

**Consistency Review**

August 9, 2010

Prepared for: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Prepared by: Bruce Wolff, Lauren Ledbetter, Alta Planning + Design

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. FEDERAL AND STATE PLANS AND POLICIES.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. FEDERAL BIKE PLAN REQUIREMENTS .....	4
2.2. US DOT POLICY STATEMENT ON BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATION REGULATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, 2010.....	5
2.3. AASHTO GUIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF BICYCLE FACILITIES, 1999 .....	6
2.4. AASHTO GUIDE FOR THE PLANNING, DESIGN, AND OPERATION OF PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES, 2004 .....	7
2.5. CALTRANS HIGHWAY DESIGN MANUAL .....	8
2.6. CALIFORNIA STREETS AND HIGHWAYS VEHICLE CODE .....	8
2.7. NEVADA VEHICLE CODES AND REVISED STATUES.....	9
2.8. MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES (MUTCD) (2009) AND CALIFORNIA MUTCD (2010) .....	9
2.9. STATE OF NEVADA BICYCLE PLAN 2005.....	10
2.10. CALTRANS BIKE PLAN REQUIREMENTS .....	11
2.11. CALTRANS DEPUTY DIRECTIVE 64-R1 .....	12
2.12. CALIFORNIA STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN, 2006.....	13
2.13. CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 1358 (AB 1358).....	13
2.14. CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL 375 (SB 375) .....	14
2.15. NEVADA STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN, 2006.....	14
<b>3. REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS AND POLICIES.....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1. TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT.....	15
3.2. REGIONAL PLAN FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION .....	16
3.3. TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY REGIONAL VISIONING AND PLANNING SUMMARY, AUGUST 2007.....	16
3.4. TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (CEP), JULY 2007 .....	17
3.5. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION .....	17
3.6. LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MOBILITY 2030).....	18
3.7. FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (FTIP) FOR THE LAKE TAHOE REGION, 2008.....	18
3.8. LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN, LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT, 1988 .....	19
3.9. NORTH SHORE TRAIL ACCESS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT .....	19
3.10. WATERBORNE TRANSIT SITE SELECTION STUDY .....	20
3.11. LAKE TAHOE ATMOSPHERIC DEPOSITION STUDY .....	20
3.12. LAHONTAN REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD REPORT .....	21
3.13. CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE.....	22
3.14. NLTRA INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION INTEGRATED WORK PLAN .....	22
3.15. NORTH TAHOE PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT LAND USE ORDINANCE.....	24
3.16. DOUGLAS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLAN .....	25
3.17. PLACER COUNTY REGIONAL BICYCLE PLAN (2002) .....	25
3.18. CARSON AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN .....	26
3.19. TRUCKEE TRAILS AND BIKEWAYS MASTER PLAN (2007) .....	26
3.20. MEASURE S.....	28
3.21. TAHOE CITY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT DOCUMENTS.....	28
3.22. NORTHSTAR-AT-TAHOE HABITAT MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	28
3.23. EAST SHORE ACCESS PLAN.....	29
3.24. EASTSHORE DRIVE NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAY CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	29

3.25. EAST SHORE BEACHES TRAIL ACCESS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT PLAN..... 29

3.26. NEVADA STATELINE TO STATELINE BIKEWAY FEASIBILITY STUDY ..... 30

3.27. CALTRANS STATE ROUTE 89 CASCADE TO RUBICON BAY BIKEWAY STUDY, FEBRUARY 2003. 30

**4. OTHER PLANS..... 31**

**5. PLAN AND POLICY MATRIX ..... 31**

## 1. Introduction

This memo summarizes bicycle and pedestrian-related planning documents and policies of the Lake Tahoe Region, with the purpose of assisting Tahoe Regional Planning Agency staff in developing a Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan that is consistent with other local plans and that follows applicable local policies.

Plans and policies are organized by jurisdiction, starting with federal and state documents and moving to more local plans and policies.

Summaries include the authoring agency, a URL (when available), a summary of the plan, and a discussion of plans or policies that are relevant to TRPA's Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

A summary matrix of plans and policies is provided at the end of this document.

## 2. Federal and State Plans and Policies

### *2.1. Federal Bike Plan Requirements*

Agency: Federal Highway Administration

URL: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/bp-broch.htm>

The United States Code Title 23 Section 217 calls for the integration of bicycles and pedestrians into the transportation network. The FHWA defines a bicycle facility as “a new or improved lane, path, or shoulder for use by bicyclists and a traffic control device, shelter, or parking facility for bicycles.”

The FHWA provides a range of funding opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. To be eligible for these funds, states, metropolitan planning organizations, and planning agencies of urbanized areas with 50,000 or more residents, are required to carry out a comprehensive planning process that results in the following:

- A long range (20 year) transportation plan provides for the development and integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities, including pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities. Both State and MPO plans will consider projects and strategies to increase the safety and security of the transportation system for nonmotorized users.
- A Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that contains a list of proposed federally supported projects to be carried out over the next three years. Projects that appear in the TIP should be consistent with the long range plan.

Bicycle and pedestrian design standards are determined on a State or local level and should adhere to the American Association of Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the

Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) publications including “*Guide to the Development of Bicycle Facilities* and *A Policy on Geometric Design of Streets and Highways*.”

The FHWA also provides guidance on accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians in new roadway design. The policy statement, “*Integrating Bicycling and Walking into Transportation Infrastructure*”, states:

Bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be established in new construction and reconstruction projects in all urbanized areas unless one or more of three conditions are met:

- Bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using the roadway. In this instance, a greater effort may be necessary to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians elsewhere within the right of way or within the same transportation corridor.
- The cost of establishing bikeways or walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Excessively disproportionate is defined as exceeding twenty percent of the cost of the larger transportation project.
- Where sparsity of population or other factors indicate an absence of need. For example, the Portland Pedestrian Guide requires "all construction of new public streets" to include sidewalk improvements on both sides, unless the street is a cul-de-sac with four or fewer dwellings or the street has severe topographic or natural resource constraints.

These guidelines can be found at:

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/design.htm>.

## ***2.2. US DOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations, 2010***

Agency: United States Department of Transportation

URL: <http://www.dot.gov/affairs/2010/bicycle-ped.html>

The US DOT’s Policy Statement reflects the Department’s support for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks. The Policy Statement encourages all transportation agencies to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects, to improve conditions for walking and bicycling, and to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.

The policy refers to sections in the United States Code and the Code of Federal Regulations that describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved in the planning process, should not be adversely affected by transportation projects, and should be able to track funding and expenditures for non-motorized transportation projects.

The Policy Statement lists the following recommended actions for government agencies, professional associations and community groups:

- Consider walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes.
- Ensure that there are transportation choices for all ages, especially children.
- Go beyond minimum design standards for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Integrate bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges.
- Collect data on walking and biking trips.
- Set mode share targets for walking and biking and track over time.
- Remove snow and sidewalks from shared-use paths.
- Improve non-motorized facilities during maintenance projects.

### ***2.3. AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 1999***

Agency: American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials

URL: <http://www.transportation.org/>

The AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities was developed to provide transportation professionals a resource for constructing safe bicycle facilities. The guide contains suggested guidelines for bicycle facilities, including lane widths, turning lanes, intersections, shared use paths, pavement, lighting, and maintenance. An updated Draft Guide was completed January 2010, and has been distributed to AASHTO for ballot. The Draft Guide, which significantly expands on the 1999 version, is available here:

[http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/docs/NCHRP\\_15-37\\_FR.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/docs/NCHRP_15-37_FR.pdf)

Note that the final, adopted Guide may change significantly from the Draft Guide.

The 1999 AASHTO Guide defines different types of bikeways.

- Most bicycle trips are made on shared roadways: streets that do not have bikeway designations. AASHTO recommends minimum 12 foot wide outside lane curb widths for all streets to allow for simultaneous use by bicyclists and motorists.
  - For roadways with on-street parking, 12 feet combined width for bicycle travel and automobile parking is recommended.

- Signed shared roadways are bike routes designated by signs. AASHTO recommends that on-street parking is removed or restricted and that pavement be well maintained. Signs should be installed every quarter mile, at every turn and at major signalized intersections. Signed shared roadways should:
  - Provide continuity to other bike routes or
  - Designate bike routes through high demand corridors
- Bicycle lanes are established with appropriate markings and signs along high demand corridors. They should be a minimum four feet in width and five feet where on-street parking is present.
- Shared use paths are paved and separated from roadways. AASHTO recommends analyzing expected user types and demand when designing shared use paths. At a minimum, shared use paths should have an eight-foot paved width and in most circumstances should have a paved width at least 10 feet wide. Shared use paths should have two-foot wide graded shoulders.
- Sidewalks are not an AASHTO recommended bicycle facility.

#### ***2.4. AASHTO Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, 2004***

Agency: Agency: American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials

URL: <http://www.transportation.org/>

The AASHTO Ped Guide was developed to provide guidance on the planning, design, and operations of pedestrian facilities along streets and highways. The guide includes appropriate methods for accommodating pedestrians on a variety of roadway and facility types, and addresses how land use planning and site design affect pedestrian mobility.

The guide emphasizes that the design pedestrian should include children, older persons, and people with disabilities, and includes appropriate design guidelines. The guidelines presented are generally not intended to set strict standards, but in some cases specific design criteria have been provided to indicate suggested minimums.

The Guide is divided into four sections.

- The Introduction describes the purpose and scope of the document, and summarizes design regulations and guidelines.
- The second chapter, Planning for Pedestrians, describes pedestrian activity, characteristics of a variety of pedestrians, ways in which pedestrians can be accommodated in the planning process, recommendations for land use and site development to support walking, and traffic calming strategies.

- The third chapter, Pedestrian Facility Design, provides recommended design guidelines for roadways, sidewalks, intersections, midblock crossings, and grade-separated crossings.
- The fourth chapter, Pedestrian Facility Operation and Maintenance, provides guidelines for pedestrian signal phasing, timing, and warrants, pedestrian signage, sidewalk maintenance, and pedestrian traffic in construction zones.

## ***2.5. Caltrans Highway Design Manual***

Agency: Caltrans

URL: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hdm/hdmtoc.htm>

The Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) provides design guidelines for the construction of streets and highways. Chapter 1000 provides specific planning and design recommendations for bicycle facilities. This should not be confused with California MUTCD, which only provides design standards for signing and striping, not the construction of facilities.

The HDM defines bikeways by classes, which are listed below. In order for bicycle facilities to be eligible for California State funding, bikeways must be constructed by HDM guidelines.

- Class I bikeways are paved multi-use paths with a minimum paved width of eight feet and two-foot graded shoulders.
- Class II bikeways are striped bicycle lanes on roadways with a minimum width of four feet.
- Class III bikeways are roadways that are signed as bicycle routes, but do not have a lane dedicated to bicycles.
- Shared Roadways do not have bikeway designations. Bicyclists are afforded the same rights as motorists on all California roadways as provided in the vehicle code.

## ***2.6. California Streets and Highways Vehicle Code***

California Department of Motor Vehicles

URL: <http://www.dmv.ca.gov/pubs/vctop/vc/tocd11c1a4.htm>

The California Streets and Highways Vehicle Code Division 11 Chapter 1 Article 4 defines bicycle use on roadways statute. Bicyclists riding on highways (including local streets) are afforded the same rights as motor vehicle operators. This includes using a full traffic lane to either pass a slower moving vehicle or positioning for a left turn. Bicyclists must ride as close a practicable to the right curb, except on multi-lane one-way roadways, where they may ride close to the left curb.

No person shall obstruct a bikeway unless operating a public utility or delivery vehicle or where signs restricting parking are posted.

Division 11, Chapter 5 of the Vehicle Code defines pedestrians' rights and duties. Drivers are required to yield to pedestrians who are crossing at marked or unmarked crosswalks. Pedestrians are required to use due care when crossing. A person on skis traveling on or across a highway at a pace no greater than a walk is considered a pedestrian.

Section 21949 is most relevant to the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan:

“...it is the intent of the Legislature that all levels of government in the state, particularly the Department of Transportation, work to provide convenient and safe passage for pedestrians on and across all streets and highways, increase levels of walking and pedestrian travel, and reduce pedestrian fatalities and injuries.”

## ***2.7. Nevada Vehicle Codes and Revised Statutes***

Agency: Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles

URL: <http://www.dmvnv.com/codebook.htm>

The Nevada Vehicle Code Chapters most relevant to bicycle travel are 480 and 484. Chapter 484 contains codes relevant to pedestrians.

- 480 – Section 700 states that the Department of Transportation shall develop a bicycle education program. Section 710 states the DOT shall form a governor appointed bicycle advisory board made up of seven representatives from each geographic area of the state in addition to representatives from select public agencies. Section 720 defines the duties of the board.
- 484 – Section 324 defines bicycle use on roadways. Bicyclists shall not interfere with the movement of a motor vehicle, nor shall they overtake a motor vehicle unless it can be done so without endangering the occupants of the motor vehicle or themselves.
- 484 – Section 325 defines right-of-way in crosswalks. When official traffic-control devices are not in place or not in operation the driver of a vehicle shall yield the right-of-way to a pedestrian crossing the highway within a crosswalk.
- 484 – Section 327 defines crossing other than at crosswalks. Every pedestrian crossing a highway at any point other than within a marked crosswalk or within an unmarked crosswalk at an intersection shall yield the right-of-way to all vehicles upon the highway.

## ***2.8. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (2009) and California MUTCD (2010)***

Agency: Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans

URL: Federal MUTCD: <http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/>

California MUTCD:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/ca\\_mutcd2010.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/ca_mutcd2010.htm)

The MUTCD provides standards for installing traffic control devices. States may choose to adopt the federal plan or adopt a revised plan. Nevada uses the federal plan, and California has adopted a revised version of the MUTCD specific to California. The most recent CAMUTCD was adopted in 2010, and based on the 2006 Federal MUTCD, not the 2009 Federal MUTCD. By 2012, California is required to issue a revised state MUTCD based on the 2009 Federal MUTCD.

Parts most relevant to the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan are listed below

- Part 7 – Traffic Controls for school areas.
- Part 9 – Traffic Controls for bicycle facilities, providing standards for signs, markings and signals for bicyclists.

The Nevada MUTCD differs from the California MUTCD in several ways, most notably by including pedestrian hybrid beacons (also known as HAWK signals, Chapter 4F), including a “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” sign (R4-11, Section 9B.06) and a combined bicycle and pedestrian warning sign (W11-15, Section 9B.18), and requiring that school warning signs be fluorescent yellow-green rather than yellow.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities constructed within California and Nevada must follow the respective State MUTCD requirements.

## ***2.9. State of Nevada Bicycle Plan 2005***

Agency: State of Nevada

URL: [http://www.bicyclenevada.com/pdf\\_bpc/bikeplan.pdf](http://www.bicyclenevada.com/pdf_bpc/bikeplan.pdf)

The Nevada Department of Transportation is the agency in charge of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians in Nevada.

The 2005 Nevada Bicycle Plan is an update from the 2003 version, and emphasizes how the different levels of government agencies can implement the plan. For metropolitan planning organizations, the Nevada Bicycle Plan lists the following roles and responsibilities.

- Develop, revise and update long-range bicycle plans.
- Provide technical assistance to local communities, especially for plan implementation.
- Develop Transportation Improvement Program project selection criteria that apply to bike facilities.

- Develop land use and transportation plans that will lead to compact and contiguous development.

NDOT's State Bicycle Plan recommends that local agencies adhere to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' bicycle facility design standards. Facilities not meeting AASHTO design standards shall be retrofitted pending future funding availability.

The NDOT Bike Plan recommends the following design guidelines.

- Landscaping should be low water consuming native vegetation.
- Lighting should be installed on shared use paths.
- Barriers at path entrances should be clearly marked with reflectors and meet ADA requirements.
- Shared use paths should consider emergency vehicle access.
- NDOT recommends that wider bicycle lanes, beyond the minimum standard, be installed whenever possible.
- AASHTO provides recommended intersection treatments including bicycle lane 'pockets' and signal loop detectors. The plan recommends that NDOT develop a protocol for the application of these recommendations, so that improvements can be funded and made as part of regular improvement projects.
- Signal loop detectors that sense bicycles are recommended at all arterial/arterial, arterial/collector, and collector/collector intersections.
- The location of the detectors should be identified by a stencil of a bicycle.
- When loop detectors are installed, traffic signalization should be set to accommodate bicycle speeds.
- Bicycle-sensitive loop detectors are preferred over a signalized button specifically designed for bicyclists.
- Bike lane pockets (min. 4' wide) between right turn lanes and through lanes should be provided wherever available width allows, and right turn volumes exceed 150 motor vehicles/hour.
- Where bottlenecks preclude continuous bike lanes, they should be linked with bikeway route treatments.

## **2.10. Caltrans Bike Plan Requirements**

Agency: Caltrans

URL: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/PDFs/BTPChecklist.pdf>

As California's Department of Transportation, Caltrans is the agency responsible for implementing bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Caltrans funds local facilities through its Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA). The BTA requires applicants to have adopted or updated a bicycle plan within the past five years.

Because some local governments in the Lake Tahoe Region adopt TRPA's regional bicycle plan as their own, and use it to apply for BTA funds, TRPA's plan will need to comply with CA Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2. To comply with Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2, a bicycle plan must include the following eleven elements:

1. Estimated number of existing and future bicycle commuters;
2. Land use and population density;
3. Existing and proposed bikeways;
4. Existing and proposed bicycle parking facilities;
5. Existing and proposed multi-modal connections;
6. Existing and proposed facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment;
7. Bicycle safety and education programs;
8. Citizen and community participation;
9. Consistency with transportation, air quality, and energy plans;
10. Project descriptions and priority listings; and
11. Past expenditures and future financial needs.

This list is also available at the URL below.

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/PDFs/BTPChecklist.pdf>

## **2.11. Caltrans Deputy Directive 64-R1**

Agency: California Department of Transportation

URL:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/complete\\_streets\\_files/dd\\_64\\_r1\\_signed.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/complete_streets_files/dd_64_r1_signed.pdf)

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) adopted Deputy Directive 64-R1 "Complete Streets-Integrating the Transportation System" in 2008. DD 64-R1 policy strengthens the Department's prior Deputy Directive (DD-64), and directs Caltrans to provide for the needs of travelers of all ages and abilities in all planning, programming, design, construction, operations, and maintenance activities and products on the State highway system. The Directive "recognizes bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system" and "views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access, and mobility." To implement this policy, DD 64-R1 defines the roles of Department positions, which can be found at the URL above

## **2.12. California Strategic Highway Safety Plan, 2006**

Agency: Caltrans

URL: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/SHSP/>

The 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires each state to develop and implement a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). Caltrans partnered with the California Office of Traffic Safety, California Highway Patrol, and California State Association of Counties to develop a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) that was adopted in 2006, with Version 2 issued a few years later.

The SHSP is divided into sixteen challenge areas, with action items listed under each challenge area. Many challenge areas address bicyclist and pedestrian safety issues, but the following two challenge areas are specific to those modes:

Challenge Area 8: Make walking and crossing the street safer. Major focus: Expanding existing programs, better identification of problem areas, and improving maintenance and planning efforts. Goal: By 2010, reduce the number of pedestrian fatalities attributed to vehicle collisions by 25% from their 2000 level.

Challenge Area 13: Improve Bicycle Safety. Major focus: Developing a bicycle safety improvement program, increasing driver awareness, establishing better planning practices, and improving educational campaigns. Goal: By 2010, reduce the number of bicycle roadway fatalities by 25% from their 2000 level.

## **2.13. California Assembly Bill 1358 (AB 1358)**

URL: [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/asm/ab\\_1351-1400/ab\\_1358\\_bill\\_20080930\\_chaptered.pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1358_bill_20080930_chaptered.pdf)

AB 1358, the “Complete Streets Act,” requires the legislative body of a city or county, upon revision of the circulation element of their general plan, to identify how the jurisdiction will provide for the routine accommodation of all users of the roadway including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and users of public transportation.

While the BPP is not a city or county plan, local cities or counties may choose to adopt portions of it into their general plans. The proposed facilities in the BPP should be an integral part of planning for Complete Streets. The BPP also contains policy language supporting the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians in new projects, including roadway projects.

## **2.14. California Senate Bill 375 (SB 375)**

Agency: California Air Resources Board

URL: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>

SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emission. The new law establishes a “bottom up” approach to ensure that cities and counties are involved in the development of regional plans to achieve those targets.

AB 32, California’s *Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*, gives CARB authority over sources of GHG emissions, including cars and light trucks. According to CARB, transportation accounts for some 40 percent of GHG emissions, with cars and light trucks accounting for almost three-quarters of those emissions (30 percent overall). SB 375 helps California achieve GHG reduction goals for cars and light trucks.

SB 375 requires each MPO to include a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” in the regional transportation plan that demonstrates how the region will meet the GHG emission targets. If the sustainable communities strategy falls short of meeting the targets, the region must prepare an “alternative planning strategy” that, if implemented, would meet the targets. SB 375 also requires that decisions relating to the allocation of transportation funding be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

SB 375 has three major components:

1. Using the regional transportation planning process to achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions consistent with AB 32’s goals;
2. Offering California Environmental Quality Act incentives to encourage projects that are consistent with a regional plan that achieves greenhouse gas emission reductions; and
3. Coordinating the regional housing needs allocation process with the regional transportation process while maintaining local authority over land use decisions<sup>1</sup>.

Many of the projects and policies listed in the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan are anticipated to become a part of the Lake Tahoe Region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy under SB 375.

## **2.15. Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan, 2006**

Agency: Nevada DOT and Nevada Public Safety Department

URL: [http://www.nevadadot.com/reports\\_pubs/Safety\\_Plan/](http://www.nevadadot.com/reports_pubs/Safety_Plan/)

---

<sup>1</sup> Text adapted from the Institute for Local Government, “The Basics of SB 375: Transportation, Housing, and Greenhouse Gases.”

The 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires each state to develop and implement a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). The Nevada Departments of Transportation and Public Safety collaborated with other safety partners to develop the State’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), which was adopted in 2006.

The plan identifies five Critical Emphasis Areas (CEA) for safety improvements. One of these relate to pedestrian safety, CEA 1: Making walking and street crossing safer. The plan notes that pedestrian-crashes comprises 15% of Nevada’s fatal crashes from 1998-2002. (p. 6). The Plan’s overall goal is to reduce the statewide traffic fatality rate (fatalities per million vehicle miles traveled) by 33% from 2003 levels.

The strategies to make walking and street crossing safer include:

- Reduce pedestrian exposure to vehicular traffic through infrastructure and operations, and improve visibility between motorists and pedestrians.
- Improve motorist and pedestrian safety awareness and behavior through education and enforcement.
- Implement a pedestrian safety program targeting high crash locations in the major urbanized areas and select rural areas.
- Use enforcement to raise compliance for both motorists and pedestrians.

### 3. Regional and Local Plans and Policies

#### 3.1. *Tahoe Regional Planning Compact*

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

URL: <http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=0&tabid=175>

The ***Tahoe Regional Planning Compact*** calls for:

*“A transportation plan for the integrated development of a regional system of transportation, including but not limited to parkways, highways, transportation facilities, transit routes, waterways, navigation facilities, public transportation facilities, bicycle facilities, and appurtenant terminals and facilities for the movement of people and goods within the region. The goal of transportation planning shall be:*

- a) To reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes and of public transit to move people and goods within the region; and*
- b) To reduce to the extent feasible air pollution which is caused by motor vehicles*

The Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is incorporated by reference into the transportation plan.

### ***3.2. Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region***

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

URL: <http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=4&tabid=188>

The Regional Plan contains the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances. The Transportation Chapter of the TRPA Goals and Policies contains goals and policies specific to bicycle and pedestrian planning. The Code of Ordinances contains regulations that relate to bicycle and pedestrian planning in the following chapters:

Chapter 20. Land Coverage Standards

Chapter 93. Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program

Chapter 97. Employer Trip Reduction Program

The Regional Plan is undergoing a 20-year update which is expected to be completed in 2011. New policies from the BPP will inform the updated Regional Plan Goals and Policies and Code of Ordinances.

### ***3.3. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Regional Visioning and Planning Summary, August 2007***

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Available at the TRPA offices.

The Tahoe Basin Regional Vision Summary is an overview of principles and concepts that frame a desired direction for Tahoe Basin built and natural environments over the next 20 years. The Vision Summary is the result of the public outreach process associated with the update of the TRPA Regional Plan, and represents a variety of local, regional, and national interests. The process engaged local community members, second home owners, and visitors in the development of the next 20-year plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The “Community Contribution” section of the Regional Vision Summary, dated May 2007, includes the following details which have been integrated into the BPP as appropriate:

South Shore: Include bicycle trails along the Caltrans right-of-way between Meyers and Stateline; bicycle trail along Sawmill Road; bicycle facilities between Emerald Bay and Sugar Pine Point recreation areas; US Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade will make pedestrians safer and more comfortable (p. 3).

Placer County: Neighborhoods will include lighted streets and sidewalks (p. 4); all new public and private investment should connect to existing and future pedestrian and bicycle facilities

(p. 9); complete bicycle connections from Dollar Hill to Kings Beach, Northstar to Kings Beach, and Dollar Hill to points south (p. 11).

Washoe County: The highway would be designed as a mixed-mode street as it passes through Incline and Crystal Bay with pedestrian and bicycle facilities being accommodated in the right-of-way (p. 12).

Regional Vision concepts: A Basin-wide transportation system would consider...bike trail systems that make it easy and safe to circumnavigate the Basin (p. 14).

Recreation: Build bike and pedestrian trails with access to recreation sites around Lake Tahoe; bike lock-ups would be placed at trailheads and in towns; free “community blue bikes” would be available at various locations for ease of transit (p. 31); bike and pedestrian paths would connect Incline Village with Tahoe City; bike trails would be accessible throughout the [East Shore], where gaps currently exist and at recreation trailheads, where environmentally appropriate (p. 32); bikeway connections to Sand Harbor would be improved (p. 34).

### ***3.4. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Community Enhancement Program (CEP), July 2007***

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

URL: <http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=0&tabid=335>

The focus of the CEP is to encourage revitalization projects in downtown and recreation areas that demonstrate substantial environmental, as well as social and economic benefits. The program provides incentives for mixed-use development projects on existing disturbed or underutilized sites. The CEP is competitive and is designed to encourage the “best” projects that will demonstrate the desires of the community captured in the Regional Vision.

Goals of the CEP related to bicycling and walking include (p. 4):

- Create/enhance mixed-use Community Centers
- Create a multi-modal transit future
- Strengthen and create gathering places and economic centers.

### ***3.5. Environmental Improvement Program for the Lake Tahoe Region***

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

URL: <http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=12&tabid=227>

The Environmental Improvement Program encompasses hundreds of capital improvement, research, program support, and operation and maintenance projects in the Tahoe Basin, all designed to help restore Lake Tahoe's clarity and environment.

EIP projects are designed to achieve and maintain environmental thresholds that protect Tahoe's unique and valued resources.

All bicycle and pedestrian projects from the EIP that are not yet completed are included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Some edits to project descriptions or boundaries may have been made in the BPP based on updated information from implementing agencies. Projects in the BPP will inform the next update of the EIP.

### ***3.6. Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (Mobility 2030)***

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

URL: <http://www.tahoempo.org/rtp.aspx>

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) includes policies, project implementation plans, and funding strategies to meet community goals. The RTP is consistent with the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan, and is expected to be included in the TRPA Regional Plan update in 2011.

The Regional Transportation Plan includes Goals and Policies with the heading "Pedestrian & Bicycle Friendly Communities". The Goal in this section states:

"Design an atmosphere that encourages bicycle and pedestrian usage as a viable and significant mode of transportation at Lake Tahoe".

Policies from this section were incorporated and expanded upon in the Goals and Policies of the BPP. The prioritized project list of the BPP informs the prioritized project list of the RTP.

### ***3.7. Federal Transportation Plan (FTIP) for the Lake Tahoe Region, 2008***

Agency: Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization

URL: <http://www.tahoempo.org/funding.aspx?SelectedIndex=1>

The 2008 FTIP is the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization's (TMPO) financially constrained priority listing of funded projects including transit, highway, bicycle and pedestrian projects that are currently being developed through the year 2012. The FTIP contains projects that:

- 1) Receive federal funds,
- 2) are subject to a federal action,
- 3) are regionally significant.

Projects from the BPP move onto the FTIP when they have received federal funding.

### ***3.8. Land and Resource Management Plan, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, 1988***

Agency: United States Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU)

URL: <http://fs.usda.gov/goto/ltbmu/1988ForestPlan>

The National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan was developed to direct the management of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit of the US Forest Service. The goal of the forest plan is to provide a management program that uses a mix of management activities to direct the use and protection of resources, fulfill legislative requirements, and address local, regional, and national issues. Almost 148,000 acres of land in the Lake Tahoe Basin is under the jurisdiction of the LTBMU.

The Forest Plan includes multiple resource goals. Those with the most relevance to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan include the Social and Economic, Roads and Trails, and Recreation goals. These goals stress the importance of recreation in providing social and economic benefits, and that there should be a variety of opportunities to enjoy outdoor recreation experiences. The Roads and Trails goal specifically states that one measure to achieving a reduction in vehicle trips shall be providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities along major transportation corridors and interconnecting public transportation terminal and population and activities centers.

The Forest Plan also lists management practices used by the LTBMU to accomplish its goals and objectives. The practice for Trail Construction and Reconstruction is the “planning and building of permanent trails for pedestrian, bicycle, horse and motorcycle use. The primary purpose is to provide trails to support the goals (primarily recreation) for the area in an economically efficient manner.”

Finally, the Forest Plan includes direction for each of 21 physical Management Areas around the Lake Tahoe Basin. Most of the direction relevant to bicycle and pedestrian planning in each of these Management Areas includes the construction or decommissioning of trails, and provision of parking or toilets. Implementers of any new bicycle or pedestrian projects that cross land managed by the US Forest Service should review the management direction for that area and coordinate with the US Forest Service.

### ***3.9. North Shore Trail Access and Travel Management Plan and Environmental Assessment***

Agency: United Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit

URL: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/ltbmu/documents/trail-atm/North-Shore-Area-Final-EA.pdf>

The North Shore Trail Access and Travel Management Plan (ATM) presents three alternative transportation systems for the North Shore Transportationshed on National Forest Lands within the Tahoe Basin. Trails are included in all three alternative

transportation systems. The North Shore Trail ATM purpose is to identify and minimize environmental impacts from the transportation system.

Design features relevant to the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan are:

- Soil protection measures (p.2-2)
- Stream Environment Zone (SEZ) protection measures (p.2-4)
- Fire protection measures (p. 2-7)
- Biological protection measures (p. 2-8 to 2-10)
- Heritage resource measures (p. 2-10)
- Air protection measures (p. 2-15)

### **3.10. *Waterborne Transit Site Selection Study***

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

URL: <http://www.tahoempo.org/documents.aspx?SelectedIndex=5>

This study is the first step in determining appropriate station locations for a future ferry service on Lake Tahoe. The study presents a preliminary screening of four potential ferry landing sites: Lakeside Marina near the South Shore/Stateline area, Ski Run Marina in South Lake Tahoe, Tahoe City Marina, and the Kings Beach State Recreation Area. The Study found the following bicycle and pedestrian issues.

- There are no dedicated bicycle and pedestrian facilities on SR 28 near Kings Beach.
- There are no dedicated bicycle and pedestrian facilities near Lakeside Marina. However, the low traffic volumes on nearby streets make walking and cycling relatively attractive.
- The study estimates bicycle and pedestrian access will be good at all sites with the exception of Lakeside Marina, where access is estimated to be adequate.

### **3.11. *Lake Tahoe Atmospheric Deposition Study***

Agencies: Lahontan Regional Water Quality Board, California and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

URL: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/ltads/ltads.htm>

In a response to the declining clarity of Lake Tahoe, California's Lahontan Regional Water Quality Board and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection established a Total Maximum Daily Load for the lake. TMDL is the maximum amount of pollutants a water

body can absorb while maintaining set standards. Contaminants adversely affecting water clarity enter the lake via runoff containing sediments and nutrients, seepage of groundwater containing nutrients, shoreline erosion and direct atmospheric deposition.

Lake Tahoe Atmospheric Deposition Study was designed to provide the following information, for developing the technical TMDL.

- Improved estimates of the loading of nutrients and particulate matter from atmospheric deposition to Lake Tahoe.
- Improved attribution of the in-basin and out-of-basin sources of these materials.
- Assessment of the effect of ozone concentrations on forest health.
- Confidence levels associated with these estimates and assessments.

The LTDS does not have any policies or design standards that apply to the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

### ***3.12. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board Total Maximum Daily Load Report***

Agencies: Lahontan Regional Water Quality Board, California and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection

URL:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water\\_issues/programs/tmdl/lake\\_tahoe/index.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/lake_tahoe/index.shtml)

This report presents a discussion of those factors contributing to the loss of lake clarity. Organic particles less than 16 micrometers, nitrogen and phosphorus significantly affect lake clarity, with organic particles accounting for two-thirds of the poor lake clarity conditions. The report identifies five categories that are the source of nitrogen, phosphorus and fine sediment pollutants:

- Upland runoff (urban and non-urban)
- Atmospheric deposition
- Stream channel erosion
- Ground water
- Shoreline erosion

The first two categories relate to bicycle paths. Urban upland sources include non-vegetated land uses where runoff eventually flows into the lake. Examples include impervious surfaces

such as highways, parking lots and bike paths. According to the research, urban upland sources account for 72 percent of fine sediment particle loading in Lake Tahoe.

The plan describes a Recommended Strategy to reduce pollution from each pollutant source to desired levels within 20 years. It specifically calls for a 24.5% reduction in urban uplands sources.

Methods that can be used to reduce pollutants from urban uplands sources are listed on pages 9-4 and 9-5 in the plan. The plan states that land uses with dispersed impervious coverage require less extensive treatments than land areas with concentrated impervious coverage

Page 11-8 lists example load reduction measures, some of which may be applicable to bicycle paths:

- Current best practices – treatment basins, stormwater vaults, road shoulder stabilization, limited street sweeping, and annual facilities maintenance with vacuum trucks.
- Use of alternative deicing and traction abrasive compounds and advanced technologies for determining the need and appropriate deicing and abrasive application rates.
- Advanced roadway facilities maintenance, including more frequent use of state-of-the-art vacuum sweeping equipment and alternative pavement surfaces

### ***3.13. City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Update***

Agency: City of South Lake Tahoe

URL: <http://sltgpu.com/>

The September 16, 2009 draft of the City's General Plan includes a map of proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and a Transportation and Circulation Element with policies related to bicycling and walking.

### ***3.14. NLTRA Infrastructure and Transportation Integrated Work Plan***

Agency: North Lake Tahoe Resort Association and Placer County

URL: FY 2008 2009 Work Plan: <http://www.nltra.org/docs/Work%20Plan%20doc.pdf>

2009-2010 Work Plan, reviewed here, is not available online.

The Placer County Infrastructure and Transportation Committee and the NLTRA Board of Directors compiled this FY 2009-2010 Integrated Work Plan and Long Range Funding Plan. The NLTRA plan summarizes the ongoing and future infrastructure projects slated for 2009-2014.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities included in the plan are listed below:

- Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project (A-1) will construct a pedestrian-friendly commercial core area. Final project expected to be approved in 2009, with construction occurring between spring 2010 and 2012.
- Dollar Hill/Tahoe Vista Class I Bicycle Trail (A-6) will construct a paved bicycle path from Dollar Hill to the Regional Park in Tahoe Vista. This project is restarted after being stalled due to concerns over potential impacts to wildlife species.
- Northstar Community Multi-Purpose Trail (A-7) will construct a 7-mile paved path from Northstar border near Highway 267 through the community to Four Corners. Environmental documentation is expected to be completed in 2009.
- Truckee River Outlet Winter Plaza Maintenance (A-12) will provide winter maintenance to this plaza and multi-use trail through a partnership between TCPUD, NLTRA and CA State Parks. A partnership agreement is expected to be completed in 2009.
- Visitor Multi-Purpose Trail Map Signage (A-13) will design a trail map to the Class I paths.
- Homewood Class I Bicycle Trail (A-19) will construct a Class I path in conjunction with a Caltrans highway/water quality improvement project on Highway 89 in Homewood.
- Tahoe City Historic Walking Trail (A-20) will develop a self-guided tour to Tahoe City.
- North Shore Traffic Calming (A-22) will provide better-delineated pedestrian crossings and improved pedestrian warning signage along Highway 28 through the business areas.

The high-priority bicycle and pedestrian facilities in need of funding are listed below.

- Burton Creek State Park/Tahoe City East Parking, Trailhead, Transit, and Visitor Information. (D-1) This project is being studied.
- Tahoe Vista to Northstar Trail Multi-Use Trail. (D-2) The expected lead agency will be California Tahoe Conservancy. NLTRA anticipated funding is \$1,000,000.
- Winter Multi-Use (Lakeside) Trail Maintenance. (D-6) The lead agency will be Tahoe PUD. NLTRA anticipated annual funding is \$40,000.
- Bike Trail Restrooms (West Shore, Truckee River Access Park, Truckee River). Bathroom locations have been identified. NLTRA anticipated funding is \$800,000.

- North Tahoe Regional Park Trail Renovation. (D-11) The lead agency will be North Tahoe PUD. NLTRA anticipated funding is \$75,000.
- Lakeside Multi-Purpose Trail/Tahoe Marina Lodge. (D-12) The lead agency will be Tahoe City PUD and Redevelopment Agency. NLTRA funding not defined.
- Squaw Valley/Truckee Multi-Purpose Trail. (D-15) The lead agency is Placer County. NLTRA anticipated funding is \$600,000.

For a TRPA project to be considered by the NLTRA, it must submit an application. The project must receive recommendation for approval by the Joint Committee and be approved by the NLTRA and the Placer County Board of Supervisors. North Lake Tahoe Resort Association requires the constructing agency to submit a three-year maintenance plan to receive construction funds

### ***3.15. North Tahoe Public Utility District Land Use Ordinance***

Agency: North Tahoe PUD

URL: <http://www.ntpud.org/Pages/Page.aspx?PageID=100>

The North Tahoe PUD is responsible for sewer, water and recreation facilities, including maintaining public beaches within its jurisdiction. The North Tahoe PUD ordinances relevant to the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan are listed below:

- Ordinance 345
  - No business or individual shall conduct a Commercial Activity, Group Activity or Demonstration, solicit, sell, hawk, or peddle any goods, wares, merchandise, services, liquids, or edibles for human consumption, distribute circulars or conduct any activity which impacts or effects property operations, facility use or visitor safety on District owned or operated property without first obtaining a permit from the District and complying with all conditions of the permit.
  - Any activities permitted by the District shall be subject to fees and charges set by the District for said activities, as well as other conditions of approval.
  - Where the District operates property owned by other agencies, any user of said property shall, in addition to complying with District regulations for use of District operated property, comply with all applicable regulations of the owning agency. Where activities are regulated by both the District and the owning agency, the most restrictive of the regulations shall apply.
- Ordinance 349

- Property Line Adjustments. Any Property Line Adjustment resulting in physical modification of existing service or resulting in changes to existing billing account addresses or information shall be subject to a flat fee of \$360.00. No additional time and material charges shall apply.

### **3.16. Douglas County Transportation Plan**

Agency: Douglas County

URL:

[http://www.douglascountynv.gov/sites/CDAdmin/engineering/2007\\_Transportation\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.douglascountynv.gov/sites/CDAdmin/engineering/2007_Transportation_Plan.pdf)

Douglas County is responsible for developing a long-term (20 year) plan that guides the implementation of transportation infrastructure, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The County's Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Plan is a separate document that is included in its entirety as an appendix in the Transportation Plan.

The transportation policies that apply to TRPA's Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan include:

- Ensure the development and maintenance of multi-purpose trails throughout Douglas County, connecting to public lands, recreational facilities of local and regional interest.
- Coordinate transportation planning and land use development.
- Provide medians and bicycle and pedestrian connections on US 395 from Minden to Gardnerville.

In addition, the plan does not allocate funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities beyond 2009. However, policy 12.38 states that the development of funding mechanisms is needed.

### **3.17. Placer County Regional Bicycle Plan (2002)**

Agency: Placer County Transportation Planning Agency

URL:

[http://www.pctpa.net/library/bikeplans/Placer\\_County\\_Regional\\_Bikeway\\_Plan\\_web.pdf](http://www.pctpa.net/library/bikeplans/Placer_County_Regional_Bikeway_Plan_web.pdf)

The Regional Bicycle Plan guides the development of bicycle facilities and network in Placer County. This Plan identifies bicycle projects on County land and includes an appendix with bicycle projects within incorporated city limits. Bicycle plans for the incorporated cities have been or will be developed.

Policy 7 is of most relevance to TRPA stating, "encourage all Placer County jurisdictions, including Municipal Advisory Committees, to include bikeways in their planning efforts." The Regional Bicycle Plan does not define any bicycle or pedestrian design guidelines that are inconsistent with Caltrans.

### **3.18. Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Transportation Plan**

Agency: Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

URL: <http://www.carson-city.nv.us/Index.aspx?page=1927>

CAMPO's primary responsibility is the continued, cooperative and comprehensive multi-modal transportation planning for the Carson City area. Relevant CAMPO policies are listed below.

- When feasible, roadway improvements should implement a "Complete Streets" design.
- Goal 2, Objective d. states that CAMPO should coordinate with state and local jurisdictions to provide well-maintained and easily accessible pedestrian, bicycle and other multi-use facilities.
- Page 5-12 presents a list of Bicycle and Pedestrian related goals and policies, including design standards that are consistent with AASHTO, MUTCD and AADAG.

### **3.19. Truckee Trails and Bikeways Master Plan (2007)**

Agency: Town of Truckee

URL: <http://www.townoftruckee.com/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=676>

The Town of Truckee developed a Trails and Bikeways Master Plan under the guidance of its General Plan, which contains policies encouraging non-motorized travel. Among these policies are "establish a town-wide multi-use public trail system" and include "linkages outside the Town's limits." Relevant planning goals of the plan include:

- The trail and bikeway system should link the Town's historic downtown, residential and commercial areas, and recreational, educational, natural, and historical resources utilizing public and private lands as necessary and appropriate.
- Trail and bikeway design should adhere to a consistent design format to promote the development of a safe, recognizable and uniform system in keeping with the mountain character of Truckee.

The Trails and Bikeways Plan Design Guidelines identify two general groups of facilities: 1) Class I bike paths and on-street bikeways (that is, Class II and Class III facilities) and 2) earthen surface recreational trails. Class I bike paths and on-street facility design follow Caltrans standard. If a bicycle facility does not meet Caltrans standard, it shall not be defined as Class I, II or III. In addition to Caltrans standards, the following guidelines should be followed. (p. 41)

- Multi-use trails and unpaved facilities that serve a primarily recreation function will not be funded with federal transportation dollars.

- Class I roadway crossings require preliminary design review.
- Landscaping should not be water intensive and consist of native vegetation.
- Barriers at pathway entrances should be clearly marked with reflectors and should be ADA accessible
- Bike path construction should take into account impacts of maintenance and emergency vehicles on shoulders and vertical requirements.
- Two-foot wide unpaved shoulders for pedestrians or runners or a separate tread-way should be provided where feasible. Direct pedestrians to the right side of the pathway with signing and stenciling.
- Provide adequate trailhead parking and other facilities such as restrooms and drinking fountains at appropriate locations.
- Caltrans provides recommended intersection treatments in Chapter 1000 including bike lane ‘pockets’ and signal loop detectors. The Department of Public Works should develop a protocol for the application of these recommendations, so that improvements can be funded and made as part of regular improvement projects.
- Signal loop detectors should be considered for all arterial/arterial, arterial/collector, and collector/collector intersections. The location of the detectors should be identified by a stencil of a bicycle and the words ‘Bicycle Detector’.
- Bike lane pockets (min. 4' wide) between right turn lanes and through lanes should be provided wherever available width allows, and right turn volumes exceed 150 motor vehicles/hour.
- Although not completely unavoidable or inappropriate for all situations (i.e.: South Shore Drive, south side of Donner Lake), Class II bike lane transitions into Class III bike routes should be discouraged. Alternatives to a Class II-Class III transition should be analyzed, including a reroute of the Class II bike lane or entire designation as a Class III bike route.

The Trails and Bikeways Plan defines the following trail design guidelines.

- Provide workable facilities for multiple users
- Preserve scenic resources
- Protect water quality, wetlands, floodplains and streams
- Protect sensitive areas, including designated wildlife habitats and plant communities
- Protect historic resources

- Control erosion and protect exposed soil areas

Page 50 of the Trails and Bikeways Plan provides additional design guidelines organized by user group (hikers, mountain bikers and equestrians) identifying optimal trail gradients, overall elevation gain, sight distances, overhead and right-of-way clearing recommendations, and optimal radii for switchbacks and climbing turns...The plan includes illustrations of the different facility types and design concepts.

### **3.20. Measure S**

Agencies: El Dorado County, City of South Lake Tahoe, Paradise Valley Association

In 2000, El Dorado County, the City of South Lake Tahoe and Paradise Valley Association formed a Community Facilities District Recreation Joint Powers Authority and in a special election asked district voters to approve Measure S, authorizing the District to issue bonds that could be used to pay for a variety of maintenance activities, including maintenance of bike trails. Bonded indebtedness will not exceed \$6.5 million and bonds have a 30-year term. To repay the bonds, all taxable property within the District is assessed at a rate determined by the use of that property. Residential uses are assessed at between \$14 and \$18 annually, and the special tax is higher for commercial, industrial, and recreational facilities. (City Council of South Lake Tahoe)

Measure S maintenance funding applies to trails constructed after 2000, specifically the 26 miles of paths planned for construction through the City's Master Plan. Measure S funding is allocated to a trail based on mileage, and in increments of 2/10 of a mile. The \$5000 per mile more than covers all daily maintenance (sweeping, vegetation trimming, emptying garbage cans, snow blowing). The excess funding is held in an account and used for more expensive maintenance such as slurry seal or overlay.

Measure S was a response by these communities to establish a long-term maintenance plan for trails, so that the communities would be eligible for construction funding.

### **3.21. Tahoe City Public Utility District Documents**

Agency: Tahoe City Public Utility District

URL: <http://www.tcpud.org/>

The Tahoe City Public Utility District is responsible for the sewer, parks and recreation facilities. Of specific interest to the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan are the PUD's trails. Lakeside Trail 1A, located along the Truckee River, is the first of nine trail segments to be constructed. As of June 26, 2009, the PUD was analyzing potential alignments for the Homewood Trail.

### **3.22. Northstar-at-Tahoe Habitat Management Plan**

Agency: Northstar at Tahoe and Sierra Watch

URL: [http://www.northstaratahoe.com/info/ski/media/habitat\\_management\\_plan.asp](http://www.northstaratahoe.com/info/ski/media/habitat_management_plan.asp)

The Northstar-at-Tahoe Habitat Management Plan establishes a habitat management area for, among other things, non-mechanized recreational use. The HMP identifies sensitive and unique wildlife in the late seral forest surrounding the Northstar at Tahoe Resort.

### **3.23. *East Shore Access Plan***

Agency: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

URL: <http://www.tiims.org>

The purpose of the East Shore Access Plan was to develop acceptable use levels for the East Shore, and to consider parking and transit options for the East Shore. The East Shore Access Plan does not specifically list bicycle and pedestrian enhancements as part of its recommendations.

### **3.24. *Eastshore Drive National Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan***

Agency: City of Carson City, in cooperation with Nevada Department of Transportation, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and TEAM Tahoe.

Available at the TRPA Transportation offices

The purpose of the Corridor Management Plan (CMP) is to balance the management and conservation of the byways' intrinsic qualities with the public's use and enjoyment of those qualities. It also provides a clear statement of the issues affecting the corridor, recommends a prioritized set of actions with clear responsibilities for agencies and other groups in resolving issues, and establishes a structure for continued management of the corridor's intrinsic qualities.

The CMP recommends conducting overall corridor carrying capacity and beach studies, to implement off-highway parking and shuttle projects, and to eliminate shoulder parking in conjunction with off-highway parking and shuttles. It also recommends developing a bicycle facility within the corridor, from Incline Village to Sand Harbor.

### **3.25. *East Shore Beaches Trail Access and Travel Management Plan***

Agency: United States Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit

URL: <http://fs.usda.gov/goto/lbmu/publications>

The East Shore Beaches Trail Access and Travel Management Plan (ATM) covers the area extending from Spooner Summit north to Chimney Beach and from the water's edge to Nevada State Park lands. The entire project is in Nevada and is on National Forest System land within the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU).

The East Shore Beaches Trail Access and Travel Management Plan (East Shore Beaches ATM) proposes to redevelop the trail system within the project area. Approximately 1.6 miles of trail would be decommissioned (generally involves decompacting soil to 8" and mulching with native material), 2.2 miles of trail would be constructed (20 - 30" width and constructed to Forest Service Standards), and 3.5 miles of trail would be upgraded (generally involves soil stabilization, drainage features, stairs, and trail definition). All project work is on National Forest System Land.

There are several actions that include trail decommissioning and trail construction in areas that overlap with the area under consideration for the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway, shown on the BPP maps and project lists. Planning for the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway is in close coordination with the US Forest Service and should take into account recommendations of the East Shore Beaches ATM.

### **3.26. Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Feasibility Study**

Agency: Tahoe Transportation District

URL: <http://www.nvtahobikeway.com/site/default/defHome.aspx?SiteID=56>

The Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Feasibility Study will evaluate possible alignments for a shared-use path from the North Stateline to the South Stateline along the east shore of Lake Tahoe. Although the final feasibility study is not complete at the time of publishing the BPP, the *Vision and Goals* and *Alternative Alignments Evaluation Summary Report* are available. The BPP incorporates potential alignments and policies from these documents.

### **3.27. Caltrans State Route 89 Cascade to Rubicon Bay Bikeway Study, February 2003**

Agency: California Department of Transportation

URL: <http://www.tahoempo.org/documents.aspx?SelectedIndex=5>

This plan researched several ways to improve bicycle access around the severely constrained section of roadway around Emerald Bay, along the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. There were three major recommendations to come out of this study:

- 1) Widen the highway from 2 to 4 feet where feasible. Divert riders onto a combination of on-street neighborhood routes and new Class I/Shared Use Paths where topography allows.
- 2) Facilitate a bicycle ferry from Camp Richardson to Meek's Bay.
- 3) Expand existing transit to better serve bicyclists around the Emerald Bay Area

## 4. Other Plans

The following plan was reviewed for the development of the 2003 Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and does not need to be reviewed for this update:

- Lake Tahoe Community Plans

In compliance with The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, all city governments were required to complete a self-evaluation of their facilities, programs, policies, and practices by January 26, 1993. If a city that employs 50 or more persons decides to make structural changes to achieve program access, it must develop a transition plan that identifies those changes and sets a schedule for implementing them. Both the self-evaluation and transition plans must be available to the public. 28 C.F.R. §§ 35.105, 35.150(d) (citing <http://www.ada.gov/comprob.htm>). Local transition plans may include information about curb ramps or other pedestrian facilities that will be upgraded to meet ADA requirements. TRPA did not review individual transition plans for consistency, as they go beyond the level of detail covered in the BPP. However, project implementers should be aware of the possible existence of transition plans and check with city and county governments to coordinate on planned upgrades before project construction.

## 5. Plan and Policy Matrix

The following matrix summarizes the plans and policies that are reviewed in this document.

**Table 1: Plan Consistency Matrix**

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
Federal Bike Plan Requirements	Federal Highway Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calls for the integration of bicycles and pedestrians into the transportation network.</li> <li>To be eligible for FHWA funds, states, metropolitan planning organizations, and planning agencies of urbanized areas with 50,000 or more residents, are required to carry out a comprehensive planning process.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/bp-broch.htm">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/bp-broch.htm</a>
US DOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation	US DOT	<p>Calls for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks.</p> <p>Encourages all transportation agencies to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects, to improve conditions for walking and bicycling, and to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes</p>	<a href="http://www.dot.gov/affairs/2010/bicycle-ped.html">http://www.dot.gov/affairs/2010/bicycle-ped.html</a>
Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 1999	AASHTO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AASHTO recommends minimum 12 foot wide outside lane curb widths for all streets to allow for simultaneous use by bicyclists and motorists.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o For roadways with on-street parking, 12 feet combined width for bicycle travel and automobile parking is recommended.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• AASHTO recommends that on-street parking is removed or restricted on shared roadways and that pavement be well-maintained. Signs should be installed every quarter mile, at every turn and at major signalized intersections.</li> <li>• Bicycle lanes should be a minimum four feet in width and five feet where on-street parking is present.</li> <li>• AASHTO recommends analyzing expected user types and demand when designing shared use paths. At a minimum, shared use paths should have an eight-foot paved width and in most circumstances should have a paved width at least 10 feet wide. Shared use paths should have two-foot wide graded shoulders.</li> <li>• Sidewalks are not an AASHTO recommended bicycle facility.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.transportation1.org/AASHTON/EW/">http://www.transportation1.org/AASHTON/EW/</a>

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities	AASHTO	<p>Recommends applying urban design criteria to rural areas with 1000 persons/square mile.</p> <p>Minimum clear width of a sidewalk is 4 feet, with passing spaces 5 feet in width provided at reasonable intervals.</p> <p>Recommended paved width of 10 feet for shared use paths.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.transportation.org/">http://www.transportation.org/</a></p>
Caltrans Highway Design Manual	Caltrans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order for bicycle facilities to be eligible for California State funding, bikeways must be constructed by HDM guidelines.</li> <li>• Class I bikeways are paved multi-use paths with a minimum paved width of eight feet and two-foot graded shoulders.</li> <li>• Class II bikeways are striped bicycle lanes on roadways with a minimum width of four feet.</li> <li>• Class III bikeways are roadways that are signed as bicycle routes, but do not have a lane dedicated to bicycles.</li> <li>• Shared Roadways do not have bikeway designations. Bicyclists are afforded the same rights as motorists on all California roadways as provided in the vehicle code.</li> </ul>	
California Street and Highways Vehicle Code	California Department of Motor Vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defines bicycle use on roadways statute (Division 11 Chapter 1 Article 4).</li> </ul>	<p><a href="http://www.dmv.ca.gov/pubs/vctop/vc/toc/d11c1a4.htm">http://www.dmv.ca.gov/pubs/vctop/vc/toc/d11c1a4.htm</a></p>
Nevada Vehicle Codes and Revised Statutes Chapters 480 and 484	Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 480 – Section 700 states that the Department of Transportation shall develop a bicycle education program. Section 710 states the DOT shall form a governor appointed bicycle advisory board made up of seven representatives from each geographic area of the state in addition to representatives from select public agencies. Section 720 defines the duties of the board.</li> <li>• 484 – Defines bicycle and pedestrian use on roadways.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="http://www.dmvnv.com/codebook.htm">http://www.dmvnv.com/codebook.htm</a></p>

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
2.8. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (2009) and California MUTCD (2010)	Federal Highway Administration, Caltrans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part 7 – Traffic Controls for school areas.</li> <li>Part 9 – Traffic Controls for bicycle facilities, providing standards for signs, markings and signals for bicyclists.</li> </ul> Bicycle and pedestrian facilities constructed within California and Nevada must follow the respective State MUTCD requirements.	The MUTCD provides standards for installing traffic control devices. States may choose to adopt the federal plan or adopt a revised plan. Nevada uses the federal plan, and California has adopted a revised version of the MUTCD specific to California. <a href="http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/">http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/</a> <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/ca_mutcd.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/mutcdsupp/ca_mutcd.htm</a>
NDOT Bike Plan	Nevada Department of Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local agencies should adhere to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Official’s bicycle facility design standards.</li> <li>Facilities not meeting AASHTO design standards shall be retrofitted pending future funding availability.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.bicyclenevada.com/pdf_bpc/bikeplan.pdf">http://www.bicyclenevada.com/pdf_bpc/bikeplan.pdf</a>
Caltrans Bike Plan Requirements	Caltrans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires applicants to have adopted or updated a bicycle plan within the past five years.</li> <li>Plan must comply with CA Streets and Highways Code Section 891.2 (i.e., the plan must include the eleven required items identified on Caltrans' website).</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/PDFs/BTPChecklist.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/PDFs/BTPChecklist.pdf</a>
Caltrans DD 64-R1	California Department of Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DD 64 policy directs the Caltrans to provide for the needs of non-motorized travelers in programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities and projects.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/complete_streets_files/dd_64_r1_signed.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/complete_streets_files/dd_64_r1_signed.pdf</a>
Caltrans Policy Directive 09-06	California Department of Transportation	Requires bicyclists to be detected at all traffic-actuated signals on public and private roads and driveways. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defines a 6 foot by 6 foot Limit Line Detection Zone in which a Reference Bicycle-Rider must be detected</li> <li>Provides guidelines for when non-compliant limit line detectors must be replaced</li> <li>Defines bicycle start-up and travel times that should be used to time signal phases to accommodate bicyclists.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/signdel/policy.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/signtech/signdel/policy.htm</a> Signal timing recommendations were under discussion as this document was written, and may be subject to change.

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
California Strategic Highway Safety Plan	Caltrans	Includes specific strategies for meeting goals listed in Challenge Area Eight: Making walking and crossing the street safer and Challenge Area Thirteen: Improve Bicycle Safety. Has goal of by 2010 reducing the number of motor vehicle involved bicycle and pedestrian collisions by 25% from their 2000 level.	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/SHSP/">http://www.dot.ca.gov/SHSP/</a>
California Assembly Bill 1358 (AB 1358), the Complete Streets Act		None. AB 1358 requires the legislative body of a city or county, upon revision of the circulation element of their general plan, to identify how the jurisdiction will provide for the routine accommodation of all users of the roadway including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and users of public transportation.	<a href="http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1358_bill_20080930_chaptered.pdf">http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1358_bill_20080930_chaptered.pdf</a>
California Senate Bill 375 (SB 375)	California Air Resources Board	None. SB 375 requires each MPO to include a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” in the regional transportation plan that demonstrates how the region will meet the GHG emission targets. If the sustainable communities strategy falls short of meeting the targets, the region must prepare an “alternative planning strategy” that, if implemented, would meet the targets. AB 375 also requires that decisions relating to the allocation of transportation funding be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Projects and policies in the BPP will be incorporated into the Sustainable Communities Strategy.	<a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm">http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm</a>
Nevada Strategic Highway Safety Plan	Nevada DOT and Nevada Public Safety Department	Identifies five Critical Emphasis Areas (CEA) for safety improvements, including CEA 1: Making walking and street crossing safer. Overall goal is to reduce the statewide traffic fatality rate (fatalities per million vehicle miles traveled) by 33% from 2003 levels.	
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Compact	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	The Tahoe Regional Planning Compact calls for the development of a regional transportation plan that includes the development of bicycle facilities.	<a href="http://www.trpa.org">http://www.trpa.org</a>

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Includes Goals and Policies related to developing and maintaining bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	
Lake Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Regional Visioning and Planning Summary	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Community vision of development within the Lake Tahoe Basin over the next 20 years. Contains general and specific recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Community Enhancement Program	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Encourages revitalization projects in downtown and recreation areas that demonstrate environmental, social and economic benefits. Includes general goals related to bicycling and walking.	www.trpa.org
Environmental Improvement Program	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Includes specific proposed bicycle and pedestrian projects.	
Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan (Mobility 2030)	Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization/ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	The Regional Transportation Plan (Mobility 2030) is both the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) document, fulfilling federal requirements, and the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan. This plan includes goals and policies related to bicycles and pedestrians, and a prioritized, financially constrained project list.	http://www.tahoempo.org
Federal Transportation Plan (FTIP) for the Lake Tahoe Region	Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization	The FTIP contains a priority list of the TMPO's federally funded projects, including bicycle and pedestrian projects being developed through the year 2012. Projects from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan move onto the FTIP when they have received federal funding.	
Land and Resource Management Plan, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit	US Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit	Management Area plans contain plans for construction or decommission of trails, provision of parking or toilets.	

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
USFS North Shore Trail Access and Travel Management Plan and Environmental Assessment	United Forest Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and minimize environmental impacts from the transportation system relating to soil protection, air quality, fire prevention and biological and historical resources.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/lbmu/documents/trail-atm/North-Shore-Area-Final-EA.pdf">http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/lbmu/documents/trail-atm/North-Shore-Area-Final-EA.pdf</a>
Waterborne Transit Site Selection Study	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This study assesses bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of four potential Ferry landing sites on Lake Tahoe. Contains design features relevant to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.tahoempo.org/documents.aspx?SelectedIndex=5">http://www.tahoempo.org/documents.aspx?SelectedIndex=5</a>
Lake Tahoe Atmospheric Deposition Study	LRWQCB	This study contains no policies related to the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	<a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/ltads/ltads.htm">http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/ltads/ltads.htm</a>
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board Total Maximum Daily Load	California Environmental Protection Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban upland sources, with special impervious surfaces, account for 72 percent of fine sediment particle loading in Lake Tahoe. The Plan includes goals for clarity attainment, and lists of best practices and appropriate measures to reduce pollution.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/app_b2_rbpolicies.pdf">http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/app_b2_rbpolicies.pdf</a>
City of South Lake Tahoe General Plan Update	City of South Lake Tahoe	September 16, 2009 draft contains maps of proposed pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and policies related to transportation and circulation.	
NLTRA Infrastructure and Transportation Integrated Work Plan	North Lake Tahoe Resort Association and Placer County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For a TRPA project to be considered by the NLTRA, it must submit an application. The project must receive recommendation for approval by the Joint Committee and be approved by the NLTRA and the Placer County Board of Supervisors. Bicycle trails must have a three—year funded maintenance plan to qualify for construction funds.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.nltra.org/docs/Work%20Plan%20doc.pdf">http://www.nltra.org/docs/Work%20Plan%20doc.pdf</a>
North Tahoe Public Utility District Land Use Ordinance	North Tahoe PUD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No business or individual shall conduct any activity which impacts or effects property operations, facility use of visitor safety on District owned or operated property without a permit from the District (Ordinance 345).</li> <li>Any activities permitted by the District shall be subject to fees and charges set by the District, as well as other conditions of approval (Ordinance 345).</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.ntpud.org/Pages/Page.aspx?PageID=100">http://www.ntpud.org/Pages/Page.aspx?PageID=100</a>

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where the District operates property owned by other agencies, any user of said property shall, in addition to complying with District regulations for use of District operated property, comply with all applicable regulations of the owning agency. Where activities are regulated by both the District and the owning agency, the most restrictive of the regulations shall apply (Ordinance 345)</li> <li>• Property Line Adjustments. Any Property Line Adjustment resulting in physical modification of existing service or resulting in changes to existing billing account addresses or information shall be subject to a flat fee of \$360.00. No additional time and material charges shall apply (Ordinance 349)</li> </ul>	
Douglas County Transportation Plan	Douglas County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and maintain trails that connect to public lands, recreational facilities of local and regional interests.</li> <li>• Coordinate transportation planning and land use development.</li> <li>• Provide medians and bicycle and pedestrian connections on US395.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.douglascountynv.gov/sites/CDAdmin/engineering/2007_Transportation_Plan.pdf">http://www.douglascountynv.gov/sites/CDAdmin/engineering/2007_Transportation_Plan.pdf</a>
Placer County Regional Bicycle Plan (2002)	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Placer County jurisdictions, including Municipal Advisory Committees, are encouraged to include bikeways in their planning efforts (Policy 7).</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.pctpa.net/library/bikeplans/Placer_County_Regional_Bikeway_Plan_web.pdf">http://www.pctpa.net/library/bikeplans/Placer_County_Regional_Bikeway_Plan_web.pdf</a>
Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Regional Transportation Plan	Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When feasible, roadway improvements should implement a “Complete Streets” design.</li> <li>• Coordinate with state and local jurisdictions to provide well-maintained and easily accessible pedestrian, bicycle and other multi-use facilities (Goal 2, Objective D).</li> <li>• Bicycle and Pedestrian related goals and policies, including design standards that are consistent with AASHTO, MUTCD and AADAG.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.carson-city.nv.us/Index.aspx?page=1927">http://www.carson-city.nv.us/Index.aspx?page=1927</a>
Truckee Trails and Bikeways Master Plan	Town of Truckee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a town-wide multi-use public trail system and including linkages outside the Town’s limits.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.townoftruckee.com/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=676">http://www.townoftruckee.com/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=676</a>

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
(2007)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The trail and bikeway system should link the Town’s historic downtown, residential and commercial areas, and recreational, educational, natural, and historical resources utilizing public and private lands as necessary and appropriate.</li> <li>• Trail and bikeway design should adhere to a consistent design format to promote the development of a safe, recognizable and uniform system in keeping with the mountain character of Truckee.</li> </ul>	
Measure S	City of South Lake Tahoe	Measure S provides maintenance funds to trails constructed in South Lake Tahoe after 2000.	<a href="http://www.cityofslt.us/ordinances/measure-s.html">http://www.cityofslt.us/ordinances/measure-s.html</a>
Tahoe City Public Utilities District	Tahoe City Public Utilities District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PUD is responsible for trail facilities, including Lakeside Trail 1A and the planned Homewood Trail.</li> </ul>	<a href="http://www.tcpud.org/">http://www.tcpud.org/</a>
Northstar-at-Tahoe Habitat Management Plan	Northstar at Tahoe and Sierra Watch	Establishes a habitat management area for, among other things, non-mechanized recreational use. Identifies sensitive and unique wildlife in the late seral forest surrounding the Northstar at Tahoe Resort.	<a href="http://www.northstarattahoe.com/info/ski/media/habitat_management_plan.asp">http://www.northstarattahoe.com/info/ski/media/habitat_management_plan.asp</a>
East Shore Access Plan	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	The East Shore Access Plan did not have any requirements or recommendations related to bicycling and walking.	<a href="http://www.tiims.org">http://www.tiims.org</a>
Eastshore Drive National Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan	Carson City, NDOT, TRPA, TEAM Tahoe	Recommends developing a bicycle facility within the corridor, from Incline Village to Sand Harbor.	Available at TRPA Transportation offices
East Shore Beaches Trail Access and Travel Management Plan	United Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit	Proposes redeveloping trail system on National Forest System land within area extending from Spooner Summit north to Chimney Beach and from the water's edge to Nevada State Park lands. 1.6 miles of trail decommissioned, 2.2 miles of new trail, 3.5 miles of trail upgraded	
Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Feasibility Study	Tahoe Transportation District	Studies potential alignments for a separated bicycle trail along the east shore of Lake Tahoe.	<a href="http://www.nvtahoebikeway.com">http://www.nvtahoebikeway.com</a>

Plan/Policy Name	Agency	Requirements for TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan	Notes
Caltrans State Route 89 Cascade to Rubicon Bay Bikeway Study	Caltrans	Studied alternatives for bicycles to travel through the Emerald Bay corridor on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe.	<a href="http://www.tahoempo.org/documents.aspx?SelectedIndex=5">http://www.tahoempo.org/documents.aspx?SelectedIndex=5</a>