

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the **Advisory Planning Commission** of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at **9:30 a.m.** on **Wednesday, December 12, 2007**, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, located at 8318 North Lake Blvd., Kings Beach, CA. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

December 5, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Singlaub", written in a cursive style.

John Singlaub
Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

North Tahoe Conference Center
8318 North Lake Blvd.
Kings Beach, CA

December 12, 2007
9:30 a.m.

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

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item not listed on the agenda may do so at this time. Public comment on Public Hearing items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

- IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
 - A. Recommendation to Distribute 2008 Residential Allocations Page 1-20
 - B. Amendment to Chapter 71 Tree Removal and Other Related Amendments to Allow Tree Removal for Defensible Space Purposes to be Approved by a Defensible Space Assessor Page 21-28
- VI. PLANNING MATTERS
 - A. Regional Plan Update Status Report Page 29-82
- VII. REPORTS
 - 1. Executive Director
 - 2. Legal Counsel
 - 3. APC Members
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**

North Tahoe Conference Center
8318 North Lake Blvd.
Kings Beach, CA

November 14, 2007
9:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

Called to order at 9:36 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Breuch, Mr. Harris, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Kemper, Ms. Krause, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Maurer, Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Riley, Ms Sertic, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Zuckerman

Members Absent: Mr. Plemel, Ms. Schmidt, Mr. Upton

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda Approved

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No Public Comment

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

A. July 2007

Mr. Maurer: Motion to Approve July 2007 Minutes with Changes
Second Mr. Riley
Motion Carries

B. September 2007

Mr. Lefevre: Motion to Approve September 2007 Minutes with Changes
Second Mr. Riley
Motion Carries

C. October

Ms. Jamin: Motion to Approve October 2007 Minutes with Changes
Second Riley
Motion Carries

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A.** Amendment to Chapter 4.2.A(13) Project Review and Exempt Activities and Chapter 71.3 Tree Removal to increase the diameter limit on trees requiring a permit for removal from 6 inches dbh to 14 inches dbh and other related amendments.

Staff member Mike Vollmer presented the reasoning behind the increase of the tree diameter. Proposed amendment will not change the way trees are marked this streamlines the process allowing the homeowner to remove a tree up to 14 inches. The concern is with scenic quality. Would not apply to SEZ.

Board concerns included whether or not the amendment change would be retroactive, if any environmental document was needed to make the amendment change, the need for a more extensive analysis/scenic simulation and scenic mitigation for the shorezone area.

Staff's response: Our recommendation will be to call and have trees assessed first. It could be the trees less than 14 inches are the trees that need to stay. This is not a prescription to cut all your trees. It is better to have the professional out sooner. Production of educational piece will help understand the value and purpose of trees, introduce how to spot a potential hazard tree and encourage property owners to call a professional first. We did prepare a checklist on this as part of the file. We are not subject to any environmental documents for this. The purpose is to expedite the removal of trees for defensible space.

Mr. Tolhurst opens Public Comment

Nathan Rouse: Example of six inch and fourteen inch rounds. Six inch to small fourteen inch two large we need to find something more moderate. Concerned with shorezone and mitigation. Please reconsider the size.

Mr. Zuckerman: Any idea of how old the 14 inch tree is?

Mr. Rouse: No

John Pickett with the Fire Safe Council and Executive Director of Sugar Pine Council: Supports the ordinance change.

Mr. Tolhurst Closes Public Comment

Consensus of Board is the proposed amendment needs two motions to clarify shorezone activities.

Ms Kemper: Motion to recommend the Governing Board adopt changes to Chapter 4.

Second Mr. Jepsen
Motion Carries

Mr. Tolhurst Motion to recommend the Governing Board adopt changes to Chapter 71 with the addition of language for permit requirements for tree removal in the Shorezone

Mr. Lawrence Second

Motion Carries

Aye – 9

Nay – 3

Abstained - 2

B. Scoping Hearing for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR), for the Tahoe Sands Time Share Project, 6873 N. Lake Blvd., Tahoe Vista, Placer County, CA

Staff Member David Landry presented the Tahoe Sands Timeshare changes including alternatives. We are asking the board to recommend the

Matt Hansen: Presents Alternatives

Alternative one is no touch alternative

Alternative two is preferred alternative 7 buildings on lake side and

Alternative three has buildings moved away from street with parking closer to the street

Alternative four reduced unit development by fifteen percent with smaller units reducing the square footage of each unit and having more one-bedroom units

Alternative five would increase affordable housing on mountain side for a total of 14

Alternative six would reduce unit development by removing buildings on both the upland and lakeside with negative impact on the project

Mr Breuch: Clarification of proposal of pier.

Mr. Hansen: No pier is being proposed.

Mr. Tolhurst: Interested seeing more affordable housing

Mr. Hansen: Education period in proposing an alternative we could not do. Need a second set of eyes to come to the conclusion the smaller project would not work. EIR/EIS important to community as far as the cumulative effects of the project.

Mr. Tolhurst: Clarification of affordable housing units

Mr. Hansen: Sites current TAU's and density

Mr. Tolhurst: Funds from additional units

Mr. Hansen: New owners burden, building size, building setback, thought process.

Mr. McIntyre: Number of alternatives?

Mr. Hansen: We used the education process to guide the project using the alternatives to show some of the history of the work going into the project. Brought back some of the alternatives we may have thrown out to quickly.

Ms. Jamin: Alternative three has more detail than the other alternatives.

Mr. Hansen: We could not go back to the homeowners to ask for additional money to create artist renditions of each alternative. We are expecting the EIR/EIS process to help shape the project.

Mr. Tolhurst Open Public Comment

Lori Gregory neighbor concerned with increase in density, traffic, and project quantity in Tahoe Vista area. Concern with increase of number of units to fund the project. Why the existing can't be remodeled and the property be kept as it is.

Mr. Tolhurst Closes Public Comment

Mr. Landry: Introduces fax received from adjacent property owner opposing the project.

Board recommends the project go forward with the EIR/EIS process.

VI. PLANNING MATTER

A. Presentation on TMDL Results

Staff member Larry Benoit presents TMDL update. Program Overview including the causes of loss of clarity, how much of each pollutant is reaching the lake, how much of each pollutant can the Lake accept and still achieve the clarity goal, the options for reducing pollutant inputs to the lake, the potential costs associated with the pollutant load reduction options, the next steps and TMDL Goals & Policies/EIS. Reports may be obtained at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan>.

B. Status Report on Scope of Work Plan Alternatives for Regional Plan Update EIS

Staff member John Hitchcock presented the Regional Plan Update including the Schedule, Catalysis for the Update, Proposed Development Process and reasons for moving forward with the components to obtain thresholds.

Staff member Eileen Carey summarized the public comments received to date. Issues and questions raised through the public scoping include: How should affordable and moderate income housing be encouraged, to what degree will the regional plan update be consistent with other planning efforts, how should development rights such as commercial floor area and tourist accommodation units be allocated, to what degree will input from the Pathway process be incorporated in the Regional Plan Update, to what degree will regulations related to public safety be updated, To what degree will existing thresholds be modified, to what degree should the proposed transect system of land use differ, how will the updated regional plan adapt to changing circumstances and new technologies. Applicable comments will be incorporated into the range of alternatives.

Staff member John Hitchcock summarized the alternatives and timeline.

Alternative 1: Continuation of existing Regional Plan.

Alternative 2: Place Based: Implementation of smart growth principles that provide for concentrated community nodes that support mixed-use development.

Alternative 3: Projected Trends: Continued additional development based on current demand trends.

Alternative 4: Concentrated Development: Concentrate development in urban core area. Focus on reducing development potential in low density areas and removing existing development for less appropriate areas.

Mr. Tolhurst Opens public comment

None heard

Mr. Tolhurst Closes Public Comment

Non-action Item

C. Community Enhancement Program Update on Pre-application Proposals and Public Meetings

Staff Member Brenda Hunt summarized the Community Enhancement Program to date. Nine pre-applications two on the south shore, one on the west shore and six on the north shore. Outline of the South Shore Meeting public meeting including the comments received at each meeting were handed out to Board. The North Shore meeting was summarized additional comments were taken at the North Shore Meeting copies will be available by the end of the week and posted on the website by Friday under the CEP section. One additional application was received however was incomplete, staff seeking advise on how to proceed.

The Board decides even though the project may not compete well with the other projects since they were overlooked they should be given a window of thirty five days to present required information.

Mr. Breuch: Is the applicant here?

Mr. Tolhurst opens public comment

Jerry Wittell: If a project is sold does the commodity go with it? The Commodity will have monetary value; will it be treated as public financial support? How is the commodity determination made, could it be made on a point system rather than a subjective system?

Staff: There is a one-year timeframe on the allocations. These commodities have no financial value and conditions will be placed on allocations to be transferred with the land if the project is sold.

Cliff Altman: Miksa site property owner representative. Owners of the property for fifty years under master lease which is coming due. Space can be leased. Family has chosen not lease it due to the length lease one twenty five years and other is twenty with two twenty year options. This is a unique opportunity to develop the site. Discussions are taking place for the incorporation of the AAA building. If developed the area could serve as a gateway. This commitment is not everlasting. The way these leases are written the lessee will control the property for many years. Public meetings are on the table.

Mr. Tolhurst Closes Public Comment

Board discussion included the possibility of combining projects to encourage a truly walkable community, the method for ranking applications, how the CEP program will inform the regional plan including the continuing improvement to the regional plan, and the number of applications the Board will see.

Non-Action Item

VIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Mr. Singlaub provided an update on the Governing Board meeting schedule.

B. Legal Counsel

A District Court Judge has ruled in favor of the TRPA in the suite filed over the CalNeva permit. The McNeil's do have the right to appeal.

C. APC Members

Mr. Bruech: Study on development rights. They can present to APC or provide the report to APC if interested

Mr. Lawrence: Discussion regarding teardown of existing gaming property will be held on the 28th during the lunch hour.

Mr. McIntyre: Will not be here next APC due to conflicting meeting.

Mr. Zuckerman: On a personal level, I am humbled by the experience, skill and professionalism of staff and fellow Board members.

Ms. Jamin: Will we be getting allocation audit information before the next APC meeting?

Mr. Singlaub: Yes, we are scheduled to bring that to the next APC meeting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Sandoval
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 589-5277. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
www.trpa.org

P.O.Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449-5310

Phone: (775) 588-4547
Fax (775) 588-4527
Email: trpa@trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Date: November 29, 2007
Subject: Recommendation to Distribute 2008 Residential Allocations

Requested Action: Motion to forward a recommendation to the TRPA Governing Board for the approval and distribution of residential allocations for 2008.

Staff Recommendation: TRPA staff recommends the APC forward to the Governing Board the attached Resolution recommending the approval and distribution of the residential allocations for 2008.

Performance Review Committee Recommendation: At the November 29, 2007 meeting, the Performance Review Committee unanimously recommended the approval and distribution of the residential allocations for 2008 as contained in the attached Staff Summary.

Required Motion(s): Motion to approve the attached Resolution (Attachment A) recommending approval and distribution of the residential allocations for 2008. The Board must make the following motions, based on this staff summary and the evidence in the record:

- 1) A motion that the recommendation for approval and distribution of the residential allocations for 2008 meets the requirements of Chapter 33, Subsection 2, Allocation of Additional Residential Units of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and;
- 2) A motion to approve the attached Resolution (see Attachment A).

Project Description/Background: In July 2002, the TRPA Governing Board took action to change the base number of residential allocations for the local jurisdictions within the Tahoe Basin from 300 to 150 with the ability to range from a minimum of 78 to a maximum of 294 based on performance criteria in four areas: permit issuance and compliance, EIP Implementation, BMP Retrofit and increase Transit Level of Service (TLOS). The action followed adoption of the 2001 Threshold Evaluation, which is performed every five years to evaluate TRPA's progress towards achieving the environmental standards, or thresholds, for the Lake Tahoe Region. The 2001 evaluation concluded that sufficient progress was not being made towards meeting the thresholds and that the rate of implementing environmental improvement programs and projects needed to be increased. Development of a linkage system was the recommended approach in part because the TRPA Goals and Policies states that "The timing and phasing of both new development and remedial measures must, therefore, be carefully linked to ensure steady progress toward the environmental thresholds"

(Chapter VII, Implementation Element, Development and Implementation Priorities). The Residential Allocation Linkage System binds additional residential development to:

- Increased efforts in the areas of Best Management Practice (BMP) retrofits
- Accelerated Water Quality/Air Quality/SEZ Restoration EIP implementation
- Increased Transit Level of Service (TLOS)
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) permit issuance and compliance

Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (subsection 33.2) includes performance targets that have been evaluated in determining the annual number of residential allocations distributed to the local jurisdictions. Allocation enhancement or deduction increments represent the jurisdictions' proportional share of the historic annual allocations. Each jurisdiction has a baseline number of allocations that represents the starting point from which additional allocations will be awarded or deducted. The Allocation Performance Table is as follows:

Jurisdiction	Minimum Allocation with Deductions	Deduction Increments	Base Allocation	Enhancement Increments	Maximum Allocation with Enhancements
Douglas	9	-1	13	1	21
Washoe	13	-3	25	3	49
EI Dorado	27	-7	55	7	111
CSLT	11	-3	23	3	47
Placer	18	-4	34	4	66
Total	78		150		294

2007-2009 Interim Allocation Program

On October 25, 2006, the TRPA Governing Board, with endorsement from the Advisory Planning Commission, approved amendments to the TRPA Goals and Policies (Land Use and Implementation Elements), the Code of Ordinances (Chapters 33 and 35) and Community Plans to extend the expiration dates for residential allocations, enabling "additional development" to continue until the updated TRPA Regional Plan is adopted. No more development potential is being proposed which was not analyzed and contemplated for development during the life of the current Regional Plan (20 year development horizon, 1987-2007).

Issues/Concerns: The issues discussed by the Performance Review Committee were:

- The availability of Residential Allocations for the market rate components of CEP projects and;
- The training needs of the local jurisdictions to achieve a greater number of residential allocations.

Regional Plan Compliance: The proposed project complies with all requirements of the TRPA Goals and Policies and meets the specific requirements of Chapter 33, Subsection 2, Allocation of Additional Residential Units of the Code of Ordinances.

If you have any questions, please contact Mike Cavanaugh at mcavanaugh@trpa.org or 775-589-5209.

Attachments:

- Rational (Attachment "A")
- Draft Resolution (Attachment "B")
- TLOS Performance Memo (Attachment "C")
- EIP Implementation Performance Memo (Attachment "D")
- BMP Retrofit Performance Memo (Attachment "E")
- Permit Issuance Performance Memo (Attachment "F")
- Permit Compliance Performance Memo (Attachment "G")

Attachment A, Rationale

Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (subsection 33.2) includes performance targets that have been evaluated in determining the annual number of residential allocations distributed to the local jurisdictions. Allocation enhancement or deduction increments represent the jurisdictions' proportional share of the historic annual allocations. Each jurisdiction has a baseline number of allocations that represents the starting point from which additional allocations will be awarded or deducted. The Allocation Performance Table is as follows:

Jurisdiction	<u>Minimum Allocation with Deductions</u>	<u>Deduction Increments</u>	<u>Base Allocation</u>	<u>Enhancement Increments</u>	<u>Maximum Allocation with Enhancements</u>
Douglas	<u>9</u>	<u>-1</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>21</u>
Washoe	<u>13</u>	<u>-3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>49</u>
EI Dorado	<u>27</u>	<u>-7</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>111</u>
CSLT	<u>11</u>	<u>-3</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>47</u>
Placer	<u>18</u>	<u>-4</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>66</u>
Total	<u>78</u>		<u>150</u>		<u>294</u>

On October 25, 2006, the TRPA Governing Board, with endorsement from the Advisory Planning Commission, approved amendments to the TRPA Goals and Policies (Land Use and Implementation Elements), the Code of Ordinances (Chapters 33 and 35) and Community Plans to extend the expiration dates for residential allocations, enabling “additional development” to continue until the updated TRPA Regional Plan is adopted. No more development potential is being proposed which was not analyzed and contemplated for development during the life of the current Regional Plan (20 year development horizon, 1987-2007).

Attachment B

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION 2007-__

RESOLUTION TO SET THE NUMBER OF 2008 RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS

WHEREAS, Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances was amended on December 18, 2002, to modify the performance-based allocation system; and

WHEREAS, the amendments to Chapter 33 included the previously established Performance Review Committee, which includes one member from each local jurisdiction receiving residential allocations; and

WHEREAS, the amendments to Chapter 33 charged the Performance Review Committee with determining the number of residential allocations based on the general guidelines provided by the Governing Board; and

WHEREAS, the Performance Review Committee used the adopted criteria to evaluate the performance of each local jurisdiction receiving allocations, and recommended the assignment of 2008 residential allocations based on these criteria; and

WHEREAS, the Performance Review Committee presented it's recommendations for assignment of 2008 residential allocations

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board, based on the recommendation of the Performance Review Committee and substantial evidence in the record, hereby sets the number of 2008 residential allocations for each local jurisdiction as follows:

City of South Lake Tahoe	35 allocations
Douglas County	14 allocations
El Dorado County	76 allocations
Placer County	50 allocations
<u>Washoe County</u>	<u>37 allocations</u>
Total	212 allocations

Passed and adopted this 19 day of December, 2007 by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

Julie Motamedi, Chairperson
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

ATTACHMENT "C"



**Tahoe
Transportation
District**

P.O. Box 5310 - Stateline, NV 89449 - T. 775.588.4547 F. 775.588.4527

October 31, 2007

To: Tahoe Transportation District

From: Transportation Staff

Subject: Recommendation to TRPA Governing Board Regarding Transit Level of Service (TLOS) Jurisdictional Reports (TRPA Ch. 33)

Action Requested: For the TTD Board to review the annual TLOS reports and provide TRPA Governing Board and the Performance Review Committee (PRC) with a recommendation regarding the release of 2008 residential allocations.

Staff Recommendation: TLOS reports have been received from all participating jurisdictions. Based on the information provided, staff recommends the following:

- Placer County: Placer County increased three of nine TLOS criteria by over 5%. Based on Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, this will result in Placer County receiving **1 increment** of enhancement to the baseline allocation.
- City of South Lake Tahoe: The City of South Lake Tahoe did not experience significant increases in TLOS criteria nor did the city's transit system experience significant decreases in TLOS criteria. Based on Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, this will result in the City of South Lake Tahoe receiving a **baseline** allocation in regards to the TLOS linkage.
- Washoe County: Washoe County did not experience significant increases in TLOS criteria nor did the county's transit system experience significant decreases in TLOS criteria. This will result in Washoe County receiving a **baseline** allocation in regards to the TLOS linkage.
- El Dorado County: El Dorado County did not experience significant increases in TLOS criteria nor did the county's transit system experience significant decreases in TLOS criteria. This will result in El Dorado County receiving a **baseline** allocation in regards to the TLOS linkage.
- Douglas County: Douglas County did not experience significant increases in TLOS criteria nor did the county's transit system experience significant decreases in TLOS criteria. This will result in Douglas County receiving a **baseline** allocation in regards to the TLOS linkage.

Background: In December 2002, at the TRPA Governing Board meeting, the board approved amendments to Chapter 33 TRPA Code of Ordinances. With this amendment, 2003-2006 residential allocations can be enhanced or reduced depending on the jurisdictions' performance

in EIP, Compliance, Best Management Practices, and Transit Level of Service. In May 2003, further amendments were presented and accepted by the TRPA Governing Board.

The adopted code language is as follows:

TRPA Code of Ordinances

CHAPTER 33 - ALLOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT 33-10

(g) Transit Level Of Service 2004-06: The base allocation for years 2004 through 2006 shall be enhanced or reduced, with recommendation from the TTD, as follows:§

(i) A jurisdiction shall receive one increment of enhancement for improving the previous year's three§ of nine of the TLOS criteria by 5-10% as determined by the jurisdiction specific TLOS Criteria Matrix in the TLOS Guidelines Handbook, or

(ii) A jurisdiction shall receive two increments of enhancement for improving the previous year's five of nine TLOS criteria by greater than 5%§, as determined by the jurisdiction specific TLOS Criteria Matrix in the TLOS Guidelines Handbook, or

(iii) In the event a jurisdiction does not qualify for either increment of enhancement but improves a minimum of one (1) TLOS criteria by at least 5% under subsection (g)(i), or three (3) criteria by at least 5% under subsection 33.2.B (5)(g)(ii), a jurisdiction can qualify for an initial or second increment if other measurable commitments to transit (listed below), approved by TRPA and TTD at least one (1) year in advance, are met. Other measurable commitments to transit that may increase ridership include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following: expenditure of new transit funds on transit, development/ implementation of a parking management plan, establishment of a regional or local revenue source to fund transit operations, establishment/extension of inter-jurisdictional service, provide transit passenger incentives such as free fares, implementation of new transit marketing and/or promotional programs.
§ Amended 5/28/03

(iv) A jurisdiction shall be penalized one increment of deduction for a 5% or greater decrease in the previous year's four of nine TLOS criteria as determined by the jurisdiction specific TLOS Criteria Matrix.

Discussion: Staff will present the available information at the November 2007 TTD meeting. Jurisdictional representatives will also be on hand to address any questions board members or the public may have regarding the TLOS reports and methodology. Reports from the Placer County, Douglas County, the City of South Lake Tahoe, Washoe County, and El Dorado County are attached for review.

Attached: County and City TLOS Reports

If you have any questions regarding this matter, feel free to contact Karen Fink at (775) 589-5204 or by e-mail at kfink@trpa.org.

ATTACHMENT "D"

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
eip@trpa.org

P.O.Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449-5310

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

November 13, 2007

To: Performance Review Committee

From: TRPA Environmental Improvement Branch Staff

Re: Recommendation for Release of 2008 Residential Allocations Based on EIP Project Implementation Performance Linkage

Background:

Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) Implementation Performance Review for 2008 allocations involves a two-step process: 1) Submittal and TRPA approval of Five-Year EIP Component Lists and Maintenance Efficiency Plans (MEP); and, 2) Determination of FY 2006-07 performance-based on the jurisdictions' Five-Year EIP Component Lists. In October 2007, TRPA staff contacted local jurisdictions to prepare and submit these materials based on the required format adopted in December 2003. Preparation and submittal of these materials are required by October of each year.

Recommendation:

The table below recommends release of residential allocations based on the Performance Review Criteria for EIP Implementation (TRPA Code 33.2.B (5)(c)).

EIP Implementation: Performance Review for 2008 Allocations

	<u>Submittal & Approval</u>		Performance <i>(Project Component Completion based on 2006-2011 EIP Project List Submittals)</i>				Recommended Enhancement Increments (and Residential Allocations)
	EIP List	MEP	<50% Completion (-1)	50-70% Completion (0)	71-100% Completion (+1)	>100% Completion (+2)	
City of SLT	✓	✓				✓	+2
Douglas Co.	✓	—	Please see the paragraph below for a discussion of Douglas County's performance.				-1
El Dorado Co.	✓	✓			✓		+1
Placer Co.	✓	✓			✓		+1
Washoe Co.	✓	✓			✓		+1

El Dorado, Placer and Washoe Counties and the City of South Lake Tahoe have met the basic requirement of submittal and approval of Five-Year EIP Component Lists and MEPs. For FY 2006-07, the City of South Lake Tahoe received a performance score of 117% which results in an allocation of +2 Enhancement Increments, El Dorado County received a performance score of 76% which results in an allocation of +1 Enhancement Increments, Placer County received a performance score of 83% which results in an allocation of +1 Enhancement Increments, and Washoe County received a performance score of 75% which results in an allocation of +1 Enhancement Increments. Douglas County submitted their EIP progress information however they did not include a MEP. Also, Douglas County's EIP progress information submitted last year did not include predicted dates of completion for the project components. Douglas County's submittal this year did include predicted dates of completion for project components therefore comparisons on their progress can be done next year. Due to the lack of a MEP and no predicted dates of completion, this results in a minus 1 Deduction Increment score.

Summary:

On October 1, 2007, TRPA mailed and emailed out the request for information for the 2008 allocation assessment. The Basin partners were provided a deadline of October 31, 2007 to submit material for the 2007 allocations. As of November 7, 2007, all of the Basin partners had submitted materials to TRPA.

Relevant TRPA Code of Ordinance Section- Chapter 33.2.B (5)(c):

EIP Implementation 2004 and beyond: TRPA must receive and approve an updated 5-year EIP Component List for years 2006-11, in addition to a Maintenance Efficiency Plan (MEP) by the October prior to the allocation year. The base allocation for years 2004 and beyond shall be enhanced or reduced as follows:

- (i) A jurisdiction shall receive one increment of enhancement for a 71-100% completion of project component scores for the EIP Component List, or
- (ii) A jurisdiction shall receive two increments of enhancement for performance greater than 100% completion of project component scores for the EIP Component List, or
- (iii) A jurisdiction shall be penalized one increment of deduction for performance 50% below completion of project component scores for the EIP Component List, or not having an approved EIP Component List and MEP.

ATTACHMENT "E"

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
www.trpa.org

P.O.Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449-5310

Phone: (775) 588-4547
Fax (775) 588-4527
Email: trpa@trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

November 7, 2006

To: PRC

From: TRPA's Erosion Control Team

Subject: Recommendation Regarding Release of 2006 Residential Allocations Based on the BMP Retrofit Performance Linkage

BACKGROUND:

The BMP Retrofit Performance linkage to determine distribution of 2007 residential allocations is based upon the requirements established at the October 25, 2006 TRPA Governing Board meeting, summarized below.

Local jurisdictions shall receive two (2) increments of enhancement each year from 2004 and beyond for greater than 100% compliance with the BMP retrofit target, one (1) increment of enhancement for making progress toward meeting established targets equal to 50% to 100% compliance; baseline (i.e. no increments of enhancement) for maintenance of the BMP Retrofit Implementation program; or one (1) increment of deduction for not maintaining the BMP Retrofit Implementation program or not making progress toward meeting established targets (see Table 1). The targets are based on implementation of BMPs on all remaining properties needing them as of September 2002. The targets are as follows: 5% completion by October 2003, 25% by October 2004, 65% by October 2005 and 85% by October 2006 and beyond.

Table 1: BMP Retrofit Linkage to Allocations

Allocation Determination Criteria for October 2007
Annual target based on 85% of remaining P1, 2 & 3 properties needing BMPs as of Sept. 2002
+2 increments for >100% compliance with target (numbers over target credited to following year)
+1 increment for 50% to 100% compliance with target
BASELINE = Maintenance of BMP Retrofit Implementation Program
-1 unit for not maintaining BMP Retrofit Implementation Program

RESULTS:

In November 2007, TRPA's *Erosion Control Team* staff performed a query of our basin-wide BMP database, and local jurisdictions submitted information about their performance relative to their individual BMP Retrofit Implementation Programs. The results are summarized below:

Table 2: BMP Retrofit Targets & Actual Number of Certificates Issued

Local Jurisdiction	BMP Certificates Issued Year 6 <i>Oct. 2006 through Oct. 2007</i>	BMP Certificates Issued Through Year 6 <i>Oct. 2002 through Oct. 2007</i>	Target for Year 6 (cumulative) October 2007 Target	Percent of compliance with target
<i>City of So. Lake Tahoe</i>	263	2,085	10,316	20%
<i>Douglas County</i>	238	735	3,441	21%
<i>El Dorado County</i>	227	988	7,172	14%
<i>Placer County</i>	365	1436	8,034	18%
<i>Washoe County</i>	292	2,719	5,236	52%
TOTAL	1,385	7,963	34,199	

RECOMMENDATION:

As referenced in Table 3 below and based upon an analysis of the statistical data, the TRPA *Erosion Control Team* recommends one increment of enhancement for Washoe County and baseline for El Dorado County, Placer County, Douglas County and the City of South Lake Tahoe.

Table 3: BMP Retrofit Implementation: Performance Review for 2007 Allocations

Local Jurisdiction	Maintain BMP Retrofit Implementation Program (baseline)	Achieving 50% to 100% of 2006 target (+1 increment)	Achieving >100% of 2006 target (+2 increments)	Recommendation
<i>El Dorado County</i>	✓	⊘	⊘	0 baseline
<i>Placer County</i>	✓	⊘	⊘	0 baseline
<i>Washoe County</i>	✓	✓	⊘	+1 increment
<i>Douglas County</i>	✓	⊘	⊘	0 baseline
<i>City of So. Lake Tahoe</i>	✓	⊘	⊘	0 baseline

It should be noted that while only Washoe County is recommended for an increment of enhancement based on BMP implementation as evidenced by BMP Certificates of Completion issued, Placer County, El Dorado County, the City of South Lake Tahoe, and Douglas County maintained their BMP Retrofit Programs in 2007.

In 2007, Placer County staff worked closely with the Tahoe Resource Conservation District (TRCD) to increase BMP implementation. As a result, informational letters were sent to property owners adjacent to Placer County EIP projects to encourage installation of BMPs on private parcels, 16 public outreach and interagency events related to BMPs were coordinated, BMP Retrofit Program information was incorporated into Site Assessment reports and right-of-way encroachment permit applications, and financial support was provided to fund an in-house TRCD staff person.

El Dorado County maintained the BMP Retrofit Program by providing assistance to the Tahoe Resource Conservation District, providing BMP educational materials to costumers, and they have been closely involved in the Angora fire clean-up effort and rebuild efforts, including daily inspections to ensure sites are complying with temporary BMPs during construction.

The City of South Lake Tahoe maintained the BMP Retrofit Program by responding to inquiries from the public regarding BMPs, offering educational literature to costumers, and working with TRCD to increase implementation. As a result informational letters were sent to the property owners located in South Lake Tahoe EIP project areas to encourage installation of BMPs on those private parcels.

Douglas County maintained the BMP Retrofit Program by providing funding to the Nevada Tahoe Conservation District to complete Phase I and II of the Stormwater Utility Initiative. This program will, if implemented, provide a coordinated effort to implement and maintain BMP's.

REFERENCE:

TRPA CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 33

- (e) BMP Retrofit Implementation 2004 and beyond: The base allocation for years 2004 and beyond shall be enhanced or reduced as follows:
 - (i) A jurisdiction shall receive one increment of enhancement for maintaining the jurisdiction specific BMP Retrofit Implementation program and making progress toward meeting established targets equal to 50% to 100% compliance, or
 - (ii) A jurisdiction shall receive two increments of enhancement for greater than 100% compliance with the established annual retrofit targets for implementation of BMPs for years 2003 and beyond, or
 - (iii) A jurisdiction shall be penalized one increment of deduction for not maintaining the jurisdiction's specific BMP Retrofit Implementation program or not making progress toward meeting established targets.

ATTACHMENT "F"

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
www.trpa.org

P.O.Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449-5310

Phone: (775) 588-4547
Fax (775) 588-4527
Email: trpa@trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

November 1, 2007

To: Performance Review Committee
From: Wendy Jepson, Senior Planner
Subject: 2007 MOU Permit Monitoring Audit Results

The 2007 MOU permit monitoring audit results are summarized as follows:

Douglas County

APN	Type	Score	Comments
1418-10-802-003	SFDA	100%	
1418-10-511-016	SFDA	100%	
1318-25-111-020	SFDA	100%	
1318-23-511-004	SFDA	100%	
1318-10-416-007	NSFD	100%	
1418-11-110-001	NSFD	100%	
1318-03-212-034	SFSA	100%	
1418-03-812-002	NSFD	100%	
1318-23-311-017	SFDA	100%	
1418-11-110-002	SFDA	100%	

The average score for the audited files is 100%.

City of South Lake Tahoe

APN	Type	Score	Comments
032-262-09	NSFD	100%	
025-541-14	NSFD	100%	
025-510-72	NSFD	100%	
028-082-02	NSFD	100%	
028-100-24	NSFD	100%	
026-085-18	NSFD	100%	
027-355-17	NSFD	95%	Allowable coverage miscalculated.
031-341-01	NSFD	100%	
025-244-06	NFDR	100%	
025-032-03	NSFD	100%	

The average score for the audited files is 99.5%.

Washoe County

APN	Type	Score	Comments
130-211-08	SFDR	100%	
122-121-01	SFDR	100%	
125-162-19	NSFD	100%	
130-201-01	SFDR	100%	
126-241-01	NSFD	100%	
130-241-09	NSFD	100%	
122-193-37	SFDR	100%	
124-082-18	NSFD	100%	
124-082-17	NSFD	100%	
124-082-16	NSFD	100%	

The average score for the audited files is 100%.

Placer County

APN	Type	Score	Comments
085-342-007	NSFD	100%	
112-260-021	NSFD	100%	
084-092-011	NSFD	100%	
084-092-037	NSFD	95%	Excess coverage mitigation fee not charged/incorrect.
097-082-012	NSFD	95%	Vegetation protection incorrect/incomplete.
092-022-004	SFDA	100%	
097-170-010	NSFD	100%	
097-170-007	SFDA	100%	
085-083-022	SFDA	100%	
116-080-035	SFDA	95%	Vegetation protection incorrect/incomplete.

The average score for the audited files is 98.5%.

El Dorado County

APN	Type	Score	Comments
016-522-05	NSFD	100%	
035-134-07	NSFD	100%	
081-091-05	NSFD	100%	
025-792-37	NSFD	100%	
016-522-08	NSFD	100%	
025-421-10	NSFD	100%	
025-812-04	NSFD	100%	
034-823-04	NSFD	100%	
014-244-06	NSFD	100%	
025-644-01	NSFD	100%	

The average score for the audited files is 100%.

ATTACHMENT "G"

Placer County Audit
October 2007

Average Winterization Score: 88%

Average Security Return Score: 95%

Scores for Winterization Inspections:

APN	Address	MOU#	Score
093-241-002	122 Mammoth	121422.06	85%
083-151-010	1210 Holly	20050934 MOU	94%
083-210-001	1390 Woodland Way	20050637 MOU	90%
111-160-012	1345 Canterbury Dr.	20060336 MOU	90%
085-321-003	370 Elizabeth	20050030 MOU	94%
085-342-007	4530 Interlaken Rd.	20060632 MOU	85%
085-302-005	4470 Interlaken	20050473 MOU	90%
083-143-005	1050 Holly Road	20051043 MOU	80%
097-170-101	130 Tahoe Ski Bowl	20050740 MOU	100%
083-153-101	1261 Sequoia Ave.	20060773 MOU	75%
112-060-017	6971 Toyon	20060153 MOU	90%

Scores for Security Return Inspections:

APN	Address	MOU#	Score
090-191-010	8862 Salmon	B-120332	97%
090-101-009	8549 Dolly Varden	B119012	95%
090-161-020	8840 Cutthroat Ave.	B12164	90%
092-160-018	660 Terrace	B119136	85%
092-213-006	3810 LaCross	B120845	100%
094-122-020	320 Pioneer Way	B118988	97%
083-041-011	955 Big Pine Dr.	B115952	95%
083-350-001	338 Woodview Ct.	B-116505	100%
098-033-003	6131 McKinney	B12034	98%
085-321-014	330 Chris Way	B118983	92%

Douglas County Audit
October 2007

Average Winterization Score: 89%
Average Security Return Score: 98%

Scores for Winterization Inspections:

APN	Address	File#	Score
1418-10-802-005	1951 Glenbrook Road	20070282 STD	93%
1418-03-301-011	2200 Lands End Road	20051454 STD	75%
001-020-16	2228 Lands End Road	20010491 STD	90%
1418-03-811-027	2179 Slaughter House Rd.	20061094 STD	100%
001-201-01	2134 The Back Road	20030393 STD	95%
1418-00-311-006	1968 Glenbrook House	20062032 STD	80%
003-180-40	1268 Tamarack Drive	20021022 STD	98%
003-191-09	1180 Hwy 50	19960397 STD	75%
1318-15-611-021	297 Seminole	20062027 STD	85%
1318-23-811-024	177 Pine	20050661 STD	98%

Scores for Security Return Inspections:

APN	Address	File#	Score
1318-10-412-011	254 S Martin Drive	20051075 STD	100%
1318-10-310-050	729 Cedar Street	20040151 STD	98%
1318-10-310-026	723 Lincoln Hwy.	20031201 STD	97%
007-234-21	195 Hall Ct.	20010110 STD	95%
007-234-02	196 Kingsbury Circle	20030565 STD	97%
011-121-17	118 Vesper Ct.	20030307 STD	97%
005-230-11	180 Elks Point	20000830 STD	98%
003-180-012	1260 Tamarack	20030282 STD	100%
1318-03-212-080	187 Willow Dr.	20070338 STD	98%
1318-10-416-055	624 Riven Rock Road	20041066 STD	98%
1318-16-810-043	462 Elk Ave.	20030752 STD	98%

Washoe County Audit
October 2007

Average Winterization Score: 93.9%
Average Security Return Score: 98.7%

Scores for Winterization Inspections:

APN	Address	File#	Score
126-241-01	701 Fairview	07T0026	94%
125-141-10	409 Valerie Ct	06T0019	96%
125-162-20	910 Tyner	07T0039	97%
125-162-18	918 Tyner	07T0071	98%
125-162-17	920 Tyner	07T0037	100%
125-162-19	916 Tyner	07T0038	100%
130-211-08	1100 Lakeshore	06T0022	70%
130-201-01	105 Pine Cone	07T0069	99%
131-227-02	444 2 nd Tee	05T005, 07T0087	85%
131-234-07	383 2 nd Tee	07T0076	100%

Scores for Security Return Inspections:

APN	Address	File#	Score
130-241-57	1605 Pine Cone Cir	05T0074	92%
125-482-10	586 Rockrose Ct	05T0009	100%
125-511-26	600 Tyner	05T0067	100%
122-113-03	551 Silvertip	03T0047, 05T0008	100%
122-129-04	620 Martis Peak	05T0001	100%
122-215-14	870 Freels Peak	05T0060	95%
131-012-22	908 Driver	06T0015	100%
130-211-40	121 Mayhew	06T0051	100%
131-261-34968	968 4 TH Green	05T0053	100%
131-012-38	630 14 th Green	07T0060	100%

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
www.trpa.org

P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449

(775) 588-4547
Fax (775) 588-4527
Email: trpa@trpa.org

City of South Lake Tahoe Audit

Average Winterization Score: 92%

Average Security Return Score: 96%

Scores Winterization Inspections:

APN	Address	MOU#	Score
023-601-07,08	771 Julie	05060155	96%
031-145-11	2487 Osborne	07090044	94%
022-191-12	516 Christie	07050079	98%
031-224-07	2604 Pinter	06071094	97%
028-090-07	1393 Wildwood	07080146	96%
028-100-26	1348 Wildwood	06020048	93%
028-090-45	1399 Wildwood	N/A	98%
023-373-05	1030 Chonokis	06120047	100%
023-441-45	603 Tata	06050001	59%
023-482-11	946 Tata	06070196	100%
023-441-28	685 Tata	07050103	86%
031-191-15	2577 Kubel	06080003	97%

Scores for Security Return Inspections:

APN	Address	MOU#	Score
022-132-11	2224 Texas	N/A	95%
022-182-35	2066 Slalom	05120053	97%
031-121-18	1065 Sierra	04070026	100%
023-691-38	630 Gardner	05120022	100%
028-131-06	1381 Timberlake	05040041	98%
026-101-13	799 Modesto	04080126	100%
026-242-15	945 Trout Creek	05080123	100%
025-580-06	3605 Needle Peak	05010051	92%
023-512-18	1874 10 th	02-075	85%
025-765-12	1491 Murietta	06030009	100%

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
www.trpa.org

P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449

(775) 588-4547
Fax (775) 588-4527
Email: trpa@trpa.org

El Dorado County Audit

Average Winterization Score: 89%

Average Security Return Score: 97%

Scores for Winterization Inspections:

APN	Address	MOU#	Score
015-301-01	489 Alder	169472	61%
033-792-17	102 Nottaway	174806	80%
016-462-06	8923 Glen	167026	100%
016-462-08	8897 Glen	177008	96%
015-302-31	7275 Ninth	N/A	100%
034-762-08	1890 Meadow Vale	183732	96%
025-612-03	2306 Del Norte	167170	100%
035-241-08	2404 Wasabe	149115	81%
025-812-04	2232 Colombine	167133	72%
033-672-13	1110 Washoan	176091	100%
080-154-10	3124 Deer Trail	162886	98%
034-203-13	1244 E. San Bernardino	159726	98%
025-733-12	1857 High Meadow	178425	98%
032-331-05	2315 Tartan Way	159916	71%

Scores for Security Return Inspections:

APN	Address	MOU#	Score
016-091-48	8449 Meeks Bay	161181	98%
015-101-06	317 Elm	165711	95%
014-351-06	7310 Timberwolf	163669	94%
015-152-09	7145 Ninth	172838	100%
015-161-02	7137 Sixth	153921	100%
034-762-13	1774 Meadow Vale	150599	97%
035-234-04	2275 Blitzen	162935	95%
036-391-11	3516 So. Upper Truckee	157907	100%
034-823-06	2054 Hopi	163684	100%
034-104-04	1738 Erie	140906	100%
033-801-01	1160 Onnontioga	156427	99%
033-703-06	949 Muskwaki	167273	93%
025-602-05	2341 Cold Creek	166775	100%
034-112-04	1891 Bella Coola	142364	100%

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
www.trpa.org

P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449-5310

Phone: (775) 588-4547
Fax (775) 588-4527
Email: trpa@trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Date: December 5, 2007

Subject: Amendment to Chapter 71 Tree Removal and Other Related Amendments to Allow Tree Removal for Defensible Space Purposes to be Approved by a Defensible Space Assessor

Requested Action: Staff requests that the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) make a recommendation to the Governing Board on the proposed Code amendment changing Chapter 2, Definitions and Chapter 71.5.C Tree Removal and other related amendments to allow tree removal within 100 feet from a structure to be approved by a Defensible Space Assessor.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC recommend approval of the proposed amendment and make a recommendation to the Governing Board to make the required findings and approve the proposed Code amendment.

Required Motion(s): To recommend approval of the proposed action, the APC should make the following motions, based on this staff summary and the evidence in the record:

- 1) A motion to recommend approval by the Governing Board of the required findings (see Attachment A), including a finding of no significant effect; and
- 2) A motion to recommend approval by the Governing Board of the proposed Ordinance. (see Attachment B).

Project Description/Background: Chapter 71.5.C of TRPA Code requires marking trees for removal to be performed by a "Qualified Forester" as defined in Chapter 2 of TRPA Code. The required qualifications of the "Qualified Forester" definition are currently being met by the 5 fire protection districts (FPDs) under MOU's with TRPA. In the 9-Point Letter from the Tahoe Basin Fire Chiefs, they requested a broader definition of "Qualified Forester" as it relates to defensible space assessments. The Fire Chiefs seek an easier way to meet the needs of the homeowner requesting an on-site defensible space assessment.

In response to the Fire Chief's request, TRPA staff proposes to add a new definition of "Defensible Space Assessor" to Chapter 2 – Definitions of TRPA Code. The addition of the "Defensible Space Assessor" definition will allow a person who works for a Tahoe Basin FPD or fire department and has successfully completed an annual Defensible

Space Training to evaluate structures within the Tahoe Region for defensible space including marking trees for removal that are deemed a fire hazard to the structure.

Attachment B specifies sections of the Code of Ordinances that will be changed as a result of approval of this requested action.

Issues/Concerns: The professional associations governing the practice of forestry (California) and arboriculture (International) have established minimum qualifications for eligibility and practice. TRPA's proposed Code amendments could potentially be considered inconsistent with those requirements. In California, in order to become a Registered Professional Forester (RPF), a candidate must first complete 7 years of education and experience, with 3 years of work under the supervision of a RPF before taking the RPF exam. The International Society of Arboriculture requires 3 years of full-time arborist experience before becoming eligible to take the Arborist exam and practice as a Certified Arborist. After attaining an Arborist Certification, 30 Continuing Education Units are required every 3 years to maintain the certification. The RPF license is required in California for an individual to practice forestry. An arborist certification is intended to demonstrate competence and expertise in the field of arboriculture.

In the Spring of 2007, conversations were initiated by John Pickett of the Nevada Fire Safe Council with the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the requirement to use Registered Professional Foresters (RPF), or an RPF designee, for marking trees for defensible space. TRPA staff later contacted Eric Huff, Executive Officer, Foresters Licensing, Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (California), to clarify the Board of Forestry's determination. The following is an excerpt from the email received from Mr. Huff dated May 1st, 2007: *"So long as the tree marking is within the 100' defensible space perimeter around a structure and is consistent with the Board-adopted General Guidelines for Creating Defensible Space, the Board will raise no issue. Defensible space work on forested landscapes beyond that 100' structure perimeter clearly requires RPF involvement."*

Based on this correspondence, application of the proposed amendment is being limited to the 100 feet or the property boundary, whichever is less, immediately adjacent to the structure being evaluated for defensible space in California and limited to the property boundary of the structure being assessed for defensible space in Nevada. Nothing in this amendment shall supersede any State or Federal regulations.

Regional Plan Compliance: The proposed project complies with all requirements of the TRPA Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements, and Code of Ordinances, including all required findings in Chapters 6 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (see attachment A for details).

If you have any questions please contact Mike Vollmer at (775) 589-5268 or via email at mvollmer@trpa.org.

Attachments:

- Required Findings/Rationale (Attachment A)
- Draft Ordinance (Attachment B and Exhibit 1)

6.3 Threshold-Related Findings: The following specific findings shall be made, pursuant to Articles V(c), V(g) and VI(b) of the Compact in addition to any other findings required by law.

6.3.A Findings Necessary To Approve Any Project: To approve any project, TRPA must find, in accordance with Sections 6.1 and 6.2, that:

- (1) The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, plan area statements and maps, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs.

Rationale: The amendment to Chapter 2 Definitions and Chapter 71.5.C Tree Removal, will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan. Staff's proposed amendment is consistent with the Regional Plan and TRPA plans and programs, because the proposed amendment is limited in scope to promote health and safety concerns with regard to fire safety and defensible space. This amendment will allow persons successfully completing Defensible Space Assessor training to evaluate structures for defensible space including the marking of trees deemed a fire hazard. Wildfire prevention is consistent with the goal of maintaining and promoting Lake clarity.

- (2) The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities Thresholds to be exceeded; and

Rationale: This amendment will change the requirement for Fire Protection Districts (FPD) and Fire Departments to use a person who meets the definition of "Qualified Forester", as defined in Chapter 2 of TRPA Code, to mark trees for removal for defensible space. FPD's and Fire Departments will be able to use persons who successfully complete, and annually repeat, a defensible space training and therefore qualify as a Defensible Space Assessor to perform defensible space evaluations including the marking of trees for removal that are deemed a fire hazard. The limited application of the rule change to allow a trained defensible space assessor rather than a Qualified Forester to mark trees for removal for defensible space will not cause the vegetation conservation threshold standards to be adversely affected or exceeded.

- (3) Wherever federal, state or local air and water quality standards applicable for the region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: Any project that may come forth due to this provision will be required to meet air and water quality standards as set forth in the TRPA Compact.

6.5 Findings Necessary To Amend Or Adopt TRPA Ordinances, Rules Or Other TRPA Plans And Programs:

To approve any amendment or adoption of the Code, Rules or other TRPA plans and programs which implement the Regional Plan, TRPA must find, in addition to the findings required pursuant to Section 6.3, and in accordance with Sections 6.1 and 6.2, that the Regional Plan and all of its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: See Findings and Rationale listed above. The amendment is consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.

Environmental Documentation: Staff has completed an Initial Environmental Checklist for the proposed Code of Ordinance changes. Staff recommends that a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) be made for the Code Amendments based on the IEC, Chapter 6 and 13 findings and information contained in this Staff Summary and the agency record.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE 2007 –

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY; CHAPTER 2 DEFINITIONS AND CHAPTER 71.5.C TREE REMOVAL, AMENDING THE REQUIREMENT FOR A “QUALIFIED FORESTER”, AS DEFINED BY TRPA CODE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MARKING TREES FOR DEFENSIBLE SPACE PURPOSES SURROUNDING STRUCTURES, AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

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

Section 1.00

Findings

- 1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance 87-9, as amended, which ordinance relates to the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) by amending Chapter 2 Definitions and Chapter 71.5.C Tree Removal, to further implement the Regional Plan pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.
- 1.20 These amendments have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment, and are therefore exempt from the requirements of an environmental impact statement pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.
- 1.30 The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) has conducted a public hearing on the amendments and recommended adoption. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. At those hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.
- 1.40 The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Chapter 6 of the Code and Article V(g) of the Compact, and the findings required by Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8. As to the Ordinance 87-8 findings, the Board finds that those findings were supported by a preponderance of the evidence in the record
- 1.50 The Governing Board finds that the amendments adopted here will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental

threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.00 Chapter 2 Definitions and Chapter 71.5.C Tree Removal, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedures

2.10 Subsection 6.60 of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended by amending Chapter 2 and Chapter 71.5.C as set forth on Attachment B, dated December 5, 2007, which attachment is appended hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 3.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this Ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to affect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion thereof is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this Ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this Ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.00 Effective Date

The provisions of this Ordinance amending Chapter 2 Definitions and Chapter 71.5.C Tree Removal, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances shall be effective immediately after its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held December 19, 2007 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent

Julie Motamedi, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Proposed Language Amendments to Chapter 2 Definitions and Chapter 71.5.C Tree
Removal

Proposed language is double-underlined and deleted language is struck-through

Chapter 2

DEFINITIONS

2.2 Definitions: The following terms are defined as set forth below.

Defensible Space Assessor: A person who works for an organization that is operating under a TRPA MOU, which has been approved by TRPA, who has successfully completed a Defensible Space Certification Program for Lake Tahoe and evaluates structures for defensible space. Annual renewal of this certification is required.

Chapter 71

TREE REMOVAL

71.5 Reasons For Tree Removal: Except for trees identified for retention under section 71.2,[§] tree removal shall incorporate measures and prescriptions that promote a range of threshold standards and SEZs pursuant to Subsection 71.4.C (Tree Cutting Within Stream Environment Zones). Trees may be removed for the following reasons:^{§§}

71.5.A Hazardous Tree Removal: To protect lives and property, trees reported by a qualified forester to be hazardous to property or lives may be removed upon approval by TRPA. Other vegetation shall be protected during removal operations to prevent their injury.

71.5.B Dead, Dying, Or Diseased Tree Removal: To enhance forest health, trees reported by a qualified forester to be dead, dying or diseased may be removed upon approval by TRPA. (See Subsection 78.2.D.) Dead trees may be removed without TRPA approval. Green stumps shall be treated, and insect-infested wood shall be disposed of, or treated as appropriate, as specified by a qualified forester.

71.5.C Fire Hazard Tree Removal: Trees identified and marked by a qualified forester or a Defensible Space Assessor to be a fire hazard may be

[§] Amended 5/23/01

^{§§} Amended 1/28/04

removed upon approval by TRPA or pursuant to a TRPA MOU Authorization. Fuel reduction projects shall consider multiple threshold objectives. (See Section 18.4 for definition of fuels management.)^{§§}

Fire Hazard Tree Removal: Trees reported....MOU Authorization. Trees reported by a defensible space assessor to be a fire hazard within 100 feet of a structure may be removed upon approval by TRPA or....

- 71.5.D Tree Removal for Early Successional Stage Vegetation Management: Tree removal may be permitted when it has been determined by TRPA, that it is appropriate to convert an area to, and/or maintain an area in, an early successional stage vegetation type. (See Section 18.4 for definition of early successional stage vegetation management.) Where revegetation is required to stabilize soils and/or replace removed vegetation, the applicant shall provide a revegetation plan in accordance with Section 77.4.[§]

Excerpt from Chapter 18.4 – Fuels Treatment Definition:

Fuels Treatment: Activities required to treat fuels in order to reduce potential for damaging wildfires and secondarily enhance visual quality. Included are tree cutting, treating slash by lopping and scattering, piling and burning, chipping, hauling slash to another area for utilization, burning or burial, and broadcast burning. Fuels treatment also includes pruning limbs, removing ladder fuels such as brush and small diameter trees, thinning for adequate crown spacing, removing ground and surface fuels, etc. Any treatment that disrupts the vertical and horizontal continuity of fuels could be included. “Fuels Treatment” is equivalent to the following terms: “Fuels Treatment Management”, “Fuels Management”, “Fire Hazard Reduction”, “Fuel Hazard Reduction”, and “Hazardous Fuels Reduction”.[§]

[§] Amended 1/28/04

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

128 Market Street
Stateline, Nevada
www.trpa.org

P.O.Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449-5310

Phone: (775) 588-4547
Fax (775) 588-4527
Email: trpa@trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

Date: December 5, 2007

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Status Report on Scope of Work and Alternatives for the Regional Plan Update EIS

Requested Action: Staff is not requesting a formal action from the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) on this item. However, staff is requesting that the APC review and offer any final comments on the proposed range of alternatives presented in Attachment A. At the meeting, staff will give a presentation on the status and schedule of the Regional Plan Update.

Background: The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to consider the potential effects of updates to the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities (ETCC's / Thresholds) and current Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region. This project will comply with all TRPA EIS requirements in Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (Compact), Chapter 5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Article VI of the TRPA Rules of Procedure.

As part of the Pathway 2007 planning process, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), together with the three other Pathway agencies, has been receiving input regarding future management of the Tahoe region from Federal, State, and local governments; stakeholders of the Tahoe Region; technical and scientific experts; public-interest groups; the general public; and a consensus-seeking advisory group called the Pathway 2007 Forum (Forum). TRPA is engaged in the Pathway collaborative process to update its existing Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities and its Regional Plan.

In developing the proposal, TRPA, as part of Pathway, held five visioning public workshops in and out of the Basin, conducted 1800 individual surveys and 8 focus groups in and out of the basin, held numerous meetings of 11 technical working groups, held 17 Forum Meetings with numerous subcommittee meetings, and had many meetings among the four Pathway agencies. The APC and Governing Board reviewed the Vision and Desired Conditions in May of 2006. The proposal takes into account the products of 12 Place-Based Workshops and joint APC-Governing Board Workshops that produced the 2007 Tahoe Basin Regional Vision Summary. For more than four years, TRPA has been considering a wide array of information and viewpoints and has been developing a recommendation to update its Thresholds and Regional Plan.

Staff officially started the public scoping period for the Regional Plan Update environmental analysis with the release of the proposed Regional Plan Project Description in September and held public workshops on this matter at the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and Governing Board meetings. Subsequently staff has been continually refining the project description and the range of alternatives to be analyzed based on comments received during the scoping period and from input received during workshops held before the APC and Governing Board in October and November. Attachment A is the alternative description reviewed by the Governing Board in November. For information purposes, staff has also attached a copy of the summary of comments received for scoping the EIS for the Regional Plan Update.

If you have any questions regarding this matter please contact John Hitchcock at jhitchcock@trpa.org or (775) 589-5220.

Attachments:

Attachment A: Draft Alternatives Matrix

Attachment B: Scoping Comments Summary

Draft Regional Plan EIS Alternatives Matrix

Purpose and Need				
<p>Threshold Attainment: The TRPA compact requires that the Regional Plan and all of its elements achieve and maintain environmental threshold carrying capacities.</p> <p>Allocations: The original 20-year growth plan is complete and therefore requires additional policies and code to establish and regulate development within the Basin for the next 20 years.</p>				
<p>Opportunities</p> <p>Collaboration: Pathway 2007 is a collaborative process for Basin resource management agencies to coordinate their plans to increase management and resource efficiency. Adoption of visions and desired conditions has created and would continue to make possible a common thread throughout the various Basin plans.</p> <p>Community Values: Place-Based Planning is a public-focused effort to identify the values and concerns of local communities as they relate to the natural and built environments</p>				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Programmatic Theme	<p>The no-action Alternative would result in no change to the current Regional Plan (Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances). No additional allocations or development commodities would be created, while un-used allocations and commodities would be honored. Development would still be allowed through transfer and redevelopment of existing commodities, as well as non-commodity development, such as public services and affordable housing. Threshold attainment would continue to be advanced through mitigation of environmental impacts from new development and through the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP).</p>	<p>Alternative 2 aligns with the place-based community planning effort and uses an incentive-based approach to deliver net environmental gains. New residential allocations and commodities would be created under this option. Additional Commercial Floor Area (CFA), bonus units, increased height and densities would be awarded to some projects in return for significant environmental and community benefits such as reuse of existing commodities (on site and transfers), reduced coverage, and inclusionary housing. In comparison to Alternative 1, threshold attainment would be accelerated by projects mitigating above and beyond their site-specific impacts.</p>	<p>Alternative 3 reflects current trends (e.g., development, ownership, and visitation) and would create new residential allocations and commodities and distribute them through the existing system. New development would continue to negate any site-specific potential environmental impacts. Because additional new development would be allowed under this alternative, as compared to Alternative 1, increased regulatory and mitigation programs would be required to accelerate threshold attainment.</p>	<p>Alternative 4 consists of a concentrated development approach with new allocations and commodities included, although quantities would be fewer than under Alternatives 2 and 3. Distribution of new commodities would be similar to Alternative 2. Through minimal allocations, restructured zoning ordinances, and reduction of potential developable lands, the alternative would look to improve the existing built environment, rather than expand additional development. Threshold attainment would be advanced through concentration of existing development and reduction of future potential development.</p>

Land-use	Alternative #1	Alternative #2	Alternative #3	Alternative #4
Zoning/Planning System	No Change to existing Plan Area Statements.	Plan Area Statements system would be converted to a transect planning system with form-based building code. Development in urban areas would be concentrated in identified nodes	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 2, but with more concentrated development nodes.
Quantity of Allocations	No new allocations would be created.	Additional commercial floor area (CFA) and tourist accomodation units (TAU) quantities dependent on reuse and conversion of existing development. Residential allocations would resemble historic distributions.	Greater quantities of CFA and TAUs than in Alternative 2 to facilitate development and redevelopment of projects. Residential allocations would be allocated similar to historic distribution.	Reduced number of residential allocations, no additional CFA or TAUs.
Residential	0	up to 4000	up to 5000	up to 2000
Residential Bonus Units	500	500	1000	600
CFA	0	up to 400,000	up to 500,000	up to 200,000
TAU Bonus Units	0	200	400	0
Distribution of allocations	No Change	Continuation of current residential system with additional requirements relating to affordable housing. Expansion of Community Enhancement Program (CEP) program to annual allocation process.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 2
Transfer of development	No Change	Market-based system that provides matching incentives, conversions and specific sending, receiving and sending/receiving areas for all commodities.	Same as Alternative 1	Allow transfer of development through specified sending, receiving and sending/receiving sites. Assist redevelopment through public purchasing program.
Development Standards				
Height and Density	No Change	Specified minimum and maximum height and density standards. Additional height and density incentives available for projects.	Form-based design standards with increased height and density standards in specific planning areas	Same as Alternative 2

Conservation Elements	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Overall theme	No Change	Baseline regulations with incentives for enhancements.	Increased regulatory requirements and mitigation fee programs to offset impacts from additional development.	Alternative 2 with increased regulatory requirements for some areas.
Water Quality	Extended current practice for residential, commercial (and other parcels dominated by impervious coverage) and roadway BMPs. Treat a greater majority of urban areas and increased parcel BMPs.	Focus on innovation and advanced practices. Implement advanced controls including active conveyance and treatment of stormwater on the majority of the urban areas. Combine the active treatment with using current Best-practices on smaller portion of the urban area, and advanced passive controls in some areas. Achieve parcel BMPs mostly in dispersed coverage areas.	Focus on retrofit and enhanced best practices. Balance emphasis on extended current practices for residential, concentrated impervious coverage parcels and roadway areas with employment of advanced passive treatment technologies, and achieve implementation of parcel BMPs for urban subwatersheds.	Implement advanced controls including active conveyance and treatment of stormwater in most of the concentrated coverage urban areas, and use advanced passive controls on dispersed coverage urban areas that are in close proximity to Lake Tahoe with high groundwater elevations unsuitable to traditional infiltration treatment, and achieve a high level of parcel BMPs in these areas.
Soils	No Change	Focus on incentives and technical updates, such as: Updated Land Capability Maps, Limit Excess Coverage to Hard and Soft Coverage, SEZ Mitigation Focus on Critical Watersheds.	Same as Alternative 2, with additional focus on mitigation, such as, increased excess coverage mitigation fees for projects.	Same as Alternative 2 with additional focus on concentrating development, such as: Change Mitigation Ratio to 2:1 for coverage transfers and Increase EIP SEZ Restoration.
Fish and Wildlife	No Change	Focus on place-based themes and technical updates such as Wildlife Protection Zones and time periods.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2
Vegetation	No Change	Designate Wildland Urban Interface Zone and Treatments, revised Landscaping Guide (Plant List) with focus on Native Vegetation.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2
Noise	No Change	Focus on place-based values and themes, such as a Noise Mitigation Program.	Same as Alternative 2, plus Noise mitigation fee for projects under Noise Mitigation Program.	Same as Alternative 2
Air quality	No Change	Focus on place-based themes and new technology, such as reduction of emissions using best available technology for all new and modified mobile and stationary sources.	Same as Alternative 2, plus focus on mitigation, such as Air quality mitigation fee for human and environmental health.	Same as Alternative 2

Scenic	No Change	Focus on incentives and place-based values and themes such as: Dark Sky Standards, Design Standards only, Revised Height Standards allowing more Height/Bulk in mixed-use areas. Design standards would reflect existing uses and building form in urban transects.	Same as Alternative 1	Focus on concentrated development, and building forms that reflect current conditions through regulations such as residential floor area limits.
Housing	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
	No Change	Affordable and moderate housing would be encouraged through project components such as creating a scoring component for special projects and as part of the environmental allocation review system.	Affordable and moderate housing would be encouraged through regulatory requirements such as inclusionary housing requirements for commercial, TAU, and market-rate/multi-family projects.	Affordable and moderate housing would be encouraged through plan components such as increased number of bonus units and exemption of moderate-income housing from residential allocations.
Recreation				
	Maintain current PAOT targets.	Maintain current PAOT targets and increase non-outdoor recreation.	Reduce current PAOT targets based on previous development.	No additional capacity for outdoor recreation. Improved quality of experience and rehabilitation and restoration of recreational facilities.
Transportation	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Non-auto oriented facilities	No Change	Incorporate transit-oriented design features, such as pedestrian and bike facilities into special project scoring criteria.	Require transit-oriented design features, such as pedestrian and bike facilities to be funded through project fees.	Same as Alternative 1. Dependency on government agencies and jurisdictions to provide pedestrian and bike facilities.
Land-use design	No Change	Develop projects and patterns that encourage non-auto oriented travel through features such as parking requirements, cross-walks, building orientation, and road features.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2
Mode Shifts	No changes	Increased pedestrian activity and transit ridership in redevelopment and recreation areas.	Same as Alternative 1	Greater regulatory measures to influence non-automotive Alternatives, such as parking fees and parking standards.
Level of Service (LOS)	No Change	Vehicle Delay incorporated as a LOS Standard.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1
Public Service				

	No Change	Implementation of hazardous fuels BMPs and fire protection.	Same as Alternative 2	Same as Alternative 2 plus adoption of Title 24 Fire Regulations for the Region and no waiver on basic fire flow requirements.
--	-----------	---	-----------------------	--

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
SUMMARY OF SCOPING COMMENTS**

In accordance with requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), the environmental process for the TRPA Regional Plan Update (project) EIS began with public scoping. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued to inform agencies and the public that an environmental impact statement (EIS) would be prepared for the project and to solicit views of agencies and the public regarding the scope and content of the EIS. The NOP was distributed on September 5, 2007, and comments were received through October 5, 2007. A total of 15 written comment letters were received from a variety of sources including local and federal agencies, organizations, and private citizens.

Two scoping meetings were also held to obtain oral comments:

- ▶ September 12, 2007, TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) meeting, beginning at 9:30 a.m. at the TRPA office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada
- ▶ September 26, 2007, TRPA Governing Board (GB) meeting, beginning at 9:30 a.m. at 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, Nevada

The issues and questions identified in this report are summarized from the written and oral comments on the scope and content of the draft project description published with the NOP and distributed at the September APC and GB meetings.

Comments that are within the scope of the EIS, as determined by TRPA's executive director, will be used to identify the issues that the Regional Plan Update should consider, the nature and extent of impacts to be addressed, and to define the alternatives for the Regional Plan Update that will be analyzed in the EIS. Some comments may not be evaluated in the EIS because they are beyond the scope of the current Regional Plan Update. Factors influencing the scope of issues to be evaluated include whether they are within TRPA's authority, can be accomplished within the budget and timeframe for project completion, and have the support of TRPA's stakeholders and planning partners. Although some comments may not be addressed in the EIS they are identified in this scoping report as they relate to the project.

TOPICS ADDRESSED IN SCOPING COMMENTS

TRPA received comments on a broad range of topics that addressed both the scope and content of the Regional Plan Update and the EIS. The text below identifies major topics for which comments were received and summarizes the content of those comments, both suggested issues for consideration and questions about content and approach. Examples of the comments are also provided. Substantive comments received from all letters and public comment opportunities are included in a table following the comment summary. To assist in review, the comment categories identified in the list below correlate to the column "Issue Area" in the table. (An electronic copy of the entire collection of comment letters can be obtained upon request from TRPA staff.)

- (A) Adaptive Management:** Commenters asked questions regarding how threshold attainment would be monitored, how the Regional Plan could be changed to respond to monitoring data, and how the Regional Plan could be modified after the update to incorporate other types of new information.

Sample comments

- Where do we take into account or acknowledge that we will have to be proactive in our ability to adapt to new technologies as they become available (e.g., ignition-resistant building materials, pervious concrete, artificial turf.)
- Provide threshold attainment progress reports to the public as frequently as progress is made (i.e., more frequently than every 5 years).
- Include new and more transparent measurements for achieving thresholds. Incorporate results into a real-time (adaptive management) monitoring program.

(B) Affordable Housing: Information was requested about the stated need for affordable housing, with some commenters agreeing that more low- or moderate-income housing is needed and other commenters concerned that such requirements limit the availability of other types of housing and/or commercial development unnecessarily. Commenters requested that a needs assessment be conducted. Questions were raised about the appropriate definition and level (percentage of median income) of such housing; the viability and effectiveness of incentives, and several mechanisms for funding additional affordable housing were proposed and opposed (including a real estate transfer tax). Many commenters offered suggestions regarding alternative means and incentives to assist in improving affordable housing availability.

Sample comments

- Need to develop viable and effective incentives for affordable housing.
- Need to find a way to limit second homes and vacation rentals; there is no shortage of housing, only a shortage of affordable housing.
- Real estate tax incentives are a good benefit; Martis Valley has approved this approach.
- Need to move away from restrictions and toward incentives for redevelopment.

(C) Allocations of Commercial Floor Area (CFA), Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs), and Residential Allocations: Commenters expressed concerns about the proposal in the draft project description to provide CFA and TAUs to new projects only in return for transferring existing CFA and TAUs off of sensitive lands. Specifically they expressed concern regarding the locations and nature of transfers of CFA and TAUs from sensitive lands to other areas and provided various alternative methods for distributing these commodities. With respect to residential allocations, commenters expressed concern regarding the number of allocations that would be available, coverage transfers, and whether providing additional residential allocations would be consistent with accelerating Threshold attainment.

Sample Comments

- The proposed CFA commodity transfer program [from sensitive areas] is clearly a disincentive to make improvements to substandard urban areas.
- The Regional Plan's environmental analysis should study a menu approach to financial, development and allocation incentives and requirements that will result in acceleration of the net gain revitalization envisioned in the proposed Regional Plan. There could be a sliding scale of incentives and requirements which would allow both small and large projects to be implemented by contributing improvements commensurate with each development proposal.
- Will/how will land banks and public, private and local agencies be affected by incentives for removing CFA from sensitive lands?
- The Regional Plan EIS must evaluate a system of incentives [for CFA and TAUs] that promotes net gain improvements that can be applied to each jurisdiction fairly.

- The EIS should include a Regional Plan alternative that links development allocations, application of commercial floor area, use of TAUs, and other development rights to documented pollutant load reductions.
- The proposal continues to allow the transfer of TAUs, which in practice has resulted in the replacement of small buildings with limited footprints and limited traffic impacts with much larger buildings with their associated larger footprints and traffic and other impacts. The EIS should document whether this current TAU transfer right creates a net environmental gain or loss and must analyze the additional potential population and overall environmental impacts of this provision.
- The EIS must analyze the additional potential population and overall environmental impacts associated with converting TAUs to residential units.
- The EIS should prepare an alternative that contains prohibition of development on steep slopes, such as those greater than 30%.
- No documentation has been presented upon which to base a conclusion that the level of residential development has in fact been compatible with threshold attainment. The EIS must explain the environmental basis for not altering the residential allotment system, taking into consideration continuation of current large home building trends, use of transferred coverage, etc.
- The EIS should analyze the impacts of allowing additional residential allocations using current coverage and transfer rules, compared with lower-impact alternatives, such as one that would disallow transfer of excess coverage onto residential properties, with annual allocations reduced by half.

(D) Consistency with Other Plans: Public and agency commenters raised questions about consistency between the Regional Plan Update (project description) and other planning efforts such as the USDA Forest Service Plan Revision, the TMDL, the Draft Recreation Assessment, and adopted Master Plans.

Sample Comments

- Since the Regional Plan update is concurrent with Lahontan, NDEP, and the USFS plan updates, this would be an ideal time to develop one consistent set of regulations in all four documents addressing fire safety and BMP requirements.
- How does TMDL fit in? Should have a description of the TMDL in the EIS.
- Need to define interaction between TRPA Regional Plan and USFS fuel reduction plan.
- Do the Draft Recreation Assessment, Bike Master Plan, Transportation Plan, etc. fit into the current Regional Plan Update?
- Given the fact that TMDL standards and pollutant reduction and allocation strategies are still being developed, how will Regional Plan specifics be adapted to these moving targets?

(E) Coverage and Soils: Comments were received regarding a wide range of topics including the current coverage transfer system, the potential implications of adopting the most recent Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey, uses permitted in stream environment zones, and the individual parcel evaluation system (IPES).

Sample Comments

- Investigate regulations and/or incentives to remove existing coverage without providing allocations in exchange. According to the TMDL, unless we can find a way to reduce over half of our inputs (with most of the sediment coming from urban runoff), we will clearly need a net reduction in development to achieve ETCCs [Thresholds].
- The EIS should consider removing all exceptions for SEZ development. The EIS should also analyze the impacts to ETCCs from the current exemptions for agriculture, recreation and public service.

- The EIS should evaluate the appropriateness of the sensitive lot retirement program – is it working as it should? Can it be improved? What type of development is being created through the allocations given to applicants as part of this program?
- Change the coverage transfer program to limit house size.
- Document the efficacy of the coverage transfer system for acquiring targeted parcels and protecting raw land from further development.
- EIS should address sensitive lot/Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) issue. What does the new soil survey mean for IPES score?
- Numerous flaws have been documented with the formula used for deriving IPES scores, such as the subjectivity of the soil erodibility, or “k” factor. In addition to the “k” factor, the EIS should provide analysis of, and recommendation for improving, other IPES variables. The EIS should carefully analyze the way in which the current and proposed coverage systems are applied, and present alternatives that have fewer loopholes subject to manipulation.

(F) Environmental Improvement Program: Comments regarding the EIP expressed the need to include the program in the Regional Plan Update, to evaluate the efficacy of the EIP to date, and to obtain funding commitments for the program. Comments were also received that expressed concern that the EIP continue to be used to remediate the environmental impacts of past development.

Sample Comments

- Include the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) as part of the Regional Plan and include a program-level environmental document.
- We have long held that EIP projects should be used only as intended – to remedy impacts from past development. Yet we fear they have been used to justify new development – the EIS must analyze this situation. The project description further implies that allocations for new development will be granted to local and private sectors in “reward” for completing EIP projects. This skates a very fine line between using EIP to justify new development. The EIS must consider alternative mechanisms for completing EIP projects (other than any direct or indirect tie to new development).
- The effectiveness of the EIP program over the past 10 years should be evaluated. The new EIP should discuss the funding mechanism for the future and how the local contribution can be acquired.

(G) Global Change, Sustainability, and Green Design: Commenters raised questions about how the potential for climate change in the Basin would be addressed in the Regional Plan Update and evaluated in the EIS. Suggestions were provided about ways in which the Regional Plan Update could address sustainability and green design and reduce impacts on climate change.

Sample Comments

- Climate change trends, if not addressed and countered, will negatively impact Lake Tahoe’s economy, environment and quality of life. Lake Tahoe should be a leader in efforts to address and reduce the impacts of climate change. Lake Tahoe should be a leader in sustainable development, accelerating the effort to reverse decades of extremely poor building and community design and development.
- Residential and commercial allocations should be used in such a manner as to promote and facilitate sustainable design and a reduction in the “carbon footprint” of development in the Basin, consistent with emerging broader state, national and international goals to offset and reduce the effects of climate change.

- The EIS should address the affects of Global Warming on Lake Tahoe, including the effects of more winter flooding, increased pollutant loading to Lake Tahoe, warming of Lake Tahoe and tributaries and growth of algae.
- Need to include incentives to implement green building initiatives.
- Analyze the relative contribution of larger homes versus smaller homes to greenhouse gas emissions.

(H) Impacts Analysis: Comments and suggestions were received with respect to the how the EIS should analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. A general suggestion received was to give all alternatives equal technical review and consideration in the EIS. Another suggestion was to analyze alternatives that meet Thresholds through regulatory-based approaches, incentive-based approaches, and a combination of the two. Specific comments were received regarding the analyses related to affordable housing, air quality, build out, soils and coverage, performance standards, population growth, recreation, socioeconomics, vegetation, and water quality.

Sample Comments

- The environmental analysis must consider the environmental, economic and social impacts of affordable and moderate housing being located outside of the Tahoe Basin, as is currently the case, and compare those impacts to those of providing affordable and moderate housing locally.
- The plan EIS must show how many potentially developable parcels exist in the Basin and how close the Basin is to “build out.” The EIS must consider residential tear-down/re-builds in this analysis. What is the total additional amount of coverage that could be added in the Basin if every developable parcel were developed to its maximum coverage potential (including transfers of coverage to parcels), and every home was replaced and rebuilt to the maximum allowable size.
- The EIS should analyze the environmental impacts of eliminating the coverage transfer system, and investigate options for accomplishing this, such as the buy-down of coverage banks with EIP or other funds.
- Because allocations levels are tied to local government and individual erosion control efforts, the EIS must analyze the effectiveness of local jurisdiction BMP and erosion control programs to assess whether they have sufficiently offset the impacts of the additional coverage and development granted by their implementation.
- Will potential increase in population growth increase the need for increase mitigation? Will these types of impacts be incorporated as part of the analysis?
- If visitation to the Basin is expected to increase by 50,000 visitors per year, as has been discussed, then the EIS must calculate the environmental impact of 1 million additional visitors per year over current levels (by 2027).
- The EIS should comprehensively describe the impacts of motorboats on Lake Tahoe, including levels of CO, NOx, hydrocarbons and other pollutants of concern, relative to automobiles. Options such as restrictions on motorboat access and mandatory boat washing programs should be analyzed.

(I) Land Use, Development, and Transect System: Comments on land use and development addressed questions about the conversion to a transect system of land use planning from the current Plan Area Statements, concerns about specific land use designations and specific project areas, and questions about the assumption that the Basin is nearing buildout for residential development. Comments were offered about transit-oriented development and mixed-use development and ways in which these planning concepts should be applied in specific areas. Concerns were expressed about modifying (either expanding or contracting) the urban boundary.

Sample Comments

- With the transect system, will the PAS boundaries remain the same or will new boundaries be developed?
- The EIS must provide data comparing current PAS system and the proposed transect system, including the amount and placement of new impervious coverage, total development, density of development, scenic impacts, and all other related environmental impacts.
- Given the focus in the proposed Plan Update on redevelopment, the EIS should describe in more detail any policies to protect undeveloped land, in exchange for the proposed incentives for redeveloping already disturbed areas.
- What are the impacts of the transect system on inclusionary housing, retention of full time residents, community sustainability, and the percentage increase/decrease in the pollutant loadings that preliminary TMDL data tell us need to be drastically reduced in order to re-gain lake clarity. The pros and cons of extending 3 story development into the T-7 areas as well as the amount of height being proposed in T-8, 9 and 10 need to be explored as to whether those height recommendations are needed or whether lesser height allowances would suffice, keeping in mind such things as housing affordability, community character, scenic values, etc.
- Will the urban boundary in the current Regional Plan be retained, modified, or replaced?

- (J) **Pathway:** Comments received expressed support of the integration of the Regional Plan Update with the Place-based and Forum Processes. However, questions were raised regarding the specifics of how the input from Pathway would be incorporated into the plan update and how the input and desired outcomes from the individual jurisdictions that participated would be incorporated.

Sample Comments

- The place-based planning effort and Pathway Forum discussions indicate a strong consensus emerging for creating a livable, healthy, sustainable Tahoe Basin. A place where the environment is protected and the local economy and our communities are strengthened in ways compatible with restoring Lake Tahoe. How will the public input from the place-based process be used to form a new plan?
- Amendments proposed for analysis in the Regional Plan EIS do not appear to acknowledge the individual identities of communities with the common goals of threshold attainment, as initially developed in the Regional Vision.

- (K) **Performance Standards:** Comments expressed the need for improved enforcement of performance standards and for better integration between water quality and defensible space BMPs.

Sample Comments

- Incorporate strong performance standards into all aspects of the Plan. Tie levels of development to demonstrated environmental improvement
- There must be greater accountability for results, including environmental performance standards, better evaluation of mitigation effectiveness, and enforcement provisions [in the updated Regional Plan].
- Serious consideration should be given to integrating the goals and implementation of Water Quality BMPs and Defensible Space BMPs. The Regional Plan Update should facilitate and encourage BMP integration.

- Incorporate an annual review of all urban properties for BMP and fire protection compliance. Incorporate enforcement provisions to be applied when local governments do not act.

(L) Process: Comments related to managing the EIS process spanned a number of topics. There were requests to extend the scoping period, to delay the Regional Plan update until after completion of the TMDL, and to adopt updated Thresholds separately prior to completing the Regional Plan Update and associated EIS. Questions were raised regarding the relationship between the update of the Regional Plan and corresponding updates to the Code of Ordinances, Community Plans, and other TRPA documents. Commenters also expressed interest in having additional opportunities to participate in the planning process.

Sample Comments

- Either prepare a separate environmental document on Thresholds prior to adopting them and then prepare a new Regional Plan and corresponding EIS or change none of the current thresholds, except where required by law, and prepare and EIS on the new Regional Plan. Then update additional thresholds as necessary.
- I am concerned about losing the ability to provide input into the project description once the EIS is underway or completed. I am also concerned that once the money is spent on the EIS, there will be no ability to change course.
- What will be the process for on-going public review, comment, and input during preparation of the EIS?

(M) Public Safety/Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI)/Forest Health: Commenters requested that the Regional Plan Update address fire safety and forest health through a wide range of avenues, including allocation of funds to assist with defensible space, incentives or prescriptions to use ignition-resistant materials, and policies regarding building regulations. Comments were also received regarding updating other public safety regulations.

Sample Comments

- To what degree will regulations related to public safety be updated? (WUI, avalanche, etc.)
- WUI is a near-top priority for money allocation; does TRPA have any authority over how revenue is spent?
- Need to encourage ignition-resistant incentives.
- The Plan EIS should describe a consistent, coherent set of regulations that meet both fire defensible space AND residential BMP objectives. This will require coordination with other agencies. Incorporate enforcement provisions to be applied when local governments do not act.
- The EIS should describe how TRPA will enforce new fire-resistant building material regulations in California, and plans for introducing those requirements to the Nevada portion of the Basin.

(N) Recreation: Commenters asked for clarification regarding the relationship of the Draft TRPA Regional Recreation Plan to the Regional Plan Update, raised questions about the possibility of placing caps on visitation at certain recreational sites, requested improved access to recreation areas, and made suggestions about specific types of recreation that should be evaluated for restriction or consideration (e.g., snowmobiles, bike trails, horse trails). Concerns over the environmental impacts of recreation were also raised.

Sample Comments

- It is essential that the Regional Plan Update aggressively support our need to promote and provide public transit and non-automobile access to public and private recreation opportunities.

- The EIS should examine adding additional protections to natural areas for recreation versus only rehabilitating existing areas. Further, the EIS should examine the impacts of protecting “natural settings” in all situations, not just “wherever possible” – which often is interpreted to apply only when it doesn’t impede a development.
- Alternatives should consider methods to get bike trails and pedestrian paths completed without requiring they be tied to new development.
- The planning of recreation opportunities must consider potential impacts to sensitive areas, such as stream environment zones, shorelines, and other fragile lands to protect water quality and other resources.

(O) Thresholds: Commenters identified concerns about specific Thresholds being modified or not being modified. Specifically air quality, scenic, water quality, and vegetation Thresholds were identified as needing modification. The adoption of a transportation threshold was also suggested.

Sample Comments

- A detailed rationale should be included in the EIS for why certain Thresholds were selected for update.
- It is important that the EIS evaluate the ability of the proposed Thresholds, in concert with those retained, to meet the revised Vision and Goal/Value Statements.
- Bring forward alternatives that will address concerns regarding vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and scenic thresholds.
- The late seral/old growth threshold is outdated and needs significant revision.
- Thresholds that should be updated include: Old Growth/Late Seral Stage Ecosystems (V-4), Sensitive Plants (V-3), Lake Clarity (WQ-2), and Scenic Resources.

(P) Transportation: Commenters expressed support of increased public transportation options but different opinions regarding whether or not a centrally-managed transportation system would be most appropriate for the Tahoe Basin. Comments also noted the need for projects to address traffic impacts and for road projects to minimize environmental impacts and be consistent with the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Sample Comments

- Level of service (LOS) is the most direct measure we have to address traffic impacts, and it’s not adequate. Cannot imagine voting for a Regional Plan that doesn’t adequately address traffic, and need appropriate measures and metrics. May still have more cars on the road even if transit is successful.
- Require all new road maintenance projects and new development to address the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians, consistent with the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The Plan must contain strong provisions that do not allow permits to be granted for any major road reconstruction projects in the Basin that do not contain both bicycle lanes and adequate water quality BMP provisions.
- Include alternatives that focus on reducing vehicle use associated with travel into and out of the Basin (in addition to those to reduce vehicle use once visitors have arrived).
- The EIS should analyze options where new development provides a net gain (versus “no significant impact”) to transportation needs.
- It is essential that the Regional Plan Update aggressively support our need to promote and provide public transit and non-automobile access to public and private recreation opportunities.

- (Q) **Other:** Additional comments were received that did not fit into the topic areas described above. There were requests for clarification regarding the meaning of some of the terms (e.g., smart growth principles, green building, transit-oriented development) used in the project description. There were comments requesting clarification of the roles of cooperating agencies and MOU partners in implementing TRPA's Regional Plan. There were also requests to include provisions for updating the sewage export system, to incorporate shorezone structure regulations into the plan update, and to eliminate the two-step subdivision process.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
A	Adaptive Management
A	Where do we take into account or acknowledge that we will have to be proactive in our ability to adapt to new technologies as they become available (e.g., ignition-resistant building materials, pervious concrete, artificial turf.)
A	Provide threshold attainment progress reports to the public as frequently as progress is made (i.e., more frequently than every 5 years).
A	Include new and more transparent measurements for achieving thresholds. Incorporate into a real-time (adaptive management) monitoring program.
A	The EIS must also consider built-in mechanisms for adaptive management and monitoring of the ETCCs (and how the monitoring affects development and other actions). For example, rather than waiting until a threshold has been exceeded, the Regional Plan should include “triggers” based on levels below a standard such that if the triggers are reached, the ETCCs have not already been exceeded. Rather, if a trigger is reached, it includes an associated reaction that immediately works to resolve the cause of the increase which cause the trigger to be reached. Alternative triggers should be considered, along with associated reactions, and what those will mean to ETCC attainment.
B	Affordable Housing
B	Suggestion for a comprehensive needs assessment to evaluate workforce housing needs, appropriate percentage of median income (80%, 120%, 190-200%) for which affordable housing incentives are needed, effect of population decrease in the Basin. Suggestion to use the needs assessment being prepared in Truckee by Sierra Business Council and Workforce Housing Authority.
B	Concerns about the lack of corresponding grants and other incentives for moderate-income housing, and suggestions for ways to provide and fund additional incentives for this housing segment.
B	Need to find a way to limit second homes and vacation rentals; there is no shortage of housing, only a shortage of affordable housing.
B	In Transect 10 (the core/multiuse area), if transit programs are successful and casinos don't need large parking lots, could they convert those areas to affordable housing?
B	Need to evaluate environmental impacts of the “no build” alternative for moderate-income housing.
B	Moderate-income housing is a huge issue; consider using the EIP approach. Real estate tax incentives are a good benefit; Martis Valley has approved this approach.
B	Build the few available multi-family parcels as densely as possible.
B	Need to move away from restrictions and toward incentives for redevelopment. Inclusionary housing should not be mandatory.
B	Regarding the use of a Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) to fund affordable housing: Unless this is a “fee,” you have to go to the voters

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	and get a supermajority.
B	EIS needs to analyze allowing bonus units for moderate income housing.
B	There remains very limited potential for new development within the next planning cycle. Existing policies tend to encourage construction of larger homes and high-end tourist accommodation units. There needs to be a critical look at the problem and creative ways to redirect plan incentives toward housing and accommodations appropriate for users at all economic levels and consistent with Tahoe’s fragile environment.
B	Regional Plan goals such as “housing that strengthens neighborhoods” and “housing that matches the needs of employers and employees” need to be defined, as well as a clear method for attainment.
B	Until replacement housing that meets Housing and Urban Development Agency standards in the Affordable (households earning 60 to 80 percent of median income) and Moderate (households earning 80 to 120 percent of median income) categories can be built, Placer County is unable to displace anyone from existing blighted housing.
B	Mandatory inclusionary requirements are not the answer to the shortage of affordable housing opportunities in the Basin.
B	Objections raised to affordable (inclusionary) housing include the following: results in few units, has high costs and makes market-priced homes more expensive, restricts supply of new homes, costs government revenue, price controls do not address the cause of the affordability problem.
B	The environmental analysis must consider the environmental, economic and social impacts of affordable and moderate housing being located outside of the Tahoe Basin, as is currently the case, and compare those impacts to those of providing affordable and moderate housing locally.
B	Environmental analysis has already been completed and accepted for Affordable Housing set-asides that do not require utilization of a market rate allocation. Why doesn’t the analysis then also support this program for moderate housing?
B	There are currently little if any incentives or public grant programs for moderate housing, yet it is important to retaining viable communities in the Tahoe Basin. TRPA’s requirement that Moderate units compete with market rate units for residential building allocations is a disincentive for moderate housing development and should be revised to mirror the affordable housing policy.
B	The base program for affordable housing does not acknowledge jurisdictional progress in these areas and is instead allocated on perceived need. The entire program must be more consistent in its application.
B	Develop an inclusionary housing policy for the Basin. Establish an inclusionary housing trust fund. Require affordable replacement housing when units are demolished.
B	Any project leading to increased number of employees should be involved in funding or providing employee housing.
B	Consider legal conversion of old hotel/motel properties to affordable housing stock.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
B	Projects that replace smaller, more affordable housing units with large vacation homes should be required to provide replacement housing in the affordable category, or provide funding for larger replacement projects.
B	Limit coverage to produce homes built at an affordable size.
B	Use affordability and energy efficiency, in addition to coverage, as part of the rationale to limit house size.
B	The notion of utilizing a real estate transfer tax to fund low income housing was discussed [in the project description presented at the September APC and GB meetings]. The Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors opposes the use of such a mechanism to fund regional needs that are better (more appropriately) addressed by the community as a whole.
B	The Plan should accept needs assessment data generated by a comprehensive assessment [of affordable housing needs] conducted by local jurisdictions and Workforce Housing Association of Tahoe Truckee (WHATT); critically consider any data that shows a need above the 80% income level, and work to accommodate those needs.
B	Statements such as “housing that strengthens neighborhoods” and “housing that matches the needs of of employers and employees” need to be defined and then policies created to make sure that it is fiscally feasible to attain these goals.
B	TRPAs requirement that Moderate units compete with market rate units for residential building allocations is a disincentive for Moderate housing development. The requirement should be revised and moderate units included in the Affordable Housing set asides.
B	Various questions about how current land coverage and land transfer rules affect the availability of moderate-sized homes in the Basin, the supply of affordable housing, a moratorium on vacation rentals, conversion of vacation rentals to primary rentals.
B	If TRPA intends to meet the objectives for a range of affordable housing options as described in the Plan Project Description, while at the same time meeting threshold and TMDL targets, some tough planning choices will be required.
B	The current allocation system (regional plan) does not meet objectives for affordable housing.
B	Will affordable housing options be dispersed around the Basin, particularly in already developed areas near transportation, workplaces, shopping and other services? The Plan EIS should describe incentives to renovate existing deteriorated housing stock.
B	The Regional Plan EIS should address the following factors affecting affordable housing development and environmental impact: 1. How do current land coverage and land transfer rules that allow construction of very large homes and vacation rental properties affect the availability of moderate-sized homes in the Basin? 2. If current residential development, land use and related rules and practice continue on current trajectories for the next twenty years, how will the supply of homes affordable to low and moderate-income residents be affected? 3. How would the supply of affordable and moderate-income homes be affected by lowering limits on residential coverage and total home size, including elimination of coverage transfers on to residential parcels? 4. How would the need for affordable housing throughout the Tahoe Basin be affected by a moratorium on new vacation rentals? 5. How would the need for affordable housing in the Basin be impacted by incentives to rent our second homes and current vacation

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	rental properties to local residents? 6. How would a policy of carving out and setting aside 50% + of the annual residential building allocations for moderate-income housing impact the supply of moderate housing in relation to demand in the Basin over periods of 1, 5 and 10 years? 7. How would a policy of setting aside from the market allocation pool a greater number of allocations dependent upon retiring sensitive lots affect the amount of sensitive lands purchased and preserved? 8. What would the population of the Basin be if all employees were housed in the Basin? Please include a scenario in which current housing stock continues to be unaffordable to most Tahoe-based employees. In that case, how much land would be needed to house Basin employees, and how much additional raw land would be needed to provide the adequate supply of affordable housing? 9. What would be the cumulative environmental impact if all future affordable housing demand in the Basin, including increased demand in scenarios presented above, is met by developing projects on currently undeveloped land in the Basin?
B	The Regional Plan EIS should evaluate alternatives for meeting both housing and threshold objectives, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Carve out and set aside a percentage of allocations for residential development from the market rate pool for moderate-income housing and the sensitive lot retirement program. (6 above) ◆ Limit the square footage of some of the homes being built in the Basin to a size affordable for low and moderate-income workers. (1 above) ◆ Prohibit coverage on to residential properties beyond their Bailey coefficients, so that more homes are built at more affordable sizes.(3 above) ◆ Provide incentives for the 70% of homes that sit empty most of the year of that are used as vacation rentals to instead be rented to local residents (5 above) ◆ Maintain land zoned for affordable housing for that use, rather than convert it to timeshare development. ◆ Better scrutinize new proposals for development in the Basin for their impact on affordable housing options, in addition to environmental impacts.
B	Can the EIS analyze an incentive based program for developing bonus units for Moderate [income] Housing? Are there other alternatives?
B	Do not allow moderate income hosing allocations to come from retired lots. Allocations from retired lots should remain unavailable for any future development as they are retired to reduce development.
B	The EIS should analyze whether 800 “bonus units” is still appropriate. There is no analysis tying units to ETCCs at this time.
B	The impacts from affordable housing on the ETCCs are the same as impacts from other forms of development. The EIS should evaluate these impacts and whether it is feasible to continue to exempt affordable housing from allocation limits.
B	Need to develop viable and effective incentives for affordable housing. One alternative would be a real estate transfer tax to fund affordable housing (focus on financial incentives, not density). Is there a way to use some of the environmental improvement funds

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	(\$1.1 billion since 1997) on affordable housing?
B	What is the impact of the “no-build” moderate housing alternative (i.e., driving from outside of the basin).
C	Allocations of Commercial Floor Area (CFA), Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs), and Residential Units
C	Consider an allocation system that relies solely on redevelopment versus new development for urban mixed-use (no net increase in allocations).
C	Commercial Floor Area and Tourist Accommodation Units
C	Evaluate the relationship and incentive between mixed use and additional CFA? One approach is to remove CFA from the equation and simply allow commercial uses on commercial properties.
C	Need additional TAU and CFA in addition to that made available through the transfer program.
C	Using existing CFA works in redeveloped areas, but those are casino and core areas, not Placer County. It would be a hardship to remove development from “inappropriate areas” to infill.
C	No analysis of where sensitive lands are; is there enough to remove and rebuild elsewhere in Placer County?
C	North Shore doesn’t have enough inventory to redirect development and do special projects. There need to be incentives for obtaining additional CFA and TAUs other than a transfer system (especially on the North Shore).
C	Where are the available TAUs and CFA on sensitive land for conversion? Tahoe City is an example of where this wouldn’t work; where are these areas?
C	All of the artificial commodities need to be evaluated in the EIS.
C	Placer County is willing to commit staff resources to further develop the menu approach to land use (to replace CFA/TAU) with TRPA and other stakeholders.
C	Disincentivizing revitalization of communities [by placing undue restrictions on acquiring CFA and TAUs] to attain economic and quality of life goals is synonymous with disincentivising environmental threshold attainment.
C	Remaining commercial space allocation should favor smaller, locally owned, business ventures.
C	Will/how will land banks and public, private and local agencies be affected by incentives for removing CFA from sensitive lands?
C	The Regional Plan’s environmental analysis should study a menu approach to financial, development and allocation incentives and requirements that will result in acceleration of the net gain revitalization envisioned in the proposed Regional Plan. A sliding scale of incentives and requirements which would allow both small and large projects to be implemented by contributing improvements commensurate with each development proposal.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
C	The Regional Plan EIS must evaluate a system of incentives [for CFA and TAUs] that promotes net gain improvements that can be applied to each jurisdiction fairly.
C	Has TRPA determined whether the proposed system [of transferring coverage from sensitive lands to obtain CFA] will result in an appropriate distribution of CFA based on smart growth, transit oriented development, and green building principles?
C	Components in the Land Use section related to CFA [i.e., CFA available through transfer off of sensitive lands or through Special Projects Program] make it nearly impossible to accomplish small to mid-size infill redevelopment projects which are the economic and social engine of any community revitalization plan. With respect to Special Projects it is virtually impossible for a small to mid-sized project to “significantly contribute to an EIP project” as required by the Program.
C	The proposed CFA commodity transfer program [from sensitive areas] is clearly a disincentive to make improvements to substandard urban areas.
C	The Regional Plan EIS must consider and analyze how this proposal [transfer of CFA from sensitive areas] will impact the cost of sub-standard development in SEZ’s and the further impact that will have on the feasibility of development shouldering the cost of environmental improvements.
C	We are concerned that this plan [of obtaining CFA through transfer of existing CFA out of sensitive lands] unfairly hits Placer County and will not only result in slowing environmental and economic improvements and impinge on heretofore preserved property rights. As an example, Placer County GIS data illustrates 98 acres of privately-owned non-sensitive lands in the Kings Beach Community Plan boundary alone. Development rights impacts on these and similar lands in other more urban areas must be analyzed.
C	The EIS should include a Regional Plan alternative that links development allocations, application of commercial floor area, use of TAUs and other development rights to documented pollutant load reductions.
C	CFA Incentives: Is there an economic analysis to support the ratio? Has the success of the Industrial Tract Community Plan CFA incentives been reviewed?
C	The Proposed Action alternative must include the allocation of additional commercial floor area (CFA) and additional tourist accommodation units (TAU).
C	Should the incentives proposed for removing CFA from sensitive lands be extended to other types of development in sensitive areas (e.g., TAUs, residential, land coverage without CFA on it, etc.)?
C	Not all jurisdictions have an adequate supply of existing CFA or TAU available for acquisition and transfer. In addition transfers are frequently cost prohibitive. May need to customize urban revitalization incentives and allocations to the needs of specific areas of the region.
C	The current proposal to remove and relocate existing CFA and TAUs off of sensitive lands to more appropriate soils types may work in jurisdictions that have already “overdeveloped,” but in jurisdictions that do not have that capacity from which to draw, it will simply not result in the desired affect.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
C	Support the continued and expanded use of the Special Project Allocation Program. In addition to the new CFA, new TAUs should be made available as part of the Special Project Program.
C	Additionally, based on soils data obtained from the TRPA, communities within Placer County would fare quite differently if the proposed CFA and TAU standards [CFA and TAUs available through the transfer of existing CFA and TAUs from sensitive lands] were applied. Kings Beach has few TAUs in sensitive lands and under the proposal would not gain environmentally or economically from the proposal. Tahoe City, on the other hand has nearly its entire commercial core in an SEZ. We do not believe it is TRPA’s intention to remove all commercial and TAU development from Tahoe City’s main core. In fact, we’re certain that based on mutually agreed-to goals and policies outlined in the TRPA-approved Tahoe City Community Plan that this is not your intention. However, the unintended consequences of the current proposal could cause irreparable damage to the environment and economy at North Lake Tahoe.
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has TRPA completed an analysis to determine what each jurisdiction’s capacity is for removal of development in sensitive lands? ▪ Has TRPA completed an analysis to determine whether the proposed system [of obtaining CFA and TAUs through transfer of existing CFA out of sensitive lands] will move toward attainment of its thresholds? ▪ Has TRPA determined whether the proposed system will result in attaining urban revitalization and other social and economic goals? ▪ Has TRPA determined whether the proposed system will result in appropriate distribution of CFA based on smart growth, transit oriented development and green building principles? ▪ Will lessons learned through the Community Enhancement Program process be utilized to develop goals, policies and codes? How?
C	The EIS should include a Regional Plan alternative that links development allocations, application of commercial floor area, use of TAUs and other development rights to documented pollutant load reductions.
C	Based on soils data obtained from the TRPA, communities within Placer County would fare quite differently if the proposed CFA and TAU standards [CFA and TAUs obtained through transfer off of sensitive lands] were applied.
C	The EIS must consider and analyze how this proposal [to obtain CFA and TAUs from transfer of these commodities from sensitive lands] will impact the cost of sub-standard development in SEZs and the further impact that this will have on the feasibility of development shouldering the cost of environmental improvements.
C	Concern that the proposed amendment to the Commercial Floor Area system and allocation plan relies too heavily on reuse of existing CFA and transfers to more appropriate locations. Same concern regarding TAUs.
C	Regarding TAUs, analyze an option in which TAUs can be transferred to a location where they’re economically viable.
C	We have to maintain and upgrade the remaining economically healthier stock of hotel/motels for tourists who cannot afford the new large developments.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
C	We encourage TRPA to redefine the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR), transfer of coverage, (residential and tourist accommodations) and how commercial allocations will be used in the future to accomplish fairness to all economic levels of our community and visiting public.
C	It is unlikely that local jurisdictions will agree to transfer TAUs from one to another.
C	The proposal continues to allow the transfer of TAUs, which in practice has resulted in the replacement of small buildings with limited footprints and limited traffic impacts with much larger buildings with their associated larger footprints and traffic and other impacts. The EIS should document whether this current TAU transfer right creates a net environmental gain or loss and must analyze the additional potential population and overall environmental impacts of this provision.
C	The EIS must analyze the additional potential population and overall environmental impacts associated with converting TAUs to residential units.
C	Given the additional building footprint, plus the associated increase in vehicle traffic that results from transfers of TAUs from small motel rooms to larger timeshares, the EIS must contain an alternative that produces an equivalent of lesser impact from the TAU transfer. One such mechanism would be a requirement that TAUs be transferred in proportion to their square footage. Another would be to match transfer rights to the number of bedrooms in the TAU sending and receiving properties.
C	Analyze the true respective impacts of TAUs under different scenarios. (e.g., a 3-bedroom timeshare, while a single TAU has a greater impact than a 1-bedroom hotel/motel room)
C	Consider alternative methods for allocating TAUs in different locations around the Basin. Consider that impacts will vary by location and propose ways to address this. (e.g., TAUs in Stateline generally result in fewer VMTs than westshore TAUs).
C	Include an alternative that does not allocate additional TAUs including those remain under the current Regional Plan.
C	The EIS must analyze the impact of the proposal to convert TAUs to multi-family housing and how that impacts ETCCs.
C	Create design standards that make the units resulting from conversions of TAUs to residential attractive to neighborhoods.
C	<i>Residential Allocations</i>
C	Need to evaluate how restricting or not increasing the number of housing allocations would affect growth potential; how many buildable lots there are, and how many the plan would allow.
C	The EIS should prepare an alternative that contains prohibition of development on steep slopes, such as those greater than 30%.
C	No documentation has been presented upon which to base a conclusion that the level of residential development has in fact been compatible with threshold attainment. The EIS must explain the environmental basis for not altering the residential allotment system, taking into consideration continuation of current large home building trends, use of transferred coverage, etc.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
C	Clarify that “no proposed change” to residential allocations means that a bunch of new allocations are being created, so that annual levels may stay the same.
C	Consider an alternative for residential development allocations that ties allocations to environmental performance parameters (e.g., within watersheds).
C	The EIS should also consider the total number of buildable lots left in the Basin and consider the possibility of “tapering off” allocations so that they last for the full period of the Regional Plan and so that local homebuilders gradually adjust to the diminishment and eventual termination of residential allocations rather than being forced to face that situation suddenly when build-out is achieved.
C	In regard to the market rate Residential Allocation program, please remember that Placer County is not satisfied with how the “base” program is allocated between jurisdictions. While the add-on performance program is based on EIP and Transit performance, the base program does not acknowledge jurisdictional progress in these areas and is instead allocated on perceived need. The entire program must be more consistent in its application.
C	Include an alternative with no new residential allocations.
C	The EIS should analyze the impacts of allowing additional residential allocations using current coverage and transfer rules, compared with lower-impact alternatives, such as one that would disallow transfer of excess coverage onto residential properties, with annual allocations reduced by half.
D	Consistency with Other Plans
D	It is imperative that the forest fuels threshold is compliant with the Forest Plan (as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment). The Forest Service is mandated by law to follow the direction in the Forest Plan.
D	Do the Draft Recreation Assessment, Bike Master Plan, Transportation Plan, etc. fit into the current Regional Plan Update?
D	The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board staff encourages you to [perform an environmental analysis on the TMDL] that also complies with CEQA requirements.
D	USDA Forest Service is concerned that if TRPA updates only a limited list of Thresholds, the two agencies will have inconsistencies in goals and management direction [as the Forest Plan Revision is based on the collaborative work done in Pathway].
D	The Lake Clarity Threshold needs to be in sync with current TMDL load reduction targets prescribed by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection..
D	Since the Regional Plan update is concurrent with Lahontan, NDEP, and the USFS plan updates, this would be an ideal time to develop one consistent set of regulations in all four documents addressing fire safety and BMP requirements.
D	The EIS should analyze the impacts associated with the US Forest Service (USFS) Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit’s upcoming Forest Plan Revision.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
D	The EIS could include a discussion of alternatives associated with the proposed Forest Vision document [for the US Forest Service (USFS) Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit's upcoming Forest Plan Revision] including its goals and objectives for controlling and reducing pollutant loads from the public trails, unpaved roads, and undeveloped areas.
D	The consequences should analyze the expected impacts on the management of National Forest System lands as currently directed by the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit's Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan)
D	The EIS should fully disclose how the proposed amendments will be applied as well as the associated consequences including any potential conflict or inconsistency with the Forest Plan.
D	How does TMDL fit in? Should have a description of the TMDL in the EIS.
D	Given the fact that TMDL standards and pollutant reduction and allocation strategies are still being developed, how will Regional Plan specifics be adapted to these moving targets?
D	The EIS should reflect the attainment measures identified in the TMDL analysis.
D	The TMDL approach is promising, but will not work unless enforcement and a major continuing maintenance effort is an integral part of the plan.
D	The EIS must specify which entities will be responsible for the actions required to achieve the TMDL, based upon what numerical standards, and at what consequence for failing to meet the standards.
D	The Plan EIS must clearly describe how the Regional Plan will achieve TMDL pollutant reduction standards. How will performance targets, monitoring and enforcement provisions be structured in the Regional Plan to meet TMDL standards?
D	The Tahoe TMDL Technical Report and the Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report should be included in the EIS and can be used to help inform decision makers when pollutant reduction options are prioritized and ultimately selected for implementation.
D	Three variations of source control regulations from the TMDL should be represented by 3 separate Regional Plan alternatives that are evaluated in an EIS.
D	The Regional Plan EIS should not be developed prior to completion of the TMDL.
D	What is the role and status for the developing Lake Tahoe TMDL in this proposed EIS and Regional Plan Update?
D	Delay the regional plan until the TMDL can be incorporated.
E	Coverage/Soils
E	Coverage
E	Prohibit coverage on residential properties beyond their Bailey coefficients, so that more homes are built at more affordable sizes.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
E	How would a policy of setting aside from the market allocation pool a greater number of allocations dependent upon retiring sensitive lots affect the amount of sensitive lands purchased and preserved?
E	Investigate regulations and/or incentives to remove existing coverage without providing allocations in exchange. According to the TMDL, unless we can find a way to reduce over half of our inputs (with most of the sediment coming from urban runoff), we will clearly need a net reduction in development to achieve ETCCs.
E	Focus should be given to remove excess hard coverage and to restore natural function in environmentally sensitive zones to maximize pollutant reductions and improve other water-quality related benefits such as aquatic habitat, wildlife habitat, and floodplain attenuation.
E	Which proposed changes to watershed protection policies are tied to and directly related to the TMDL? Should these be delayed until the TMDL is adopted to more effectively analyze the potential impacts of these changes?
E	While we support recreation opportunities in the Basin, the current exemptions that apply when development is proposed for the sake of recreation may be contributing to non-attainment of ETCCs. The EIS should evaluate the impacts of this exemption and of removing this exemption and perhaps alternatives with fewer exemptions.
E	The EIS should consider removing all exceptions for SEZ development. The EIS should also analyze the impacts to ETCCs from the current exemptions for agriculture, recreation and public service.
E	The EIS should evaluate the appropriateness of the sensitive lot retirement program – is it working as it should? Can it be improved? What type of development is being created through the allocations given to applicants as part of this program?
E	Are there opportunities to purchase sensitive lots to prevent future development through a fee program on new development (that is sufficient to achieve this goal)?
E	Chapter 20 recommendations include focusing mostly on removing existing coverage rather than protecting undeveloped coverage from future development. The EIS should consider alternative methods for preventing the future development on such parcels, as well as removing existing hard coverage. The recommendation to neglect protecting raw, undeveloped land in favor of removing coverage on already impacted land seems to suggest some implications to ETCCs; the EIS must evaluate the impacts of this concept.
E	The availability of coverage for public and private projects through either of the Land Banks is problematic in particular hydrologic zones. Of particular concern is the availability of restoration credit that might be necessary for linear public facilities (i.e. bicycle trails to implement the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and Highway/Road Dept. water quality & related improvements)
E	The implications of the proposed changes for either Land Bank are largely unknown. Due to higher land and real estate costs, the financial ability for project proponents or the Land Banks to provide restoration credit and retire meaningful quantities of hard coverage is questionable.
E	Chapter 37: Placer County is on record as favoring changes to the manner in which parcels are accounted for within IPES. The current system does not properly account for actual parcels in Placer County, which has resulted in an inaccurate and unfairly high

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	score.
E	To facilitate the implementation of the TRPA/TMPO's Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, current coverage and low-capability restoration credit requirements should be evaluated for a more cost effective means of implementation.
E	Due to the linear nature of these facilities (e.g., bike paths), is it realistic or fiscally prudent to be requiring the transfer of land coverage for these projects?
E	Will the development of a bike path be seen as a 'net environmental gain' given the multiple threshold benefits, and thereby be granted additional exemptions for coverage regulations, SEZ crossings and habitat encroachment?
E	Elimination of this exception for linear public service and recreation facilities would eliminate the possibility for construction of several major bikeways that provide vital links in the bikeway around the Lake, and the South Lake Tahoe bicycle network. These bikeways are part of the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and have been in intensive planning for a number of years. SEZ development exceptions should not be categorically eliminated for these facilities. If development restrictions in SEZs are to be tightened, public service and recreation facilities could perhaps bear a greater burden of proof that they need to enter the SEZ, OR that they do indeed provide necessary gains in threshold attainment in other threshold categories.
E	Is any change proposed to the current regulations that allow grandfathered land coverage on sensitive lands to remain through payment of an excess coverage mitigation fee?
E	The EIS should prepare an alternative that contains prohibition of development on steep slopes, such as those greater than 30%.
E	Change the coverage transfer program to limit house size.
E	Document the efficacy of the coverage transfer system for acquiring targeted parcels and protecting raw land from further development.
E	Soils
E	Commenter would like to review a copy of the most up to date NRCS soil survey and map
E	EIS should address sensitive lot/Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) issue. What does the new soil survey mean for IPES score?
E	Reevaluate land coverage requirements (e.g., using new soils information and new water quality model) and determine if we are on the right path [which is??].
E	Incorporate results and conclusions from soil surveys and the USDA Forest Service watershed assessment.
E	Soil survey implications: Without the quantitative analysis it is difficult to know whether adoption of the new soil survey now is advisable. Perhaps delay this transition?

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
E	Numerous flaws have been documented with the formula used for deriving IPES scores, such as the subjectivity of the soil erodibility, or “k” factor. In addition to the “k” factor, the EIS should provide analysis of, and recommendation for improving, other IPES variables. The EIS should carefully analyze the way in which the current and proposed coverage systems are applied, and present alternatives that have fewer loopholes subject to manipulation.
E	The EIS should analyze the impacts of the IPES program and whether it is appropriate for achieving the ETCCs. The concept behind the IPES program was intended to reflect allowable development in the face of environmental improvement; completion of projects does not necessarily mean environmental improvement. The IPES system should be tied directly to environmental measurements. Some examples include tying the IPES score to environmental measurements of the condition of a watershed, to distance from the Lake, etc
E	The EIS should analyze the impact of construction-related compaction on the alteration of soil types and function. In other words, the EIS should evaluate whether the assumptions about suitable coverage percentages take into account soil function degraded in the construction process, reducing the capacity for the un-covered soil to effectively infiltrate runoff on-site.
E	The EIS must describe how the current land coverage system has been “thoroughly reviewed and modified to incorporate new scientific findings,” including the impervious coverage model.
E	The report from the Soils TWG found that negative impacts to streams and watersheds are present when coverage exceeds 10% impervious coverage. The EIS must thoroughly examine these findings and how the existing, proposed, and other alternative methods incorporate these findings.
E	The Soils TWG report stated a “need to revise amount of coverage allocated to parcels in light of amount of impervious cover associated with transportation systems.” This reflects the fact that roads are not accounted for when evaluating the amount of allowable coverage assessed by Bailey as compatible with different soil groups. The EIS must explain how the presence of roads and other impervious surfaces not accounted for in IPES will be accounted for when assigning allowable coverage limits.
E	The EIS should analyze whether allowing continued development on parcels with low IPES scores meets the goals set forth in the proposed Regional Plan Update. It is possible that the definition of “sensitive lot” may need to be reviewed. From the perspective of a casual observer, it seems more residential development is occurring within scenic corridors and scenic vistas. Should the term “sensitive” refer to more than just land capability?
E	Use of the new soil survey map should be based on Order 1 application of maps, which requires individual, in-situ site verification of soil types, since they can vary throughout relatively small areas (including on individual parcels). The EIS should analyze how the new soil map and associated threshold will be implemented. Further, the EIS should examine the cumulative coverage that will result from various implementation methods of the new map and explain how implementation will provide a net reduction in coverage. Also, explain how the new map will relate to the IPES program.
F	EIP
F	Will the EIS coordinate Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) construction capacity?

<p align="center">TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007</p>	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
F	Include the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) as part of the Regional Plan and include a program-level environmental document.
F	We have long held that EIP projects should be used only as intended – to remedy impacts from past development. Yet we fear they have been used to justify new development – the EIS must analyze this situation. The project description further implies that allocations for new development will be granted to local and private sectors in “reward” for completing EIP projects. This skates a very fine line between using EIP to justify new development. The EIS must consider alternative mechanisms for completing EIP projects (other than any direct or indirect tie to new development).
F	The EIS must evaluate the effectiveness of the first 10 years of the EIP and whether committed state and federal funding was received and appropriately spent.
F	We must also make a renewed effort to fully fund the EIP program and expedite critical projects. This includes the need for committed funding at the local/private level in addition to federal and state levels.
F	The effectiveness of the EIP program over the past 10 years should be evaluated. The new EIP should discuss the funding mechanism for the future and how the local contribution can be acquired.
F	The Presidential Forum of 1997 was successful in getting state and federal commitments [for the EIP], but we failed to get adequate commitments to the one-third local/private contribution; this must be addressed.
F	How will the EIS and Regional Plan Update seek to “coordinate EIP project implementation construction capacity”?
F	Can the regional revenue strategy incorporate an O&M component for these types of facilities? (e.g., bike paths)
G	Global change, Sustainability and Green Design
G	<i>Global change</i>
G	Need to evaluate how species (plankton, algae) may be affected by climate change if there is less snow, less skiing
G	Less snow means less skiing, and this is an economic issue. Need to reduce carbon footprint; the Basin likes to be a leader, we should do it here first.
G	The EIS should evaluate whether mitigation measures relied upon to attenuate additional/excess impervious coverage have known and proven effective outcomes across a range of inputs (such as frequent heavy storms). The EIS must consider potential impacts of global climate change, such as increased runoff and erosion due to increased winter flooding and warming waters, in relation to the sufficiency of measures designed to “fully mitigate” new impervious coverage.
G	Include measures to combat global warming/climate change
G	Residential and commercial allocations should be used in such a manner as to promote and facilitate sustainable design and a reduction in the “carbon footprint” of development in the Basin, consistent with emerging broader state, national and international goals

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	to offset and reduce the effects of climate change.
G	Climate change trends, if not addressed and countered, will negatively impact Lake Tahoe's economy, environment and quality of life. Lake Tahoe should be a leader in efforts to address and reduce the impacts of climate change. Lake Tahoe should be a leader in sustainable development, accelerating the effort to reverse decades of extremely poor building and community design and development.
G	Build into the Goals and Policies incentive-based program to address and mitigate global warming. Establish performance measures for reducing global warming issues. Considering that climate change will affect thresholds, to what extent will it be human caused vs. climate based? Will each of the threshold standards and indicators be changed accordingly with these changes? What impacts will they that have on attainment for each and all thresholds?
G	The EIS should address the affects of Global Warming on Lake Tahoe, including the effects of more winter flooding, increased pollutant loading to Lake Tahoe, warming of Lake Tahoe and tributaries and growth of algae.
G	The EIS should also analyze the adequacy of prescribed BMPs and other erosion control measures in response to the intensified impacts of global warming.
G	The Plan EIS must analyze proposed TMDL standards and other elements of the proposed Regional Plan for sufficiency in consideration of the expected impacts of global climate change, as described in the IPCC and TERC reports, and other sources.
G	Analyze the relative contribution of larger homes versus smaller homes to greenhouse gas emissions.
G	The EIS should include an analysis of the impacts of climate change on the following and should also describe how the Regional Plan and ETCCs will address these:: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Water supply, Basin-wide and in individual communities b. Ski Resort Operations (and impacts of expanding resorts that will later demand more water to make snow) c. Forests (impacts to forest health, forest species, fire danger) d. Transportation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Traffic: the more the valley heats up, the more people who will come here to escape it, even if bumper to bumper the entire way) ii. Higher temperatures cause higher emissions of certain air pollutants (e.g. precursors to ozone) e. Energy Demand (more Tahoe residents/retail installing A/C units) f. Green Building to reduce impact – Besides paying attention to WHAT is built, we must also examine HOW it's built. This should include examining requirements for new homes which require "green" building, e.g. homes which can power and heat/cool themselves. There is simply no reason to continue building inefficient structures. g. Impacts from changing weather conditions (e.g. more rain and less snow will cause more runoff; planning and mitigation must be able to account for this increase).
G	Sustainability and Green Design

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
G	Supportive of green building, but some technologies are less than cost efficient.
G	Compact energy-efficient homes should be encouraged.
G	Use affordability and energy efficiency, in addition to coverage, as part of the rationale to limit house size.
G	Alternatives should examine requirements for green building such that new homes are constructed to be self-sufficient (no increased demand for power, natural gas, etc.).
G	Residential and commercial allocations should be used in such a manner as to promote and facilitate sustainable design and a reduction in the “carbon footprint” of development in the Basin, consistent with emerging broader state, national and international goals to offset and reduce the effects of climate change.
G	Need to include incentives to implement green building initiatives
G	Chapter 30 – Design Standards: Are we missing the opportunity to require energy efficient concepts, fire safe construction and design? Is it possible to create incentives for LEED Certification?
G	The proposal to incorporate “sustainable” and “green” design as Agency standards: Given the lack of definitional clarity, methodologies, and even effectiveness of these conceptual matters, the Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors believe these matters are best left under the heading of guidelines or preferences, not a standards in the Code of Ordinances. Incentives to implement these concepts might better serve all concerned.
H Impacts Analysis	
H	Re-analyze the potential environmental impacts of the current regional plan to account for the trend for developers in the Basin to maximize their building footprint with additional coverage often transferred in to allow construction of the largest home possible for a particular lot.
H	Analyze the No Action Alternative assuming it were properly enforced. We suspect that the results of implementation of the existing Regional Plan as it was intended may provide better achievement of thresholds. For thresholds where this is the case, enforcing current standards may be all that is needed. An alternative examining an enforced regional plan along with “clean-ups” of problem areas would be another alternative to analyze in the EIS.
H	The EIS should evaluate alternative mitigation fee programs (e.g., annual to account for ongoing impacts versus one-time fees).
H	Analyze the impacts of various height and coverage scenarios in mixed-use areas and be sure to include impacts associated with increased population density.
H	All alternatives should be given equal technical review and consideration in the EIS.
H	We would like the EIS to analyze alternatives that meet Thresholds through regulatory-based approaches, incentive-based approaches, and a combination of the two.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
H	The EIS should disclose the consequences (direct, indirect and cumulative effects) of not updating the Thresholds identified in the Pathway collaboration process at this time as well as a timetable and direction to complete the job for updating the Thresholds.
H	<i>Affordable Housing</i>
H	The environmental analysis must consider the environmental, economic and social impacts of affordable and moderate housing being located outside of the Tahoe Basin, as is currently the case, and compare those impacts to those of providing affordable and moderate housing locally.
H	the affordable housing element of the Plan EIS must address the issue of environmental carrying capacity and the corresponding target for overall resident and visitor population levels in the Basin. The EIS must then describe specific policies that provide a diverse range of housing options for the level of resident and visitor population that is compatible with Tahoe's fragile ecosystem, threshold attainment, and TMDL pollutant reduction targets.
H	<p>The Regional Plan EIS should address the following factors affecting affordable housing development and environmental impact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do current land coverage and land transfer rules that allow construction of very large homes and vacation rental properties affect the availability of moderate-sized homes in the Basin? 2. If current residential development, land use and related rules and practice continue on current trajectories for the next twenty years, how will the supply of homes affordable to low and moderate-income residents be affected? 3. How would the supply of affordable and moderate-income homes be affected by lowering limits on residential coverage and total home size, including elimination of coverage transfers on to residential parcels? 4. How would the need for affordable housing throughout the Tahoe Basin be affected by a moratorium on new vacation rentals? 5. How would the need for affordable housing in the Basin be impacted by incentives to rent our second homes and current vacation rental properties to local residents? 6. How would a policy of carving out and setting aside 50% + of the annual residential building allocations for moderate-income housing impact the supply of moderate housing in relation to demand in the Basin over periods of 1, 5 and 10 years? 7. How would a policy of setting aside from the market allocation pool a greater number of allocations dependent upon retiring sensitive lots affect the amount of sensitive lands purchased and preserved? 8. What would the population of the Basin be if all employees were housed in the Basin? Please include a scenario in which current housing stock continues to be unaffordable to most Tahoe-based employees. In that case, how much land would be needed to house Basin employees, and how much additional raw land would be needed to provide the adequate supply of affordable housing? 9. What would be the cumulative environmental impact if all future affordable housing demand in the Basin, including increased demand in scenarios presented above, is met by developing projects on currently undeveloped land in the Basin?
H	The impacts from affordable housing on the ETCCs are the same as impacts from other forms of development. The EIS should evaluate these impacts and whether it is feasible to continue to exempt affordable housing from allocation limits.
H	<i>Air Quality</i>

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
H	Include air quality transport studies and conclusions
H	<p>The EIS should analyze the environmental benefits – including improvements to air quality, reduction of CO2 emissions, fewer vehicle miles traveled – of implementing some or all of the following measures (many of which have been adopted by Aspen and other communities):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Congestion traffic fees (along Hwy. 50) ▪ Toll booths at Basin entry points to encourage alternatives to the private automobile, as well as to raise funds for alternative transportation systems ▪ Mandatory parking fees in heavily trafficked areas ▪ Operation of free shuttles ▪ Creation of a car sharing program ▪ Mandatory greenhouse gas and related fees for new development ▪ Mandatory bicycle lanes on all Caltrans road improvement projects ▪ Basin gas taxes, used to clean transportation alternatives ▪ High-impact recreation fees, assessed to users of motorboats, snowmobiles, OHVs to help offset pollution impacts.
H	Examine the impacts of construction, including the air quality impacts from current construction practices as well as alternative construction practices using equipment with fewer emissions and additional dust/particulate control measures.
H	<i>Buildout</i>
H	How many undeveloped residential lots remain eligible for development? Is the size of that number consistent with the statement “almost at build out”? The concept that the region is almost at buildout of anticipated growth is questioned. The term build-out should be defined, as it is unclear whether this includes redevelopment infill potential. For instance, Placer County has roughly 740 vacant eligible parcels with an IPES score above the buildable 726 line. At current rate of roughly 45 residential building allocations per year, the allocations would last nearly the full life of the plan.
H	Perform a geographically-based analysis of “build-out” including the potential extent of coverage under the existing transfer program (which results in bigger houses).
H	Potential ranges of residential building allocations, including allocations based on watershed and coverage characteristics, should be analyzed in the EIS.
H	The plan EIS must show how many potentially developable parcels exist in the Basin and how close the Basin is to “build out.” The EIS must consider residential tear-down/re-builds in this analysis. What is the total additional amount of coverage that could be added in the Basin if every developable parcel were developed to its maximum coverage potential (including transfers of coverage to parcels), and every home was replaced and rebuilt to the maximum allowable size.
H	<i>Coverage/Soils</i>
H	The Plan EIS must thoroughly analyze the current status and application of coverage banks and coverage transfer system. Are there

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	any quantifiable, verifiable environmental gains being realized to offset the impacts of allowing coverage in excess of land capability on parcels throughout the Basin? The EIS should describe whether most of the currently transferred coverage is being purchased from coverage banks or gained through transferring coverage from sensitive parcels.
H	The EIS should analyze the environmental impacts of eliminating the coverage transfer system, and investigate options for accomplishing this, such as the buy-down of coverage banks with EIP or other funds.
H	The EIS must describe how the impacts of impervious coverage within particular watersheds will be evaluated and monitored. This analysis should also describe the performance effectiveness of mitigation measures used to offset coverage impacts. The EIS should then also describe how this monitoring evaluation will be used to determine the suitability of additional coverage in particular watersheds.
H	To meet the intention of limiting impervious coverage impacts, the EIS must analyze whether IPES variable such as watershed health and distance to Lake Tahoe should be afforded greater relative significance. Similarly, the EIS should disclose the cumulative coverage implications that will come from implementing the new soil survey, and present options that will reduce total additional impervious cover below what would be allowed with the current soil survey and IPES formula.
H	<i>Performance Standards</i>
H	The EIS should include an alternative where development permits are tied to demonstrated environmental improvement.
H	The EIS should evaluate the extent to which the stated intention of the Plan to produce an environmental “net gain” will be backed up with enforcement teeth (i.e., analyze a Plan with an enforcement program)..
H	The EIS should evaluate full monitoring plans which are used to evaluate pre-determined environmental parameters and therefore affect development determined by the Plan. As mentioned in several comments, new development should be tied to achieving environmental parameters; this monitoring plan should identify what those parameters may be, how they’ll be monitored, etc. The plan should undergo peer review by outside scientists (perhaps through the Tahoe Science Consortium) and be coordinated with plans related to ongoing monitoring the ETCCs. For example, the plan would dictate where water quality monitoring would take place for individual watersheds. Development in those individual watersheds would be tied to the results of that specific monitoring.
H	Because allocations levels are tied to local government and individual erosion control efforts, the EIS must analyze the effectiveness of local jurisdiction BMP and erosion control programs to assess whether they have sufficiently offset the impacts of the additional coverage and development granted by their implementation.
H	With TRPA out of attainment in 75% of threshold indicators and lake clarity continuing to decline, the EIS must evaluate whether the overall level of development has, if anything, contributed toward overwhelming the capacity of the fragile Tahoe ecosystem to absorb impacts.
H	The EIS must describe the standard of effectiveness that will be used to conclude that the effects of impervious cover and disturbance are fully mitigated.

<p style="text-align: center;">TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007</p>	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
H	The EIS must analyze the effectiveness of local jurisdiction BMP and erosion control programs, to assess whether they have sufficiently offset the impacts of the additional coverage and development granted by their implementation.
H	Chapter 25 – BMP Requirements: Will this EIS analyze the effectiveness of this management strategy? Will these code changes include some type of enforcement actions? Revision of the BMPs should be an interagency effort (this bullet is from LTBMU).
H	The EIS must describe the standard of effectiveness that will be used to conclude that the effects of impervious cover and disturbance are fully mitigated. How will baseline standards be established? Does “fully mitigated” require that stated effects of impervious coverage – changes to infiltration, runoff detention capacity, nutrient uptake capacity and growing conditions – will be fully offset by mitigation measures to the level of pre-disturbance soil function? How will evaluation of mitigation effectiveness be tied to allowable new coverage within a particular watershed or on particular parcels?
H	Population Growth
H	The environmental impacts analysis will need to account for increased population of the Basin.
H	Concern expressed that the proposed plan will result in a much higher population in the Basin.
H	Will potential increase in population growth increase the need for increase mitigation? Will these types of impacts be incorporated as part of the analysis?
H	Recreation
H	The EIS should analyze the environmental impact of two-stroke snowmobiles, as well as the environmental gain that would be realized by a ban on two-stroke snowmobiles.
H	The EIS should include estimates of increased visitation to the Basin in the years ahead, and the cumulative environmental impact of that increased level of visitation, particularly transportation-related impacts. The EIS must propose specific measures to offset the cumulative impacts of intensified tourism in the Basin, and propose mitigation and restoration measures sufficient to attain thresholds and meet TMDL pollutant reduction targets.
H	The EIS must clarify if “adequate parking” will be provided for the expected increase in Basin visitation (1 million additional tourists per year by 2027?), and what the impervious cover and related impacts of this provision of adequate parking would be.
H	If visitation to the Basin is expected to increase by 50,000 visitors per year, as has been discussed, then the EIS must calculate the environmental impact of 1 million additional visitors per year over current levels (by 2027). The EIS must then also put forth pollution reduction strategies sufficient to absorb that level of visitation with less impact than what exists today, in order to meet TMDL targets.
H	While we support recreation opportunities in the Basin, the current exemptions that apply when development is proposed for the sake of recreation may be contributing to non-attainment of ETCCs. The EIS should evaluate the impacts of this exemption and of

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	removing this exemption and perhaps alternatives with fewer exemptions.
H	The EIS should examine adding additional protections to natural areas for recreation versus only rehabilitating existing areas. Further, the EIS should examine the impacts of protecting “natural settings” in all situations, not just “wherever possible” – which often is interpreted to apply only when it doesn’t impede a development.
H	The EIS should evaluate sediment and nutrient loading from proposed recreation activities.
H	What information will preparers of the EIS use to analyze the impact strategies to “cap” the number of visitors in popular destination or during peak times, if necessary, in the summer and winter?
H	<i>Socioeconomic</i>
H	The analysis should describe the social and economic consequences of the proposed actions in light of predicted trends in regional growth and visitation.
H	Has TRPA determined whether the proposed system will result in attaining urban revitalization and other social and economic goals?
H	<i>Vegetation</i>
H	The EIS should analyze the impacts of yard equipment (both at the residential and commercial scale) on ETCCs. Equipment includes leaf blowers, which create air, water and noise impacts. Consider alternatives which ban leaf blowers (this has been done in other cities – this is not a new idea). Consider requirements for other yard equipment, e.g. lawnmowers.
H	Examine the impacts of fertilizer use on ETCCs. What alternative fertilizers are available? What alternatives to lawns which require fertilizer are available? What alternative landscaping options can we use which reduce fire danger but do not require fertilized lawns? What other options are there for golf courses?
H	Analyze the impacts of available forest management technologies and methodologies that both reduce the risk of wildfire while protecting sensitive lands such as steep or highly erodable slopes and riparian areas.
H	<i>Water Quality</i>
H	The EIS should comprehensively describe the impacts of motorboats on Lake Tahoe, including levels of CO, NOx, hydrocarbons and other pollutants of concern, relative to automobiles. Options such as restrictions on motorboat access and mandatory boat washing programs should be analyzed.
H	The EIS should analyze the effects of the current wintertime practices of applying road deicing and traction abrasives.
H	The EIS should evaluate methods other than the deicing and traction abrasives currently used to maintain public safety, such as lower speed limits, chain controls, use of alternative deicers, along with the impacts of current use of deicers and abrasives on the overall pollutant loading to the Lake.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
I	Land Use, Development, and Transect System
I	Address height and use limitations for communications towers, particularly in residential areas.
I	Establish a policy to redevelop/restore already disturbed but undeveloped land and keep raw land undeveloped.
I	Has TRPA completed an analysis to determine what each jurisdiction’s capacity is for removal of development in sensitive lands?
I	The EIS must describe exactly what is meant and implied by “smart growth.” This phrase is currently attached to the development plan in the “Y” area favored by the City of South Lake Tahoe, which includes plans for 6-story buildings. What level of development intensity would fit within a “smart growth” framework?
I	With the transect system, will the PAS boundaries remain the same or will new boundaries be developed?
I	The transect boundary encompassing Developed Recreation at Camp Richardson should encompass more than the permit boundary but rather should include the entire complex of Camp Richardson, the [Forest Service] Visitor Center, Fallen Leaf Lake Campground, and Baldwin and Pope Beaches.
I	If a plan alternative considers restricting the urban boundary then another should consider expanding the urban boundary.
I	Smart growth and compact development are good, but the plan needs parking incentives.
I	The EIS must specify what sort of coverage or density benefits will be achieved in exchange for loosening building height limits. What are the additional population and coverage implications for allowing a greater intensity of development in Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) areas? Will reductions in allowable development in non-TOD areas necessarily compensate for this more intensive development?
I	It is important to clarify if the proposed TOD/Urban Transect program replaces Redevelopment Area incentives currently included in Chapter 15.
I	Current regulations allowing expansion of the urban boundary should be removed.
I	There should be consideration of narrowing the urban boundary through public buyout or other means to avoid further encroachment and resulting safety issues [i.e., WUJ].
I	Will the urban boundary in the current Regional Plan be retained, modified, or replaced?
I	The urban boundary lines should be strengthened and, where possible, adjusted inward where raw land inside the boundary has not yet been developed. This is a great opportunity to get the interface with forestland fixed.
I	The EIS must clarify what is meant by development being “generally” limited to existing urban boundaries.
I	The Plan EIS should describe any current conditions that allow changes in the urban boundary, or urban uses outside of the established urban boundary, as well as conditions proposed in the Regional Plan Update that would allow such development beyond

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	the urban boundary. Any such conditions should be proposed for elimination in a Plan alternative, and ambiguity about developing outside of the urban boundary, or moving the urban boundary line, eliminated from the proposed plan.
I	Need an explanation of the transition from Plan Area Statements to transect land uses
I	Placer County likes transect concept but wants newer design guidelines. EIS should evaluate conversion from Plan Area Statements to transects.
I	Looking for more form-based codes.
I	Suggest transect model be married with soils management system.
I	Not sure unique qualities of communities are going to be represented in transects.
I	Providing no new CFA and no new TAUS and only transfer from sensitive lots is an impediment to urban infill.
I	Provide mixed use option in light industrial areas.
I	How will community plans be modified to incorporate concepts laid out in the draft regional plan description in the scoping packet?
I	Placer County would like consideration of mixed use in certain light industrial areas, which extend beyond the downtown urban boundaries.
I	The Neighborhood Mix Use Land Use District (T-8) is too limiting with respect to height and density. It is not clear what a one-story mixed use project would look like.
I	The EIS must provide data comparing current PAS system and the proposed transect system, including the amount and placement of new impervious coverage, total development, density of development, scenic impacts, and all other related environmental impacts.
I	The current proposal fails to recognize both existing and planned uses in these proposed transect categories and must be revised to include those uses in select areas. Various suggestions were submitted for adjustment of the transect system in specific areas or in specific ways.
I	Given the focus in the proposed Plan Update on redevelopment, the EIS should describe in more detail any policies to protect undeveloped land, in exchange for the proposed incentives for redeveloping already disturbed areas.
I	Under High Density Residential it [the transect descriptions] lists potential density patterns at 8 to 15 units per acre. Because of the lack of land and the great need for affordable housing, higher housing densities, up to 30 units per acre, must be allowed.
I	High density residential should be increased to a minimum of 30 units per acre which is the minimum requirement in the LEEDs certification program.
I	Increased density in mixed use areas should be offset through a reduction in density in other areas.

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
I	What are the impacts of the transect system on inclusionary housing, retention of full time residents, community sustainability, and the percentage increase/decrease in the pollutant loadings that preliminary TMDL data tell us need to be drastically reduced in order to regain lake clarity. The pros and cons of extending 3 story development into the T-7 areas as well as the amount of height being proposed in T-8, 9 and 10 need to be explored as to whether those height recommendations are needed or whether lesser height allowances would suffice, keeping in mind such things as housing affordability, community character, scenic values, etc.
I	The proposal states that [new development in transects] development is “generally limited” to existing urban boundaries. What might the exceptions [to this] be? Also, recreation uses are identified as an exception. What is envisioned here and what kinds of recreation uses are included, and what kind of caps, if any, are contemplated? What would the benefits be to ETCCs if recreation exemptions were decreased or eliminated?
I	[with respect to the descriptions of transects] Please also define what is meant by “areas where moderate amounts of existing land coverage should (be) retained,” and why this statement differs from those in T-8 and T-10.
I	There have been many problems identified in the Plan Area Statement system over the past 20 years. The EIS should evaluate the impacts of the existing PAS system and what the impacts would be if the PAS system were updated to “fix” the problems. The EIS should then compare this to a full analysis of the impacts of the proposed Transect System.
I	Alternatives should consider definitions of community character that are specific to individual communities and that are acceptable to each community.
I	The Proposed Action alternative should be revised to include both the California Main Lodge and Boulder Base Lodge areas at Heavenly within the urban boundary and possibly an updated transect district for certain existing developed recreation uses.
I	Tighten standards restricting all development to within existing urban boundaries. Where existing urban boundaries include undisturbed land, consider redefining the boundary to avoid encroachment on such lands.
I	USFS support the implementation of the “Transect System” and are working to incorporate a compatible system in the revised Forest Plan. However, those transect zones that are primarily on National Forest System lands need further refinement. Our significant concern is the possibility that a classification scheme that does not recognize the influence of a large urban population living near or among the forested lands will artificially constrain management options. It is also important that we work together to ensure that the boundaries of the transect areas match the functional definitions.
I	It is important to clarify if the proposed TOD/Urban Transect program replaces Redevelopment Area incentives currently included in Chapter 15.
I	Chapter 21: It is impossible to see the maps in Figures 1 through 5 to determine whether the Density, Transit Oriented Development and Mixed Use areas designated are consistent with existing and future planning goals in the Urban areas. It is clear that this increased density is not currently being proposed at all on the West Shore, which is also devoid of T7-T10.
I	What is the specific intent of the proposal to “Update the Code to implement a height envelope for structures located on steep slopes”?

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
J	Pathway
J	Pleased with the integration of input from Place-Based and Forum processes into the Regional Plan Update.
J	Tahoe Basin has common environmental goals, but how would the document address individual identities of individual areas? The goals being discussed are too broad.
J	Which Pathway desired conditions are being addressed? Incorporate Pathway vision statements.
J	No changes indicated to Chapter 15, which doesn't apply to Placer County; wanted to make this change during Place-Based process and were told to wait for Regional Plan Update.
J	The place-based planning effort and Pathway Forum discussions indicate a strong consensus emerging for creating a livable, healthy, sustainable Tahoe Basin. A place where the environment is protected and the local economy and our communities are strengthened in ways compatible with restoring Lake Tahoe. How will the public input from the place-based process be to used to form a new plan?
J	Amendments proposed for analysis in the Regional Plan EIS do not appear to acknowledge the individual identities of communities with the common goals of threshold attainment, as initially developed in the Regional Vision.
J	The USDA Forest Service is concerned that because the project description states that "Many ideas for amendment of standards and indicators identified in the Pathway collaboration process have not been completely formulated or resolved and additional time is needed to fully develop acceptable scientific level [sic]" the Pathway process will not be completed and therefore Thresholds needing modification will not be revised.
J	The project description should describe the Agency collaboration in the Pathway process and, specifically, should describe the partnerships with the Water Board and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) on the Lake Tahoe TMDL.
K	Performance Standards
K	Incorporate strong performance standards into all aspects of the Plan. Tie levels of development to demonstrated environmental improvement.
K	There must be greater accountability for results, including environmental performance standards, better evaluation of mitigation effectiveness, and enforcement provisions [in the updated Regional Plan].
K	The EIS must specify which entities will be responsible for the actions required to achieve the threshold standard, based upon what numerical standards, and at what consequence for failing to meet the standards.
K	The EIS should include an alternative where development permits are tied to demonstrated environmental improvement.
K	The EIS must provided alternatives that establish higher standards for mitigation effectiveness, including required testing of mitigation effectiveness before those measures are relied upon to offset development impacts to levels of "insignificance."

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
K	Incorporate an annual review of all urban properties for BMP and fire protection compliance. Incorporate enforcement provisions to be applied when local governments do not act.
K	Serious consideration should be given to integrating the goals and implementation of Water Quality BMPs and Defensible Space BMPs. The Regional Plan Update should facilitate and encourage BMP integration.
K	Form a multi-jurisdictional basin wide BMP monitoring program and related effectiveness evaluation within the framework of the new water quality model.
L	Process
L	Request to extend comment period to November 1, 2007, to allow comments on TMDL to be included
L	Request to extend scoping comment period to November 1 to allow TMDL input to be part of the scoping process; RWQCB wants TMDL to be included in the Regional Plan Update EIS.
L	The EIS should be developed using an interactive process, rather than consultant work first, then comment.
L	Concerned about losing ability to provide input into the project description once the EIS is underway or completed. Concerned that once the money is spent on the EIS, there will be no ability to change course.
L	Suggest providing a detailed plan (such as a Gantt chart) that expresses what has to be done and what is needed to keep the project on track.
L	The EIS is the process by which these impacts are vetted. Project description is the most important piece. Should the GB review administrative drafts? Perhaps Board needs to approve the project description.
L	Regarding process issues and Thresholds: Doesn't believe a January 2009 moratorium will occur; shouldn't design the EIS process around that. This is a 20-year Regional Plan. Concern about collapsing the process of deciding on Thresholds with the analytical process that needs to use those Thresholds. Regional Plan is a method for achieving the goal, but there is not yet agreement on the Goals. Encourages TRPA to do an EIS on Threshold changes. Resolution 82-11 addresses an orderly process for revising Thresholds.
L	To expedite the new plan, our organization will support a TRPA planning process that 1) respects existing goals; 2) improves implementation leading to attainment of thresholds ; 3) does not weaken existing regulations; 4) very carefully streamlines plan implementation for those directly affected by the regulatory process.
L	I support the focus of the proposed Threshold Revisions and Regional Plan update – the revitalization and redevelopment of Tahoe's urban commercial core areas to achieve community goals and a net gain with respect to Threshold attainment, and efforts to reduce hazardous fuels and promote forest health.
L	Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors is requesting an 30-60 day extension beyond the October 5, 2007 cutoff of the comment period

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
L	What will be the process for on-going public review, comment and input during preparation of the EIS?
L	TRPA cannot proposed plan alternatives to meet ETCCs, as required by the Compact, at his time because the ETCCs have not yet been properly reviewed and adopted
L	Is there adequate funding to complete the proposed EIS? If not, TRPA should take immediate steps to identify and secure the total funding required.
L	Either prepare a separate environmental document on Thresholds prior to adopting them and then prepare a new Regional Plan and corresponding EIS or Change none of the current thresholds, except where required by law, and prepare and EIS on the new Regional Plan. Then update additional thresholds as necessary.
L	The League has grave concerns about the wisdom and the legality of the decision to combine the environmental documentation on proposed Threshold changes with the environmental documentation on proposed Regional Plan changes. The environmental process on Thresholds should be non-controversial (assuming that the amendments that are ultimately brought forward maintain or improve the level of environmental protection provided by the current Thresholds). However, the Regional Plan by its nature is very likely to be controversial in many ways. These very different efforts clearly call for separate environmental documents. In the absence of clearly defined Threshold goals, it is inherently impossible to tell whether the Regional Plan is adequate to achieve and maintain those goals.
L	We strongly urge the TRPA to immediately focus on the specific measures required to meet environmental standards in the Basin (Thresholds).
L	Strong support of goals and efforts to allow and facilitate mixed use development, amending current TRPA Code, including density and height standards, to promote vertical mixed use and “transit oriented development.”
M	Public Safety/Wildland-Urban Interface/Forest Health
M	WUI is a near-top priority for money allocation; does TRPA have any authority over how revenue is spent?
M	Need to encourage/incentivize the use of ignition-resistant building materials..
M	Water quality and defensible space best management practices (BMPs) need to complement each other. This will help reduce perceived conflicts.
M	Incorporate an annual review of all urban properties for BMP and fire protection compliance. Incorporate enforcement provisions to be applied when local governments do not act.
M	Include a description of why forest health is less than ideal and treatment progress made since the 1997 forum. Discuss state/federal EIP funding commitment and status of studies to acquire local matching funds [to perform hazardous fuels treatments]..
M	The Plan EIS should describe a consistent, coherent set of regulations that meet both fire defensible space AND residential BMP objectives. This will require coordination with other agencies. Incorporate enforcement provisions to be applied when local

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	governments do not act.
M	The EIS should describe how TRPA will enforce new fire-resistant building material regulations in California, and plans for introducing those requirements to the Nevada portion of the Basin.
M	The EIS should examine an alternative where building materials required by the New 1/1/08 California Code are required on all new development and redevelopment in the entire Basin. The EIS should also examine options for existing homeowners to better protect their homes from ember ignitions.
M	Public expenditures for fire protection should initially focus on a 300-foot wide area on each side of the wildland-urban interface. This a great opportunity to get local governments and local revenues focused within the residential side of the boundary where some of the biggest problems exist. This considerable expenditure for public safety would be wasted if the urban boundary continues to be flexible.
M	Review all fire protection standards and revise if necessary.
M	Expedite replacement of wood roofs. Perhaps a financial assistance proposal, such as low interest loans, would expedite replacement. Strictly enforce property cleanup and maintenance of property setbacks from adjoining property.
M	TRPA should provide support to local jurisdictions in enforcing defensible space measures on private property.
M	Chapter 12 – The proposed WUI Zone and 10-Year Fuel Strategy Map requires modification to meet Conservancy needs.
M	The EIS should evaluate Code of Ordinances which prohibits new development in hazardous areas [chapter 28] and on steep slopes [chapter 22] (which are hazardous areas). We clearly should not be putting people into harm's way.
M	A coordinated BMP review and monitoring system is needed.
M	Serious consideration should be given to integrating the goals and implementation of Water Quality BMPs and Defensible Space BMPs. The Regional Plan Update should facilitate and encourage BMP integration.
N	Recreation
N	The recreation opportunity ratio (ROR) is in the conceptual phase- should this be fully developed and adopted after this Regional Plan update?
N	Will the Regional Recreation Plan [Draft TRPA Regional Recreation Plan] be adopted with the Regional Plan?
N	To facilitate the implementation of the TRPA/TMPO's Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, current coverage and low-capability restoration credit requirements should be evaluated for a more cost effective means of implementation.
N	Due to the linear nature of these facilities (e.g., bike paths), is it realistic or fiscally prudent to be requiring the transfer of land coverage for these projects?
N	Will the development of a bike path be seen as a 'net environmental gain' given the multiple threshold benefits, and thereby be granted

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	additional exemptions for coverage regulations, SEZ crossings and habitat encroachment?
N	Can the regional revenue strategy incorporate an O&M component for these types of facilities? (e.g., bike paths)
N	Include snowmobile technology improvements (similar to watercraft regulation). Basin snowpack becomes polluted and runoff enters waterways.
N	Horse trails create major silting problems heading to waterways. [limit horse trails and develop horse-specific BMPs]
N	Basin recreational trails should be evaluated, BMPs placed, and users signed to trails with active BMP maintenance.
N	The proposed changes to the recreation capacity provisions must be made with the existing commitments like the persons at one time (PAOT) allocations that are contained in the adopted Heavenly Master Plan, in mind
N	It is essential that the Regional Plan Update aggressively support our need to promote and provide public transit and non-automobile access to public and private recreation opportunities.
N	The Forest Service, as a major provider of recreational opportunities in the Basin, is concerned about potential unintended consequences related to the undisclosed components of the Draft TRPA Regional Recreation Plan, Recreation Assessment that might be applied to the Regional Plan. In particular it appears the use of Recreational Opportunity Ratio (ROR) in place of Persons at One Time (PAOT) may not be compatible with the Forest Plan and Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) delineations.
N	It appears that Recreation Opportunity Ration (ROR) does not take into full account undeveloped recreational opportunities such as hiking.
N	The planning of recreation opportunities must consider potential impacts to sensitive areas, such as stream environment zones, shorelines, and other fragile lands to protect water quality and other resources.
N	Alternatives should consider methods to get bike trails and pedestrian paths completed without requiring they be tied to new development.
N	The EIS should analyze the impacts of motorized recreational equipment and vehicles and compare alternatives with variable allowances for motorized versus non-motorized recreation. Because the existing Plan favors motorized recreation (either through the Code itself or how it is implemented), it makes sense that there should be an alternative which evaluates a Plan package favoring non-motorized recreation.
N	The proposal seems to give a new name to an existing concept which has simply not been enforced – PAOTs. The outcome of this new “ROR” concept appears to be similar to the intent of assigned PAOTs. We suggest the EIS also evaluate the impacts of actually enforcing the PAOTs.
N	The EIS should examine adding additional protections to natural areas for recreation versus only rehabilitating existing areas. Further, the EIS should examine the impacts of protecting “natural settings” in all situations, not just “wherever possible” – which often is

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	interpreted to apply only when it doesn't impede a development.
N	Elimination of this exception for linear public service and recreation facilities would eliminate the possibility for construction of several major bikeways that provide vital links in the bikeway around the Lake, and the South Lake Tahoe bicycle network. These bikeways are part of the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and have been in intensive planning for a number of years. SEZ development exceptions should not be categorically eliminated for these facilities. If development restrictions in SEZs are to be tightened, public service and recreation facilities could perhaps bear a greater burden of proof that they need to enter the SEZ, OR that they do indeed provide necessary gains in threshold attainment in other threshold categories.
N	Use the TRPA Regional Recreation Plan, Recreation Assessment to inform recreation planning.
N	What will EIS use for capping visitors to the east shore? What strategies will be analyzed?
N	Recreation plan elements are potentially inconsistent with capacity limits and the enforcement of caps between other agencies with jurisdiction like the Forest Service.
O	Thresholds
O	Evaluating Thresholds in the EIS is okay only if we have thoroughly examined the metrics. Board isn't yet in agreement on the Thresholds, which are the measures we'll use to evaluate the impacts.
O	A detailed rationale should be included in the EIS for why certain Thresholds were selected for update.
O	In reviewing the threshold updates proposed in the Threshold Update EA against the twelve updates listed in the Project Description, it is unclear why some were chose over other. As presented, the currently proposed mix of Threshold updates appears arbitrary.
O	Review regulations allowing "less than significant" determinations for thresholds. Cumulative impacts should be mitigated, causing a net benefit.
O	It is important that the EIS evaluate the ability of the proposed Thresholds, in concert with those retained, to meet the revised Vision and Goal/Value Statements.
O	Analyzing inclusion of other potential mixes of Threshold updates [in addition to those desribed in the project description distributed at the September APC and GB meetings] could form the basis of additional alternatives.
O	Different rates of threshold attainment could be used to help formulate various alternatives analyzed in the EIS.
O	Review regulations allowing "less than significant" determination for thresholds. Cumulative impacts should be mitigated, causing a net benefit.
O	Noise

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
○	Examine the impacts of construction, including:the impacts of construction-related noise on humans and wildlife. Consider alternatives to the current regulations. For example, conflicts remain because the current CNEL standard is intended to protect communities from the collective impacts of noise over a 24-hour period, yet construction noise is exempt during daytime hours. This conflict has never been resolved in terms of the noise threshold and monitoring, nor when complaints are received. Also, consider requiring BACT (best available control technology) for noise on construction equipment. Perhaps there is no need to exempt construction noise if all equipment uses BACT; provide contract incentives to companies which purchase BACT equipment.
○	Scenic
○	The USDA Forest Service is continuing to develop the Scenic Management System from Pathway. Without integration, the two agencies may end up with inconsistent and conflicting direction.
○	Bring forward alternatives that will address concerns regarding vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and scenic thresholds.
○	Page 13 of the document addresses amendments to Chapter 30 of the Code. The first 3 bullet points, turning TRPA’s guidelines into standards, adding sustainable and green building standards, as well as incorporating the so-called “Dark Sky” lighting standards, gives TSBOR cause for concern. The unintended consequences associated with the elevation of these matters to “standards” are many (e.g., housing affordability damaged, compliance dependent upon understanding of ever-changing technologies and policies...). An incentive based approach to the implementation of these concepts might better serve all concerned.
○	Vegetation
○	Improve old growth timber definitions and criteria for implementation
○	The Plan EIS must describe how proposed policies will improve protection of old growth forest stands, considering that numerical targets for percentage of stands in old growth condition in the Basin are slated for elimination.
○	Code sections on Late Serval/Old Growth Enhancement and Protection need to be revised to reflect definitions that use structure and function rather than arbitrary tree diameters. The Forest Service is legally bound by the prescriptions included in our Forest Plan (as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment). It is imperative that direction for the late seral/old growth is compatible with our plan direction.
○	The special-status plant species standard states “protect all known occurrences.” This is inconsistent with the Forest Plan which states that sensitive plants should be “managed to ensure that species do not become threatened or endangered.” The word “protection” connotes a hands-off approach which may not be appropriate depending on the ecology of the plant.
○	The late seral/old growth threshold is outdated and needs significant revision.
○	The sensitive plants threshold does not reflect current science. For example, the indicators for Tahoe Yellow Cress do not reflect the findings in the Conservation Strategy for that species.
○	It is imperative that the forest fuels threshold is compliant with the Forest Plan (as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	Amendment). The Forest Service is mandated by law to follow the direction in the Forest Plan.
○	The special-status plant species standard states “protect all known occurrences.” This is inconsistent with Forrest Plan which states that sensitive plants should be “managed to ensure that species do not become threatened or endangered.” The word “protection” connotes a hands-off approach which may not be appropriate depending on the ecology of the plant.
○	Thresholds that should be updated: Old Growth/Late Seral Stage Ecosystems (V-4), Sensitive Plants (V-3), Lake Clarity (WQ-2), and Scenic Resources
○	Suggests that vegetation threshold be re-titled “Vegetation and Forest.”
○	Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) needs to be its own Threshold. These kinds of issues should be discussed in an environmental document before we do an EIS on the Regional Plan.
○	Water Quality
○	Need to provide incentives for better collection, treatment, and discharge of runoff.
○	Sediment should be specified to include the total number of fine sediment particles less than 20 micrometers in diameter.
○	Get regional authority for issuance of federal Clean Water Act (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, or NPDES) permits, avoiding fragmented permit issuance and enforcement in the Basin.
○	The Regional Plan amendments should also focus on reducing input of pollutants to the Lake, especially fine sediment.
○	The Regional Plan project description should acknowledge the purpose of requiring retrofit of facilities, roads, trails, and other projects is to address water quality goals to capture and remove fine sediment, especially particles less that 20 micrometers in diameter, and reduce the discharge of nitrogen and phosphorus to surface and groundwater.
○	Pre-treatment of stormwater should focus on capture and removal of fine sediment (i.e., particles less than 20 micrometers in diameter).
○	The key restoration concepts should include reducing the total number of fine particles less than 20 micrometers in diameter from stormwater and airborne discharges.
○	Incorporate results and conclusions from the completed groundwater studies.
○	The EIS should discuss the reasoning behind why existing over coverage should be reduced and how the coverage reductions are source control actions for lessening the stormwater runoff and subsequent pollutant flux to the Lake.
○	Chapter 80: Pollutant load reduction targets should focus on achieving a certain clarity goal within the 20-year timeframe of the Regional Plan. These targets may not necessarily be a particular percentage reduction in one pollutant, but may be starting with minimum levels of pollutant reductions with increasing reduction over time. The overall load allocations may be different than the

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	reductions needed in the 20-year timeframe.
<input type="radio"/>	Lake clarity: measurement should shift from wintertime to an annual standard (consistent with Lahontan).
<input type="radio"/>	The project description should describe the Lake's historic clarity loss in light of the Lake being designated an Outstanding National Resource Water (ONRW) in 1980.
<input type="radio"/>	Wildlife
<input type="radio"/>	The EIS needs to define the current baseline in terms of habitat quality and quantity and criteria for measurement of the fisheries standard, as well as disclosing the consequences.
<input type="radio"/>	The proposed standards for fisheries and wildlife apply a non-degradation standard to habitat. The term “non-degradation” is open to interpretation. Will some form of a “net gain” concept be applied or will non-degradation mean no impacts regardless of the outcome?
<input type="radio"/>	The non-degradation standard for wildlife habitat conflicts with the Forest Plan (as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment), which prescribes Protected Activity Centers of 200 acres for Northern Goshawks. It is important that this inconsistency be resolved.
<input type="radio"/>	Limited operating periods (Chapter 78) should be compatible with those established by the Forest Plan (as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment).
<input type="radio"/>	The wildlife standard conflicts with the Forest Plan (as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment), which prescribes Protected Activity Centers of 200 acres for Northern Goshawks. It is important that this inconsistency be resolved.
<input type="radio"/>	Chapter 78: Limited operating periods should be compatible with those established by the Forest Plan (as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment).
<input type="radio"/>	Other – Invasive Species
<input type="radio"/>	Watercraft from contaminated waters outside the basin could cause serious problems [e.g., introduction of Eurasian milfoil or quagga mussels]. Boat washing prior to launching may be necessary.
<input type="radio"/>	The EIS should describe the risks posed to Lake Tahoe by the introduction of Quagga Mussels and other invasive species from motorboats that have been operated in infected waters.
<input type="radio"/>	Describe the risks posed to Lake Tahoe by the introduction of Quagga Mussels and other invasive species from motorboats that have been operated in infected waters.
<input type="radio"/>	Include strategies to keep foreign aquatic species out of the Tahoe Basin.
P	Transportation
P	It is not clear how the proposed amendments to the [transportation component of the regional]plan are different from existing goals

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	and policies. Does TRPA not currently “actively pursue programs that promote the use of mass transit as an alternative to the automobile?”
P	Does a “centrally managed” transportation system mean for the entire region, or locally? EIS should evaluate whether we have the right structure for the transportation system, and what is the right clean fuel.
P	Level of service (LOS) is the most direct measure we have to address traffic impacts, and it’s not adequate. Cannot imagine voting for a Regional Plan that doesn’t adequately address traffic, and need appropriate measures and metrics. May still have more cars on the road even if transit is successful.
P	Propose legislative modifications to Article IX of the TRPA Compact to create a fully functioning district, hopefully including maintenance of transportation-related BMP facilities for the entire Basin.
P	Include strategies for appropriate CTS (BlueGo) implementation and expansion to the entire basin.
P	Placer County disagrees that centralized transit system management based on the Tahoe Basin’s regional watershed boundary is a functional method of managing a transportation system.
P	Placer County is also on record having concerns about a centrally-managed poorly developed/defined parking management program proposal and do not believe such a program should be considered as part of the Regional Plan.
P	Placer County’s Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) bus system has already invested millions of dollars in clean-burning Compressed Natural Gas vehicles and fueling stations to date. This Regional Plan update proposal is unclear regarding how future plans may impact our significant investment in these environmental improvements.
P	Two bullet points in this section [describing transportation] seem to contradict each other, as one states “goals and policies shall encourage the introduction of low to zero emission transit fleet,” while another states “policies and regulations shall encourage and increase the use of fuel efficient and clean-technology vehicles for public bus fleets.” Was this an oversight?
P	What is meant by the term “centrally managed transportation system” – one for the entire region or for each subregion?
P	The EIS or a related study should analyze whether the existing institutional structure for transportation planning and project implementation can and should be improved.
P	More analysis is needed for determining the appropriate “clean fuel technology” for Lake Tahoe’s transit vehicles.
P	The need for waterborne transit should be specifically emphasized.
P	What incentives will be developed to “encourage” the improvement of transportation infrastructure and programs? Will land coverage in low capability restoration rules be relaxed as an incentive?
P	Require all new road maintenance projects and new development to address the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians, consistent with the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. The Plan must contain strong provisions that do not allow permits to be

TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
	granted for any major road reconstruction projects in the Basin that do not contain both bicycle lanes and adequate water quality BMP provisions.
P	The EIS should evaluate the way in which the Tahoe Valley Airport fits into the Tahoe transportation network and integrate the need to develop a new Airport master plan into the new regional plan.
P	The EIS should examine alternatives to achieving clarity-reducing pollutant loads such as a decrease in or removal of the South Lake Tahoe Airport. There is substantial documentation indicating potentially significant environmental impacts (and known economic impacts) from the Airport. The EIS should also examine a variety of alternative options to decreasing loading to the Lake.
P	Include alternatives that focus on reducing vehicle use associated with travel into and out of the Basin (in addition to those to reduce vehicle use once visitors have arrived).
P	The EIS should analyze options where new development provides a net gain (versus “no significant impact”) to transportation needs.
P	The EIS should analyze different pavement options (which maintain public safety) and their impacts on water quality, air quality and noise.
P	The EIS should analyze requirements for frequent transit operations between the Reno/Tahoe Airport and benefits to VMT. Alternatives may include a mitigation fee program which directly supports these operations such that any development which will draw visitors that will use aircraft to travel pays into this fund.
P	What incentives will be developed to “encourage” the improvement of transportation infrastructure and programs? Will land coverage in low capability restoration rules be relaxed as an incentive?
P	It is essential that the Regional Plan Update aggressively support our need to promote and provide public transit and non-automobile access to public and private recreation opportunities.
P	Public transit access to recreation lands needs to be improved (it’s working on the west shore)
Q	Other
Q	The natural environment is interconnected and an “ecosystem restoration” approach would appear to be more appropriate than separating the forests from the watersheds.
Q	Define the Pathway Management approaches described in this section. Describe how and when the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), EIP, and Air Quality Plan (AQP) are going to be integrated and at what scale.
Q	Alternatives should be developed based on their ability to achieve selected ETCCs.
Q	EIS should have definitions of the planning terms used in the project description (smart growth, CFA ratios, centrally managed transportation, regional revenue source...)

<p style="text-align: center;">TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period September 5–October 5, 2007</p>	
Issue Area	Environmental Issue
Q	Focus on urban areas/ community cores/forest health is good, but how do we get there?
Q	Chapter 14 and 15 – clarify and expand TRPA roles.
Q	Incorporate methods for expanding delegation of functions through memorandum of understanding (MOU) to logical implementing agencies with the right of appeal to the TRPA Board.
Q	Regional Plan Goals such as “housing that strengthens neighborhoods” and “housing that matches needs of employers and employees” need to be defined, as well as a clear method for attainment.
Q	Overall there seems to be a lack of connectivity between the proposed amendments to the Regional Plan, Code of Ordinances, and Thresholds in the draft project description provided at the September APC and GB meetings. Reviews of each section did not, in many cases, include recommended changes to the Code of Ordinance language, compliance forms, or Standards and Indicators.
Q	The EIS should explain the purpose and need for all of the proposed changes and the connection to either existing or amended direction. For every updated goal or policy, there should be a corresponding basis for the change in the Thresholds and appropriate modification of the Codes. The EIS and project description need to clearly outline the purpose and rationale for why the attainment of environmental values needs to be accelerated, including background information about the historic and recent trends of important environmental indicators. Many parts of the scoping document focus on desired improvements in urban areas; it is very hard to understand how the existing system, especially the adopted Community Plans, will be modified to incorporate the concepts laid out in the scoping document.
Q	The EIS needs to define “net environmental gain” and “smart growth principles,” evaluate how each alternative would achieve these goals, and evaluate potential adverse effects or reduced benefits that may result. How can alternatives be crafted to maximize environmental benefits?
Q	Describe and define terms such as smart growth, green building, and transit-oriented development prior to drafting a preferred alternative so that exactly what is being proposed is clear. Also sensitive lot, hierarchical and watershed scale conservation plans, enhanced CFA rations, conversion incentives, centrally managed transportation systems, transit oriented development, complete streets, regional revenue source.
Q	Implementation
Q	The roles and jurisdictions of all the cooperating agencies need to be fully described and functional.
Q	Chapter 4: A clear definition of the roles and responsibilities between the Forest Service and TRPA is critical.
Q	Consideration should be given to expanding not just clarifying the roles and responsibilities of TRPA and its MOU partners
Q	Public Service
Q	Include sewage export and collection system improvements for the aging system and resulting harmful failures.

**TRPA Regional Plan Update EIS
Environmental Issues Raised During the Scoping Period
September 5–October 5, 2007**

Issue Area	Environmental Issue
Q	<i>Shorezone</i>
Q	Incorporate shorezone structure regulation into new plan.
Q	<i>Subdivisions</i>
Q	The 1987 consensus process created some unusual regulations such as the two-step process allowing prohibited subdivisions. These provisions should be removed.
Q	The EIS should include an alternative that eliminates to the two-step process for permitting otherwise prohibited subdivisions.