

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, April 12, 2017** at the **TRPA Offices**, located at **128 Market Street, Stateline, NV**. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

April 5, 2017

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Joanne S. Marchetta". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Joanne S. Marchetta  
Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
Stateline, NV

April 12, 2017  
9:30 a.m.

---

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 listed or not listed on the agenda may do so at this time. TRPA encourages public comment on items on the agenda to be presented at the time those agenda items are heard. Individuals or groups commenting on items listed on the agenda will be permitted to comment either at this time or when the matter is heard, but not both.

All public comments should be as brief and concise as possible so that all who wish to speak may do so; testimony should not be repeated. The Chair shall have the discretion to set appropriate time allotments for individual speakers (3 minutes for individuals and 5 minutes for group representatives as well as for the total time allotted to oral public comment for a specific agenda item). No extra time for speakers will be permitted by the ceding of time to others. Written comments of any length are always welcome. So that names may be accurately recorded in the minutes, persons who wish to comment are requested to sign in by Agenda Item on the sheets available at each meeting. In the interest of efficient meeting management, the Chair reserves the right to limit the duration of each public comment period to a total of 2 hours. In such an instance, names will be selected from the available sign-in sheet. Any individual or organization that is not selected or otherwise unable to present public comments during this period is encouraged to submit comments in writing to the Advisory Planning Commission. All such comments will be included as part of the public record.

*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 HEARINGS

- A. 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional  
Transportation Plan/Sustainable  
Communities Strategy and Amendment  
of Regional Plan, Transportation Goals and Policies

**Recommendation**      **Page 1**

	B. Review and recommendation on Watercraft Inspection Fee Structure	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b><u>Page 39</u></b>
VI.	PLANNING MATTERS		
	A. Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program Update	<b>Informational Only</b>	<b><u>Page 45</u></b>
	B. Transportation Measures Working Group: Overview of Existing Transportation Measures and Related Matters <i>(at the conclusion of the APC Meeting)</i>	<b>Discussion and Possible Direction to Staff</b>	<b><u>Page 47</u></b>
VII.	REPORTS		
	A. Executive Director	<b>Informational Only</b>	
	B. General Counsel	<b>Informational Only</b>	
	C. APC Members	<b>Informational Only</b>	
VIII.	PUBLIC COMMENT		
IX.	ADJOURNMENT		



TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA  
Stateline

March 8, 2017

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Teshara called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

Members present: Mr. Buelna, Ms. Carr, Mr. Esswein, Ms. Ferris, Mr. Guevin, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Hymanson, Ms. Krause, Mr. Larsen, Ms. McClung, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Teshara, Mr. Trout, Mr. Weavil

Members absent: Mr. Donohue, Mr. Drew, Washoe Tribe representative

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Larsen moved approval.  
Mr. Hymanson seconded the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Teshara provided his comments to Ms. Ambler  
Mr. Larsen moved approval of the February 8, 2017 minutes as amended.  
Mr. Guevin seconded the motion.  
Mr. Teshara and Mr. Trout abstained.  
Motion carried.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Draft – Linking Tahoe: 2017 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Ms. Marchetta said the Transportation Initiative was one of seven that the Governing Board prioritized two years ago. This initiative has three components; Vision, Funding, and Measures. Today's presentation is focused on the long-term vision and the plan update that

looks out to the year 2040. TRPA is required to update the Regional Transportation Plan every four years. When this plan comes forward for adoption the Governing Board will represent three entities; the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, TRPA, and the California Regional Transportation Planning Authority. A timely approval is necessary as a predicate to the continued receipt of Federal Transportation funding. The second part of the initiative is related to funding which was discussed at the Governing Board retreat in February. At that meeting, there was a willingness to engage with the two states to convene a task force to start addressing some of the long-term funding strategies for Transportation. The third aspect is Measures, ensuring that the plan has the intended results. It will be completed after the adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan.

TRPA team member Ms. Beryl provided an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

A goal of the plan is to better manage congestion by providing seamless round the Lake transit service that is free and frequent to the user, connect trail systems, use technology to provide real time information on parking availability, bus arrival times, travel times to destinations, and more alternative fuel charging stations. This long-term vision addresses the Tahoe Basin and Northern California and Nevada “megapolitan” regions.

Our roadways are geographically constrained; therefore, we need to more efficiently manage the roadways and provide park and ride locations. Through the implementation of the RTP there will be approximately 17 corridor revitalization projects around the region.

Today, most routes have a one hour service, there are limited recreation site services, no year-round north and south shore connections, and limited interregional service. With the implementation of this plan, they expect to see 30-minute frequency on most main routes, new services from Meyers to Stateline, new and expanded service to Truckee, increased and new service to recreational sites, free to the user transit on all in Basin services, and increased but still limited interregional services.

Active transportation facilities include bike lanes, shared use paths, crosswalks, and sidewalks for safe and convenient access. Through implementation, there will be 25 miles of additional shared use paths, 20 of those miles are within the next four years and already have secured and guaranteed funding. This will be coupled with innovation and technology by applying alternative fuel charging infrastructure including hydrogen cells, electric vehicle and zero emission vehicles. It also means providing real time information on changeable message signs, on mobile phone apps and online.

Newer data states that there are nearly ten million vehicles entering the region annually. By knowing where people are going, services and programs can be better planned. The focus needs to be on creating connections from town centers and neighborhoods to recreation sites. Outreach was done to over 800 public participants through surveys, community workshops, door to door visits, and multiple association meetings. In addition, four stakeholder meetings were held to discuss opportunities, challenges, and solutions by corridor and had over 50 technical advisory committee members who reviewed goals,

policies, and projects.

In 2012, they looked at walkable, bikeable neighborhoods. In 2017, the focus is on the Discover Tahoe travel behavior pattern; mid-length trips from town centers and neighborhoods to a recreation site. The Visit Tahoe travel behavior pattern is the longer distance trip of visitors and commuters traveling in and out of the region to visit Lake Tahoe. Fifty-five percent of trips are in that Discover Tahoe, mid-length distance trips, there are three different types of users; residents, visitors, and commuters. Lake Tahoe is a mountain resort destination and does not have a typical commute pattern.

Services need to be dynamic to the amount of people that are here in the region by planning for infrastructure and services for improved transit, trails, and technology. Those need to be coupled with transportation demand management incentive programs through the use of technology and partnerships with private and public entities and non-profits.

State, Federal, and Regional Agencies requires reporting on the performance measures, this plan does report on the existing performance measures. National best practices will be reviewed to ensure that the best measures are used for success.

The Advisory Planning Commission Working Group is developing potential measure best practices and will bring that forward to the Governing Board next month. Funding is also a major focus with this plan; the plan does provide for incremental progress towards the long-term vision.

Presentation can be viewed at:

<http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-V.A-Regional-Transportation-Plan.pdf>

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson asked how much funding is needed to implement the Regional Transportation Plan.

Ms. Beryl said they are required to have both a fiscally constrained and unconstrained list. The constrained list is what they see as foreseeably available funding. Some of that is annual formula funding and some of it is discretionary funding, where they would have to apply for it. The unconstrained list includes their long-term vision with high level estimates needed to implement that vision.

Mr. Hymanson asked if those totals for the constrained list is in the millions or billions.

Ms. Beryl said transit, trails and technology amounts are in the millions, however, looking at the constrained list as a whole, the amount is in the billions.

Ms. Hill asked if there is anything in the Regional Transportation Plan for private transportation incentives.

Ms. Beryl said after the Regional Transportation Plan is approved staff will conduct a stakeholder process where they will review national best practices in transportation demand management that includes financial incentives, discounts, etc. Additionally, the transportation trip planning tool will include a public private partnership to include financial incentives and other types of items.

Ms. Hill said she was referring more to the private relationships. For example, if someone wanted to fund the replacement of the Tahoe Queen service to Emerald Bay with waterborne transit, she asked if that would something that TRPA could approve and could the environmental review process be streamlined.

Ms. Marchetta said staff would accept an application for review if a private partner submitted one that was within TRPA's jurisdiction.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Jennifer Quashnick, Friends of the West Shore said there is a lot of encouraging information in this Regional Transportation Plan and it is laid out well. On a recent Sunday afternoon, the City of South Lake Tahoe issued a traffic alert stating that traffic from the Y to Meyers was four hours. They were encouraged by the Board's discussion at the retreat to look at more aggressive, less politically desirable solutions such as a Basin road user fee. They suggested that this be started soon because it will be a long-term process to get buy ins and the resources to do that. The adaptive roadway management also looks like a promising way to help but is on the unconstrained project list because of funding and buy in.

Shannon Eckmeyer, League to Save Lake Tahoe said they will submit written comments before the March Governing Board meeting. They are excited about the Regional Transportation Plan and feel it will provide a road map for local jurisdictions with area planning and corridor planning for the Tahoe Transportation District. It will also provide the League with funding needs that they can use to lobby in Washington DC and Sacramento to bring sustainable funding to Lake Tahoe to improve public transit. They are in support of the parking management strategy and a Basin entry fee. Their comments will also suggest an interim not net vehicle miles traveled policy. Although, the Advisory Planning Commission working group, the Development Rights working group, and the Regional Transportation Plan are all long-term strategies to look at the transportation and traffic issues in Lake Tahoe, however they feel this type of policy should be adopted now. This does not mean a moratorium, it means appropriate redevelopment within town centers and innovative solutions for mitigation if there is increased traffic associated with redevelopment.

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson asked if the Governing Board's direction to staff to work with both states on funding strategies, includes working with local governments and considering "out of the box" solutions or funding mechanisms.

Ms. Marchetta said yes.



Mr. Teshara said what he has observed at some of the Regional Transportation Plan presentations is that people want more detail on items such as transit and the transportation corridor plans around the Basin. There are several plans that come out subsequent to this, that will integrate and be part of the transportation picture. Currently, the Tahoe Transportation District is finalizing the Lake Tahoe Basin Transit Master Plan which gets to the Discover Tahoe part of this where there is now data that shows where people are coming from and going to. There is more detail to come in the Transit Master Plan, as well as the corridor plans. It is a comprehensive multimodal review, not just looking at one type specific transportation, but rather the whole picture. He is encouraged by where we are at right now and feels they are turning the corner with technology being a large part of it.

Ms. Beryl said the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) Tracker shows every project in the Regional Transportation Plan with descriptions and funding needed to deliver the project.

Mr. Weavil asked what are the long-term ideas for travel between the Bay Area, Sacramento, and Lake Tahoe.

Ms. Beryl said on the constrained list, this plan includes increasing frequency on interregional transit service from Sacramento, the Bay Area, and Reno. Some of the longer-term visions are to increase passenger service on rail and provide mobility hubs at airports and strategically placed locations within cities. Adaptive roadway management would also help to make using transit more attractive. For example, holding traffic during certain times to give busses priority to pass through the traffic. This is a way to operate more efficiently and encourage alternative modes of transportation.

Ms. Marchetta said that will be the focus in 2021. This year staff is starting to do outreach with the partners of other Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Council of Governments across Northern Nevada and California to build the dialogue of how to work together on this.

Ms. Hill said Incline Village has a Facebook page that has information about road conditions, carpooling options, etc. She asked if the Regional Transportation Plan will have anything like that.

Mr. Beryl said social media can be a transportation trip planning tool that crowd sources information. Staff is looking at the different functionalities that this could provide.

Mr. Hester said at the Metro-North Tahoe Gateway Workshop one of the ideas discussed was how to fund an information site that had travel options from the Bay Area and Sacramento to Lake Tahoe on bus, Amtrak, Ride Sharing, etc. This could possibly be less than \$100,000 to develop. There are a lot of out of the box ideas that are affordable and would provide better information.

Ms. Carr said the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection in Carson City installed a vehicle charging station and learned that if they allowed the public to use that charging

station and charged them for the power, they became an electric utility regulated by the Public Utilities Commission. They have chosen to absorb that cost of electricity which could be several thousands of dollars per year. It should be taken into consideration what types of incentives are being used that could offset costs for these types of investments.

Ms. Beryl said TRPA has received a number of grants to help with Plug in Electric Vehicles readiness planning and are now moving into an implementation phase. They are taking a systematic approach to identify barriers or challenges.

Mr. Hester said when the Plug in Electric Vehicles plan was announced, there were a number of private charging providers that offered to put in chargers once locations are selected.

## VI. PLANNING MATTERS

### A. Review and Recommendation on Work Plan for the Transportation Measures Working Group

TRPA team member Ms. Maloney provided an overview of the performance measures for the Transportation Strategic Initiative.

TRPA received significant feedback on the vehicle miles traveled standard during the development of the 2015 Threshold Evaluation. The Regional VMT standard establishes a goal of a ten percent reduction in regional daily VMT from the 1981 values. The standard was assessed as in attainment and has been assessed as in attainment since 2007. Stakeholder feedback contained recommendations for additional VMT base standards and suggestions for how VMT could be used to evaluate projects and guide policy. The feedback was motivated by a suite of concerns and range from water quality to noise to other concerns for which stakeholders perceived the VMT standard to be the closest surrogate. Recent federal legislation has also prompted renewed thinking about how performance can be measured for transportation planning. Tahoe's designation as a Transportation Management Agency; "big boy Metropolitan Planning Agency" under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act requires development of a congestion management process and additional strengthening of our performance based planning framework. Additional California State requirements are also changing the transportation measures discussion and landscape. On February 22, 2017, the Environmental Improvement Program Committee endorsed the creation of a working group to address these multiple needs around performance measures for transportation. They endorsed that the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission be the convening body for this working group. The working group was charged with surveying the transportation measures landscape to identify state of the practice for measuring and reporting on transportation related issues. They asked that the working group engage transportation experts and planners at Federal, State, Regional, and local levels and for the group to provide a white paper by the July 2017 Governing Board meeting.

During the drafting of this work program staff started with comments from the Governing Board's Environmental Improvement Program Committee meeting on January 25, 2017,

comments from the Advisory Planning Commission's February 8 workshop, and considered the project schedule and available staff resources.

The mission statement is to survey the transportation landscape to compile data and concepts on transportation measures and prepare a white paper that can be used to inform future transportation policy decisions including those related to congestion management. Staff recommends that the working group be comprised of all the Advisory Planning Commission members, one representative from the environmental community and one from the business and tourism community. Members of the community not included in the working group will be encouraged to participate in this process.

The taxonomy; categories, values, or goals is what the survey of the landscape will address. The taxonomy is the framing of the white paper, it was developed through looking at federal transportation goals and measures, other transportation planning organizations such as the Sacramento Council of Governments and Washoe Regional Transportation Commission, and the TRPA Bi State Compact and Regional Plan Goals and Policies. The proposed taxonomy is broad and inclusive to service as functional categories for the white paper and focused to facilitate a Tahoe centric review.

The follow seven categories are proposed by staff:

- Air Quality (greenhouse gas emissions measures)
- Water Quality (pollutant loading)
- Reliance on Automobile (transit ridership and mode share)
- Safety (crashes and fatalities)
- Congestion (levels of service)
- Quality of Life (travel time to work and visitor experience)
- State of Good Repair (infrastructure and pavement condition)

A key component of the survey will be engagement and outreach to experts such as transportation professionals and other organizations in the transportation field. Federal, State, Regional, local and other organizations have been identified to serve as sources of measures. This list is a representative sample of the organizations from every level of government and planning.

Presentation can be viewed at:

[http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.VI\\_A-Transportation-Measures-Working-Group.pdf](http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.VI_A-Transportation-Measures-Working-Group.pdf)

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Larsen said the draft work plan reflects what was discussed at last month's meeting.

Mr. Hymanson asked how the Transportation Measures Working Group will integrate with the Advisory Planning Commission members.

Ms. Maloney said the Advisory Planning Commission regular meeting would adjourn and then reconvene as the Transportation Measures Working Group with the additional members participating at the table.

Mr. Teshara said it will be the same as what was done for the residential allocations working group.

Mr. Hymanson said the list under taxonomy is a complete and good list. He asked if there has been any discussion on the architecture beyond the list of these seven items.

Mr. Hester said Agenda Item VI.C, Advisory Planning Commission role and Threshold Assessment may answer that question.

Mr. Hymanson said in terms of the taxonomy it is good to have a list of individual items but it would also be of value to put thought into how those interact and is there a need to have a way to roll it up to a higher order. For example, the natural environment and the human environment.

Mr. Larsen said he had suggested side boards at the last meeting. He agreed that more work can be done to figure out if there are better ways to integrate. He looks forward to flushing this out and better integrate and discuss this in the larger threshold conversation.

Mr. Hymanson suggested staff contact the Colorado Department of Transportation. He feels they have parallel habitats and issues.

Ms. Maloney said staff will add the Colorado Department of Transportation to the list. The interactions between these different categories is something that they should be keeping in mind and if it makes sense and resources allow, she agreed that the interactions between different categories should be added in whatever way they can.

Mr. Teshara said some of that may come from talking to others who have best practices in place about how they have integrated some of these items.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Jennifer Quashnick, Friends of the West Shore said they look forward to collaborating with this working group. In terms of the taxonomy and trying to figure out how items may be grouped; there might be an environmental grouping with air quality, water quality, noise, and other potential impacts that might come up.

Shannon Eckmeyer, League to Save Lake Tahoe said the League supported this work plan. They suggested outreach to the following entities the Colorado Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Aspen Colorado, California Office of Planning and Research, the Natural Resources Defense Council, City of San Francisco, City of Pasadena, and the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy.

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Teshara suggested that the California Association of Councils of Government be added.

Ms. Carr suggested Zion and Yosemite National Parks be added.

Ms. Maloney proposed collapsing air quality and water quality into an environmental category and include air quality, water quality, and noise as examples. This would leave options for additional environmental measures if they come up. She suggested adding evacuation measures as an example under the safety category. All suggestions received to date from the League to Save Lake Tahoe, Ms. Quashnick, and the Advisory Planning Commission will be added to the work plan. Any additional suggestions that come up can also, be included in the white paper as well.

Mr. Larsen made a motion to recommend the Work Plan as amended by comments made at today's meeting and Ms. Maloney's suggestions listed above.

Mr. Esswein seconded the motion.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

B. Development Rights Strategic Initiative Status Report

TRPA team member Ms. Cannon provide an overview of the Development Rights Strategic Initiative Status Report.

This initiative looks at "commodities" needed for residential, commercial and tourist lodging development. TRPA has a Transfer of Development Rights program to steer new development outside of the rural environmentally sensitive areas into the town centers.

Advisory Planning Commission member, Mr. Trout and Ms. Merchant from the Placer County Executive Office are the APC representatives on this working group. PlaceWorks Consulting Team was also selected to assist the working group. The working group has had three meetings since last Fall.

Accomplishments have been to establish a mission for the initiative and a scope of work. The working group selected and refined criteria and goals for how the alternatives will be evaluated.

Mr. Pruetz, Planning and Implementation Strategies provided an overview of the best practices.

Transferable Development Rights (TDR) are a mechanism for steering development from a place you want to conserve to a place where you want to develop. Developers get to build up to a minimum threshold in the receiving area, but to exceed that threshold, they have to contribute to environmental protections in the sending area. It is a suspicion that the

Transferable Development Rights program is one of the hindrances to the revitalization of the town centers. The Tahoe system is one of the most complicated systems in the nation.

The Best Practices Report looked at dozens of programs throughout the United States. They narrowed it down to 24 features that were most relevant to the problems in the Tahoe Basin. Some of the issues heard are that it is too costly for developers and there is too much uncertainty. The 24 features were put into five groups:

1. Development Rights Costs (1-15)
2. System Complexity (16)
3. Improve Predictability (17-18)
4. Increase Flexibility (19-20)
5. Workforce Housing (21-24)

They used the last Development Rights Working Group meetings to create four subgroups including one that was composed of community members to define the features to be put into alternative packages that should be subject to additional study. Particularly additional economic analysis.

All four groups identified taking all the existing commodities with the exception of the land capability transfer program and make them into a single currency such as a development credit (feature 16). The benefit to that is it would reduce the complexity and create a larger market.

Another item suggested for further analysis was to eliminate the local veto of the inter-jurisdictional transfers (feature 17). Local Governments have the ability to not allow the transfers outside of their jurisdiction. A few of the subgroups wanted to dispose of that regulation altogether and a couple of them agreed to have that but suggested setting up some safe guards. The suggestion was to have at least enough leftover so each jurisdiction could complete and accomplish its own local planning.

There were three of the four groups that agreed to look further into density transfer charges; cash in lieu (feature 2). Instead of the developers bringing actual commodities or Transferable Development Rights to the table, they could decide to write a check. If the amount of that check is known in advance, it is helpful to the economic analysis for the projects. There is a strong likelihood that if the banks are going to be selling the Transferable Development Rights for less than cost, there will need to be mechanisms to fund these banks.

All four groups agreed to increase reliance on non-Transferable Development Rights sources to fund preservation (feature 7).

At least two of the four groups agreed upon to sell Transferable Development Rights bank commodities at prices that developers can afford (feature 1). This would help address the Development Rights Costs to make the public entities "banks" be able to buy transferable

development rights “commodities” and hold them and sell them at prices developers can afford.

Another way of generating cash for the Transferable Development Rights banks (currently a TDR is required for an additional or bonus dwelling unit) is to create a threshold within an individual residential unit. To exceed that one would have to buy Transferable Development Rights or would have to pay the Density Transfer Charge (DTC) or cash in lieu. This in reference to Feature 9, allow bonus floor area for individual dwelling units.

Set area-specific Density Transfer Charge requirements for bonus density (feature 4). Some agreed that they should look further during the economic phases analysis.

There is at least one program in the United States that defers the time at which a person would have to bring a TDR or pay the Density Transfer Charge to actual closing of the development product that was built with that TDR. The bonus for the developer is that they not have the carrying costs. This is in reference to Feature 12, optional deferral of DTC compliance until lots are sold.

Transferrable Development Rights banks discounts the sale price for bonus workforce and affordable housing units (feature 24). The Transferrable Development Rights program is considered to be constraining the development of affordable housing. Some programs sell TDR's to developers at reduced price if that TDR is being used to create a bonus affordable unit. Some felt this should be explored more.

The groups were split on the use Transferrable Development Rights as a matter of right, with less discretionary review (feature 18). In general, the developers often don't know until the last vote, whether their project is going to be approved, if there is going to be additional costs imposed, or the project may be changed.

Some of the features generated from these sub groups that were not part of the 24 features.

If the banks are subsidizing the price of Transferrable Development Rights, maybe there is a way to recapture those costs after the project that used the TDR's is done and producing profit. It could be informal such as getting more real estate tax base or transient occupancy tax or in a formal manner such as a development agreement that would include repayment in a specified amount of years.

There is a lot of concern amongst the Development Rights Working Group of the problem of the conversion of tourist lodging into defacto affordable housing. The question was how to address those high priority sending sites. One idea was to give them more Transferrable Development Rights to sell. It was also suggested to combine it with the environmental restoration authority that exists with TRPA and the California Tahoe Conservancy. To the extent possible some of these ideas could be tested through pilot programs. Another comment from the group was that this is a cap and trade system; there is not a lot of excess

development capacity in the system and maybe the system should allow more TDR's for free.

There were many ideas to incentivize work force housing. If in fact we are going to be addressing some of these issues of moving people out of affordable housing that was formally created by tourist lodging, there needs to be housing that these people can move into. There may be some procedural items needed such as granting more authority for the California Tahoe Conservancy to operate in non-wetland areas.

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Ms. Hill said that the Density Transfer Charge (DTC) seems like anyone willing to write a check could develop whatever they want. The point of the commodity transfer is to keep a limit on the amount of development.

Rick Pruetz, Planning & Implementation Strategies said the 25 programs that he is aware of that use the Density Transfer Charge (DTC) approach don't have the concerns that the Tahoe program does with dealing with a development cap that must be maintained. It may work in Tahoe if there is a strong belief that when the developer is "writing this check", you could preserve the land that is being granted. You could buy the Transferrable Development Rights (TDR) that is represented in that receiving site project, or there are banks that could have a rich inventory of all the TDRs that the DTC is written, and whether or not it covers the full cost of what the Transferrable Development Rights spent to buy those, the TDR bank then extinguishes those TDRs. That accounting system would stay intact. There has to be a mechanism to ensure that if there is a DTC program, it is doing the same as a TDR program would do.

Ms. Hill asked why the development rights aren't being transferred if they are going to be eliminated from the sending parcel.

Mr. Marshall said it is similar to excess coverage mitigation fee. There is an option on site to mitigate excess coverage either by retiring them onsite, offsite retiring, or paying the fee. That fee is then used to retire coverage elsewhere in the Basin by the California Tahoe Conservancy or Nevada State Lands. You would have to utilize the proceeds from the fee to meet the cap policies, whether it is reduction coverage, reduction in a tourist accommodation unit, or whatever units are being built or their equivalents.

Rick Pruetz, Planning & Implementation Strategies said the payments will go the banks to buy the commodities.

Mr. Larsen asked if there was analysis done and is it accomplishing the goal. He said many people have concerns that residences are being used as tourist accommodation units and not actually being accounted for as such. If tourist accommodation units were established as a way to manage visitor ship and development rights were established to accomplish some degree of environmental protection, development, and rate control. He asked where are we and how is the system functioning to achieve that goal, have those goals shifted and how



does any adjustment in the system begin to accomplish and achieve the benefits?

Rick Pruetz, Planning & Implementation Strategies said the question of whether the tourist accommodation units be required of Airbnb, etc. will be addressed by a different committee. They are unsure if it is accomplishing what is it supposed to until they do the economic studies on how much developers can contribute to further environmental preservation. There is a good chance that it is not as much as having them accomplish what this program hoped in the beginning, but he believed that the economic study will find that they can help out in some respect. He feels that it is worth looking into maintaining the Transferrable Development Rights program in order to get as much bang for the buck as out of the development process. There are many needs and you have to look at every resource you can.

Mr. Hester said the Development Rights Working group asked staff to look at the adopted local and regional plans and convert that to how many development rights there are and see if the local plans could substitute for a development rights system.

Mr. Marshall said part of the ranking criteria of the selection of the measures, eventually include effectiveness.

Mr. Larsen said there is a concern and perspective that the system was established to control the rate and extent to some degree. Whether or not that is necessary, warranted, or otherwise achievable or has been achieved, it brings us to the larger question of the efficacy and value of the system holistically.

Mr. Guevin asked if there are different banks for different areas of the region for how the development can be laid out as a regional approach.

Rick Pruetz, Planning & Implementation Strategies said there are banks in operation, but they are limited. What is envisioned by some of these features is a more robust system that gets funded by different sources, including additional public funding from the same avenues that are used for any other programs. For example, if there was a threshold with an individual residential unit, we do not know what the demand for that is but it could be quite great and would be an additional way of funding the work of the bank. This would be needed if they are selling these at a loss.

Mr. Guevin said he is concerned that the developers that have the money, "have the money" and those people that don't have the money, "do not." There are single family homes that are subdivided four to eight times to accommodate affordable housing. There are dangerous situations occurring when landlords are splitting their duplexes into fourplexes. We need the local workforce to have affordable housing available.

Mr. Hester said there is a housing task force that has been created by the local governments that has convened meetings and are addressing those issues. When you get out of the Basin, commodities are referred to as Development Rights.

March 8, 2017

Mr. Trout said the Development Rights Working group is great and is appreciative that he is working with them.

Ms. Cannon said there is a fact sheet eight that is located on the project website that outlines their goals.

Ms. Cannon said the Fiscal Impact Analysis was initiated after TRPA was awarded a grant from the California Strategic Growth Council for technical assistance in the form of consulting services to perform a fiscal impact analysis on various land use scenarios. Normally there would only be allowed to have one local jurisdiction for this analysis, a request was granted to have two local jurisdictions so that the analysis would be more broadly applicable. The Development Rights Working Group will look at the City of South Lake Tahoe and Placer County. This analysis will look at the long and short term revenue shifts for the public sector for different land use scenarios. The working group will review the status quo growth that has been seen over the past couple of decades and the second land use scenario is town center development where there is more infill development in the centers. The last scenario to be addressed is less development with a buyout program. It is anticipated that the results will be available in April.

Presentation can be viewed at:

<http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-VI.B-Development-Rights-Working-Group-1.pdf>

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson under the analysis of the three different scenarios; Existing (baseline), Compact center development, and less development (Buyout), is that land retirement without further development of that land?

Ms. Cannon said that is correct. It is looking at the Transferrable Development Rights bank buyout program.

#### Public Comments & Questions

None

### C. Advisory Planning Commission Role in Threshold Assessment

Mr. Hester provided an update on the Threshold Update Initiative and the Advisory Planning Commission's role in the Threshold Assessment.

The assessment phase will be to create a knowledge base of informed decisions about the strengths and weaknesses of a standard and the data behind the standard. The assessment will be done through smart criteria; specific, measurable, attributable, relevant, and time bound.

The prioritization phase will be worked through incrementally based on priority.

The update phase will include the substantive work to update the prioritized measures within the groups. This will be a 12-step process.

March 15, 2017, staff will provide the Tahoe Science Advisory Council a revised Threshold assessment that incorporated their initial feedback. On March 27, the Council will be considering the revised assessment. Staff will start to work with key partners on April 3 to look at the individual standards through that smart analysis format. On May 4, staff will take this to the Tahoe Interagency Executive (TIE) Steering Committee. The Advisory Planning Commission will review the draft assessment on May 10. From May 10 to June 14, the Advisory Planning Commission and the public will be invited to engage on this assessment. On June 14, the Advisory Planning Commission will have review of the final assessment and prioritization.

Presentation can be viewed at:

[http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-VI.C-APC\\_Threshold-Assessment.pdf](http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/Agenda-Item-No.-VI.C-APC_Threshold-Assessment.pdf)

#### Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Hymanson said there is a Threshold assessment that looks in depth at the existing set of Threshold standards and then the Tahoe Science Advisory Council is going to launch an effort to look at other systems to see how they address any issues in a programmatic and ongoing way. He cautioned that if the current system is being assessed in a vigorous way and being compared to other systems, it can either come together and integrate and result in recommendation for change or they can collide. It becomes particularly tricky with managing expectations.

Mr. Hester said staff is receptive to any suggestions. To keep this moving we need to start “eating the elephant one bite at a time.”

#### Public Comments & Questions

Jennifer Quashnick, Friends of the West Shore asked that the Threshold assessment report is issued for public review as soon as possible.

## VII. REPORTS

### A. Executive Director

- 1) Strategic Initiatives Monthly Status Report  
No further report.
- 2) 2016 Annual Report

Ms. Marchetta provided some of the highlights of 2016 Annual Report.

Environmental Improvement Program: Last year there were significant steps to renew the foundation of the EIP with the successful Presidential Summit and the passage of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA) in December 2016. President Obama's comments placed Lake Tahoe among the most important large landscape restoration initiatives and worthy of federal attention. The LTRA gave us the means to continue that renewed federal commitment with an authorization of up to \$415 million over the next seven years. We are already positioning in Washington, D.C. for the future appropriations. On the ground EIP progress; there are hundreds of projects, with many underway and some already completed.

Forestry: Forest Health is being evolved to the next generation. In response to the dead and dying trees in the Sierras the (Bi State) Tahoe Tree Mortality Task Force was developed as an offshoot of the California statewide task force. Planning for the long-term forest resilience, the Lake Tahoe West collaborative was formed with TRPA, California Tahoe Conservancy, and the US Forest Service as part of the core team.

Current Planning, Compliance and Enforcement, and Research and Analysis are moving TRPA into automation and technology improvements. Work is being performed better, faster, and more streamlined. We are moving into online permitting. Converting paper transactions into electronic versions, real time permitting and authorizations in the field and starting digitizing Mylar maps last year. The Welcome Mat Initiative coordinates with external governments and agencies to streamline the permitting process. The 2015 Threshold Evaluation Report was completed and confirmed that the Basin is experiencing steady incremental progress toward the environmental goals. The goal is to make the Threshold Evaluation available in real time. In 2013, quarterly and annual reports were being created. We are on track and on schedule with all of our strategic initiatives; Development Rights, Stormwater, Shoreline, Aquatic Invasive Species, Threshold Update, Forest Health and the Transportation initiative.

The Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan was the fourth Area Plan to be adopted along with the approval of the Tahoe City Lodge Project.

#### B. General Counsel

Mr. Marshall said the use of your personal device in your official capacity does not protect any communication relating to your duties as a TRPA Advisory Planning Commission member. For emails, he recommended using an account that is only used for TRPA business or always copy your public account if you conduct any business on your personal account.

#### C. APC Members

Mr. Hymanson said the second meeting of the Tahoe Science Advisory Commission will be held on March 16, 2017. One of the topics will be the Council's part in the Threshold Update Initiative and assessment.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

March 8, 2017

Mr. Guevin said the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team (TFFT) and their Fire Public Information Team (Fire PIT) will be holding the Angora Fire Summit on June 24, 2017 as part of the ten-year anniversary of the Angora Fire.

Mr. Teshara said two of the six bills (SB197 and SB 198) addressing Nevada's share of the Environmental Improvement Program that came out of the Tahoe Oversight Committee during the last interim is being heard today at the Senate Committee on Government Affairs hearing.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Teshara adjourned the meeting at 11:56 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board

*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) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review.*





**MEMORANDUM**

Date: April 5, 2017  
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission  
From: TRPA Staff  
Subject: Recommendation of Approval of the Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

---

Requested Action: Recommendation to TRPA Governing Board to approve 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend approval of 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Required Motions: To recommend approval of the 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy as contained within **Attachment A**, the APC must make the following motions. An affirmative recommendation requires a majority vote of the quorum present:

- I. A motion to make the findings required by Compact Articles IV and VII and Code of Ordinances Chapter 3 and 4, including a finding of no significant effect, for adoption of the 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, as provided in **Attachment C**.
- II. A motion to recommend Governing Board adoption of Ordinance 2017-\_\_\_, amending Ordinance 87-9, as previously amended, to amend TRPA’s Regional Plan to incorporate the 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy **Attachment E**.

Background: On February 22, 2017, TRPA/TMPO released a Draft of Linking Tahoe: 2017 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2017 RTP/SCS), and the associated environmental analysis in accordance with Article VII of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Chapter 3 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Comments on the 2017 RTP/SCS were accepted until March 24, 2017 at 5:00pm. The purpose of the comment period was to gather input from the public, Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC), APC and TRPA/TMPO Governing Board members on the Draft 2017 RTP/SCS. Staff will present at the April TRPA Governing Board the major public comment themes, staff responses, and updates to the Final 2017 RTP/SCS. The public comment received and responses will be included in the April Governing Board staff summary packet.

Plan Description: The 2017 Regional Transportation Plan sets forth a comprehensive transportation system to serve the travel needs of the Lake Tahoe Region and meet regional goals. The plan identifies a long-term vision, regional transportation goals and supportive projects, and policies and programs needed to meet these goals. The 2017 RTP/SCS is an update to the 2012 RTP (Mobility 2035) and as such identifies the projects, policies, and programs planned for implementation in the Tahoe Region through 2040. The 2017 RTP/SCS includes a transportation strategy package containing a financially constrained project list (i.e., identifies those projects for which reasonably available funding has been identified). The 2017 RTP/SCS establishes the regional blueprint for transportation and satisfies TRPA Compact, State, and Federal transportation planning requirements. The plan is developed to reduce the dependency on the private automobile per the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and implements the TRPA Regional Plan through an update of the Transportation Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies. Acting as the federally recognized Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), this plan satisfies federal planning requirements identified in 23 CFR 450. As an MPO in California, the plan also serves as the updated Sustainable Communities Strategy aimed at reducing mobile sources of greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with California SB 375.

Environmental Document Description: Concurrently on February 22, 2017, TRPA/TMPO issued a Notice of Intent and Notice of Availability (NOI/NOA) and a joint environmental document consisting of an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Environmental Checklist/Finding of No Significant Effect, referred to hereafter as the Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist (IS/IEC), for the proposed 2017 RTP/SCS (**Attachment B**). The IS/IEC examines the update in policy framework and project list from the 2012 RTP/SCS to the 2017 RTP/SCS and tiers from the 2012 RTP/SCS EIR/EIS. For the majority of impact topic areas, the changes in policy and project list provide no impacts not already disclosed by the 2012 environmental review (see Section 3.5, *Abbreviated Environmental Checklist*). For those environmental impact topic areas where the regulatory environment has changed and more detail is needed, a more detailed description and analysis is included (see *Section 3.4, Expanded Environmental Checklist*). These sections include: Transportation, Greenhouse Gases, Air Quality, Noise, and Aesthetics. The IS/IEC discloses no unmitigated significant impact and TRPA therefor intends to rely on the IS/IEC to support a Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Effect.

Public Comment Outreach: During the 30-day public comment period, TRPA staff presented at **five** public hearings. These included the March meetings for TRPA Governing Board and sub-committees including the Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) and Environmental Improvement Program Committee (EIP), and the APC and TTC. Additionally, staff presented at **14** individual association, advocacy groups and stakeholder meetings. Staff also held one-on-one meetings with local agency stakeholders.

Draft 2017 RTP/SCS Public Comment Recap: Over the 30-day public comment period, staff received a total of **46** public comments, from individuals, non-profits, advocacy groups, local jurisdictions, and state agencies. Staff responded to public comment through email, phone, and official response letters. A full public comment record will be included in the April TRPA Governing Board staff summary packet. Major public comment themes arose during this period. The major themes, staff response, and update to the final 2017 RTP/SCS are discussed below.



**1. Connections with Neighboring Regions:**

- a. Inclusion of boundary projects outside of the Tahoe Region, but providing connections to the Region

**Staff Response and Inclusion in Final 2017 RTP/SCS:**

In response to this request, Staff added a section to Chapter 2, under the section “Partnering and Collaboration” and added information to Figure 3.5 “Shared-Use Path Gaps.” Included in Chapter 2 on pages 2-4 is a discussion regarding the transit services and active transportation infrastructure planned for neighboring regions that will connect to or indirectly serve the Tahoe Region. This includes additional information on North Tahoe Resort Triangle, Douglas County’s Pony Express shared-use path, and Carson City’s single track path which will connect to the Tahoe Rim Trail. Figure 3.5 has been updated to include existing, funded, and unfunded share-use path facilities that express the plans for the North Tahoe Resort Triangle area and the importance of transportation planning across jurisdictional boundaries.

**2. Transit:**

- a. Support for increasing transit frequency
- b. Support for providing free-to-the-use transit
- c. Support for expanding hours and season of services

**Staff Response and Inclusion in Final 2017 RTP/SCS:**

Staff responded with appreciation for support of the many key focus areas and priority projects within the draft 2017 RTP/SCS. Many public comments underscored support for 30-minute transit service frequency, but noted that 15-minute service is preferred. Staff agrees that 15-minute service is preferable for certain high-use main routes and does reference this need in the plan, however also finds it prudent to first deliver 30-minute service to increase ridership to support the need and ridership of 15-minute service when delivered.

Free-to-the-user transit also received widespread support. Free-to-the-user transit is located on the constrained project list, but will require coordinated funding efforts to deliver within the next four years. Support for expanding service dates to longer seasons, and expanding hours of service was provided both in written public comment and at association meeting presentations. In particular, the Tahoe Truckee Community Collaborative explained that expanding season and hours of service will have a positive impact on lower-income and traditionally underserved communities. No changes were made based on these comments, as they reflected already existing strategies, policies, and projects.

**3. Congestion:**

- a. Support for transit prioritization
- b. Support for parking management strategies
- c. Support for new regional transportation funding

**Staff Response and Inclusion in Final 2017 RTP/SCS:**

Staff received many comment letters noting the intense congestion during peak seasons and weekends on entry corridors. Support for prioritizing transit, better managing parking, and new funding sources for the Region were expressed as a method for better managing congestion. Most of these strategies are proposed within the plan and are listed as projects. In response to the

support for new regional transportation funding, staff explained that a bi-state funding workgroup will be formed to look at all possible funding mechanisms to support priority transportation projects, that could also act as an incentive system. Importantly, implementing agencies also have the ability to bundle projects, programs, and strategies within the 2017 RTP /SCS to accelerate delivery, partnerships, and cost effective improvements. No changes were made based on these comments, as they reflected already existing strategies, policies, and projects.

**4. Multi-Modal:**

- a. Support for increasing bicycle carrying capacity on buses, specifically TTD’s Route 23.
- b. Support for maintaining year-round use on shared-use paths

**Staff Response and Inclusion in Final 2017 RTP/SCS:**

Staff received many comments related to bicycle carry capacity of South Shore Transit buses. Staff responded by connecting commenters with George Fink of the Tahoe Transportation District. Mr. Fink responded that the District is looking at purchasing a bicycle trailer for Route 23 and is looking for financial support. Staff connected Mr. Fink with Tahoe Area Mountain Bike Association (TAMBA) to encourage a public/ private partnership. Staff also received comments related to maintaining year-round use on shared-use paths. Staff responded by noting Policy 6.1 which states: “Preserve the condition of sidewalks and bicycle facilities and where feasible, maintain their year-round use.” Staff also pointed to the good work already underway by El Dorado, Placer, and Washoe counties, the City of South Lake Tahoe and Tahoe City Public Utility District. TRPA continues to encourage increased year-round maintenance through winter monitoring, and knowledge sharing through the Bikeway Partnership. No changes were made based on these comments, as they reflected already existing strategies, policies, and projects.

**5. Trails (Active Transportation):**

- a. General support for closing gaps in the shared-use path active transportation network.
- b. Support for new share-use path alignment from Meeks Bay to Rubicon Bay in conjunction with not supporting a bicycle route through Rubicon Estates<sup>1</sup>.

**Staff Response and Inclusion in Final 2017 RTP/SCS:**

Staff received comments in support of closing gaps on shared-use paths in general. Meeks Bay Vista Property Owners Association (MBVPOA) residents also sent comments specifically supporting a shared-use path that would connect Meeks Bay and Rubicon Bay, however this project is not on the 2017 RTP/SCS project list. Support for this path is coupled with not supporting a bicycle route through Rubicon Bay, which is also not on the 2017 RTP/SCS project list. Staff corresponded with multiple MBVPOA members regarding their request for a new path. Staff is assisting MBVPOA residents in communicating with the necessary public land managers and implementing agencies to further develop the feasibility of the proposed shared-use path connection. No changes were made based on these comments, as they reflected already existing strategies, policies, and projects.

---

<sup>1</sup> A bicycle route through Rubicon Estates was previously part of the 2010 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan but removed during the update of that plan, now called the 2016 Active Transportation Plan. This project has not been added back onto the project list in either the Active Transportation Plan or the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan. However, the new alignment suggested by the Meeks Bay Vista Property Owners Association is not yet on any project list as it still needs to be vetted by the necessary implementing and operating agencies.

2017 RTP/SCS Appendix A: Goals and Policies Updates: Staff received comments from the TRPA Governing Board Regional Plan Implementation Committee, the South Shore Transportation Management Association, the League to Save Lake Tahoe, Friends of the West Shore / Sierra Club on 2017 RTP/SCS Appendix A: Goals and Policies. Staff made many of the recommendations requested. **Attachment F** illustrates the changes made to the Goals and Policies in track changes.

Environmental Document Public Comment Recap: Staff received comments from Friends of the West Shore (FOWS) and the Tahoe Area Sierra Club (TASC) suggesting that the baseline traffic analysis include impacts from recently approved projects just outside the Region (Squaw Valley, Martis Valley West), post 2012 RPU Amendments, post-2014 (baseline year) traffic counts, and alleged land use changes regarding vacation home rentals. The IS/IEC traffic analysis did include changes to the transportation system and land use development patterns that have occurred, or are newly planned to occur, since adoption of the 2012 RTP as documented within Appendix D of the Draft RTP. After completion of the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan, TRPA initiated an update to the TransCAD model. The update applied 2010 Census demographic updates and incorporated data from a 2011 license plate survey. The data refinements better identified and responded to changing travel behavior in the Region. Notably, these refinements provided an updated accounting of several variables that serve as critical primary predictors of travel behavior for the TRPA model, including the overall percentage of full-time homeowners, secondary homeowners, commuters, and visitors to the region at the seven Basin-entry locations. The data refinements for this model update also included use of the latest US Census demographic and socioeconomic data (US Census 2010), including: resident vs. seasonal homeownership, persons per occupied dwelling unit, household income, and employment.

Some comments suggest that the existing baseline is artificially low and that the transportation analysis did not account for potential increases in economic activity, the temporary effects of drought, or other changes in visitation that could increase future traffic into and through the Region since 2014. The IS/IEC is based on a 2014 baseline. Other environmental review guidelines (e.g. CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, Environmental Setting) and judicial guidance on the subject of baseline have determined that the baseline against which a project's impacts should be compared is generally existing conditions at the time the analysis commenced unless special circumstances warrant a modified baseline. Because the modeling process is extremely lengthy, TRPA began development of the Regional Transportation Plan model inputs in the summer of 2015. Since land use regulations and information regarding existing and available development rights is constantly being updated, running the model necessitates selecting a cutoff date and loading the model with the best available data as of that date. TRPA selected December 31, 2014 as the cutoff date. Therefore, the modeled land-use scenario included all regulations and in place as of December 31, 2014, and all data on existing and planned development in place up to December 31, 2014, with the documentation available by August 2015. The TRPA Governing Board acknowledged this cut-off date at their June 24, 2015 meeting, and at that time, the most up to date traffic count information published by Caltrans and NDOT were the 2014 Traffic Counts. The IS/IEC traffic analysis was conducted by using the 2014 base year, prepared using the 2012 RPU/RTP Model land use inputs (2010 base year) updated using the most up-to-date information and forecasting methodology, described above and within RTP Appendix D. Therefore, the traffic analysis conducted for this RTP IS/IEC represents a 2014 land use scenario produced with the best available traffic model configuration available at the time the model was run.

Appendix D of the RTP contains detailed descriptions of the methods used for estimating overnight visitation (hotel/motel occupancies) and seasonal and vacation home use. Estimates of day-use visitation and addition of external trips from development adjacent to TRPA boundaries are also described within Appendix D: "In order to account for this additional traffic growth, TRPA staff conducted a series of sensitivity analyses to better characterize the anticipated increase in day-use visitation and increase in projected traffic counts along the two corridors. Within the modeling framework, day-use visitation was originally generated from the 2005 travel survey records and has since been updated with the 2010-2011 License Plate and Postcard Survey. External station cordon counts are then used to calibrate the day-use population size, which is then indexed to the overnight visitor population. Therefore, if the overnight visitor population increases, the day-use visitation component of the model increases accordingly. Another factor that affects the day use population in the model is increases in commercial center and recreational amenities (i.e. beach attractiveness and gaming). Each of these areas is assigned an attraction value, which influences the number of day visitors that are assumed to come to the Basin each day. To reflect the potential growth along the two north entry-corridors, TRPA staff made slight adjustments to the hotel-motel occupancies as well as to beach attractiveness factors to influence greater day-use visitation from the two projects along the SR 89 and SR 267 corridors. The purpose of the analysis was intended to match the forecasted entry volumes forecasted in the Squaw and Martis Valley analyses to be commensurate with the forecasted model values. The comparison of TRPA modeled traffic entry volumes and the modeled entry volumes by adjacent metropolitan planning organizations is shown in Table D.17 within Appendix D. For additional information concerning how the Lake Tahoe Transportation Model generates day visitation, refer to the Lake Tahoe Resident and Visitor Model; Model Description and Final Results, August 2007."

As described above, there are not special circumstances related to transportation modeling in the case of the IS/IEC that warrant a modified baseline. Thus, use of existing conditions as baseline is appropriate. Although traffic counts have increased slightly in the past few years, attempting to make a prediction on all the future factors that would influence population and travel behavior would be speculative. The future year traffic forecasts estimated by the TRPA travel demand model take into consideration reasonably expected growth in population, school enrollment, employment levels, and overnight and day use visitors due to release of new allocations, as presented in the Lake Tahoe Resident and Visitor Model Report (Parsons Brinckerhoff 2007).

Staff has considered the information suggested by FOWS/TASC and determines that none of it alters the conclusion that the proposed changes from the 2012 RTP to the 2017 RTP will not have an unmitigated significant adverse environmental impact.

Threshold Findings: TRPA Code Chapter 3 and 4 required findings are included in **Attachment C**, and the Threshold Indicators and Compliance Measures Tables are included in **Attachment D**.

Contact Information: If you have questions regarding this item, please contact Morgan Beryl, Senior Transportation Planner, TRPA, at (775) 589-5208 or [mberyl@trpa.org](mailto:mberyl@trpa.org)

Attachments:

- A. 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- B. 2017 RTP/SCS Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist

- C. Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy: Linking Tahoe Approval Findings
- D. Threshold Indicators and Compliance Measures Tables
- E. Ordinance 2017-\_\_\_\_
- F. Track Changes Version of the 2017 RTP/SCS Appendix A: Goals and Policies

#### Attachments

A: 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

B: 2017 RTP/SCS Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist

D: Threshold Indicators and Compliance Measures Tables

Attachments A, B, & D are available on the following website: <http://www.trpa.org/advisory-planning-commission-documents-april-12-2017/>

Attachment C  
Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy: Linking Tahoe  
Approval Findings

# REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY: LINKING TAHOE

## APPROVAL FINDINGS

### SECTION A. CHAPTER 3 -- REQUIRED FINDINGS:

1. Finding: The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure.

Rationale: Based on the completed California Environmental Quality Act Initial Study/Negative Declaration and TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist/Finding of No Significant Effect (IS/IEC), no significant environmental impacts have been identified as a result of the proposed Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2017 RTP/SCS). The IS/IEC evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the 2017 RTP/SCS and tiers from the TRPA/Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO), *Mobility 2035: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy EIR/EIS*, certified by the TMPO Board and the TRPA Governing Board on December 12, 2012 (RTP EIR/EIS).

The 2017 RTP/SCS evaluated by the IS/IEC makes some changes to the constrained project list, the vision, goals, policies, and programs of the 2012 RTP and includes the 2012 RPU land use strategy. The IS/IEC therefore analyzed the environmental impacts arising from changes over the existing 2012 RTP.

The IS/IEC is a program-level environmental document. All future projects identified in the IS/IEC are subject to the appropriate project-level environmental review and permitting. Project-level environmental documents will require identification of, and mitigation for, any potentially significant environmental impacts.



**SECTION B: TRPA CODE CHAPTER 4/COMPACT ARTICLE V(G) – REQUIRED FINDINGS:**

**TRPA Code Section 4.4 – Findings to Amend the Regional Plan, Including Goals and Policies, Code of Ordinances or Other Implementing Plans:**

1. **Finding:** The 2017 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 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:** Based on the analysis in the TRPA Staff Reports on the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan, the 2017 RTP/SCS IS/IEC, and the 2015 Threshold Evaluation (November 2016) the Governing Board finds the amendments to the Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan(RTP), are 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 (as amended).

As described in the accompanying Staff Report and the IS/IEC, the RTP amendments to TRPA’s Transportation Goals and Policies, and the RTP itself complement and accelerate implementation of the Regional Plan and its objectives: achievement and maintenance of Thresholds while planning for reasonable growth. As explained in the approval consistency findings below and in the IS/IEC, the 2017 RTP/SCS is consistent with the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, plan area statements and maps, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs with the mitigation measures included in the project. The approval findings relating to consistency and IS/IEC consistency analysis are incorporated herein by reference.

The Goals and Policies amendments and the 2017 RTP/SCS are otherwise consistent with and will not adversely affect all applicable compliance measures, indicators, additional factors and supplemental compliance measures and attainment of target dates as identified in the 2015 Threshold Evaluation.

For the 2017 RTP/SCS and the amendments’ specific mitigation measures, TRPA has identified in the IS/IEC an adequate means by which the mitigation measure’s effectiveness will be evaluated. To the extent that the amendments or the 2017 RTP/SCS would

result in direct or indirect physical environmental effects, the IS/IEC addressed all such effects. Therefore, no further mitigation is required.

Based on the foregoing and findings 2, 3 and 4 below, the Governing Board finds that adopting the 2017 RTP/SCS and RTP amendments will not adversely affect implementation of the entire Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs (as amended).

2. Finding: The Goals and Policies amendments and the project itself will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

Rationale: Based on the rationale for the foregoing finding, the analysis in the IS/IEC, the Staff Report, and TRPA Compact V(g) Findings below, and the 2015 Threshold Evaluation, the Governing Board finds Goals and Policies amendments and the 2017 RTP/SCS will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

This conclusion is based on the status review of the Threshold Standards in the 2015 Threshold Evaluation including target dates, interim targets, and compliance measures needed to achieve and maintain thresholds and the IS/IEC.

As discussed in the IS/IEC, there are no unmitigated adverse impacts to the Thresholds. The IS/IEC evaluated the proposed Goals and Policies amendments' potential impacts on environmental threshold carrying capacities. As explained in the Compact Article VII(d) and Chapter 3 Findings, which are incorporated herein by reference, changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the proposed amendments and project which avoid or reduce any significant adverse environmental effects of proposed amendments to a less than significant level.

3. Finding: Wherever stricter federal, state or local air and water quality standards apply for the Region, pursuant to Article V(d) of the TRPA Compact, the Goals and Policies amendments and the project itself meets or exceed such standards.

Rationale: Based on the rationale for the foregoing findings, the analysis in

the IS/IEC and TRPA Compact V(g) Findings below, and the 2015 Threshold Evaluation, the Governing Board finds the Goals and Policies amendments and the 2017 RTP/SCS will not cause the federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region to be exceeded.

Neither the Goals and Policies amendments, nor the RTP, themselves, affect or change the federal, state or local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region. As disclosed in the IS/IEC, these standards were used as criteria of significance where applicable and no unmitigable impacts were found.

4. Finding: The Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: **I. Introduction**

In 1980, Congress amended the Compact to accelerate the pace of environmental progress in the Tahoe Region by tasking TRPA with adopting a regional plan and implementing regulations that protect the unique national treasure that is Lake Tahoe. First, Article V (b) required that TRPA, in collaboration with Tahoe’s other regulatory agencies, adopt “environmental threshold carrying capacities” (thresholds or standards) establishing goals for a wide array of environmental criteria, including water quality, air quality, and wildlife. Second, Article V(c) directed TRPA to adopt a regional plan to “achieve and maintain” these thresholds, and to “continuously review and maintain” implementation of the plan.

The 1980 Compact instated an era of establishing and enforcing rigorous controls on new development. In 1982, TRPA adopted the necessary thresholds for the Tahoe Region. These thresholds are a mix of both long- and short-term goals for the Tahoe Region. The Region was in attainment of a number of these thresholds shortly after the adoption of the Regional Plan and remains in attainment today. Other thresholds address more intractable issues; for example, TRPA established numeric water quality standards that, even under best-case conditions, could not be attained for decades. *See, e.g., League to Save Lake Tahoe v. Tahoe Reg’l Planning Agency*, 739 F. Supp. 2d 1260, 1265 (E.D. Cal. 2010).

The second phase in this process was establishing a regional plan that, when implemented through rules and regulations, would ultimately achieve and maintain these thresholds over time. In 1987, following years of negotiation and litigation, TRPA adopted its Regional Plan. The 1987 plan employed a three-pronged approach to achieve and maintain the adopted environmental standards. First, the plan established a ceiling on development in the Region and restricted the placement, timing, and extent of new development. Second, the plan sought to prevent new harm to the environment as well as repair the environmental damage caused by existing development, particularly for projects that predated TRPA's existence. To this end, the plan created incentives to redevelop urbanized sites under more protective regulations and to transfer development out of sensitive areas that would then be restored. Third, TRPA adopted a capital investment program that was largely but not exclusively publicly funded to achieve and maintain thresholds by improving infrastructure and repairing environmental damage. In 1997, TRPA replaced this program with its Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). In subsequent years, TRPA generated investments of well over \$1 billion in public and private money to restore ecosystems and improve infrastructure under the EIP. Recent litigation confirmed that the Regional Plan as established in 1987 and subsequently amended over time will achieve and maintain the adopted environmental thresholds. *Sierra Club v. Tahoe Reg'l Planning Agency*, 916 F.Supp.2d 1098 (E.D. Cal. 2013).

### **(1) Regional Plan Update Process**

Even though implementation of the 1987 Regional Plan would achieve and maintain the thresholds, in 2004 TRPA began public outreach and analysis of the latest science and monitoring results to identify priority areas in which the Regional Plan could be comprehensively strengthened to accelerate the rate of threshold attainment. TRPA's policymakers realized that the challenges facing the region differed from those confronting the agency when it adopted its original Regional Plan in 1987. Uncontrolled new growth that had been the primary threat decades earlier had been brought into check by the strict growth limitations in the 1987 Plan. Contemporary problems differed, resulting from the continuing deterioration and lack of upgrades to existing legacy development. In essence, to make the greatest environmental difference, the Tahoe Basin needed to fix what was already in

place. In addition, TRPA realized some existing land-use controls could be improved to remove barriers to redevelopment that would address ongoing environmental degradation caused by sub-standard development constructed before TRPA had an adopted Regional Plan or even came into existence. Land use regulations and public and private investment remain essential to attaining the thresholds for Lake Tahoe.

Furthermore, TRPA recognized that the social and economic fabric of the Tahoe Region could not support the level of environmental investment needed. The economic foundation of gaming had fallen away, and the level of environmental investment needed could not be supported solely by an enclave of second homes for the wealthy. Businesses and the tourism sector were faltering. Affordable housing and year-round jobs were scarce. Local schools were closing, and unemployment was unusually high. In light of these realities, TRPA sponsored an ongoing outreach program to obtain input on how to advance TRPA's environmental goals. Between 2004 and 2010, TRPA conducted over 100 public meetings, workshops, and additional outreach. More than 5,000 people provided input regarding their vision for TRPA's updated Regional Plan. Based on this input, TRPA identified a number of priorities to be addressed by the updated Regional Plan, including:

1. Accelerating water quality restoration and other ecological benefits by supporting environmental redevelopment opportunities and EIP investments.
2. Changing land-use patterns by focusing development in compact, walkable communities with increased alternative transportation options.
3. Transitioning to more permitting by local governments to create one-stop and one permit for small to medium sized projects, where local government wanted to assume these duties.

On December 12, 2012, TRPA's nine-year effort culminated with the approval of the Regional Plan Update.

## **(2) Regional Plan Update Amendments**

The Regional Plan Update (RPU) uses multiple strategies targeting environmental improvements to accelerate achieving and maintaining threshold standards in the Region. First, the RPU maintained both regulatory and implementation programs that have proven effective in protecting Lake Tahoe's environment. TRPA's regional growth control regulatory system, strict

environmental development standards, and inter-agency partnerships for capital investment and implementation (e.g., EIP) remain in place.

Second, the RPU promotes sensitive land restoration, redevelopment, and increases the availability of multi-modal transportation facilities. The implementation of the RPU facilitates transferring existing development from outlying, environmentally-sensitive areas into existing developed community centers. The RPU provides incentives so that private capital can be deployed to speed this transformation.

Third, the RPU authorizes the Area Plan process, pursuant to Chapter 13: *Area Plans* of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, for local jurisdictions in the Lake Tahoe Region in order to address the local issues and opportunities of unique communities in the Region, and to eliminate duplicative and unpredictable land use regulations that deterred improvement projects.

### **(3) The 2017 Regional Transportation Plan**

Every four years TRPA prepares a regional transportation plan that outlines the overall vision for developing, operating, and maintaining the Lake Tahoe Region's transportation system. The 2017 Regional Transportation Plan offers strategies to address the routine travel demands of residents and commuters, as well as the recreational travel demands of visitors that during peak periods stress and cause congestion on Lake Tahoe's transportation system. Strategies focus on projects and programs that dynamically meet the needs of all roadway users by offering better travel mode options, creating incentives that spread out the times, places, and ways people travel to improve traffic flow, and by providing safe and equitable access to all the places people want to go.

The plan in its implementation is a threshold attainment program that delivers increments of improvement to many threshold categories. The plan also serves as the Region's Sustainable Communities Strategy, describing the land-use scenarios and transportation investments that allow the Tahoe Region to meet its mobile source greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets.

As noted above, a variety of strategies in the Regional Plan and RTP work together to accelerate needed environmental gains in

the categories where threshold benefits are most needed – water quality, restoration of sensitive lands, scenic quality advances in developed roadway units, and efforts to continue maintenance and attainment of air quality standards.

#### **(4) The 2015 Threshold Evaluation**

In 2016, TRPA completed the 2015 Threshold Evaluation Report. This report considers conditions relative to 178 standards in nine threshold categories. In general, compared to 2011, more standards showed improvement with attainment moving from 63 percent (58 standards) to 70 percent (77 standards). Status continued to improve for water clarity, air quality, scenic and soil conservation. Areas needing continued focus include removal of land coverage on sensitive lands, new threats to forest vegetation, deepwater plant communities, and the need for continued emphasis on water quality conditions (macroinvertebrates, periphyton (algae) and AIS control).

The next section of this finding establishes how implementation of the 2017 RTP is expected to result in further threshold gain.

## **II. RTP and Threshold Gain**

The RTP accelerates threshold gain, including water quality restoration and other ecological benefits, by supporting environmental redevelopment opportunities and EIP investments. The 2017 RTP does not alter the Regional Plan’s established growth control system, the incentives for property owners to hasten the transfer of development rights from sensitive lands or from outlying areas to the Town Center where redevelopment is better suited and will have beneficial or reduced adverse environmental impacts, or any of the EIP restoration program. The RTP will help to promote a sustainable and more efficient transportation system connecting communities and recreation sites.

As described in more specific detail below, the RTP beneficially affects multiple threshold areas.

### **A. Water Quality**

Lake clarity has continued to improve in recent years. The five-year running average from 2010 to 2015 was 22.3 meters

(73.2 feet), 18 feet better than forecasted in 2000. The continued improvement is a strong indication that the actions of partners in the Region are contributing to improved clarity and helping TRPA attain one of its signature goals.

The success of the aquatic invasive species (AIS) prevention program is another notable achievement. Thanks to the inspection of more than 200,000 watercraft prior to launch and the decontamination of more than 44,000 boats, no new AIS have been discovered in Lake Tahoe since the program's inception in 2007.

Signals of improving environmental health are also visible in other water quality parameters. The Threshold Evaluation report shows for the first time that pollutant loads from the non-urban uplands are likely decreasing as the watersheds recover from past disturbance.

The 2017 RTP/SCS benefits water quality thresholds by implementation of projects that will prevent sediment and other pollutant deposition into waterways. Implementation of the 2017 RTP/SCS will help the Region meet the Lake Tahoe Maximum Daily Load Program (TMDL) Requirements by incorporating water quality improvements in transportation projects. Since roadway runoff from the urban uplands and atmospheric nitrogen deposition from vehicle emissions are major contributors to pollutant loading, this plan has an important role to play in achieving the TMDL. Therefore, the Regional Plan, as amended, will achieve and maintain the water quality thresholds.

#### B. Air Quality

The Tahoe Basin has made significant air quality gains. The majority of air quality indicators in the Lake Tahoe Basin were at or better than attainment with adopted thresholds and standards. In total 15 of 16 indicators were in attainment with almost all having improving trends. Two indicators had insufficient data to make a determination (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report, Chapter 3, *Air Quality*). Federal and state tailpipe and industrial emission standards have likely contributed to this achievement along with local projects which delivered walkable, transit-friendly improvements such as the Heavenly Gondola (See 2011 Threshold Evaluation Report at pages 3-14, 3-16, and 3-18; Yang et al. 2010, Park Avenue/U.S. 50 Redevelopment Phase 1, Case Study,



available at: <http://lafoundation.org/myos/my-uploads/2012/10/31/park-ave-methodology.pdf>). The Regional Plan and Regional Transportation Plan include a suite of strategies to help the Region meet air quality threshold standards (TRPA Goals and Policies: Air Quality Sub element at pages 2-33 to 2-35; 2017 RTP/SCS Chapter 3, *The Plan*, Appendix B, *Project List and Revenue Narrative*). While there are many programs and policies that contribute to air quality threshold attainment, the two primary regional strategies are:

- 1) Supporting environmental redevelopment. Land Use policies outlined in the Regional Plan support clustering population and employment in compact Town Centers that are well served by transit, pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure. The Regional Plan achieves this by incentivizing redevelopment and transfers of development from outlying and sensitive areas into existing Town Center areas. (TRPA Goals and Policies: Chapter 2, *Land Use*.)
- 2) Creating walkable communities and increased alternative transportation options. The Regional Plan and the 2017 RTP/SCS, outlines the policies, programs and projects that provide a transportation system that supports this compact form of development and that will help to create an environment where walking, biking, and transit are convenient modes of transportation.

The combination of compact land-uses and convenient, diverse transportation options is intended to allow more travel to be conducted on foot, by bike, or by transit, resulting in fewer and shorter vehicle trips per person and reducing negative impacts to air quality associated with motor vehicle travel. The benefits of these strategies are further articulated in the 2017 RTP/SCS. Additionally, the RPU EIS and 2017 RTP/SCS IS/IEC demonstrated that the combination of improvements would allow the Region to achieve and maintain air quality thresholds, including the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) threshold (see Regional Plan Update Draft EIS, Chapter 3.3: *Transportation*, and Chapter 3.4: 2017 RTP/SCS IS/IEC, Chapter 3.4.5: *Transportation* and Chapter 3.4.2: *Air Quality*).

The 2017 RTP/SCS policies are focused on making connections to recreational access areas, prioritizing public and active transit, making efficient use of the existing system through

technology, monitoring, and transportation demand management, increasing safety and security, and supporting economic vitality and high quality of life for residents and experience for visitors. These policies build from the 2012 RTP/SCS which focused on bikeable and walkable town centers and now focuses on connections between town centers, neighborhoods, and recreation sites.

As described above, the 2017 RTP/SCS includes new provisions that will build upon existing provisions of the Regional Plan and will support accelerated attainment and maintenance of air quality thresholds.

### C. Soil Conservation

The Soil Conservation environmental thresholds include standards for each Land Capability District (LCD) and a standard for SEZs. The LCD standards are all in attainment (at or better than target, i.e. Bailey LCD limitations) with the exception of LCD 1b, which is considerably worse than target with a trend toward moderate improvement, and LCD 2, which is somewhat worse than target with little to no change. The SEZ standard, “Preserve and Restore Stream Environment Zones” is described as Considerably Worse than Target with a trend toward moderate improvement. The threshold for SEZs is as follows:

Preserve existing naturally functioning SEZ lands in their natural hydrologic condition, restore all disturbed SEZ lands in undeveloped, unsubdivided lands, and restore 25 percent of the SEZ lands that have been identified as disturbed, developed or subdivided, to attain a 5 percent total increase in the area of naturally functioning SEZ lands.

The Goals and Policies in the Regional Plan that provide direction for attainment of the SEZ Threshold are contained in the SEZ, Soils, and Land Use Sub elements. (TRPA Goals and Policies: Chapter 4: *Conservation* at pages 4-14 to 4-16 and 4-24 to 4-27; TRPA Goals and Policies Chapter 2: *Land Use* at pages 2-2 to 2-19.) The SEZ Sub element currently contains one goal and eight associated policies. The goal calls for the long-term preservation, enhancement, and restoration of SEZ lands as a means of achieving various environmental thresholds. The policy statements direct the restoration, preservation, and management of SEZ lands by setting numeric goals for restoration of

degraded/developed SEZ lands and requiring their protection and management for natural functions and values. The TPRA Code implements this policy and includes regulatory strategies and measures to achieve the goals listed in the SEZ Sub element of the Regional Plan.

The IS/IEC analyzed potential impacts to soils and found that the impacts would be less than significant as a result of implementation of the plan (Chapter 3.5.9, *Geology and Soils*). The 2017 RTP/SCS does not include provisions to alter or revise regulations pertaining to grading and soil disturbance or requirements related to coverage and protection of SEZ lands. Furthermore, implementation of transportation infrastructure projects would include drainage and soil retention infrastructure on project sites which could result in improved SEZ function.

Therefore, the Regional Plan, as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will achieve and maintain the soils thresholds.

#### D. Scenic Quality

The Tahoe Basin continues to make gains in scenic quality (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report: Chapter 9: *Scenic Resources*.) All six of the scenic threshold categories are overall in attainment, with two categories showing an improving trend (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report, page ES-3). As described in the RPU EIS (at page 3.9-17), the increasing trend in scenic quality is primarily due to redevelopment activities that replace old structures with updated, more scenically compatible design and the undergrounding of utilities. Examples of documented scenic improvement from redevelopment activities include the Heavenly Village/Gondola, the Chateau, and South Lake Tahoe Safeway projects.

The IS/IEC analyzed potential impacts to scenic resources and found the impacts would be less than significant (Chapter 3.4.1, *Aesthetics*). The 2017 RTP/SCS maintains provisions related to design standards and scenic attainment. Furthermore, the 2015 Threshold Evaluation found that scenic resources at a regional scale were shown to improve as a result of development of recreation and bike trails. Construction and operation of new transportation projects would be required to comply with design, shielding, and lighting standards.

Therefore, the Regional Plan, as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will achieve and maintain the scenic thresholds.

#### E. Vegetation

The Regional Plan and partner agencies have successfully protected sensitive plant species and kept those thresholds in attainment (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report: Chapter 6, *Vegetation Preservation*). A few uncommon plant communities fell short of attainment primarily because of non-native species. Aquatic invasive species, noxious weeds, and beaver were identified as potential threats to the integrity of uncommon plant communities. Progress is being made on fuels reduction and forest ecosystem restoration. (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report: Chapter 6, *Vegetation Preservation*; Environmental Improvement Program Accomplishments 1997-2012 available at: [http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/EIP\\_1pager\\_Summit2013\\_FINAL2.pdf](http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/EIP_1pager_Summit2013_FINAL2.pdf)).

The 2017 RTP/SCS IS/IEC analyzed potential impacts to vegetation and found that the impacts would be less than significant (Chapter 3.5.1, *Biological Resources*). The RTP/SCS does not include provisions to alter or revise regulations pertaining to native vegetation protection during construction, vegetation removal or groundwater management, new vegetation, unique, rare, or endangered species of plants, stream bank or backshore vegetation, or tree removal.

Therefore, the Regional Plan as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will achieve and maintain the vegetation thresholds.

#### F. Recreation

Both Recreation Thresholds have been implemented and are in attainment. (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report: Chapter 11, *Recreation*.) TRPA partners have made substantial progress in upgrading recreational facilities through the EIP. (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report at pages 11-11 to 11-16.)

The 2017 RTP/SCS IS/IEC analyzed potential impacts to recreation and found the impacts would be less than significant for some impact areas, and beneficial to others (Chapter 3.5.11, *Recreation*). Projects in the 2017 RTP/SCS would further result in improved capacity of the recreational system through more

frequent transit, traffic management and information technology, as well as pedestrian and bicycle amenities that will enable residents and visitors to more easily access and connect to recreation locations and experiences.

Therefore, the Regional Plan as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will achieve and maintain the recreation thresholds.

#### G. Fisheries

TRPA and partner agencies have implemented a robust aquatic invasive species control and prevention program; however, aquatic invasive species continue to be a major area of concern because of their threat to fisheries and other aquatic biota (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report: Chapter 7, *Fisheries*).

The 2017 RTP/SCS will not alter the resource management and protection regulations, Chapters 60 through 68, or shorezone regulations, Chapters 80 through 85, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Chapter 63: *Fish Resources*, of the Code of Ordinances includes the provisions to ensure the protection of fish habitat and provide for the enhancement of degraded habitat.

The 2017 RTP/SCS IS/IEC analyzed potential impacts to biological resources, including fisheries, and found impacts to be less than significant (Chapter 3.5.1, *Biological Resources*). Projects contained within the 2017 RTP/SCS would not affect fisheries, and for sites where infrastructure projects include stormwater retention improvements, the water quality would be improved for receiving water bodies that provide fish habitat.

Therefore, the Regional Plan as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will achieve and maintain the fisheries thresholds.

#### H. Wildlife

Indicators for special interest wildlife species show stable or improving conditions (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report: Chapter 8, *Wildlife*). TRPA's development regulations have protected riparian wildlife habitats, and partner agencies are making progress restoring these valuable habitats (2015 Threshold Evaluation Report at pages 8-34 to 8-36).

The 2017 RTP/SCS will not alter the resource management and protection regulations, Chapters 60 through 68, of the TRPA Code

of Ordinances. In addition, any future projects contemplated by the 2017 RTP/SCS would be subject to additional project-level environmental review and permitting. Consistent with existing conditions, permit applicants would be required to demonstrate that any proposals would occur consistent with TRPA Code provisions related to resource management, including specifically the provisions of Chapters 62 and 63 that address protection of wildlife and fish resources, respectively.

The IS/IEC analyzed potential impacts to biological resources, including wildlife, and found the impacts would be less than significant. The RTP/SCS does not include provisions to alter or revise regulations related to wildlife habitat, monitoring and disturbance during construction.

Therefore, the Regional Plan as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will achieve and maintain the wildlife thresholds.

#### I. Noise

TRPA has adopted noise standards for the Tahoe Basin. The noise thresholds are Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) values for the various land use categories and single event (Lmax) standards for specific noise sources. CNEL is the metric used by TRPA for determining land use compatibility. No one activity, nor combination of activities, can exceed the applicable CNEL level. CNELs are calculated pursuant to Chapter 23 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The IS/IEC analyzed potential impacts related to noise and found the impacts to be less than significant, although the noise models in the IS/IEC estimated minor increases in traffic noise levels. Because implementation of the 2017 RTP/SCS would not result in substantially louder traffic noise levels in 2040 than the baseline levels and 2035 levels presented in the 2012 RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, this would not be a significantly more severe impact.

Therefore, the Regional Plan, as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS will achieve and maintain the noise thresholds.

#### III. Conclusion

Based on the rationale described above, the 2017 RTP/SCS IS/IEC, the attached Compliance Measures and Threshold Status

spreadsheets, the previously certified RPU EIS and RTP EIR/EIS's, and the findings made on December 12, 2012 for the RPU and RTP; TRPA finds the Regional Plan and all its elements, as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will achieve and maintain the thresholds. The 2017/SCS RTP would maintain existing Regional Plan policies and programs and would result in no significant impacts to thresholds. The 2017 RTP/SCS also includes specific policies and implementation measures that would accelerate attainment and maintenance of thresholds. Thus, the Regional Plan, as amended by the 2017 RTP/SCS, will continue to achieve and maintain the thresholds.

Attachment E  
Ordinance 2017-\_\_\_



**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**  
**ORDINANCE 2017-\_\_**

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 87-9, AS AMENDED, TO ADOPT THE 2017 LINKING TAHOE:  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

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

**Section Findings**

**1.00**

---

- 1.05 The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P. L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, 1980) created the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and empowered it to set forth environmental threshold carrying capacities (“threshold standards”) for the Tahoe Region.
- 1.10 The Compact directs TRPA to adopt and enforce a Regional Plan that, as implemented through agency ordinances, rules and regulations, will achieve and maintain such threshold standards while providing opportunities for orderly growth and development consistent with such thresholds.
- 1.15 The Compact further requires that the Regional Plan attain and maintain federal, state, or local air and water quality standards, whichever are strictest, in the respective portions of the region for which the standards are applicable.
- 1.20 Compact Art. V(c) states that the TRPA Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission shall continuously review and maintain the Regional Plan.
- 1.25 In June 1987, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Ordinance 87-9, which established the Regional Plan and included, amongst other things, the Goals & Policies and the Code of Ordinances (“Code”).
- 1.30 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance 87-9, as previously amended, as it relates to the Regional Plan of the TRPA by amending the Regional Plan pursuant to Article VI (a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact in order to accelerate attainment and ensure maintenance of the threshold standards.

- 1.35 TRPA has made the necessary findings required by Article V of the Compact, Chapter 4 of the Code, and all other applicable rules and regulations, and incorporates these findings fully herein.
- 1.45 The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) conducted public meetings on the amendments and recommended adoption of these amendments. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. At these hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.
- 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.
- 1.55 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

**Section Amendment of TRPA Regional Plan**

**2.00**

---

- 2.10 Ordinance 87-9 is hereby amended to include the 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, as set forth in Exhibit A and fully incorporated herein.
- 2.15 The Transportation Element of the TRPA Goals and Policies are hereby replaced by Appendix A of the 2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

**Section Interpretation and Severability**

**3.00**

---

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

<b>Section</b>	<b>Effective Date</b>
<b>5.00</b>	
5.10	The provisions of this ordinance shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held April 26, 2017 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays: Abstain:

Absent:

---

James Lawrence, Chair  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Governing Board

Exhibit A

2017 Linking Tahoe: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy:  
<http://www.trpa.org/advisory-planning-commission-documents-april-12-2017/>

Attachment F  
Track Changes Version of the 2017 RTP/SCS Appendix A: Goals and Policies

# APPENDIX A: GOALS AND POLICIES

---

## GOAL 1: ENVIRONMENT



**Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.**

### Policies

---

- 1.1 Support mixed-use **and transit oriented** development that encourages walking, bicycling, and easy access to existing and planned transit stops **in town centers**.
- 1.2 Leverage transportation projects to benefit multiple environmental thresholds through integration with the Environmental Improvement Program.
- 1.3 Mitigate the regional and cumulative traffic impacts of new, expanded, or revised developments or land uses by prioritizing projects and programs that enhance non-automobile travel modes.
- 1.4 Facilitate the use of electric and zero emission vehicles and fleets by supporting deployment of vehicle charging infrastructure within the Region, and supporting incentives and education of residents, businesses, and visitors related to the use of electric and zero emission vehicles.
- 1.5 Require major employers of 100 employees or more to implement vehicle trip reduction programs.
- 1.6 Require new and encourage existing major commercial interests providing gaming, recreational activities, excursion services, condominiums, timeshares, hotels and motels to participate in transportation demand programs and projects.
- 1.7 Coordinate with the City of South Lake Tahoe to update and maintain an Airport Master Plan and limit aviation facilities within the Tahoe Region to existing facilities.
- 1.8 **Strongly encourage** ~~Consider~~ traffic calming and noise reduction strategies when planning transportation improvements.
- 1.9 Develop and implement a cooperative continuous, and comprehensive Congestion Management Process to adaptively manage congestion within the Region's multi-modal transportation system.

## GOAL 2: CONNECTIVITY



**Enhance and sustain the connectivity and accessibility of the Tahoe transportation system, across and between modes, communities, and neighboring regions, for people and goods.**

### Policies

---

#### Transit

- 2.1 Coordinate with Federal, state, and local government as well as private sector partners to identify and secure adequate transit service funding that provides a viable transportation alternative to the private automobile for all categories of travelers in the Region.
- 2.2 Provide frequent transit service to major summer and winter recreational areas.
- 2.3 Establish regional partnerships with surrounding metropolitan areas to expand transit to and from Lake Tahoe.
- 2.4 Improve the existing transit system for the user making it frequent, fun, and free in targeted locations. Consider and use increased frequency, preferential signal controls, priority travel lanes, expanded service areas, and extended service hours.
- 2.5 Integrate transit services across the Region. Develop and use unified fare payment systems, information portals, and shared transfers.
- 2.6 Consider waterborne transportation systems using best available technology to minimize air and water quality impacts in coordination with other modal options, as an alternative to automobile travel within the Region.
- 2.7 Provide specialized public transportation services for individuals with disabilities through subsidized fare programs for transit, taxi, demand response, and accessible van services.
- 2.8 Make transit and pedestrian facilities ADA-compliant and consistent with Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plans.
- 2.9 Develop formal guidelines or standards for incorporating transit amenities in new development or redevelopment, as conditions of project approval.
- 2.10 Provide public transit services at locations nearby school campuses.
- 2.11 Coordinate public and private transit service, where feasible, to reduce service costs and avoid service duplication.

#### Active Transportation

- 2.12 Develop and maintain an Active Transportation Plan as part of the regional transportation plan. Include policies, a project list of existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and strategies for implementation in the Active Transportation Plan.
- 2.13 Incorporate programs and policies of the active transportation plan into regional and local land use plans and regulatory processes.

- 2.14 Construct, upgrade, and maintain pedestrian and bicycle facilities consistent with the active transportation plan.

**Multi-Intermodal**

- 2.15 Accommodate the needs of all categories of travelers by designing and operating roads for safe, comfortable, and efficient travel for roadway users of all ages and abilities, such as pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists, commercial vehicles, and emergency vehicles.
- 2.16 Encourage parking management programs that incentivize non-auto modes and discourage private auto-mobile use at peak times in peak locations, alleviate circulating vehicle trips associated with parking availability, and minimize parking requirements through the use of shared-parking facilities while potentially providing funding that benefits infrastructure and services for transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
- 2.17 Coordinate and include in area plans, where applicable, intermodal transportation facilities (“Mobility Hubs”) that serve centers and other major areas of activity while encouraging the consolidation of off-street parking within mixed-use areas.
- 2.18 In roadway improvements, construct, upgrade, and maintain active transportation and transit facilities along major travel routes. In constrained locations, all design options should be considered, including but not limited to restriping, roadway realignment, signalization, and purchase of right of way.
- 2.19 Encourage jurisdiction partners to develop and plan coordinated wayfinding signage for awareness of alternative transportation modes including transit (TART/BlueGO), pedestrian, and bicycle facilities.



## GOAL 3: SAFETY



**Increase safety and security for all users of Tahoe's transportation system.**

### Policies

---

- 3.1 Coordinate the collection and analysis of safety data, identify areas of concern, and propose safety-related improvements that support state and federal safety programs and performance measures.
- 3.2 Consider safety data and use proven safety design countermeasures for safety hotspots recommended from roadway safety audits, the active transportation plan, corridor plans, and other reliable sources when designing new or modifying existing travel corridors.
- 3.3 Coordinate safety awareness programs that encourage law abiding behavior by all travelers.
- 3.4 Support emergency preparedness and response planning, including the development of regional evacuation plans, and encourage appropriate agencies to use traffic incident management performance measures.
- 3.5 Design projects to maximize visibility at vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian conflict points. Consider increased safety signage, site distance, and other design features, as appropriate.

## GOAL 4: OPERATIONS AND CONGESTION MANAGEMENT



**Provide an efficient transportation network through coordinated operations, system management, technology, and monitoring, and targeted investments.**

### Policies

---

- 4.0 Prioritize regional and local investments that fulfill TRPA objectives in transit, active transportation, transportation demand management, and other programs and directly support identified TRPA transportation performance outcomes.
- 4.1 Identify opportunities to implement comprehensive transportation solutions that include technology, safety, and other supporting elements when developing infrastructure projects.
- 4.2 Collaborate with jurisdictions and DOT partners to develop adaptive management strategies for peak traffic periods at Basin entry/exit routes.
- 4.3 Promote awareness of travel options and conditions through advertising and real-time travel information.
- 4.4 Incorporate programs and policies of the Tahoe Basin Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan into regional and local land use plans and regulatory processes.

- 4.5 Support the use of emerging technologies, such as the development and use of mobile device applications, to navigate the active transportation network and facilitate ridesharing, efficient parking, transit use, and transportation network companies.
- 4.6 Level of service (LOS) criteria for the Region’s highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods shall be: “C” on rural recreational/scenic roads; “D” on rural developed area roads; “D” on urban developed area roads; “D” for signalized intersections. Level of Service “E” may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, but not to exceed four hours per day. These vehicle LOS standards may be exceeded when provisions for multi-modal amenities and/or services (such as transit, bicycling, and walking facilities) are adequate to provide mobility for users at a level that is proportional to the project-generated traffic in relation to overall traffic conditions on affected roadways.
- 4.7 Regional transportation plan updates shall review projected travel into and within adopted area plans and effectiveness of mobility strategies.
- 4.8 Prohibit the construction of roadways to freeway design standards in the Tahoe Region. Establish Tahoe specific traffic design volume for project development and analysis.
- 4.9 Require the development of traffic management plans for major temporary seasonal activities, including the coordination of simultaneously occurring events.
- 4.10 Actively support Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) in the Tahoe Region.
- 4.11 Establish a uniform method of data collection for resident and visitor travel behavior.
- 4.12 Maintain monitoring programs for all modes that assess the effectiveness of the long-term implementation of local and regional mobility strategies on a publicly accessible reporting platform (e.g www.laketahoeinfo.org website).
- 4.13 Establish regional and inter-regional cooperation and cost-sharing to obtain basin-wide data for transportation-related activities.
- 4.14 Design roadway corridors, including driveways, intersections, and scenic turnouts, to minimize impacts to regional traffic flow, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities by using shared access points where feasible.

**GOAL 5: ECONOMIC VITALITY & QUALITY OF LIFE**



**Support the economic vitality of the Tahoe Region to enable a diverse workforce, sustainable environment, and quality experience for both residents and visitors.**

**Policies**

- 5.1 Encourage community revitalization **and transit oriented development** -projects that comprehensively support regional and local transportation, housing, land use, environment, and other goals.
- 5.2 Provide multimodal access to recreation sites. Encourage collaboration between public lands managers, departments of transportation, transit providers, and other regional partners to improve year-round access to dispersed recreation activities. Strategies could

include active transportation end-of-trip facilities, transit services, parking management programs, and incentives to use multi-modal transport.

- 5.3 Collaborate with local, state, regional, federal, and private partners to develop a regional revenue source to fund Lake Tahoe transportation and water quality projects.
- 5.4 Collaborate with regional and inter-regional partners to establish efficient transportation connections within the Trans-Sierra Region including to and from Tahoe and surrounding metropolitan areas.

## GOAL 6: SYSTEM PRESERVATION



**Provide for the preservation of the existing transportation system through maintenance activities that support climate resiliency, water quality, and safety.**

### Policies

---

- 6.1 Preserve the condition of sidewalks and bicycle facilities and where feasible, maintain their year-round use.
- 6.2 Maintain and preserve pavement condition to a level that supports the safety of the traveling public and protects water quality.
- 6.3 Make “dig once” the basin-wide standard, requiring public and private roadway projects to accommodate ~~include~~ the installation of conduit to support community needs. (e.g: fiber optic, broadband, lighting, etc.)
- 6.4 Consider the increased vulnerability and risk to transportation infrastructure from climate stressors, such as increased precipitation, flooding, and drought when designing new infrastructure and repairing or maintaining existing infrastructure.



---

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: April 5, 2017  
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission  
From: TRPA Staff  
Subject: Review and recommendation on Watercraft Inspection Fee Structure

---

**Requested Action:** The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) is asked to review the materials provided in this staff summary and recommend Governing Board adoption of the attached Resolution (Attachment A) containing the 2017 Watercraft Inspection Fee Structure maintaining the prior year's fee structure.

To recommend approval of the proposed 2017 Watercraft Inspection Fee Structure, APC must make the following motions. An affirmative recommendation requires a majority vote of the quorum present:

- I. A motion to recommend Governing Board adoption of the proposed Resolution (Attachment A) approving the 2017 Watercraft Inspection Fee Structure.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends that APC make the motions above, to recommend that the Governing Board adopt the proposed Resolution (Attachment A).

**Project Description/Background:** TRPA initiated the Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Watercraft Inspection Program (Program) to prevent the introduction and spread of AIS into the waters of the Lake Tahoe Region, and to facilitate compliance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 63.4. TRPA amended this Code Section in March 2009 and again in April 2011 to allow the collection of fees from the boating public as a long-term funding source for the Program. TRPA approved the current fee structure in March 2015. The Program utilizes two different stickers to indicate that a boat has paid the appropriate fee for that season – one for boats that are exclusively used on Lake Tahoe (“Tahoe Only”) and one for boats launching on Lake Tahoe and in other bodies of water outside of the Region (“Tahoe In and Out”). The Program also allows for a Single Inspection Pass with a reduced rate that is valid for one inspection at the inspection station and seven consecutive days of seal inspections at launch ramps. In addition to the annual sticker fees, the Program charges for each decontamination performed. The decontamination fee can be avoided if boaters adhere to the “Clean, Drain, and Dry” practice the Program promotes.

As a result of the Prevention Program, no new detections of AIS have occurred since the Program began in 2008. That success is a major reason why the two states have committed to providing the much needed remaining funding to support the Program. The Program works with a budget of approximately \$1.5 million. Boater inspection fees generally provide half of the

funds necessary to implement the Program, with the other half now provided from the state funds, which was previously provided by federal sources (e.g., SNPLMA). Having the state funds complement the inspection fees allows for long-term planning to ensure the Program remains effective. It also demonstrates a strong public-private partnership that has led to a highly effective and successful program. Because the funding commitments from both states and the boaters are adequately funding the Prevention Program at this time, the states and TRPA would like to keep the burden of fees to the boating public at a reasonable rate, and the current fee schedule is maintaining the goal of having a 50/50 split of funding between the public and private contributions, TRPA staff proposes to maintain the current fee schedule into 2017.

In 2017, TRPA will be implementing a new mobile application on handheld devices at the marinas and launch ramps. The application will improve accuracy of data collection of sticker sales and fees by providing a more efficient platform. It will improve quality control on sticker sales records and reduce errors associated with the current paper forms. Funding for the development of this application and the associated equipment has been secured through a grant with CA State Parks, Division of Boating and Waterways.

Environmental Review: None necessary.

Regional Plan Compliance: The proposed action complies with all requirements of the TRPA Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements, and Code of Ordinances, including all required findings in Chapter 6 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Contact Information: For questions regarding this item, please contact Matt Driscoll at (775) 589-5240 or [mdriscoll@trpa.org](mailto:mdriscoll@trpa.org).

Attachments:

- A. Resolution
  - Exhibit 1 – Fee Schedule

Attachment A  
Resolution 2017 -

**Attachment A**

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
RESOLUTION 2017 –  
RESOLUTION AMENDING THE WATERCRAFT INSPECTION FEE  
AMOUNT AND STRUCTURE, EFFECTIVE APRIL 2017 THROUGH APRIL 2018

WHEREAS, the introduction of aquatic invasive species such as quagga and zebra mussels pose a threat to the integrity of the Lake Tahoe Region’s ecosystem, recreation, water purveyance systems and economy in general, and

WHEREAS, Subparagraph 63.4.2.E of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as amended April 2011 requires that an owner and/or operator of a Boat Ramp (excluding Marine Railway Systems) or other Boat Launch Facility shall close any ramp or facility if the provisions of Subparagraphs 63.4.2.(A)-(C) are not met in order to prevent the launching of motorized watercraft, and

1                 WHEREAS, Subparagraph 63.4.2.A of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as amended April 2011 further requires that all motorized Watercraft shall be inspected by TRPA or its designee prior to launching into the waters of the Lake Tahoe Region to detect the presence, and prevent the introduction of, Aquatic Invasive Species, and

2                 WHEREAS, Subparagraph 63.4.2.B of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as amended April 2011 further requires that all Watercraft inspected pursuant to Subparagraph 63.4.2.A shall be subject to decontamination if determined necessary by the TRPA or its designee, and

3                 WHEREAS, Subparagraph 63.4.2.D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as amended April 2011 further states that inspections and decontaminations performed pursuant to Section 63.4 are subject to a fee related to the costs of performing such services and other Watercraft inspection program costs, and

4                 WHEREAS, Subparagraph 63.4.2.D of the TRPA Code of Ordinances as amended April 2011 further states that the TRPA Governing Board will review and approve the fee amount and structure annually, and

WHEREAS, during the April 2011 Board meeting, the TRPA Governing Board adopted Resolution 2011-07 making watercraft subject to a fee for inspection, decontamination and other program costs, and

WHEREAS, the Watercraft Inspection plan for 2017 requires a combination of public and private funding currently estimated at \$1,500,000 to inspect and decontaminate motorized watercraft, and

WHEREAS, state funding from both California and Nevada has been secured to support aquatic invasive species inspections for 2017, and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency on September 24, 2008 directed staff to bring to the Board for consideration an equitable fee structure, and

AGENDA ITEM NO. V.B.



NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency that the amount and structure of the aquatic invasive species inspection fee effective April 2017 through April 2018 be maintained as shown in Exhibit 1; (Attached);

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY AT ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON THE 26th of APRIL 2017 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

---

James Lawrence, Chair  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Governing Board

**ATTACHMENT A, EXHIBIT 1**

Staff Proposed Fees for 2017 Boating Season (effective April 2017 through April 2018)

<b>Tahoe Only Stickers</b>	<b>Proposed Fee Amount</b>	<b>Projected Boats</b>	<b>Projected Funds</b>
All Sealed Vessels	\$30.00	7443	\$223,290.00
<b>Tahoe In &amp; Out Stickers</b>	<b>Proposed Fee Amount</b>	<b>Projected Boats</b>	<b>Projected Funds</b>
Personal Watercraft (PWC)	\$35.00	588	\$20,580.00
Vessels 0.1 ft. - 17.0 ft.	\$35.00	1,167	\$40,845.00
Vessels 17.1 ft. - 21.0 ft.	\$75.00	1,550	\$116,250.00
Vessels 21.1 ft. - 26.0 ft.	\$86.00	1040	\$89,440.00
Vessels 26.1 ft. - 39.0 ft.	\$98.00	174	\$17,052.00
Vessels 39.1 ft. and Greater	\$121.00	12	\$1,452.00
<b>Single Inspection Passes</b>	<b>Proposed Fee Amount</b>	<b>Projected Boats</b>	<b>Projected Funds</b>
Personal Watercraft (PWC)	\$33.00	112	\$3,696.00
Vessels 0.1 ft. - 17.0 ft.	\$33.00	174	\$5,742.00
Vessels 17.1 ft. - 21.0 ft.	\$55.00	1,154	\$63,470.00
Vessels 21.1 ft. - 26.0 ft.	\$66.00	520	\$34,320.00
Vessels 26.1 ft. - 39.0 ft.	\$78.00	56	\$4,368.00
Vessels 39.1 ft. and Greater	\$101.00	1	\$101.00
<b>Upgrades from Tahoe Only to In &amp; Out</b>	<b>Proposed Fee Amount</b>	<b>Projected Boats</b>	<b>Projected Funds</b>
Personal Watercraft (PWC)	\$5.00	8	\$40.00
Vessels 0.1 ft. - 17.0 ft.	\$5.00	18	\$90.00
Vessels 17.1 ft. - 21.0 ft.	\$45.00	39	\$1,755.00
Vessels 21.1 ft. - 26.0 ft.	\$56.00	35	\$1,960.00
Vessels 26.1 ft. - 39.0 ft.	\$68.00	3	\$204.00
Vessels 39.1 ft. and Greater	\$91.00	0	\$0.00
Single Inspection Pass to In/Out	\$20.00	20	\$400.00
<b>Decontamination Fees</b>	<b>Proposed Fee Amount</b>	<b>Projected Boats</b>	<b>Projected Funds</b>
Engine & Bilge Flush	\$35.00	2,689	\$94,115
Ballast Tanks	\$10.00	864	\$8,640
Off-site Decontamination	\$200.00	5	\$1,000
<b>Administration Fees</b>	<b>Proposed Fee Amount</b>	<b>Projected Boats</b>	<b>Projected Funds</b>
Deferred Payment	\$20.00	10	\$200.00
<b>TOTAL - ALL BOAT &amp; FEES 2017</b>		<b>14,114</b>	<b>\$730,720</b>
<b>TOTAL ANTICIPATED BUDGET FOR 2017 WATERCRAFT INSPECTION PROGRAM</b>			<b>\$1,500,000.00</b>



**Mail**  
PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

**Location**  
128 Market Street  
Stateline, NV 89449

**Contact**  
Phone: 775-588-4547  
Fax: 775-588-4527  
[www.trpa.org](http://www.trpa.org)

---

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 5, 2017  
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission  
From: TRPA Staff  
Subject: Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program Update

---

**Requested Action:** Staff is not requesting a formal action from the APC on this item. This item is informational only.

**Project Description:** In 2016, the Lake Tahoe AIS program implemented projects related to the control, monitoring, and prevention of AIS in the Tahoe Region. The presentation staff is proposing to give will cover a general review of the structure of the Lake Tahoe AIS program, a review of accomplishments and lessons learned in 2016, in addition to what the future may bring.

**Contact Information:** If you have any regarding this item, please contact Dennis Zabaglo, Aquatic Resources Program Manager, at [dzabaglo@trpa.org](mailto:dzabaglo@trpa.org) or (775) 589-5255.



---

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: April 5, 2017  
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission, Transportation Measures Working Group  
From: TRPA Staff  
Subject: Transportation Measures Working Group: Overview of Existing Transportation Measures and Related Matters

---

Requested Action: Working Group discussion and possible direction to staff.

Background: The Lake Tahoe Region's transportation system directly affects residents' quality of life and visitors' experiences. It is also tied to the Region's economy and environmental health. Stakeholders are voicing concerns about congestion, safety, and traffic volume and suggesting a host of new policies to address transportation concerns.

To build common understanding, at its February 22, 2017 meeting, the TRPA Governing Board Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) Committee endorsed the creation of a working group to survey the transportation measures landscape. Per its Charter, the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) will convene the working group.

The working group will survey the state of the practice for assessing and reporting on a range of transportation-related issues. The working group will reach out to experts and review how transportation managers at local, regional, state, and federal levels understand and use transportation measures to evaluate performance and outcomes. The working group will prepare and transmit a white paper on the state of the practice to the Board by its July 2017 meeting to be used in future policy discussions and decision making. At the March 8, 2017 APC meeting, the APC reviewed and refined a workplan and timeline to develop the white paper. It was presented to, and approved by, the TRPA Governing Board on March 22, 2017. The approved workplan includes presenting background information on existing transportation measures. This meeting will cover:

1. Update on Work Plan and the Survey of the Landscape
2. Overview of TRPA's Existing Transportation Measures

Contact Information: If you have any questions, please contact Lucia Maloney, Senior Planner at [lmaloney@trpa.org](mailto:lmaloney@trpa.org) or (775) 589-5324; or Dan Segan, Principal Natural Resource Analyst at [dsegan@trpa.org](mailto:dsegan@trpa.org) or (775) 589-5233.

Attachments: A. Existing Federal, State & Regional Performance Measures Matrix  
B. Performance Measures Summary Template for White Paper

Attachment A  
Existing Federal, State & Regional Performance Measures Matrix

Attachment A: Existing Performance Measures Matrix

Measure	Focus				Notes			
	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Plan	State	Federal	Notes
Boardings (Passengers) per Revenue Hour			X		X			MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Boardings (Passengers) per Revenue Mile			X		X			MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Cost per Passenger					X			NDOT Reporting Measure
Cost per Revenue Hour					X			NDOT Reporting Measure
Miles of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Constructed*		X			X			Regional Plan Performance Measure (2013), NDOT Reporting Measure
Non-Auto Mode Share		X			X			Regional Plan Performance Measure (2013)
Number of Complete Streets Projects Implemented					X			NDOT Reporting Measure
Passenger Revenue					X			NDOT Reporting Measure
Percentage of Overnight Lodging and Recreation Areas with Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Access					X			Lake Tahoe Transportation Model Input
Transit Passengers per Revenue Hour			X		X			MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Transit Ridership ("Unlinked Passenger Trips")					X		X	Lake Tahoe Transportation Model Calibration Factor, NDOT Reporting Measure

Attachment A: Existing Performance Measures Matrix

Measure	Focus					Notes					
	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Plan	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Plan	
Transit Vehicles Available at Maximum Service								X	X	X	NDOT Reporting Measure
Transit Vehicles Operating at Maximum Service								X	X	X	NDOT Reporting Measure
Average Travel Time to Work										X	Lake Tahoe Transportation Model Input
Housing and Transportation (H+T) Affordability Index										X	Indicates effectiveness of Land Use and Transportation Policy implementation.
VMT by Traveler Type (Residents, Visitors, Commuters)										X	Lake Tahoe Transportation Model Input
1-Hour Carbon Monoxide						X					
1-Hour Ozone						X					
8-Hour Carbon Monoxide						X					
8-Hour Ozone						X					
Aircraft Noise Departure/Arrival (8Am To 8Pm)						X					
Aircraft Noise Departure/Arrival (8Pm To 8Am)						X					
Bliss State Park 50%						X					



Attachment A: Existing Performance Measures Matrix

Measure	Focus	Threshold				Regional Plan			State		Regional Plan		Notes
		Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Plan	Regional Plan	State	Regional Plan	State	Regional Plan			
Bliss State Park 90%	Environment	X											
Greenhouse Gas Emissions per Capita	Environment			X				X					SB 375, SB 743
Miles of Roadway Treated	Environment				X								TMDL Reporting Measure
Miles of Street Sweeping	Environment				X								TMDL Reporting Measure
Motor Vehicles Greater Than 6,000 Gvw For Speeds Greater Than 35 Mph	Environment	X											
Motor Vehicles Greater Than 6,000 Gvw For Speeds Less Than 35 Mph	Environment	X											
Motor Vehicles Less Than 6,000 Gvw For Speeds Greater Than 35 Mph	Environment	X											
Motor Vehicles Less Than 6,000 Gvw For Speeds Less Than 35 Mph	Environment	X											
Motorcycles For Speeds Greater Than 35 Mph	Environment	X											
Motorcycles For Speeds Less Than 35 Mph	Environment	X											
Nitrate Deposition	Environment	X											
Noise - South Lake Tahoe Airport Transportation Corridor	Environment	X											

Attachment A: Existing Performance Measures Matrix

Measure	Focus					Notes				
	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Transportation Plan	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Transportation Plan
Noise - State Route 28 Transportation Corridor	X									
Noise - Highway 50 Transportation Corridor	X									
Noise - State Route 89 Transportation Corridor	X									
Noise - State Route 207 Transportation Corridor	X									
Noise - State Route 267 Transportation Corridor	X									
Noise - State Route 431 Transportation Corridor	X									
Odor	X									
Oxides Of Nitrogen	X									
Ozone 3-Year Average	X									
Ozone Annual Concentration	X									
Ozone Highest One-Hour Concentration	X									
Pm10 24-Hour	X									

Attachment A: Existing Performance Measures Matrix

Measure	Focus					Notes				
	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Transportation Plan	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Transportation Plan
PM10 Annual Average	X									
Pm2.5 24-Hour	X									
Pm2.5 Annual Average	X									
Regional Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	X	X	X	X	X					Federal requirement for MPO Reporting in RTPs, SB 375, SB 743, Adopted TRPA Threshold Standard
Regional Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per Capita, Excluding Through Trips		X								Regional Plan Performance Measure (2013)
South Lake 50%	X									
South Lake 90%	X									
U.S. Highway 50 at Park Ave., President's Weekend Traffic Volumes	X									Adopted TRPA Threshold Standard
Vehicle Miles Traveled	X									
Winter Traffic Volume	X									
Transit Cost per Revenue Hour			X							MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))

Attachment A: Existing Performance Measures Matrix

Measure	Focus				Notes			
	Threshold	Regional Plan	Federal	State	Regional Plan	State	Regional Plan	Transportation Plan
Transit Cost per Revenue Mile			X	X	X	X	X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d)), NDOT Reporting Measure
Transit Farebox Recovery Rate			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Number of Fatalities			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Number of Serious Injuries			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Rate of Fatalities (per 100 million VMT)			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100 million VMT)			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Percent of Bridges in Good Condition			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))
Percent of Pavement in Good Condition			X		X		X	MAP-21/FAST Act (23 CFR 450.306(d))

Attachment B  
Performance Measures Summary Template for White Paper

<b>Performance Measure Title</b>	
<b>Measure at a glance</b>	
<p><b>Focus:</b> Describes the focus area(s) for the performance measure: Environment, Connectivity, Safety, Economic Vitality &amp; Quality of Life, Operations &amp; Congestion Management, System Preservation</p> <p><b>Element:</b> Describes the sub-category for the performance measure.</p>	<p><b>Performance Measure Type:</b> Describes whether the performance measure is an Action, an Intermediate Result, or an Outcome Measure.</p> <p><b>Required by:</b> Describes whether the measure is required by State or Federal Legislation. Agency/Organization and legislation listed.</p> <p><b>SMART Amenable (TRPA/TMPO):</b> Yes/No value that describes whether the performance measure is amenable to the establishment of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant, Time-bound) goals for either TRPA or TMPO.</p>
<b>Indicator Overview</b>	
<b>Description</b>	
Brief narrative that relates the performance measure to a Focus and Element, including a summary of what is/is not measured.	
<b>Human and Environmental Drivers</b>	
Lists factors—controllable and uncontrollable—that positively or negatively influence the performance measure. Description includes direction of known influence and reference(s).	
<b>Reporting Readiness</b>	
Describes reporting readiness.	
<p>Reporting readiness is characterized by three factors: data collection, consistent reporting, and quality assurance. Reporting readiness is defined using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>High</b> - Data for this Measure is easily and consistently collected and reported, and is quality assured by staff.</li> <li>● <b>Moderate</b> - Data for this Measure is more costly/burdensome to acquire or report, and likely needs additional quality assurance due to underreporting, inconsistent reporting, etc.</li> <li>● <b>Low</b> - Data for this Measure is costly to acquire or report and data quality for this measure is low or unknown.</li> </ul>	
<b>Application</b>	
<b>In the Region</b>	
Summarizes use of the performance measure within the Tahoe Region (TRPA, USFS, CTC, Jurisdictions, etc.)	
<b>External uses</b>	
Summarizes existing uses outside of the Tahoe Region—other organizations’ use of the performance measure.	
<b>Literature or Guidance Documents</b>	
Summarizes literature or guidance on the use of the performance measure.	
<b>Relationship with Focus</b>	
Describes the relationship between the measure and the focus area(s)—how well suited is the measure to the focus?	
<p>Relationship with goal is characterized by the connection between the goal and the measure, defined using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↔ <b>Direct</b> - This measure has a verifiably direct connection with the goal it is measuring.</li> <li>↔ <b>Indirect</b> - This measure is a proxy for, or has an indirect connection with, the goal it is measuring.</li> </ul>	
<b>Variations of the Measure / Alternatives to the measures</b>	
Summarizes the relationship between this performance measure and other similar or related measures. (e.g. Daily Regional Vehicle Miles Traveled, Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita). May also describe data relationships, for example, GHG is a modelled value that is computed using the modelled VMT value as an input.	