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NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on ______September 9, 1981_______ at
____10:00_______ a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Dated: ______August 28, 1981_______

By: ________________________________
Philip A. Overeynder
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Director
Preliminary Agenda

I. Call to Order and Determination of Quorum

II. Approval of Agenda

III. Disposition of Minutes

IV. Planning Matters

   A. List of Activities Exempt from Agency Review as Per Ordinance 81-1:
      1. Washoe County Public Work Department
      2. Environmental Threshold Project
      C. Report on Status of Barton Hospital General Plan Amendment and Barton Street General Plan Amendment
      D. Draft Ordinance for Review of New and Modified Projects Which have Adverse Air Quality Impacts

V. Clearinghouse

   A. Environmental Impact Statement for the Land Acquisition Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

VI. Reports

   A. Public Interest Comments
   B. APC Members

VII. Resolutions

   A. Resolution for Advisory Planning Commission Conflict of Interest Requirements

VIII. Correspondence

IX. Pending Matters

X. Adjournment
NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on __September 9, 1981___ at
___10:00___ a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Dated: __August 28, 1981___

By: [Signature]
Philip A. Overeynder
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Director
PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I  CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II  APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III  DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV  PLANNING MATTERS
   A.  List of Activities Exempt from Agency Review as Per Ordinance 81-1:
       1. Washoe County Public Work Department
   B. Environmental Threshold Project
   C. Report on Status of Barton Hospital General Plan Amendment and Barton Street General Plan Amendment
   D. Draft Ordinance for Review of New and Modified Projects Which have Adverse Air Quality Impacts

V  CLEARINGHOUSE
   A. Environmental Impact Statement for the Land Acquisition Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

VI  REPORTS
   A. Public Interest Comments
   B. APC Members

VII  RESOLUTIONS
   A. Resolution for Advisory Planning Commission Conflict of Interest Requirements

VIII  CORRESPONDENCE

IX  PENDING MATTERS

X  ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 2, 1981

TO
The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM
The Staff

SUBJECT: APC Agenda Item IV A. 1. - List of Activities Exempt from Agency Review - Washoe County Public Works Department

Washoe County Department of Public Works has informed the TRPA staff that the subject list will not be completed for the September APC meeting. Staff recommends that this item be continued to the October APC meeting.
MEMORANDUM

TO
The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM
The Staff

SUBJECT
Planning Matters - APC Agenda Item IV B - Environmental Threshold Project

The process of selecting a consulting firm to work with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency in establishment of environmental thresholds is now complete. Four of the five firms selected for further evaluation at the August 12 Advisory Planning Commission meeting were interviewed by the joint steering committee on August 18. The steering committee members (Roland Westergard, Dwight Steele, Ken Kjer, Bill Combs, and Mike Harper) recommended the Sacramento firm of Brown and Caldwell to the full Governing Board on August 26. The Board accepted the recommendation and directed staff to begin work with the firm.

The next task will be to prepare a more intensive program of work that identifies the specifics of the job such as key dates, individual work tasks, and contract costs. The program of work will be developed jointly by Brown and Caldwell and Agency staff through a pre-work conference conducted during the week of September 8. The results of this effort will be reviewed by the steering committee the following week prior to presenting the finalized program of work to the Governing Board. Completion of this task will also lead to a negotiated contract to be reviewed and signed off on by the Board.

The role of the steering committee in this effort becomes very important from the standpoint of providing process direction. Staff will be looking to the committee when needed for review and acceptance of tasks and milestones critical to success of the project. The Governing Board requested expansion of the steering committee to permit any Board member input into the process. Likewise, the Advisory Planning Commission should be aware of steering committee activities and provide input.

Staff has determined it is essential, from the standpoint of workability, to maintain the steering committee at its present membership of six but to permit Board and APC input prior to decisionmaking. Accordingly, notices of steering committee meetings will be sent to all Governing Board and Advisory Planning Commission members. Meeting notices will be sent, when possible, with either APC or Board agendas to duly note them as public meetings. As noted above, the first open meeting will be scheduled the week of September 14,
TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: APC Agenda Item IV C. - Report on Status of Barton Hospital General Plan Amendment and the Barton Street General Plan Amendment

At the August 26 and 27, 1981 TRPA meeting, the Governing Body followed the APC's recommendation on the Barton Street General Plan amendment and continued it until the new General Plan is completed. The amendment for the hospital was modified to Conservation Reserve, and staff was directed to reset the matter for public hearing at the September Board meeting. Agency staff will expand on this report at the meeting on the 9th.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

DATE September 2, 1981

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: APC Agenda Item IV D - Draft Ordinance for Review of New and Modified Projects Which Have Adverse Air Quality Impacts

The subject draft ordinance was discussed by the Governing Board at its August 26 meeting. The Board identified areas of concern similar to those discussed by the APC on August 12. The Board did direct staff to give notice and prepare the ordinance for public hearing at the September Board meeting.

There are some items that have not been resolved and which the Board wanted explored further for the public hearing. The issues deal with service level, amount of remaining capacity, number of new vehicle trips generated, offset ratios, and mitigation fees. There was no general concurrence on any of those items, only a desire expressed to have them fully developed for the hearing.

Board members questioned a couple of specific items dealing with the concept of the ordinance. First, a need to establish whether filing fees will or will not be charged and the amount of the fee necessary to cover preparation of the air quality report. Second, the need to provide on-site or direct mitigation as opposed to the aspect of paying a fee to pollute. The Board will be examining these items closely in its September deliberations.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT APC Agenda Item VII - Resolutions

DATE August 31, 1981

The Governing Board at its August 26 meeting did not act upon the proposed revision of Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure. This revision would require the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to adhere to the same conflict of interest standards and disclosure laws that apply to Governing Board members and employees. The requested change was a result of passage of an APC resolution at the August 12 meeting requiring members to adhere to conflict of interest standards.

The Governing Board requested staff and the APC take another look at the need for Commission members to comply with conflict of interest standards. Discussion pro and con by the Board did not settle the issue. Some felt the APC was professional enough to recognize cases of conflict of interest on an individual basis with that person disqualifying him or herself from acting. Others felt the simplest solution was for Commission members to sign a statement saying they would disqualify themselves if they had a vested interest in a project. Still others felt the Commission should achieve a high degree of professionalism and therefore be subject to the standards that apply to Board members and employees.

In returning the resolution to the APC, the Board asked for a reconsideration of the APC's motives. If the APC wishes to retain the resolution as passed, the Board will have a hearing on the revision of its Rules and Regulations to include conflict of interest standards for the APC. If the APC wishes to use some other format to insure there is no conflict of interest, the Board would like to be informed. The need for action is currently before the Advisory Planning Commission.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF NEW AND MODIFIED PROJECTS THAT MAY HAVE ADVERSE AIR POLLUTION AND TRAFFIC IMPACTS

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

Section 1.00 Findings

1.10 The Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency ("Agency") finds that the Tahoe Region, as defined in the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact ("Tahoe Region"), has been designated by the State of Nevada, the State of California and the Environmental Protection Agency as a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide.

1.20 The Governing Body further finds that there is evidence that increased use of vehicles contributes to the degradation of air quality by directly contributing to this pollutant.

1.30 The Governing Body further finds that there is, and likely will continue to be, serious traffic congestion upon major arterial highways and roads in the Tahoe Region.

1.40 The Governing Body further finds that to implement Section VI(b) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and the 1979 nonattainment area plans adopted by the States of California and Nevada, it is necessary to determine the potential impact of proposed new and modified projects on air quality and traffic conditions, and to provide for the mitigation of air quality degradation and traffic congestion which may result from such activities.

1.50 In view of the foregoing, the Governing Body further finds that in order to properly effectuate and implement the adopted Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and still provide for the maintenance of air quality in the region as mandated by Article VI(a), VI(b), and VII(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, it is necessary to determine the potential impact of proposed new and modified projects on air quality and traffic congestion, and to provide for the mitigation of air quality degradation which may result from such activities.
Section 2.00 General Provisions

2.10 Compliance

Construction, alteration and use of any structure within the Region shall be in compliance with the terms of this ordinance. Permits shall be granted or denied in conformity with the provisions of this ordinance.

2.11 The provisions of this ordinance establish the minimum standards applicable within the Region to the subject matters of the ordinance. Any political subdivision may enforce equal or higher standards within its territory and this ordinance shall not be deemed a limitation or repeal of any other powers granted to the governments of the Tahoe Region by the United States or the respective states.

2.20 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance shall be liberally construed to effectuate their purposes. If any section, clause, provision, or portion of this ordinance is adjudged unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected thereby.

Section 3.00 Permit Standards

No permit shall be approved for any new or modified project as defined in Section 4.00 Definitions, or any portion thereof unless:

(1) The source or applicable portion thereof complies with the provisions of this rule and all other applicable local, state, and federal air quality rules and regulations.

Section 4.00 Definitions

For the purpose of this ordinance, certain terms or words used herein shall be interpreted as follows: Words in the present tense include the future; words in the singular number include the plural number, and words in the plural number include the singular number. The word "shall" is mandatory and not permissive, unless the context indicates that a directory meaning is intended.
New Project - For purposes of this ordinance, any facility, building, structure, installation, real property, road or highway which attracts or may attract motor vehicles, or serves as a trip end for motor vehicles and requires review by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency pursuant to Section 5.00 Applicability of this ordinance.

Modified Project - Any physical change, change in use, change in hours of operation of any project that requires review by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency pursuant to Section 5.00 Applicability of this ordinance.

Nonattainment Designation - A designation made by either the State of California or the State of Nevada which is approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency identifying the Region or a portion thereof as an area which does not meet the federal ambient air quality standards for a specified pollutant(s).

Vehicle Trips - A vehicle trip shall be considered to be a single vehicle movement from one point to another based upon either a 1, 8, or 24 hour period.

Vehicle Trip Generation - For purposes of calculation, trip generation from residential or tourist residential units shall be considered to be the total number of vehicle trips anticipated from persons occupying such units. For commercial and other uses, trip generation shall be considered to be the total number of vehicle trips to and from the project site. For the purposes of this ordinance, vehicle trips shall be calculated by using the document "Trip Generation by Land Use, Part I, A Summary of Studies Conducted" (April 1974), at a minimum.

Remaining Roadway Capacity - The remaining roadway capacity shall be the maximum air quality and safety limit capacity of the roadway (level E) less the existing traffic during the peak 8-hour period.

Section 5.00 Applicability

5.10 TRPA shall review any new or modified project that is predicted to generate 100 vehicle trips. For a modified project, vehicle trips shall be calculated by adding the increase in trips from the date of this ordinance or the date of the last permit issued under this ordinance.
5.20 TRPA shall also review any new or modified project that generates new trips which exceed 1% of the remaining roadway capacity of any principle street, road or highway.

5.30 Approval by the agency of any project expires three (3) years after the date of final action by the agency unless construction is begun within that time and diligently pursued thereafter, or the use of the activity has commenced. In computing the three (3) year period, any period of time during which the project is the subject of a legal action which delays or renders impossible the diligent pursuit of that project shall not be counted.

Section 6.00 Prohibition of Drive-up Facilities

6.10 All applications that include new drive-up facilities within new or existing commercial developments will be subject to review.

6.20 A prohibition will apply unless such facilities will not directly or indirectly have a significant adverse air quality impact.

Section 7.00 Permit Procedures

7.10 Any project for which a review is required under the terms of this ordinance must be reviewed and approved by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

7.20 For such review, the process prescribed in the TRPA Land Use Ordinance shall be followed, with the addition that the applicant shall provide the information required pursuant to Section 7.00 Traffic and Air Quality Evaluation and the TRPA action on such proposal shall conform to the requirements of Section 9.00 Mitigation.

7.30 TRPA may charge the applicant a filing fee sufficient to cover the cost of analysis of the applicants Air Quality Evaluation. TRPA may further charge and collect a reasonable fee from the applicant to cover the cost incurred by TRPA in preparing the air quality report required by this ordinance.

7.40 Upon receipt of any application requiring review, TRPA shall forward notice of such application to the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and the California Air Resources Board, plus any local air
pollution control district within whose boundary the project is to be located. In addition, TRPA shall make available to any agency so notified any additional information supplied regarding the subject application. The notice forwarded by TRPA pursuant to this section shall specify the proposed date of Governing Board action on the subject application and shall specify a final date for receipt of comment upon the subject application. Such date shall be not less than two weeks prior to the scheduled date of action.

Section 8.00 Traffic and Air Quality Evaluation

8.10 Any project for which a review is required under the terms of this ordinance shall submit the following information:

a. The name and address of the applicant.

b. The name, address, and location of the project.

c. A description of the proposed project, including the normal hours of operation of the facility, and the general types of activities to be performed at the proposed project.

d. A map showing the location of the project and the topography of the area, including existing principal streets, roads, and highways and traffic control facilities within three miles of the project.

e. A site plan showing the location and amount of associated parking, points of motor vehicle entrances and exits at the site and its associated parking areas, and the location and height of buildings on the site.

f. An estimate of additional residential, commercial, and industrial development which may result from the construction of the proposed project (secondary growth).

g. An estimate of the number of vehicle trips, generated by the project for a 1, 8, and 24 hour period. This estimate must be based upon the document "Trip Generation by Land Use, Part I, A Summary of Studies Conducted" (April 1974) at a minimum.
h. Any additional information or documentation that TRPA deems necessary to determine the air quality impact of the proposed project.

8.20 Where a project is to be constructed in phases, the information required by this section shall be submitted for the entire project (all phases) before the review can begin.

Section 9.00 Exemptions

Any project or modification which holds formal approval and all the necessary building and construction permits on the effective date of this ordinance is exempt from the provisions of this ordinance. In the event that such a proposed project which received formal approval is substantially modified with the result of increased trip generation potential, or is not constructed in conformance with the approved plans, the proposed project is not longer exempt and must undergo review pursuant to the criteria set forth in this ordinance.

Section 10.00 Mitigation

10.10 TRPA shall not approve any project unless the applicant agrees as a permit condition to offset the impacts of the project. The impacts may be offset by improving traffic flow or by reducing trips. The impacts must be offset by the following:

a. For projects locating in areas or impact areas where the carbon monoxide air quality standard is violated the applicant must pay for a mitigation measure proposed by the applicant or Agency that will be complete at the same time as the project. The applicant must also offset the impacts from the project by the following ratios:

A. 1:1.5 as a minimum.
B. 1:1.75 within 1/4 mile of the South Tahoe Wye.
C. 1:2.0 between Ski Run Blvd. and the Loop Road on Route 50.
D. 1:2.0 within 1/4 mile of the intersection of Routes 89 and 28.
b. For projects locating in areas where the carbon monoxide air quality standard is not violated the applicant must offset the impacts from the project by a 1:1 ratio. In offsetting the impacts the applicant may either pay for a specific mitigation measure or contribute a fee towards the construction of a mitigation measure identified in Attachment B. (Note: Attachment B will be prepared in the near future.)

c. For projects locating in areas where the roadway capacity is at level of service E the applicant must pay for a mitigation measure proposed by the applicant or Agency that will be complete at the same time as the project. The applicant must also offset the impacts from the project by a 1:2 ratio.

d. For projects locating in areas where the roadway capacity is at level of service D or below the applicant must offset the impacts from the project by a 1:1 ratio. In offsetting the impacts the applicant may either pay for a specific mitigation measure or contribute a fee towards the construction of mitigation measure identified in Attachment B. (Note: Attachment B will be prepared in the near future).

Section 11.00 Violation of Ordinance

Violation of any provision of this ordinance shall be a misdemeanor. Upon notification of such violation, each day's violation subsequent to notification shall constitute a separate offense.

Section 12.00 Effective Date

This ordinance shall be effective sixty (60) days after its adoption.

FIRST READING:

SECOND READING:
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

Roland D. Westergard, Chairman
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

August 12, 1981
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman John Meder called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 10:04 a.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Hallan, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Harper, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder

APC Members Absent: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart

Chairman Meder introduced Mr. Steve Hallan who was sitting in for Mr. Milam and submitted into the record a letter of authorization from the County of El Dorado.

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION and Seconded that the Agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Smith with Second by Mr. Smith that the minutes of the July, 1981 APC meeting be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

VI PLANNING MATTERS

A. General Plan Amendment to Reclassify Approximately 7 acres to be Located Either East or West of Barton Hospital From General Forest to Public Service, South Lake Tahoe.

Senior Planner, Gordon Barrett gave a brief background and summary of this project. Ms. Bogush pointed out to the APC the City of South Lake Tahoe Counsel’s plans for alternative routes with the idea to accommodate Barton Hospital with its proposal. Mr. Barrett presented the issues to be discussed. On of the items for discussion was the environmental documentation. Mr. Beverly, on behalf of the hospital, stated the Hospital’s reasons why they felt the EIS would be premature at this time. The second concern was if the finding of no significant effect could be found, which side would be preferred by APC, the land to the East or West of the Hospital. There was quite a bit of discussion on whether the EIS should be done before the project was submitted or whether the EIS would be required when the project was submitted.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph with Second by Ms. McMorris that a finding of no significant effect cannot be made, and that environmental documentation, that can be used later with the project, be required.
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Mr. Hallan asked that a part of Mr. Randolph's motion be that another EIS may be necessary at the time of the project. There was some disagreement with this motion that it was perhaps unfair for the hospital to be required to do the EIS at this time, and further, that the rezoning should be brought in with the project. Mr. Randolph withdrew his motion and the following motion was made:

MOTION BY Mr. Randolph with Second by Ms. McMorris that there is significant impact in the changing of the zoning for this parcel of land. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallan, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Harper, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder
Nays: Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hoole, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart

MOTION by Mr. Randolph with Second by Mr. Combs that an environmental document for the zone change be prepared which addresses all the impacts associated with the property's potential uses. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallan, Mr. Combs, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder
Nays: Mr. Renz, Mr. Harper, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Smith, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hansen
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart

B. General Plan Amendment to Reclassify Property South of Barton Street Between 2nd Street and Winnemucca From High Density Residential to General Commercial, South Lake Tahoe

Senior Planner gave the presentation on this item. Mr. Barrett asked for recommendations 1) what is APC's recommendation as to the similar and appropriate use of HDR or 2) should the HDR zone be amended to allow parking lots or 3) should this area be rezoned. After some discussion the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Harper with Second by Mr. Renz that the parking lot is not a similar and appropriate use. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallan, Mr. Renz, Mr. Harper, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder
Nays: Mr. Combs, Mr. Hoole, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Shellhammer
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart

MOTION by Mr. Harper with Second by Mr. Renz that consideration of the rezoning to General Commercial is not appropriate at this time. This item should be address when the general plan is updated. The motion carried unanimously.
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C. Role of the APC and Subcommittee report.

1. Conflict of Interest Standards
2. Threshold Steering Committee

Chairman Meder gave a report and background on this topic and Randy Sheffield updated the APC on a few points. Mr. Meder informed the board that the steering committee would be comprised of six members, four from the Governing Board and two from the APC, the members will be Norm Wood, Ken Kjer, Dwight Steele, and Roland Westergard from the Governing Body and Mike Harper and Bill Combs. Mr. Combs requested that he not be appointed; however, Mr. Combs agreed to be at the first meeting.

The APC meeting recessed for lunch break from 11:55 to 1:15 p.m.

D. List of Activities Exempt from Agency Review as Per Ordinance 81-1:

1. Nevada Department of Transportation.

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett indicated that staff had no problems with this list and that this list was very similar to the Cal Trans exemption list. There was some question by the APC as to the use of chemicals (salt in particular) and whether the use of chemicals should be exempt from agency review. After some discussion the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Smith with Second by Mr. Randolph that the APC recommends to the Governing Board adoption of the Nevada Department of Transportation exemption list. The motion carried unanimously.

2. U. S. Forest Service.

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett gave the presentation on this item pointing out the differences in this list in relation to the other lists approved. Mr. Barrett went over the list and pointed out the areas of concern, namely items 7, 8, 9, and 10 under Special Use Permits, there was also an amendment to the Acquisition of water rights item under Watershed Management.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph with Second by Mr. Hallan to approve the list as presented with the exception of items 7, 8, 9 and 10 under Special Use Permits, that staff work with the Forest Service to come to an agreement and to amend acquisition of water rights under Watershed Management to read "Acquisition of water rights would be subject to applicable state laws." The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallan, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Harper, Ms. Bogush
       Mr. Hoole, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris
       Mr. Bidart, Mr. Shellhammer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder

Nays: None

Abstain: Mr. Smith, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Pyle

Absent: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart

3. Washoe County Public Works Department

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett informed the Board that this list was not as polished as the other lists submitted, the APC continued this item to September.
3. Washoe County Public Works Department.

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett informed the Board that this list was not as polished as the other lists submitted, the APC continued this item to September.

E. Nonattainment Air Quality Plan - New and Modified Sources.

Mr. Sheffield pointed out to the APC that this was a draft and that this draft would be submitted to the Governing Body at its next meeting and after that meeting would be polished and back to the Board for first reading in September. Dale Neiman came forward to answer the APC’s questions and to comment on this item. After much discussion and comments it was agreed that this item needed a lot of cleaning up, but that it was a necessary ordinance.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph that section 4, Roadway Capacity Standards be amended, Section 5.10 will have inserted "100 in California", 5.20 will be amended, 5.30 will be eliminated.

After much discussion in what the APC should recommend to the Governing Board, the Motion was withdrawn.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph with Second by Mr. Smith to change Roadway Capacity Standards from level E to level D and to change 5.20 to read "TRPA shall also review new or modified projects resulting in new trip generation which exceeds 1% of the remaining roadway capacity of any street, road or highway. The motion failed on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Harper, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Randolph
Nays: Mr. Harper, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Meder
Abstain: Mr. Hallan, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle
Absent: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart

The APC decided that it would like to see the draft ordinance for review of projects which have adverse air quality impacts in a more final form.

VI RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADOPTING CONFLICT OF INTEREST STANDARDS TO BE APPLIED TO ALL COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chairman Meder read into the record this resolution and mentioned that a conflict of interest statement was attached in the APC packet. After some discussion both pro and con the following motion was made:

MOTION was made and seconded that the Resolution be adopted and approved as per staff’s recommendations. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Hallan, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Smith Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder
Nays: Mr. Renz, Mr. Harper, Ms. McMorris
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Bidart
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Ms. McMorris stated that she did not have a problem with the Conflict of Interest Statement, however she did not agree with the wording of the resolution and therefore voted against the resolution.

F. Status of Transportation Planning

Mr. Sheffield gave the presentation to the Board and asked the APC for approval of the concept of an interim Transportation Plan developed prior to the long range transportation plan element of the general plan. Dale Neiman came forward to answer some questions the APC had on this Plan. After some discussion and audience comment, the following motion was made:

MOTION by Ms. Bogush which was Seconded that the APC approves in concept a short range transportation plan prior to the long range transportation plan to be developed by 1983. The motion carried unanimously.

VI RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY SETTING FORTH THE ROLE OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IN THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY PLANNING PROCESS.

Chairman Meder read into the record this resolution. There was some discussion as to whether this resolution really stated what the APC's intentions were as far as the role they would like to take on. After much discussion it was decided that this resolution would be deferred to the September meeting of the APC.


Gave some background and ran through the different firms that would be considered to assist with the development of the threshold study, and related to the APC how these firms were selected. The APC concurred with staff's recommendations that four firms be interviewed in the selection process.

V REPORTS

A. Public Interest Comments - None

B. APC Members - None

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT

The APC adjourned at 3:50 p.m.