are not routinely tested by any official agency.

    Moreover, experience has shown that few boats violate TRPA's single event noise standards and need to be tested. But when a boat does need to be tested, TRPA has the equipment necessary to conduct noise testing according to published Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) procedures for watercraft. Testing can usually be completed in 20 to 30 minutes.

Appendix C

Summary of Stakeholder Comments and TRPA Responses from the **Energy & Climate Change** Subelement Stakeholder Meetings

Local Jurisdictions

1. **Stakeholder Comment**: When will a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory be established?

   TRPA Response: The California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) is leading the effort to complete a GHG Emissions Inventory. CTC has entered into a contract with U.C. Davis TERC/Delta Group to assist with conducting the inventory, which is specifically geared at answering the following key management questions:

   - What are the stationary (direct) & mobile sources of GHG emissions in the Lake Tahoe Basin?
   - What is the total annual amount of GHG emissions (for each source category) generated by sources within the Basin? (Direct sources of emissions include transportation, wildfires and controlled burns, and residential heating, etc.)
   - What is the total annual amount of GHG emissions (for each source category) generated by sources outside, but caused by activities within, the Basin? (Indirect sources of emissions include power used in homes within the Basin but generated by power plants outside the Basin.)
   - What are some of the key strategies that could be implemented (as part of transportation efforts in the EIP and promoted by other planning and land management agencies) to reduce Basin-generated GHG emissions?

   The results of this effort will be a certified quantification (in tons-per-year) of emissions for each GHG and for each emissions source. Results will be reported in a Final Report, which will include the following sections:

   - a discussion of emissions sources and the emissions inventory
   - an identification of knowledge gaps as appropriate
   - recommendations for future needs to fill those knowledge gaps
   - an analysis of policy implications related to the emissions and source inventories

   Preliminary information is expected within 9-12 months. There will be a stakeholder engagement process for selecting a GHG reduction target for the region by sectors once the emissions inventory is completed. *Staff proposes to participate in the U.C. Davis stakeholder engagement process when requested.*

2. **Stakeholder Comment**: Will TRPA develop tools to measure GHGs?

   TRPA Response: TRPA will not develop tools to measure GHGs. Methodologies for measuring and estimating GHG emissions are well

established at the local, state[24], national[25], and international[26] levels. When regional stakeholders, including TRPA, agree on GHG reduction targets by sectors for the Region, the appropriate means of measuring progress toward these targets will be identified and agreed upon by the group.

State and Federal Jurisdictions

NOTE: State and federal land management stakeholders were either supportive or neutral on the plan alternatives regarding Energy & Climate Change.

Private Sector

3. **Stakeholder Comment**: Most future projects will be oriented toward redevelopment of existing building sites, since there are relatively few vacant parcels left in private hands. Building codes usually require that new or remodeled buildings meet current state and federal energy efficiency standards. This should have the effect of reducing GHG emissions over time as old buildings are modernized or replaced. Encouraging energy retrofitting of older residences would reduce emissions from these properties.

   TRPA Response: Comment noted. TRPA is also exploring the idea of reducing future Air Quality Mitigation Fees for projects that can reduce certain air emissions through the use of "green" practices such as adherence to LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards (see Air Quality measure AQ.IMP-5).

4. **Stakeholder Comment**: John Upton (a former member of the Bi-State Fire Commission and an APC Member) noted in a letter that there are several forest carbon studies that suggest that cleaning up the forests would reduce carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (see letter in Appendix D).

   TRPA Response: TRPA recognizes that forest management practices can contribute to slowing the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO_2). Forest management, including removal of hazardous fuels, can reduce CO_2 emissions in the event of a catastrophic wildfire. If the thinned forest biomass is sequestered for wood products or energy generation, the temporal benefits can be correspondingly greater. TRPA will continue to promote hazardous fuels reduction and creation of defensible space.

[24] E.g., *The Climate Registry Version 1.1*, "Accurate, transparent, and consistent measurement of greenhouse gases across North America," May 2008, available at: http://www.theclimateregistry.org/downloads/GRP.pdf.
[25] E.g., *2010 U.S. Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report*, "Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2008," April 2010, U.S. EPA # 430-R-10-006, available at: http://epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/usinventoryreport.html.
[26] *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, available at: http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.html.

League to Save Lake Tahoe and Tahoe Area Sierra Club

5. **Stakeholder Comment**: Air Quality Mitigation Fees collected for transportation impacts should only be used for transportation projects.

   TRPA Response: Code requires that the use of Air Quality Mitigation Funds be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan or the 1992 Air Quality Plan.[27] Therefore, they can be used for both transportation and air quality improvement projects.

Fire Officials

6. **Stakeholder Comment**: Will prescribed burns and pile burning be regulated as part of TRPA's Climate Change strategy?

   TRPA Response: There will be no restrictions on prescribed burns and pile burning in the Energy & Climate Change Subelement.

Boards and Commissions

Tahoe Transportation District

The Tahoe Transportation District limited their comments to the Transportation Element.

TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

7. **Stakeholder Comment**: Will TRPA prepare a Climate Action Plan (CAP) as part of the Regional Plan update?

   TRPA Response: TRPA will not prepare a CAP. It will, however, prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (along with the TMPO) and a Regional Sustainability Plan (along with Agency partners in the Basin). These efforts are discussed under the heading "*WHY IS ALTERNATIVE 2 THE STAFF-PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE?*" in the Energy & Climate Change portion of the FactSheet narrative.

[27] TRPA – *Code of Ordinances*, Section 93.5

Appendix D

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **APC Member John Upton**

Lyn Barnett

From: Joanne Marchetta
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 11:56 AM
To: Lyn Barnett
Subject: FW: Forest fuels studies

Attachments: Forest_Carbon_&_Emissions_Model_(FCEM)_Report_1.pdf; Forest_Carbon_&_Emissions_Model_(FCEM)_Report_2.pdf; Forest_Carbon_&_Emissions_Model_(FCEM)_Report_3.pdf

Forest_Carbon_&_ Emissions_Mode...

Forest_Carbon_&_ Emissions_Mode...

Forest_Carbon_&_ Emissions_Mode...

Joanne S. Marchetta
Executive Director
775-589-5226

-----Original Message-----
From: rkupton@aol.com [mailto:rkupton@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 6:22 PM
To: Joanne Marchetta
Subject: Forest fuels studies

JoAnn - Attached the forest carbon studies that suggest that cleaning up the forests would greatly reduce greenhouse gases. I sent these to John Hitchcock after last month's meeting, but for your information.
Thanks, and keep up the great work!
John Upton

1

Appendix E

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **U.S. Forest Service**

Forest Service – Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
Preliminary stakeholder comments regarding draft Noise Element – TRPA Regional Plan

The following comments are keyed to the "Matrix", Alternative 2 Implementation Measures.

Topic	Comment
Imp 2 – Complying Noises	Are forest management projects included? (forest health, fuels reduction, fire rehab (Angora), road maintenance, watershed restoration etc.) FS is concerned that the implementation measures may inadvertently limit operational periods and activities especially for projects such as mechanical fuels reduction near the neighborhoods in the WUI (urban lots), with the consequence of reducing fuels reduction accomplishments. It is difficult to assess the effect of a standard of "do not adversely affect the serenity of the community neighborhoods or wildlife." Recommend that resource protection projects be exempt.
Imp 3 – Restrict OHV 1000'	What provisions are included for trailheads and access through the neighborhoods to public land? What about areas that for resource protection purposes designated routes are within 1000' of residences? What is the standard for "and other sensitive areas or users"?
Imp 8 – Working Muffler	Compatibility with state and federal spark arrestor requirements.
Imp 26 – Helipads	How does this effect use of helicopters for fuels reduction, fire rehabilitation and other resource projects?
Imp 37 – Off road vehicles & over snow vehicles	Posting: only if funding is available. Enforcement: Federal LEO/FPOs only have authority to enforce the CFRs.
Imp 6 – Mitigation fees	What is the impact to resource management projects? Exemptions?
Imp 7 – Exemptions to Noise Limitations	Frequently resource management projects (ie fuels reduction, forest health) operate in the early morning and on Sundays due to limited operating season and fire danger (in times of high fire danger operators may only operate in the morning).
Imp 19 – OHV Noise	Is dB limit from CA PRC? And will it be applied to NV?
Imp 34 – CNEL Exceedances	(See Imp 2)
Imp 38 – Education & Signage	Posting: only if funding is available Engine brakes: does this apply to forest roads?
Imp 10 (Alt 4) – Local Jurisdiction Enforcement	Federal LEO/FPOs only have the authority to enforce the CFR. Monitoring cannot be required if funding is not available.

Appendix F

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **California Tahoe Conservancy**

California Tahoe Conservancy staff comments on TRPA Regional Plan Update Alternatives -
Transportation
April 6, 2010

Topic/Issue	Comments/Questions
Section 1.9 Transportation Element	• One topic not discussed in the element relates to better informing travelers about road conditions. "Parking lot is full." "Congestion on SR 89 – 30 minute delays at the Tahoe City Wye." Other communities and Caltrans are using up-to-date information as a traffic management tool so that travelers can make informed decisions. Should this be considered in Tahoe? Can the proliferation of changeable message signs be used as a communication tool for this purpose? The speakers I've seen at conferences call it an effective way to influence travelers.
Pg. 107 of Dec. 10, 2009 Draft Description of Alt 2 – (Second paragraph under Summary) "bike lanes would be added to all major transportation corridors"	• Can the referenced major transportation corridors be clarified? • Must the referenced bike lanes meet the true standards for bike lanes, or will the current Caltrans practice of a widening the road but not labeling as a bike lane suffice?
Pg. 109- Draft Description of Alt 2 – (First paragraph, top of page under Implementation Measures) New Code Ch. 94 "Ped and class II bicycle facilities must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained along major travel routes when the edge of the roadway is altered or improved" Also page T-13	• See comments to Page 107 • Should there be an exception clause? • Does it matter who does the alteration? For example, a new encroachment permit for a driveway would alter the edge of a roadway. What would be the private project implication? • What is the definition of an "altered or improved" as opposed to maintained?
Pg. 109- Draft Description of Alt 2 – (Second paragraph, top of page under Implementation Measures) New Code Ch. 24 "Generate revenue from private vehicle use, and/or parking management plans as described in Mobility 2030…strategies could include shared lots in central areas, incentives to visitors to arrive without a car (such as reduced hotel room rates and/or overnight parking	• Should incentives be private (reduced room rates) or should the plan stick to incentives that the TRPA can effect? • Please further explain how TRPA will require parking fees. Will this be required for new projects? Existing development? Recreation facilities? The infrastructure for parking fee areas can be quite different than for non-fee area, as NTPUD has learned at Kings Beach and North Tahoe Regional

charges), free transit or discount passes…market-rate parking charges, parking charges based on congestion levels, or in-lieu parking fees in accordance with ULI standards would be required." Also page T-7.	Park. The ramifications of this implementation measure are wide reaching and undefined at this time.

Topic/Issue	Comments/Questions
Pg. 112 of Dec. 10, 2009 Draft Description of Alt 4 – (First paragraph under Summary) "incentives to attract people out of their cars"	• Some people might not characterize road user fees as an incentive.
Pg. 112 of Dec. 10, 2009 Draft Description of Alt 4 – (First paragraph under Summary) "Property owners whose available parking exceeds that allowed by the parking maximums would be required to restore that coverage to natural vegetation…"	• So, no grandfathering of existing parking will be possible? • What about when uses change in the future (retail to restaurant) to uses that need more parking? • The details of this program will be quite a topic for discussion.
Pg. 112 of Dec. 10, 2009 Draft Description of Alt 4 – (Fifth bullet under Implementation Measures) "Require projects that are used for …mitigation to be within a ¼ mile of the projects they are mitigating."	• Add "where feasible."
Page T-10; Item T.IMP-4 "Provide dedicated transit right-of-way in Community Plans."	• Might want to clarify. Some community plans aren't even on major roadways (Industrial Tract). • How will this acquisition occur? How will this measure affect projects? (For example, look at City's existing restrictions in the PAS for the loop road – is something like this being considered? Disclose.)
Page T-21; Item T-8.1 "Require employers to implement vehicle trip reduction measures…"	• The list of examples includes showers, flexible work hours, etc. How will TRPA determine such requirements? This paragraph might best be rephrased.
Page T-24; Item T-8.3	• Define "temporary seasonal activities." "Temporary activities" are currently defined in the Code in a manner that may not be intended here.
Page T-34. Item T9.B	• The rationale for deleting this policy relates to transit, whereas the policy relates to encouraging waterborne excursion services. These are not transit; they're another way to have a recreation experience without being in your car (as described by the existing goal). Does TRPA really want to delete this?
Pages T-34 and 35. Items T10.A and T-10.1	• The existing and proposed policies are identical.

Appendix G

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **League to Save Lake Tahoe and Tahoe Area Sierra Club**

KEEP TAHOE BLUE
League to Save Lake Tahoe

Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group

April 29, 2010

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89448

Dear Karen,

We appreciate the time that you spent with the conservation community on April 12, 2010 to discuss our concerns and clarify our questions regarding the Transportation Milestone. We would like to take the opportunity to formally comment in writing our issues, concerns, and suggestions, as well as support for different aspects of the Transportation Element. The comments below are in reference to the TRPA Regional Plan Update Transportation Goals, Policies, and Implementation Strategies document dated January 27, 2010 and the Transportation Element of the Draft Alternatives document dated 12/10/2009.

Waterborne Transit
Waterborne transit is an extremely polluting form of transportation. Even with best available technology (BAT), waterborne transit is far more polluting than cars or buses[1]. TRPA should discourage the use of waterborne transit until waterborne transit technology is developed that emits equal or less emissions on a per person per mile basis than automobiles or BAT buses. The conservation community opposes proposed policy 5.8 (p. T-19, T-46).

Page T-9, Proposed Goal T-4 refers to "environmentally conscious" mass transit and Proposed Policy T-1.9 refers to giving funding preference to non-auto modes. Due to the reasons stated above, it is imperative that waterborne transit is not considered "environmentally conscious" and is not given funding preference. Further, it is important when using value words such as "environmentally conscious" to provide criteria by which to assess the actual definition. Without criteria this phrase has little meaning.

[1] This becomes very obvious when one considers the emissions per person per mile traveled on waterborne transit versus cars or buses. Further, while this examines air pollution, waterborne transit can result in water and noise pollution as well.

1

Community Plan Process
On page T-3 the existing goal T.1 C is deleted with rationale stating "Community Plan process is covered in other sections." It is imperative that these "other sections" are specifically referenced so that the public can easily find them and discern that the deleted material is indeed adequately covered in these other sections.

Parking
The conservation community supports the elimination of parking minimums, the establishment of parking maximums, and the creation of bicycle parking minimums as is presented on Page T-4 under Implementation measure T.IMP-1.

The conservation community supports the "park once" environment outlined in Proposed Policy T-1.6 (page T-6) and supports measures outlined in T.IMP-2 such as generating revenue from private vehicle use and parking fees.

The conservation community supports the development of "Park and Ride" facilities, but believes that proposed policy T-5.3 (p. T-23) is a weakening from the existing policy T5.F because of the change from "shall" to "encourage."

The conservation community supports a paid parking system that provides revenue for transit programs, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities as highlighted in proposed policy T-7.1 (p. T-24). Paid parking is a well known and effective way to increase transit use and decrease vehicle trips.

The conservation community supports planned parking management that is planned specific to the area in which it will be implemented, as suggested in proposed policy T-7.3 (p T-24). The proposed policy language begins "Coordinate with the business community and key stakeholders ..." With regards to the makeup of the 'key stakeholders', planning for parking management should include the public that will utilize the parking and transit alternatives.

The conservation community is concerned with the proposed deletion of existing policy T6.E (p. T-26), which currently states "New on-street parking shall be prohibited along major regional travel routes and existing parking should be discouraged along major regional travel routes and local roads."

The rationale for the deletion of policy T6.E (p. T-26) states that on-street parking may be desired for mixed-use, walkable designs. However, the policy does not distinguish between on-street parking in urban areas vs. on-street parking along rural highways, such as SR 89 and SR 28.

While parking management addresses many issues, one of the desired outcomes is a reduced reliance on the private automobile through a number of strategies including encouragement of carpooling and use of transit. Parking issues are particularly complex. In some cases on-street parking may be benign or even beneficial, while in other cases on-street parking may encourage driving, thus contradicting the desired outcome of dis-incentivizing the use of the private automobile. The policy should be to "carefully analyze the incentives and disincentives in order to determine whether on-site parking will encourage or discourage more use of the private auto." The conservation community supports T-IMP-11 (p. T-49, alt 4) to construct external lots with shuttles to land use districts designated as Town/Tourist Center.

The conservation community supports proposed policy T-7.1 (p. T-50, alt 4) and corresponding implementation measure T-IMP-13 that would require coverage restoration of excess areas parking areas capacity that exceeds parking maximums.

Roadways

The conservation community supports proposed policy T-9.5 (p. T-25) so that driveways are sited to minimize impacts to traffic flow, including the reduction in the number of existing driveways along major travel routes.

The conservation community supports proposed policy T-9.2 (p. T-26) which requires that roadway improvement projects incorporate stormwater/erosion control and transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accommodation.

The conservation community is opposed to the complete deletion of existing policy T7.A (p.T-27). Although we agree with the deletion of the portion of the policy about grading, we do not support the deletion of portion of the policy that states, "The Construction of roadways to freeway design standards is inappropriate in the Tahoe Region."

The conservation community supports the implementation of a user fee on Basin roadways and supports IMP-14 (p. T-50, alt 4).

Pedestrian Transit Oriented Development (PTOD)

The conservation community is concerned with Goal 1 listed on p. 108 of the Draft Alternatives Description which states, "Encourage walkable, mixed use centers with residential densities that enhance the viability of transit systems." It appears as if the statement is seeking to increase population for the purpose of making mass transit viable. The conservation community has seen no evidence that increased population will make transit viable given the Basin's special constraints, and is instead concerned that increasing the population in the Basin as proposed will simply add more people on the Basin's roads and increase pollution.

It appears counterproductive to offer reduced parking requirements as an incentive for creating PTODs as the intent of PTODs (according to TRPA) is to create walkable (not drivable) communities.

Although there may be some instances in which height incentives could be appropriate, the conservation community does not support proposed policy T-1.4 (page T-5) that gives height exceptions as an incentive to encourage developers to create mixed used redevelopment that incorporates pedestrian, cycling and transit options.

Instead of focusing on increasing populations in PTODs, the Conservation community supports a rational transit planning effort that recognizes the constraints of the Bi-State Compact, the nature of visitation, and the miles between communities in order to design a transit plan that attains and maintains the threshold standards. That plan would consider the Basin's unique characteristics, travel patterns, seasonality, etc., and then assess how transit can best serve the Basin's residents and visitors, and become more attractive for use. This will also require a separate examination of the travel patterns of

residents and visitors, as providing convenient and desirable transit to accommodate both groups will not likely be successful unless multiple solutions are considered.

All alternatives focus on increased growth in small urban areas/PTODs. Many proposed goals/policies/implementation measures in the transportation element are directly tied to the Land Use Element, which assumes, without adequate evidence or analysis, that somehow more growth in the Basin will benefit the environment.

Bicycle and Pedestrians

The conservation community supports Proposed Goal T-2 (p. T-13) that elevates bicycle and pedestrian modes from "viable" to "viable and significant."

The conservation community supports proposed policy T-2.4 (p. T-15), which states "New development in proximity to major pedestrian or bicycle routes shall include pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access." However, this should read, "New development *and redevelopment*..."

The conservation community supports proposed policy T-2.7 (p. T-44, Alt 3) which will require that projects accommodate cyclists and pedestrians in order to gain TRPA approval. However, it should revised slightly to state"...TRPA will not approve projects that do not **provide full** accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian needs."

The conservation community supports IMP-6 (p. T-6) that will require projects to incorporate the Lake Tahoe Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan into project plans and supports T-IMP-7 (p. T-13) that will require that Pedestrian and Class II bicycle facilities (bike lanes) must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained along major travel routes when the edge of the roadway is altered or improved.

It is imperative that Class II bike lanes are given a higher priority over Class I bike lanes. Class II bike lanes are most often used by cyclists who are commuting and are using their bikes as a substitute for the private automobile, whereas Class I bike lanes are most often used for recreation, not transportation. Often users will drive to the staging area with their bikes which does not reduce traffic. Furthermore, Class I bike lanes should be routed on the least sensitive land, for example, routing a trail through a forested upland instead of a Stream Environment Zone.

The conservation community supports Proposed Policy T-2.6 (p. T-8) which minimizes impacts of driveways to alternate modes of transportation and gives priority to cyclists and pedestrians at signalized intersections. Currently, riding a bicycle or walking along major routes in the Basin is challenging due to so many driveways where vehicles are entering or exiting, creating unsafe and frustrating conditions for those trying to ride or walk along these routes.

The conservation community supports proposed policy T-4.3 (page T-10) to maximize the amount of bicycles that buses can carry. However, we suggest stronger language by changing the wording from "shall seek to maximize" to "shall maximize." We also support proposed policy T-2.5 (p. T-15) to increase bicycle storage capacity at commercial and recreational areas, transit centers, lodging properties and government buildings.

In concept, we support the policy T-2.8 (p. T-16) that jurisdictions will be required to maintain all sidewalks and bike facilities including snow removal for facilities in urbanized areas or along major transportation routes with High use year round. However, more details must be fleshed out so this measure can be successfully implemented. For example, who and with what criteria will determine what is "urbanized" and what is considered "High Use Year- Round"? Will this be determined by the Bike and Pedestrian Map? How will this be enforced in a timely manner and what will be the consequences if a jurisdiction fails to comply?

Intra/Inter Regional Transit
The conservation community supports the expansion and increased frequency of inter/intra transit including better connection to/from Reno, Sacramento, and the Bay area, recreation sites, and North Shore to South Shore connections and supports proposed policy T- 5.2 (p. T-19).

The conservation community does not support T-IMP-8 which is to provide a waterborne North-South Shore connection. As stated above, waterborne transit, even with todays best technology is still a highly polluting means of transportation. The North Shore to South Shore connection should be provided through buses until it can be demonstrated that the waterborne option is a better environmental option.

Public Transit
The conservation community supports proposed policy T-4.4 (p. T-21) for free fare options or deeply discounted passes, proposed policy T-8.1 (p. T-21) for employee vehicle trip reduction programs. The conservation community finds that proposed policy T-7.2 (p. 22) is weakened from the existing policy T5.C by changing "shall" to "encourage." Also T-7.2 does not state "employer" which makes the employer's obligation vague instead of absolute. Please include the words "employer" and "shall" in the new policy.

Proposed policy T-4.10 (p. T-40, p. T-50) is weaker than existing policy T12.A regarding alternative fuel powered transit because it changes "shall" to "shall utilize alternative fuels to the "maximum extent feasible." Maximum extent feasible is vague. Please state the criteria that describes this term.

The conservation community strongly supports proposed policy 4.8 (p. T-48, alt 4) which will require that public transit fleets use the best technology to reduce emissions and support air quality goals. However, there is no nexus with the corresponding implementation measure T.IMP-10 listed in the matrix. Please correct.

The conservation community supports proposed policy T-4.5 (page T-11), including the assistance of the USFS with supporting transit to popular USFS recreational access points and facilities. The Pathway process was clear that no new additional parking at recreation access points should be permitted and service should be provided by public and private entities. New parking does not "assist" or "support" transit.

North Shore and South Shore Differences
The conservation community supports Proposed Policy T-1.8 (p. T-8) which acknowledges that differences in scale between North Shore and South Shore exist and must be considered in the new Plan. Interesting, this same policy is missing from the Land Use section and should be added to the land use sub element as well. Furthermore, there needs to be a distinction that not all North shore

communities are alike (i.e. Incline Village compared to Homewood), just as not all South Shore Communities are alike (i.e. Meyers compared to South Stateline).

Economic Vitality

The conservation community is confused by the newly Proposed Goal T-6 (p. T-20) and the associated proposed policies (T-6.1 through T-6.4) related to economic vitality. The purpose of the transportation element is to focus on achieving the related thresholds outlined in the Bi-State Compact and the need to reduce the dependency on the private automobile as outlined in that Compact. The policy rationale for T-6.1 (p. T-20) states to "Ensure that transportation's focus on alternative modes does not cause economy to suffer." Nowhere in the document is there any indication of some mysterious alternative modes that might be damaging to the economy. The point of a transportation plan is to move people to where they are going. Is the fear that they would want to go somewhere in the basin that would cause the economy to suffer?

Presumably an effective and efficient multi-modal transportation system would either be a stimulus (as described in policy rationale T-62) or neutral to the economy. The concept of a transportation system that would hurt the economy is curious indeed. More explanation is needed, so the reader can understand the underlying fear that generated this policy and rationale.

An analysis of the types of information included in the Proposed Policy (e.g. "traffic and pedestrian counts, employment, hotel-motel occupancies, and other visitation trends...") are the usual data for transportation planners to use more effective transit systems and would normally be performed during transportation planning activities. If economic vitality is a new driver of transportation policy, that would be of concern to the conservation community, as it raises issues of spending the public's money to support one type of business over another. It is important to protect transportation planning from becoming a political football. The proposed policy is unneeded.

It appears that all proposed goals and policies associated with Economic Vitality are simply out of place here and should be removed.

Level of Service

Alternative 2 proposes to reconsider/revise the LOS standards which in the current plan are focused solely on vehicle use. While the conservation community supports the development of LOS standards for pedestrian and bicycle use as well, we do not support any changes that would allow for worse LOS for vehicles (as stated on p. T-30 and 31: "*Vehicle LOS would remain the same as in the current Regional Plan, however, it could be exceeded on a case-by-case basis when necessary to attain the minimum LOS noted above for the other modes.*"). Idling vehicles create additional air pollution (of special concern is carbon monoxide, since many vehicles on the roadway emit more CO when idling than traveling at faster speeds), and vehicles spend more time in operation, thus pollutants emitted per hour will also increase. There has been discussion of the idea that more congestion may deter the use of the private automobile, however, the most congested times in the Basin occur when visitors from nearby urban areas in California and Nevada visit the Basin, and many of these visitors are 'used to' congestion as a daily occurrence where they live. Thus, while congestion may deter some users from making a vehicle trip, there is concern that any deterred trips will be extremely minor, and most people will still use their own vehicles, even with congested conditions.

Thus, the conservation community supports the analysis of possible LOS standards for pedestrians and bicyclists, but does not support modifying the LOS standards to allow for more vehicle congestion.

Aviation

The conservation community does not support proposed goal T-11 and associated polices (p. T-32) which "encourages air service to the extent that it increases mobility and public safety without compromising environment thresholds" due to the fact that air service inherently impacts the air quality and noise thresholds, which are both not in attainment. Further, much like waterborne transit, the emissions from aircraft travel, when considered as emissions per person per mile, far exceed that of most vehicles. Encouraging aviation is a policy that works against the achievement and maintenance of the thresholds.

Additionally, transportation planning in the Basin must aim to help attain and maintain the thresholds, not merely attempt to minimize or neutralize the impact (especially when several threshold standards that are impacted by transportation, and notably aviation, are currently not in attainment).

On page T-33, TRPA proposes to delete the more detailed existing policy regarding the Airport Master Plan/Settlement Agreement and replace it with very generalized language. As the conservation community expressed to TRPA staff at the 4/12 meeting, we support the existing policy, as it includes specific requirements regarding what such planning must consider and mirrors the adopted noise threshold standard.

Mitigation Funds

Air Quality mitigation funds should not be used for transportation programs. If a project impacts transportation, then a distinct traffic mitigation fund should be created that is separate from the air quality mitigation fund.

Both traffic and air quality mitigation funds should be utilized for programs/projects within close proximity to the project impact that it is being mitigated. The conservation community supports T.IMP-16 (p. T-48, alt 4) that will require projects that are used as traffic and air quality mitigation to be within a quarter-mile of the projects they are mitigating.

In the 4/12 meeting with staff, the conservation community and TRPA staff discussed the language in the rationale regarding proposed amendments to policy T-8.4 (p. T-24). The Rationale appears to indicate that there will be separate Air Quality and Transportation Mitigation programs. However staff explained this specific reference was only regarding vehicle rentals in the Basin. We recommend the language clearly explain what is meant here. Additionally, as mentioned previously, the conservation community supports two separate mitigation programs overall.

General/Other

Many times throughout the document an existing policy will be deleted with a rationale statement such as "incorporated in other policies" or "goes without saying." Staff must identify in all instances where these "other policies" are located and how the existing policy was incorporated if wording has been changed. Further, "goes without saying" is not a good rationale for explaining proposed changes to the public in the matrix. The Rationale must be clear and concise and easy for the public to understand. See existing polices T7.B and T7.C for examples (p. T-28).

Page 106 in the descriptive document states that "a separate Air Quality Plan will be developed..." When will the AQ Plan be developed?

Page T-42 includes proposed policy language that does not sound like a policy, but instead an 'excuse' that could have come from the local jurisdictions to explain why they can not implement transportation programs (Proposed Policy T-12.3). This entire topic should be removed, or at a minimum, revised to reflect that TRPA will work with the local jurisdictions to implement transportation programs which take into account local characteristics and funding mechanisms and challenges.

If you have any questions please contact Nicole Gergans with the League to Save Lake Tahoe at 530-541-5388 or Laurel Ames with the Tahoe Area Sierra Club at 530-541-5752.

Thank you,

League to Save Lake Tahoe and Tahoe Area Sierra Club Staff

8

Appendix H

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **Placer County Planning Department**

COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development/Resource Agency

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

PLANNING

June 1, 2010

RECEIVED
JUN 04 2010
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Harmon Zuckerman, Regional Plan Update Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

SUBJECT: TRPA Regional Plan Update
Placer County Comments on Transportation, Noise, and Climate Change.

Dear Mr. Zuckerman:

Thank you for providing Placer County the opportunity to review the Transportation, Noise, and Climate Change subelements of the Draft Regional Plan. For your convenience, comments from various County Departments including Planning, Sheriff, Public Works and the County Executive Office are included in this letter and conveniently organized by commenting department.

COMMENTS FROM PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Transportation:

- We concur with the City of South Lake Tahoe comment at the stakeholder meeting that while the goal may be for walkable communities, the weather of this regional makes that impractical for a year round design.

- This document speaks to providing mixed mode streets including bike paths/trails and walkways. Placer County coverage for such features should not be deducted from land development projects when they are for public benefit. The design of these features would be driven by providing the least coverage possible and would have more practical applications (better designs) and would therefore be more likely to be utilized.

- Page 107 again speaks to providing incentives for local governments to participate in redevelopment. The incentive(s) should be identified and be deliverable by TRPA.

- As was discussed at the stakeholder meeting, the discussion on lifting the minimum parking requirement could present conflicts for the local jurisdictions. It is the County's position that by doing so, developers may not provide the parking needed and simply larger buildings. While the alternative modes of transit are admirable to aspire to, from a practical standpoint it is unrealistic to assume a complete shift away from vehicular transit.

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140 / Auburn, California 95603 / (530) 745-3000 / Fax (530) 745-3080
Internet Address: http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning / email: planning@placer.ca.gov

Also discussed at the meeting were the efforts of Placer County to establish an "in lieu fee parking program" that would allow developers to provide less parking than required by the ordinance when approved by the director. The fees would be used towards providing future public parking facilities in the area. Placer County requests that the Regional Plan Update could include this as a viable mechanism for addressing parking demand/requirements of projects.

- Alternative 4 suggests requiring property owners who have more than the minimum parking to reduce their parking to the minimum and require coverage restoration. The County does not see how TRPA would achieve success implementing this as a policy. Unlike the BMP program which was based on science, this is based on an assumption that reducing parking will reduce traffic. It seems unreasonable to require property owners to reduce coverage, which is known to be a valuable commodity, without the option of banking or compensation of the restored coverage.

Energy and Climate Change:

- The County encourages TRPA to continue to work with the local jurisdictions to make certain their efforts in this area are consistent with the local efforts.

Noise:

- The 1,000 foot distance prohibition for off-road vehicles from residences seems to be an arbitrary link to the impact. The County suggests that the restriction be based on decibels instead. If the implementation measure is to be based on distance, it should be supported by evidence of the distance arrived at.

- The document states "Require the use of low-noise pavement on all major transportation routes...." Are these surfaces proven to be successful and has their durability been proven, particularly in a snow environment? How would TRPA require state and local jurisdictions to implement the requirement and do the costs of low-noise pavement out way the benefits? What would the cost implication be of such a requirement?

COMMENTS FROM PLACER COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT - NOISE:
The primary concern for the Sheriff's Department, based on the proposed Noise Chapter of the new Regional Plan, would be the impacts to staffing and response time. If the Sheriff's Department is intended to be the primary responder to noise complaints, this will create a tremendous burden on the Department not only from a response standpoint, but also for training on the decibel meters as well as the regulations themselves. Similarly, enforcement of air craft noise, snow mobiles, and other off-road vehicles would be infeasible as the Sheriff's Department does not have typical patrol vehicles capable of interdicting and performing enforcement stops of potential violators. The prioritization of response would place noise matters in a similar category to outboard motors and Quagga Mussels that rarely (if ever) result in citations. While the surface of the proposal seems like a fair concept, the enforcement of this proposal would be problematic at best. It would appear that there are already laws in place that address many of these issues (namely noise standards, nuisances, etc.).

Harmon Zuckerman
June 1, 2010
Page 3 of 8

COMMENTS FROM PLACER COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS:

- On Page 107 the last sentence in the first paragraph for Alternative 2 states "Dedicated transitways would evolve over time, as use allows, for bus rapid transit to light rail". There might be places around the lake, south shore in particular, where this might be feasible but doesn't seem to be an achievable goal in Placer County. The County doesn't believe that it would occur on its own as uses allow, so how would this be implemented?

- The last sentence of paragraph 2 states the bike lanes would be added to all major transportation corridors. Which corridors are considered major? It would seem that it could be either bike lanes or a bike path that could provide these connections and serve the same purpose.

- On Page 108, Number 4 would require the local agencies to establish a parking fee to fund other non-auto uses. It is not clear if the metered parking would apply to private parking areas or simply public lots and on-street parking. With the recent news of difficulty the Town of Truckee is experiencing with their metered parking program, this may not be a model we would want to follow for the Lake Tahoe region? (See attached article)

- This doesn't seem to be a goal that would be supported by all jurisdictions and is a mandate to the locals.

- In the implementation measure of Alternative 2, under the first bullet, it states that public-service (including roadways) projects would be required to incorporate pedestrian and bicycle facilities into their plans. While the County agrees that these are great features to have, there might be times when while improving a roadway and drainage, features for other environmental purposes and the other facilities cannot be funded by the source secured. In those cases, we would not get other environmental benefits because we couldn't construct a pedestrian path. The wording should be changed to allow for some instances where the facilities are not required. This applies to Alternative 3 as well.

- The second bullet has similar language that might not allow for a good project to move forward. As an example, there are areas around the lake that might require a substantial amount of investment to go from a 3 foot shoulder to a 4 foot shoulder, the difference between it being a wide shoulder and Class 2 facility. It could require a significant cut into a hillside causing a visual scare or a costly retaining wall to achieve the additional widening needed. There should be some flexibility for when a project doesn't work in the space provided. Three foot shoulders are much better than no shoulder at all.

- Bullet 5 discusses level of service. It appears that TRPA is keeping the same Level of Service (LOS) policy currently in place and this is problematic for any development in the Kings Beach area that requires a traffic study, as well as, other congested areas around the lake. If the TRPA Governing Board and the County BOS approved a project that we know will operate at a LOS below the TRPA standard and any project required to do a traffic study in this area will have to make findings of overriding consideration. We know what the LOS is going to be, so we should define it appropriately. This comment applies

to all areas around the lake with congestion. Tahoe City would be another specific location that we not meet LOS standards during peak times.

- The last bullet on page 109 state "Provide waterborne transit." how is this proposed to be funded? Implementation Measure in Alternative 3 speaks to providing a North-South waterborne connection. Who would be providing this connection?

- Alternative 4 discusses road base fees. Caltrans has been very clear this isn't something they would support and since all of the roadways on the California side, entering the Basin, are under their jurisdiction this doesn't seem feasible.

- The sixth bullet point is an issue the County has commented on several times in the past and we don't believe TRPA should be, nor has the authority to mandate the type of fuel used in the public fleet.

- The fifth bullet on page 109 makes a statement about increased frequency of transit service to 20 minute headways, extended evening service and extended service to areas not served. It is not clear what the context of these statements are and it should be noted that this represents more than a 200% increase in transit service on the north shore being referenced within Alternative #2. The County estimates this to be an initial capital investment of about $5 million and roughly $3.75 to $4 million per year to operate, depending on what level of service were added to evening hours and areas currently not served. This is outside the scope of current resources and any reasonable proposed new funding sources. Assuming that transit funding sources stabilize and begin to grow slowly over time, added services will need to be done incrementally and as a result of a short range transit plan that is approved by the Board of Supervisors.

- The first paragraph on Page 112 notes that under Alternative 4, transit systems would be required to emit one half as many carbon dioxide emissions per person per mile as private vehicles do. The County would need to know what the current status of emissions per person per mile is compared to private vehicles currently to be able to evaluate if this is a reasonable statement. Also, based on the placement of this statement in the document, it is not clear if this is an implementation measure or a goal.

- On page 112, 4th bulleted paragraph, there is an implementation measure to provide transit route frequency to 15 minutes or greater, extend service and make it free. This would be more than a 300% increase in TART service, have an initial capital cost of about $7 million and cost roughly $5.25 million to operate on the north shore. Again, this is far beyond any reasonable funding resources that are available to transit.

COMMENTS FROM PLACER COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE:

Transportation:

- Technical terms should be included in a definition section. Example: Intelligent Systems Technology.

Harmon Zuckerman
June 1, 2010
Page 5 of 8

- Page 105- Overview. LOS standards should be calculated seasonally with a 30th highest hour factor so as not to overburden projects with peak season road impacts that are expected during summer and winter peaks and could result in overbuilding facilities for minimal peak need

- Page 106- Overview- it should be noted when discussing TRPA's role as MPO that the MPO includes representatives from the USFS and Washoe Tribe.

- Page 107- Alternative 2- Summary- There is no associated fiscal plan that illustrates the statement that "user fees related to private vehicle use support the transit system" is sound. What type of use fee is being considered? How much money would this raise? How much does the transit system under this proposal cost on an annual basis? Will that transit system meet the goals set forth in the Regional Plan? How is that measured?

- The statement that dedicated transitways would evolve over time, as use allows, from bus rapid transit to light rail is unrealistic based on funding and right-of-way availability. Is this proposed for all highways, or where?

- Please define the term "all major transportation corridors", as it relates to the concept that they would all have "frequent" transit and bike lanes.

- In the third paragraph, add the word residents to the list of people for whom transportation options would be provided.

- The first of four goals doesn't sound alike a goal. Rather than providing incentives for redevelopment, this goal should be more related specifically to transportation goals, like "incentivize" participation in PTOD redevelopment.
- Page 108- Goals, continued- Under Goal 3, suggest removing "inter-intra regional transportation," as the following sentence is self-explanatory.

- It is confusing whether the four goals from the 1987 Regional Plan would be modified as stated or whether these goals are directly from the Plan. The act of encouraging something [walkable mixed use centers] is not a goal, nor is "strengthen[ing] language related to. . .].

- The statement that "bicycle and pedestrian access in commercial and residential projects shall, at a minimum, be provided at a level equal to private vehicle access" is confusing. What does this mean? A specific example might help.

- In the fourth goal, upgrading regional roadways to improve traffic flow might not be consistent with previously-stated PTOD goals.

- Is there a funding/implementation to attain these goals? What is the source? Fees on private vehicle use?

- Under Implementation Measures, please define "to be determined by TRPA as appropriate to the scale of development."

- Page 109- In the second bullet point, please explain how funds will be "generate[d] from private vehicle use and/or parking management plans" to provide for 20 minute transit service around the lake. Where is the finance plan for this? Also, in the second sentence it is explained that this fund will also "provide deep discount transit passes for community residents." It is not clear how this will be funded and is mistakenly included as a possible means of raising money, when in actuality it costs money.

- Following last month's APC meeting, a transportation staff person provided us with a draft revenue generation plan based on charging visitors at lodging locations for parking per room. Lodging providers are already tasked with collecting room tax and this would be yet another tax on lodging, rather than spreading revenue generation responsibility to other benefit groups. This also creates a further unfair business advantage for lodging outside of the Tahoe basin, placing even further disincentive for visitors to choose in-basin lodging. Placer County does not support this concept. As an aside, for FY 2010-2011, we have budgeted $942,000 in TOT (room tax) funds to be allocated to transit service in the Tahoe basin.

- In the fourth bullet point, what are "protocols described in NCHRP Web-Only Document 128?" This should be attached or a reference provided. Also, why would a level of service D be required for transit vehicles when F is allowed during certain peak periods. Since both use the same roadway, this would be impossible to attain. In that same paragraph an excellent concept that needs to be further explored is to allow LOS to be exceeded when other modes are taken into consideration. This would work especially when devising LOS for peak periods in town centers where you are trying to maximize density in comparison to other locations. The dates in this section are out of context without a year. Are these ideas proposed to occur in 2012?

- Where will funding come from to "increase fixed route transit frequency on the north shore to 20 minutes? Is there a demonstrated need for this service?" Placer County is not aware that this is listed as an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet in any of the TRPA documents.

- Page 111- Placer County has concerns with the practical application of the goals in Alternative 4. In summary, concepts such as "requiring coverage restoration of 'unused parking capacity,' external intercept lots with shuttles to the basin and a 'road user fee' are neither demonstrated to be necessary or feasible. Further, it is not clear that TRPA has the legal authority to "require that owners of public and private vehicle fleets use the best available fuel technologies."

Noise

- N-4- Placer County does not support a ban on seaplane bases or docking facilities in the Tahoe Basin, as well as the prohibition of seaplanes within 1 mile of the Lake Tahoe shoreline. There is a seaplane heritage that is celebrated annually and also business

operations that currently exist. Definitions such as the proposed seaplane definition of "anything that flies and can land on water" should be cautioned against. The definition itself is so broad that a number of unintended consequences could result. Lastly, one has to wonder if the noises generated by these sources result in a significant contribution to any real or perceived noise problems in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

- N-6- These statements under Implementation Measures appear to be contradictory: "All events that have the potential to violate noise standards shall be permitted and monitored. Events that may contribute to noise violations will not be permitted."

- N-12- Implementation Measure 34, "TRPA shall not approve a project which causes a community noise standard (CNEL) to be exceeded or causes further degradation to an existing non compliance condition," is excessive and should be considered on a case-by-case basis in specified community center corridors with mitigation.

Energy and Climate Change
Placer County recommends adhering to State of California protocols/requirements and working with local governments who also need to meet state mandates to coordinate consistent planning/implementation documents.

Conclusion
Knowing the commitment that TRPA has made to assuring the success of the Regional Plan, the comments above reflect the County's commitment to assisting TRPA in preparing a Regional Plan that is complete, accurate and, most importantly, implementable.

Placer County remains committed in achieving the overall goal of protecting Lake Tahoe and its surrounding environment while sustaining the vitality and well-being of the various Placer County communities and citizens who reside nearby.

Should you have any questions regarding the information in this letter, please do not hesitate to call me at (530) 745-3044. I look forward to working together with you and your team on the successful completion of the Regional Plan Update.

Sincerely,

PAUL THOMPSON
Deputy Planning Director
Placer County Planning Department

cc: Tom Miller, County Executive Officer
Jennifer Merchant, Tahoe County Executive Office
Scott Finley, County Counsel's Office
Loren Clark, Assistant Planning Director
Wes Zicker, Engineering and Surveying Director

Paul Thompson, Deputy Planning Director
Steve Buelna, Supervising Planner
Ken Grehm, Department of Public Works Director
Peter Kraatz, Deputy Public Works Director
Allan Carter, Placer County Sheriff's Department
Jim Lobue, Redevelopment Deputy Director
Rae James, Redevelopment Agency
Mary Dietrich, Deputy Facility Services Director
Nick Trifiro, Associate Planner

Appendix I

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **Jerome Evans**

Jerome Evans
Antique and Contemporary Art of the Native Peoples of Africa,
Oceania, and North and South America

March 30, 2010

RECEIVED
APR 02 2010
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

A. Lyn Barnett
Regional Plan Update
TRPA
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Dear Mr. Barnett,

I enjoyed participating in the stakeholders' discussion of the transportation, noise and energy and climate change elements of the regional plan update on Monday morning. I hope it was helpful for you and the other TRPA staff in attendance.

In general, I applaud the work that has been done in these three areas, including what has been done to consolidate and simplify proposed policy statements.

More specifically, with respect to transportation, I was pleased to see, in Alternative 2, the emphasis on encouraging walking and cycling within the basin, shared parking facilities, and inter- and intra-regional transit. Also the move away from LOS standards in urban areas, although I believe it will be an uphill fight to get Caltrans to agree.

As I said at the meeting, I would also like to see more attention (as implementation steps) to providing public transit access to basin trailheads and marinas. And I would be happy to see all references to waterborne transit, north and south and east and west, deleted entirely. It will never be feasible economically, and would be a bad thing for non-motorized craft if it were. We should not confuse Lake Tahoe with the San Francisco Bay.

Also, with regard to transportation, I believe it would be a good idea to explore the possibility of establishing a basin-wide gasoline tax to support public transit, which will always require a substantial subsidy. We can hope that carbon-based fuels will one day be replaced, but in the meantime a gas tax surcharge would make a lot of sense.

With respect to noise abatement, I strongly support the proposed effort to have noise suppression surfaces applied to our roadways in all future repaving projects. This is especially important where road noise is particularly bad for those in non-motorized craft on the lake and where the highway runs alongside community areas such as the proposed Lakeside Commons in South Lake Tahoe.

PO Box 7101, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158 / 530.541.3450
jeromeevans@sbcglobal.net www.jeromeevans.net

With respect to the energy and climate change goals, I can only applaud the early efforts to develop policies and plans to address these very important matters.

Finally, I want to say that I am pleased that TRPA has seen fit to utilize the "Master Stakeholders List" as a means of testing its proposed policies and inviting the ideas and criticisms of people from around the lake who take an interest in what the agency is trying to accomplish. Although the Pathway Forum (I won't say 2007) was a mixed bag, it did bring together interested individuals from around the lake and require them to listen to the views of others and to think in basin-wide terms for a change.

Sincerely,

Jerome Evans

Appendix J

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **Heavenly Lake Tahoe**

Heavenly
LAKE TAHOE

March 31, 2010

Mr. Lyn Barnett
Regional Plan Update Team
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Dear Lyn:

Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and members of the Regional Plan Update team regarding the Energy, Transportation and Noise Elements of the Regional Plan. Based on that briefing and the stated goal of the Executive Director and others to develop an updated Regional Plan that will include opportunities to incent private investment and redevelopment of our communities and infrastructure, I want to provide the following feedback:

TRANSPORTATION

1. Heavenly does not support the imposition of paid parking at any of its facilities. Paid parking should be a matter of choice that is left up to the individual business or land use. The reasons behind this position were communicated in testimony before the TRPA Governing Board, siting as the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO), when the same policy was proposed as part of the draft 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The TMPO did not include it in the adopted RTP and today, the situation with respect to the local economy has significantly worsened.

2. Imposing paid parking on select business and uses in the Tahoe Basin will put them at a competitive disadvantage with similar businesses and uses adjacent to, but outside of the Tahoe Basin. This is particularly the case with ski resorts where the choice is so large. In the current and foreseeable economy, requiring paid parking on private property will only serve as a disincentive to attracting and keeping local and visitor customers and guests. This will potentially worsen the downward trend in terms of the condition of the local economy.

3. The proposed conceptual changes to the parking standards are not yet well-enough developed to put forward as part of the Regional Plan

PO Box 2180
Stateline NV 89449
775/586-7000
www.skiheavenly.com

minimum amount). More input and discussion with community stakeholders, including representatives of the business community is needed. If this is not thought out carefully, it will serve as a disincentive to redeveloping properties rather than an incentive.

4. The need to provide a well-funded transit system is supported by many stakeholders around the Basin, including Heavenly. As you are aware, Heavenly is a significant contributor to the South Tahoe Area Transit Agency in terms of both operating dollars and the local 20% match used for the capital purchase of new buses. The ski shuttle portion of the STATA system is free to all riders and Heavenly annually moves approximately 400,000-450,000 riders on that portion of the system. We intend to continue that participation in support of the larger community transit goals.

5. At this time, most of the STATA fleet is relatively new in very good and new condition. Over the past five years, approximately 18 new vehicles have been purchased and have replaced older stock. The ability for the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and others to continue to participate in the federal vehicle replacement grant program is key to maintaining the fleet over time.

6. Our challenge is to secure additional transit operating funding through the federal operating fund grant formula program. This is a top priority for the Lake Tahoe Transportation and Water Quality's federal legislative agenda (includes TRPA and TTD). This priority will be pursued aggressively as part of the upcoming federal highway reauthorization bill.

NOISE

7. In general, the implementation and enforcement of a noise reduction program should be complaint driven as it is in many other communities. The noise standards that are established in the Code and based on the thresholds are worthy goals and should be pursued to the extent feasible but not made mandatory unless there is a nuisance issue or complaint that is clearly identified. The fact of the matter is that there are simply not enough resources, public or private, to accomplish every goal equally and at the same time. As a basin, we have to prioritize what to accomplish first.

8. We do not support the imposition of a new noise mitigation fee. This will only add to the costs of redeveloping and move further away from the stated goals of finding opportunities to incentivize the redevelopment of our communities and infrastructures. While I appreciate your efforts at identifying other opportunities to allow for

noise-generating uses which may exceed single event or CNEL noise levels, the requirement appears to be a broadly-applied impact fee that will only serve to discourage good redevelopment projects from moving forward, particularly in light of the idea that existing roadway noise levels already exceed threshold values.

9. We do not support the proposal that additional vehicle trips generated must contribute to a noise mitigation fund in order to fund the incremental cost of noise-reducing pavement. This fact that existing vehicle traffic, which is many cases, is significantly lower than it was in previous years, causes a threshold exceedance should be an indication that the manner way in which the noise threshold is applied to roadways is in need of revision. There are only marginal gains to be realized from such a policy and it will serve as a major disincentive to redevelop existing land uses and properties and improve community infrastructure.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the process and work with you and your staff. This effort represents a real opportunity to reinvent what the Lake Tahoe experience means to people, and at the same time, position the Region to improve our economy and our environment. Please contact me with any questions or if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Andrew Strain
Vice President of Planning & Governmental Affairs

C: Harmon Zuckerman, TRPA
Charles Emmett, TRPA
Karen Fink, TRPA

Appendix K

Written Stakeholder Comment Letter from **City of South Lake Tahoe**

City of South Lake Tahoe

"making a positive difference now"

Charles Emmett
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

RECEIVED
JUN 01 2010
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Dear Charles:

As requested, the following are the City of South Lake Tahoe's comments regarding the proposed policies and implementation measures for Noise and Air Quality. As a general concern, the Stake Holders and APC members were told that implementation measures would be presented much later in the process and to keep our view at "30,000 feet" and deal with general policies and milestones. While moving forward with implementation measures for noise and air quality is commendable, it is apparent that the implementation measures were not fully vetted internally before they were released.

There appears to be a disconnect between what can be feasibly implemented and many of the implementation measures being proposed. It has been stated by TRPA that many of the proposed implementation measures (such as requiring the use of low noise pavement) were to accommodate new technologies that may become available over the 20 - year lifespan of the Regional Plan. However, the proposed implementation measure does not state that it would be effective upon the development of best available economic technology. Many of the proposed implementation measures do not appear to be grounded in reality or vetted against the law. Requiring local governments to pay for an employee's commute time (AQ IMP. #4) would violate many of our employee agreements and could be conceived as a misuse of public funds. In addition, it is clear that no local government in the Region has a budget which would support such a concept, yet it is presented as a requirement (the term "will" is used).

As a former TRPA employee and once the Noise Threshold Manager, I am well aware of the temptation for staff to zealously embrace the threshold they are assigned. This unfortunately sometimes leads to internal struggles between threshold managers.

Office of the City Manager · 1052 Tata Lane · South Lake Tahoe, California 96150-6324
City Manager · (530) 542-6045 · FAX (530) 542-4054

In addition to the above, TRPA staff were notified of erroneous data being published on the CARB website concerning a number of air quality emissions. CARB has agreed that the methodology appears incorrect and the published data has not been verified. However, it appears that TRPA staff continues to rely on this unverified data to base their conclusions.

We look forward to meeting with you on June 10th to discuss the above.

Sincerely,

Rick Angelocci
Assistant City Manager

Cc: Joanne Marchetta
Jerry Wells
Lyn Barnett
John Hitchcock
Harmon Zuckerman
Sherry Miller
David Jinkens

Specific comments are as follows:

Noise:

N. Imp 5: Dictates TRPA priorities for thresholds.

N. Imp 18: Too encompassing and extremely difficult to enforce. It does not provide for existing uses where neighboring properties are later designated with a CNEL of 60 db.

N. Imp 20: Not feasible nor enforceable as proposed.

N. Imp 24: What?? Who defines? Punitive. Too much staff discretion.

N. Imp 25: There is no nexus with noise. What happens to existing approved landing sites?

N. Imp: 34: Does this apply to Public Health and Safety activities (i.e., Fire Stations)?

N. Imp: 36: Should be up to the developer to decide if mitigation is necessary for their project.

N. Imp: 39: What does "other current conditions mean"?

Air Quality:

AQ Imp 4: Public agencies cannot implement this legally, nor is funding available.

AQ Imp: 5: Too limiting. There are other programs such as Build It Green which produce the same results.

AQ Imp: 6: How can TRPA be responsible for vehicle right of way?

AQ Imp: 8: Does not make sense.

AQ Imp: 9: Nexus to Air Quality not clear.

AQ Imp: 11: Some fund sources may restrict purchase to American made products.

AQ Imp 12: There are 258 lane miles in the City of South Lake Tahoe. To sweep once a month would require substantial additional equipment and personnel. Did anyone check if this is feasible?

AQ Imp: 20: Too vague on "where bicycle traffic is present".

AQ Imp 23: How can TRPA management remove this requirement because they feel the TRPA Transportation Program can achieve? This is a 20-year plan.

AQ Imp. 26: **All** driveways affect traffic or pedestrian flow.

Appendix L

List of Transportation, Noise and Energy & Climate Change Stakeholder Meetings, Meeting Dates, and Participants

Regulatory Agencies	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Bob Larson, Lahontan RWQCB	No	
	Jason Kuchnicki, Nevada Dept. Environmental Protection	No	
	Earl Withycombe	No	
	Tom Thompson	No	
	Duane Sikorski	No	
	Adele Malone	No	
	Mike Brady	No	
	Tina Burton	No	
	Jaques Landy	No	
	Timothy Hart, Caltrans District 3	No	
Environmental Groups	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Carl Young, League to Save Lake Tahoe	Yes	4/12/2010
	Roger Rosenburger, Tahoe Area Sierra Club	No	4/12/2010
	Jennifer Quashnick, Tahoe Area Sierra Club	Yes	4/12/2010
	Nicole Gergans, League to Save Lake Tahoe	Yes	4/12/2010
	Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club	Yes	4/12/2010
	Melissa Thaw. League to Save Lake Tahoe	Yes	4/12/2010
Private	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Lew Feldman, Attorney	Yes	3/29/2010
	Steve Teshara, Sustainable Community Advocates	No	
	Pat Davison, Contractors Association Truckee Tahoe	No	
	Andrew Strain, Heavenly	Yes	3/29/2010
	B. Gorman, South Shore Chamber of Commerence	No	
	Carol Chaplin, LTVA	No	
	Mike Bradford, Lakeside Inn	Yes	3/29/2010
	Mark Kimbrough, Tahoe Rim Trail	No	
	John Falk- Realtor	No	
	Mark Irving-Urban Housing Communities	No	
	Lori Gualco	Yes	6/3/2010
	Jim Brennen	Yes	6/3/2010
	Robert Lober	Yes	6/3/2010
	Bob McIntyre, McInytre Enterprises	No	
	Natalia Stavinsky, Realtor	No	
	George Koster, Real Estate Consultant	No	

	Sue Simon,Simon Planning	No	
	Cindy Hannah, Saint Joseph Community Land Trust	No	
	Jamie Hodgson, Aramark Parks and Destinations	No	
	Bob Hassett, Camp Richardson	No	
	Austin Sass, Aramark	No	
	Chris Burke, Aramark	Yes	3/29/2010
	Jonathan Cook Fisher, USFS	No	
	Jim Phelan, Tahoe City Marina	No	
	Jermoe Evans	Yes	3/29/2010
	Barbara Perlman-Whyman	No	
	Jan Brisco, Lakefront Property Owners Assoc	No	
	Sue Rae Irelan Kayakers	No	
	Ty Polastri, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition	No	
	Justin Broglio, Tahoe City Downtown Association	Yes	3/29/2010
	David Kelly	No	
	Tracy Larkin, NDOT	No	
	Pamela Le Francis	Yes	3/31/2010
	Brendan Ferry, El Dorado County	No	
	Bob Bolton	No	
	Will Garner, Placer County / TTD	No	
	Alfred Knotts, TTD	No	
	Sara Ellis, NV Real Estate Association	No	
	Carl Hasty, TTD	No	
Local Jurisdictions	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Rick Angelocci, City of South Lake Tahoe Planning	Yes	3/31/2010
	Jennifer Merchant, Placer County	No	
	Paul Thompson, Placer County Planning	Yes	3/31/2010
	Peter Mauer, El Dorado County Planning	No	
	Brandy McMahon, Douglas County Planning	No	
	Lee Plemel, Carson City Planning	No	
	Eva Krause, Washoe County Planning	No	
	Duane Sikorski	No	
	Gary Moore, CSLT Parks and Recreation	No	
	Scott Morgan, Douglas County Parks and Rec	No	
	John Greenhut	No	
	Bob Slator	No	
	Bob Costa	No	
	Steve Gaytan, Cal Trans	Yes	4/7/2010
	Rick Helman, Cal Trans	Yes	4/7/2010
	Cassandra Evenson, Caltrans	Yes	4/7/2010
	Jeff Foltz, Douglas County	Yes	3/31/2010
	Dick Minto	No	
	Steven Williams, NDOT	Yes	3/31/2010

	Madonna Dunbar	No	
	Peter Kraatz, Placer County Public Works	Yes	3/31/2010
	Jon Leroy, TCPUD	Yes	3/31/0210
	Virginia Huber. El Dorado County	No	
	Bob Bolton, Tahoe City PUD	Yes	3/31/2010
	Hal Pears, IVGID	No	
	Kathy Long, North Tahoe Event Center	No	
	Bill Horn, IVGID	No	
	Rae James, Placer County	No	
	Jim Lobue, Placer County	No	
	Steve Buelna, Placer County –	Yes	3/31/2010
	Crystal Jacobson, Placer County	No	
	John Pomroy, IVGID	No	
	John Sarna	No	
State and Federal	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Ray Lacy, California Tahoe Conservancy	No	
	Charlie Donohue, Nevada Division of State Lands	No	
	Eli Ilano USFS LTBMU	No	
	Marie Barry,-Washoe Tribe	No	
	Terry Marceron, USFS	No	
	Dan Segal, CA Attorney General	No	
	Tamara Sasaki CA State Parks	No	
	Anjanette Hoefer, USFS	Yes	4/7/2010
	Mike LaFevre, USFS	Yes	4/7/2010
	Bob King, USFS	No	
	David Catalano, Nevada Department of Wildlife	No	
	Kim Tisdale, Nevada Department of Wildlife	No	
	Jody Caicco, US Fish and Wildlife	No	
	Lisa Heki, US Fish and Wildlife	No	
	William Somer, California Department of Fish and Game	No	
	Stafford Lehr, California Department of Fish and Game	No	
	Mayville, Myrnie E, BOR	No	
	Jenny Hatch, Cal Trout,	No	
Fire District	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Peter Mulvihill, North Lake Tahoe Fire Dist	Yes	3/23/2010
	Ray Zachau, CSLT Fire Marshal	No	
	Mike Brown, NLTFPD	No	
	Guy LeFever, Tahoe Douglas FPD	No	
	Jeff Michael LVFD	No	
	John Pang Meeks FPD	No	
	Duane Whitelaw, North tahoe FPD	No	
	Lorenzo Gigliotti, CSLTFD	No	
	Fallen Leaf Lake FD	No	
	Christy Daugherty, Cal Fire	No	
	Gareth Harris,LVFD	Yes	3/23/2010

	Mark Novak, TDFD	Yes	3/23/2010
	Dave Ruben,North Tahoe Fire	Yes	3/23/2010
Science Community	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Zach Hymanson, Tahoe Science Consortium	No	
	John Reuter, UC Davis	No	
	Geoffrey Schladow, UC Davis	No	
	Jim Thomas, Desert Reasearch Institute	No	
	Peter Stine, USFS_PSW	No	
	Pat Manley, USFS-PSW	No	
	James Karr, University of Washignton-Reno	No	
	Sudeep Chandra UNR	No	
	Michael Collopy UNR	No	
	Alan Heyvaert, Desert Research Institute	No	
Noise Professionals	**Invitees**	**Attended**	**Meeting Date**
	Sherry Miller, CSLT Airport Director	No	
	Paul Bollard, Bollard Acoustical Consultants,Inc	No	
	Don Lane, USFS LTBMU	Yes	3/1/10
	Jim Buntin, Buntin and Brown Consutlants	No	
	Ellen Lapham, Snowlands Network	No	
	Lawrence Anderson, USFS Noise Enforcement	No	
	Tahoe Transportation District	Yes	4/9/2010
	Adivsory Planning Commission (APC)	Yes	4/14/209