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February 9, 1982

TO: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board
FROM: South Lake Tahoe City Council and
       El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
RE: REPORT ON LOCAL/REGIONAL AND CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE/
       EL DORADO COUNTY JOINT PLANNING EFFORTS

JOINT COUNCIL/BOARD RECOMMENDATION:

1. That the Governing Board review this report and the lead and
   support role approach to planning in the City of South Lake
   Tahoe and El Dorado County and confirm the lead and support roles on
   which there is consensus between the City, County, and TRPA.

2. That the Governing Board receive the City and County Resolutions
   expressing a commitment to be involved in the process of TRPA's
   Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study.

BACKGROUND:

In April 1981, the South Lake Tahoe City Council and El Dorado County
Board of Supervisors met in joint session. One subject of discussion
was alternative approaches to joint City/County planning efforts.
The Council and Board considered six alternative ways that the City
and County can participate in joint planning efforts, and directed
the staffs and Planning Commissions to analyze the feasibility of
combining the planning process for the County Area Plan and the
City General Plan Update through a joint citizens committee, joint
public hearings, and joint final plan with support from a City/County
Planning team.

To explore the feasibility of joint planning projects, the City and
County Planning Commissions met in joint session on July 29, 1981, and
August 31, 1981. To provide background to the Commissions, the
sessions began with a mobile workshop tour of the City and the Meyers
area. City and County Planning Directors briefed the group on
planning functions and projects in the City/County. Since it was
important to consider the planning roles and activities of regional
agencies, staff from the California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
(CTRPA) summarized that agency's functions. The Tahoe Regional
Planning Agency's Executive Director, Phil Overreynder and Project
Manager, Randy Sheffield then discussed TRPA's responsibilities
pursuant to the Bi-state Compact and discussed the status of the
Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study and Regional
Plan Update.
The Commissions presented their report at a joint meeting of the South Lake Tahoe City Council and El Dorado County Board of Supervisors on December 11, 1981. The Council and Board accepted the Commission's recommendations and directed that the local and regional lead and support role concept outlined in the report be forwarded to the TRPA Governing Board. Following are the recommendations approved by the Council and Board. The Council and Board also approved the attached Resolutions of Commitment to the Environmental Threshold Carrying and Capacity Study process.

JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT ON LOCAL/REGIONAL AND CITY/COUNTY JOINT PLANNING EFFORTS:

The Commission's recommendations on Local/Regional Joint Planning Efforts and City/County Joint Planning Efforts are summarized in the attached two charts, which were generated by the group in brainstorming and workshop sessions:

- Current Lead and Support Roles of the City, County, and Regional Agencies in Tahoe basin planning.

- Future Lead and Support Roles of the City, County, and Regional Agencies in Tahoe basin planning.

The agency that has the final authority in a decision is designated as having the "lead role", shown by a circle (O) on the chart. Other agencies that have input on a decision are in a "support role" to the lead agency, which is shown by an "X" on the chart.

Local/Regional Planning Efforts

The "Current Planning Roles" chart shows that there is a lot of duplication of planning efforts, with the City, County, and regional agencies all doing land use, open space, recreation, public transportation, circulation/scenic highways, noise, public facilities, public safety, seismic safety and housing planning; project review and enforcement. The findings of the Commissions are that this duplication of effort is a waste of fiscal resources, decision-maker's time and staff time. It also creates a maze of conflicting bureaucratic regulations and three layers of approval (local, CTRPA, and TRPA) for every development project on the South Shore.

The Commissions recommend that a "division of labor" approach would be best in the future. Regional agencies would be lead in regional issues, with support from local agencies and the locals would be lead for local issues, with support from regional agencies. The Commissions used this approach in developing the "Future Planning Roles" chart which represents the ideal designation of which agencies would be lead and support when the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study and Regional Plan Update is complete in June, 1983. The time between current and future roles would be a transition period.
In many areas of planning there was a consensus on which agency should have the lead role, including:

* El Dorado County Lead Role
  * Solid Waste Planning
  * Disaster/Emergency Preparedness Planning

* TRPA Lead Role
  * Air Quality Planning
  * Water Quality Planning
  * Conservation Planning
  * Transportation Planning

* Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Lead Role
  * Public Transit Planning

In many cases, both the City and County should take lead roles in their jurisdiction including:

* Circulation/Scenic Highways
* Public Safety (natural hazards)
* Seismic Safety
* Housing
* Economic Planning
* Human Services
* Architectural Review

The number of planning areas where the local agencies are lead counters the argument that it is useless for local agencies to plan because regional agencies do all the planning. The chart shows the locals as lead in six areas of planning plus potential lead in six additional areas. If locals do not take responsibility for these areas, the regional agencies will, which has happened in the past.

However, a simple lead/support designation was not always applicable. The group developed the following three alternatives approaches to deal with planning for the remaining areas on the chart:
The Commissions recommend both approach II and III in planning with TRPA in the following areas:

- Noise
- Public Facilities
- Redevelopment
- Land Use
- Open Space
- Recreation

Approach II would give the most local control. A general Regional Plan would be adopted, with the City and County developing more detailed plans that are consistent with the regional plan. The entire project review authority could then be delegated from TRPA to the local level and implementation and enforcement would be at the local level according to local plans that are consistent with regional plans. This approach requires an adequate planning staff at the City and County levels; a spirit of cooperation between local agencies and TRPA; and support of local agencies to take responsibility for planning issues instead of reacting to regional policies.

It is important to note that in the areas of land use, open space, recreation and redevelopment, TRPA staff felt that approach I or III was the best approach. This involves local input into a detailed regional plan that the locals or regional agencies implement. As we proceed with the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study, the Regional Plan Update and local plan updates, we recommend looking at these approaches again to determine appropriate lead and support roles in the above areas.

Local/Regional Joint Planning Projects

- Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study
- Regional Plan Update
The Commission recommends the ultimate local involvement and commitment to the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study. This study will define the parameters for the City's General Plan Update, the County's Area Plan, and TRPA's Regional Plan Update and all future planning in the Tahoe Basin and requires continual input and cooperation.

City/County Joint Planning Efforts

It is appropriate for the City and County to work jointly on planning areas that have a "double-lead", or circles for both the City and County as lead agencies. The Commissions recommend sharing of information, assuring that planning policies of the City and County do not conflict and reviewing and commenting on draft documents and proposals. Beyond this, the Commissions recommend joint planning efforts on the following projects, on both a short range and long range basis:

City/County Joint Planning Projects

Short Range (1981-82)

- City Design Guidelines Revision/County Sierra Design Guidelines
- City review and comment on Housing Element
- Joint Data Collection for City General Plan Update and County Area Plan

Long Range (1982-83+)

- Joint City General Plan Update and County Area Plan for:
  - land use
  - open space
  - recreation
  - seismic safety
  - public safety
  - noise

These joint projects will use a joint citizens committee; joint public hearings, and joint final plan with support from a City/County planning team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANNING AREA</th>
<th>CITY OF S.L.T.</th>
<th>EL DORADO COUNTY</th>
<th>TRPA</th>
<th>CTRPA</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ARB 1 - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SWRCB 2 - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation (terrestrial environment)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS 3 - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- threatened and endangered species</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- unique ecosystems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other terrestrial systems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- critical wildlife components</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SWMD 9 - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation/Scenic Highways</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety (natural hazards)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 ARB - Air Resources Board
2 SWRCB - State Water Resources Control Board
3 USFS - United States Forest Service
4 SWMD - Solid Waste Management District
5 TTD - Tahoe Transportation District
6 II - Approach II - General Regional Plan - Consistent Local Plan - Locals Implement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING AREA</th>
<th>CITY OF S.L.T.</th>
<th>EL DORADO COUNTY</th>
<th>TRPA</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Water Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SWRCB - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conservation (terrestrial environment)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--threatened and endangered species</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--unique ecosystems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--other terrestrial systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--critical wildlife components</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Land Use</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open Space</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recreation</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>USFS - X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Solid Waste</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SWMD - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Circulation/Scenic Highways</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Noise</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Facilities</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Safety (natural hazards)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seismic Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Economics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Human Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Redevelopment</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Project Review (depends on planning area)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enforcement (depends on planning area)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Visual Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Natural</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>USFS - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Man-made (Architectural Review)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Emergency/Disaster Preparedness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>TTD - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Transit (Implementation)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE

RESOLUTION NO. 1981-128

A RESOLUTION OF COMMITMENT OF THE CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE WITH REGARD TO INVOLVEMENT IN AND COMMITMENT TO THE PROCESS OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY’S ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD AND CARRYING CAPACITY STUDY

WHEREAS, the South Lake Tahoe City Council and El Dorado County Board of Supervisors directed the City and County Planning Commissions to investigate ways that the City and County can cooperate in planning efforts; and

WHEREAS, the Commissions’ joint report emphasized the importance of planning at the local level in a regional planning context; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is conducting the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study pursuant to the Bi-state Compact, which will define the parameters for the City’s General Plan Update, the County’s Area Plan, TRPA’s Regional Plan Update, and all future planning in the Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, the Commissions’ recommend the complete local involvement in the process of the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study; and

WHEREAS, the City Council and Board of Supervisors on December 11, 1981, met jointly to consider the recommendation and approved it in concept at such meeting;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE THAT:

1. The Council of the City of South Lake Tahoe hereby commits itself and the available resources of the City of South Lake Tahoe to involvement in the process of the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency;

2. City staff and City Commissions are hereby directed to provide aid, assistance, and input to the conduct of said study and to take whatever steps may be required to become and remain fully apprised of and involved in said study;

3. The City Clerk is hereby directed to forward to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board and El Dorado County Board of Supervisors a certified copy of this resolution upon its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of South Lake Tahoe on December 15, 1981, by the following vote:
AYES: Councilmembers Benevento, Cafalu, Hubbell, Trupp and Hoods

NOES: Councilmembers None

ABSENT: Councilmembers None

[Signature]
Mayor

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Earlene L. Robinson
City Clerk

(City Seal)
RESOLUTION No. 26-82

OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO

WHEREAS, the South Lake Tahoe City Council and El Dorado County Board of Supervisors directed the City and County Planning Commissions to investigate ways that the City and County can cooperate in planning efforts; and

WHEREAS, the Commissions' joint report emphasized the importance of planning at the local level in a regional planning context; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is conducting the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study pursuant to the Bi-state Compact, which will define the parameters for the City's General Plan Update, the County's Area Plan, TRPA's Regional Plan Update, and all future planning the Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, the Commissions' recommend the complete local involvement in the process of the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study; and

WHEREAS, the City Council and Board of Supervisors on December 11, 1981, met jointly to consider the recommendation and approved it in concept at such meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF EL DORADO THAT:

1. The Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado hereby commits itself and the available resources of the County of El Dorado to involvement in the process of the Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency;

2. County staff and County Commissions are hereby directed to provide
aid, assistance, and input within available resources to the con-
duct of said study;

3. The County Clerk is hereby directed to forward to the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency Governing Board and South Lake Tahoe City
Council a certified copy of this resolution upon its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado at a regular
meeting of said Board, held on the 12th day of January, 1982,
by the following vote of said Board:

Ayes: Supervisor ROBERT E. DORR, PATRICIA R.
LOWE, W. P. WALKER, JOSEPH V. FLYNN,
THOMAS L. STEWART
None
Absent: None

/s/ W. P. WALKER
Chairsman, Board of Supervisors

I CERTIFY THAT
THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT IS A CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE.

DATE: January 19, 1982

ATTEST: DOLORES BREDSON, County Clerk and ex-officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado, State of
California.
By: Toni L. Padgett
Deputy Clerk

/s/ Toni L. Padgett
Deputy Clerk
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Staff has outlined a hybrid approach for dealing with mass transit improvements and measures to encourage ridesharing in the Air Quality Plan. This approach is outlined below:

Work with the City of South Lake Tahoe and Caltrans to include mass transit improvements in their FY 1982/83 budgets.

Develop and implement specific improvements before TRPA adopts a transportation plan, and include the major milestones for completing the development of these improvements in the Air Quality Plan. These improvements are outlined in Table 2 of the memo presented to APC.

Establish an objective for a reduction in trips on the Highway 50 corridor.

Outline transportation systems that will be considered in the TRPA Transportation Plan.

Adopt a transportation plan that meets, at a minimum, the objectives established in the Air Quality Plan.

Complete a study outlining potential revenue sources for funding the implementation of the TRPA Transportation Plan.

Assist the Tahoe Transportation District in adopting a financial program for implementing the transportation plan that will be adopted by TRPA.

Staff feels that this approach is positive in that certain improvements can be developed and implemented before TRPA adopts a transportation plan, and that it meets EPA requirements for a 1982 Air Quality Plan. The underlying questions of staff is when would TRPA be developing a transportation plan in the Air Quality Plan. Staff feels that the approach outlined above is consistent with the Compact, which established the following:

TRPA does not have a transportation plan until one is adopted in accordance with Article V.

TRPA cannot adopt a transportation plan before adoption of Environmental Thresholds.

TRPA must give consideration to the following before it adopts a transportation plan:

- Completion of the Loop Road
- Utilization of a light rail mass transit system in the South Shore area
- Utilization of a transit terminal in the Kingsbury Grade area

TRPA must review and consider all existing transportation plans prepared for the Basin in preparing its transportation plan.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

February 10, 1982
10:00 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PLANNING MATTERS
   A. Report on City of South Lake Tahoe/El Dorado County Joint Planning Effort
   B. Transfer of Development Rights
   C. Status Report on 208 Plan
   D. Development of 1982 Air Quality Plan
   E. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

V REPORTS
   A. Public Interest Comments
   B. APC Members

VI RESOLUTIONS

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

January 13, 1982
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 10:10 a.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Milam, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder

APC Members Absent: Mr. Renz, Mr. Harper, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Schlumpf

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Meder asked if there were any additions or deletions to the January Agenda. Executive Director Philip Overeynder requested that item V.G, 1982 Air Quality Nonattainment plan be added to the Agenda.

MOTION by Mr. Bidart with second by Mr. Dodgion to approved the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Ms. Smith questioned Planning Matter, IV.B. Environmental Impact Statement, Bureau of Reclamation, 64 Acre Tract, Tahoe City, Placer, located on page two paragraph two of the November minutes as to the accuracy of the sentence "These leases, which run year to year, provide revenue to the TCID, approximately $600,000 over the life of the lease." Ms. Smith requested that this be looked into.

MOTION by Ms. Smith with second by Mr. Smith that the November minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Ms. Shellhammer with second by Mr. Bidart that the December minutes be approved. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Milam, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder

Nays: None

Abstain: Ms. Smith

Absent: Mr. Renz, Mr. Harper, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Schlumpf

IV GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

A. Pfeiffer House Restaurant/Ice House Area, Three Parcels, General Forest to General Commercial, Placer County

- 1 -
Before discussion began on this item Chairman Meder asked if this General Plan Amendment (GPA) was under the procedure set up by the Governing Board that GPA's would only be considered twice a year. Executive Director Philip Overeynder clarified by stating that this was just a preliminary application and it was before the APC to determine whether it had merits to be heard before the Governing Board.

Senior Planner, Gordon Barrett gave the presentation to the APC stating that the applicants are requesting a GPA to change the zoning at this location in Tahoe City from General Forest to General Commercial. Mr. Barrett explained what types of uses are now existing, mostly commercial with some residential uses. The Pfeiffer House Restaurant/Ice House area is at this time nonconforming and if there was a fire or if the applicants wanted to remodel, it would not be permitted under the General Forest zoning. Mr. Barrett also noted that the applicants realized that under the General Commercial zoning the residential uses would be nonconforming and pointed out the land use restrictions on the property under land capability.

The items for discussion were 1) can this General Plan amendment qualify for a finding of no significant impact? 2) would this be a suitable urban boundary for Tahoe City? 3) is the application premature in light of the conflict with the urban design plan and the unresolved transportation issues? and 4) what is the recommendation to the Governing Board.

There was discussion and concerns by the APC on the following: What would be the impacts on the residential uses, CTRPA's Board findings on this proposal; that only the higher capability land (the lower portion of the property) be changed to General Commercial. There was input by Mr. Combs that this project, in Placer county's estimation, would conform with Placer County's urban plan, and Mr. Greg Lien, representative for the applicants.

There was also discussion that APC preferred that this location be changed to Tourist Commercial rather than General Commercial. The Applicant's representative, Mr. Lien had no objections. Staff indicated that if a public hearing were to be noticed on a proposed land use classification, it should be broad enough to include both General Commercial & Tourist Commercial.

MOTION by Mr. Combs with second by Mr. Bidart to proceed with the General Plan Amendment to rezone the location to Tourist Commercial from General Forest and recommend to the Governing Board that this proposal does have merit.

There was some discussion that perhaps both Tourist Commercial and General Commercial zoning should be considered. Mr. Combs amended his motion as follows:

MOTION by Mr. Combs with second by Mr. Bidart to proceed with the General Plan Amendment to rezone the location to either Tourist Commercial or General Commercial and the merits of each be weighed by the Governing Board. The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes:  Mr. Milam, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodbign, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Meder

Nays:  Mr. Randolph

Abstain:  None

Absent:  Mr. Renz, Mr. Harper, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Schlumpf
B. City of South Lake Tahoe Administration Building, Johnson and Al Tahoe Boulevards, 36 Acres, High Density Residential and Rural Estates to Public Service, City of South Lake Tahoe

Senior Planner, Gordon Barrett, gave the presentation to the APC stating that the City of South Lake Tahoe is requesting a General Plan Amendment to reclassify approximately 36 acres of a larger 145 acre parcel to Public Service (PS) with the remainder of the property to be classified as Recreation. The purpose of this request is to construct a new city administrative center on the PS portion of the property and to preserve the recreation and open space opportunities on the remaining portion. Mr. Barrett also went over the land use restrictions on this location, and noted the zoning that the City of South Lake Tahoe had on this location and the action of the CTRPA's Governing Board.

The issues for discussion were: 1) is this the proper location for the City's center? and 2) will an EIS be required with the General Plan amendment and/or the project?

Mr. Barrett pointed out that this would probably be a good location however, there has been no impact analysis on the proposed administrative center because no information was submitted. He also mentioned that an EIS would probably be required before there could be a General Plan Amendment, and that the City of South Lake Tahoe was willing to do an EIS if it was required but that at this time all that was being requested was the determination that this proposed General Plan Amendment had merit. Ms. Bogush stated that the City of South Lake Tahoe would do an EIS and commented on what the EIS will include.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Milam that the APC recommend this General Plan Amendment for further consideration subject to the condition that an Environmental Impact Analysis would be completed and recommend further review to the Governing Board. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Hyatt Lake Tahoe, 2.1 Acres Between Incline Creek and the West Property Line of Hyatt Tahoe, Recreation to Tourist Commercial, Washoe County

Executive Director Philip Overeynder presented to the APC the Governing Board's action and direction. Mr. Overeynder started out by giving some background and history on this proposal. The Governing Board considered a General Plan Amendment request to reclassify a 2.3 acre portion of the Hyatt Lake Tahoe site in Incline Village from Recreation to Tourist Commercial in March, 1981. Based on the APC recommendation and related enforcement matters, the General Plan Amendment was denied at that time and the staff was directed to work with the applicant to resolve the enforcement matters regarding the paving of a parking area within the limits of the stream environment zone of Incline Creek.

In July and August of 1981 the staff reported to the Governing Board a number of different alternatives available to resolve the enforcement matter regarding creation of land coverage within the stream environment zone boundary without the approval of TRPA. In September, 1981, the Governing Board accepted a proposed settlement of the enforcement matter which involved substantial resoration of the stream channel, fisheries improvements in Incline Creek, removal of land coverage both within and outside of the stream environment zone and a drainage and erosion control plan for the entire site.
At that time it was recognized that the proposed enforcement settlement would still require the resolution of the land use district boundaries on the site. The Governing Board evaluated three alternatives to resolve the zoning matter on the site including a special determination, an administrative permit to determine the appropriate used and initiation of a General Plan Amendment. After deliberation it was determined that a General Plan Amendment would be the most appropriate mechanism to resolve the zoning question and permit the enforcement matter to be resolved consistent with the Governing Board direction.

There was some discussion on this item, however, as this was a status report only, no action was taken.

V. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Shorezone Ordinance Amendments

Gordon Barrett reminded the APC of the negative comments received in December in regards to the Shorezone Ordinance Amendments and that since that time staff has gotten together with various parties to resolve those issues and that the proposed Ordinance before the APC reflected the results of the meetings. Mr. Barrett went through the ordinance and pointed out some of the areas of concern presented by Mr. Larry Hoffman and others and explained how this draft reflected or corrected these concerns. Mr. Barrett also went over some new things added: 1) Individual piers, a section was put in prohibited fueling facilities. 2) Fences; fences are prohibited except by public agencies for public good and that it has to meet the standards of permeability; and 3) Tahoe Keys lagoons, piers would be exempt with a staff sign-off if it meets the standards of 81-1, and the lagoons will not be treated as backshore.

Mr. Smith commented on Section 7.50 on page 22, that the Coast Guard did not have any standards in regards to navigational lights or aids and therefore the last sentence of this section should be dropped. There was some discussion on this point. There was also some discussion on the definition of residential use with regard to boats, and noise levels and speed limits allowed on Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Mike VanWagenen came forward on behalf of the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council, to state their concerns with these Shorezone Ordinance Amendments.

There was no action on this item, however, it was asked that if the APC members had any questions or comments to please give them to staff prior to the Governing Board meeting.

It was requested that item V.E. Clearinghouse Review, Master Plan for the Tahoe City Public Utility District be taken up out of order of the agenda.

E. Clearinghouse Review, Master Plan for the Tahoe City Public Utility District Water System

Senior Planner, David Ziegler, stated that TRPA has been asked by the State Clearinghouse, in California to review this master plan for the TCPUD Water System and that TRPA's comments are due no later than February 8.
Mr. Ziegler summarized the plan stating that the master plan has three basic purposes; 1) correct deficiencies in the system, 2) accommodate full occupancy of existing dwellings and 3) to provide for a certain amount of growth as permitted under the 208 Plan to the year 2002. The plan calls for a 20 year improvement plan costing 8.2 million dollars. The highest priority on the capital and other types of improvements list is replacement of the Bean water intake and the lowest priority is the installation of water meters. Mr. Ziegler also described the area TCPUD services and the amount and types of customers it services and pointed out where the TCPUD gets its water supply and why TCPUD would like or feel it needs more water (mainly groundwater) or water rights.

The plan outline four different growth scenarios 1) no project scenario, 2) no growth scenario, 3) the scenario for full buildout under the 208 plan, 4) the scenario of full buildout of all subdivided lots.

Mr. Ziegler pointed out the pros and cons with regard to TCPUD’s preferred groundwater exploration proposal and stated that staff does not feel they have gone far enough with their impact analysis in this area.

Mr. Pyle questioned the idea of exploration of groundwater with regard to endangered species, and the drainage of meadows.

Mr. David Antonucci, Senior Planner for TCPUD, came forward to comment on the proposed master plan and to answer questions. Mr. Andy Sawyer also came forward to comment and to supply some background as to water rights on the California side of the Basin.

There was no action taken on this matter.

It was requested at this time that the next item to be taken up be item V.G. 1982 Air Quality Nonattainment Plan.

G. 1982 Air Quality Nonattainment Plan

Executive Director Philip Overeynder gave some background as to what TRPA is trying to accomplish with this Plan stating that last month staff presented APC with a timetable and this month staff was attempting to surface some of the issues that the APC feels will be involved in putting the plan together and getting discussion and input into this so that staff can continue the process.

Associate Planner, Dale Neiman pointed out some of the issues for discussion: 1) possible delay in development of an air quality plan until after the development of the Environmental Thresholds; 2) how to deal with implementation of mass transit improvements, staggered working/operating hours and methods to encourage ridesharing, 3) establish a preliminary schedule for implementation of ordinance and policy development with respect to the control measures that will be included in the air quality plan, and 4) discuss the control measures that staff has been reviewing in developing the air quality plan to determine if the APC object to any of the measures or want to include any measures in the air quality plan.

Mr. Neiman said one of the concerns of staff was the development of the air quality plan in light of the threshold study and the ETS that is required. It was the consensus of the Governing Board that perhaps this item should be
deferred for the time being, however, after some discussions with Governing Board Chairman Westergard and Mr. Dodgion it was decided that the work on this plan should continue at least with regard to the short term until the Thresholds are developed.

With regard to Mass Transit, staff set out two alternatives, goal orientation with guidelines or Specific details on how to obtain a goal. Mr. Randolph suggested that there be something in between.

Mr. Randolph suggested that with regard to the discussion on resolving the conflicts in terms of what control measures should be implemented after adoption of the 1982 Air Quality Plan and which should be deferred until after adoption of the Transportation Plan the preferred potential approach should be worded more positive and the word conflict should be left out.

The next item Mr. Neiman wanted comment on was Potential Control Measures for Areas Exceeding the Carbon Monoxide Standard. Mr. Neiman went through each measure soliciting comment. After going through the entire draft the following recommendations were made: 1) go ahead with the plan, 2) with regard to mass transit program, create a combination of both alternatives, and 3) reword third alternative, item III of the draft, to a more positive approach with regard to control measures.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph with second by Mr. Hansen that the APC recommend that the development of the 1982 Air Quality Nonattainment Plan be continued and not ask for a delay in delivery of the Nonattainment Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

There was further discussion on control measures available and possible conflicts with the Compact and revised General Plan Development. No action was taken on the other recommendations.

B. Remedial Erosion and Runoff Control Ordinance

Senior Planner, Gary Shellhorn gave the presentation to the APC, asking the APC to look at the outline and get approval so that it can go to the Board. Mr. Shellhorn stated that the ordinance would be developed to encourage as much voluntary participation by the agencies and local government and local private business and that the ordinance would be a mechanism that could be used to insure implementation in areas where the responsible parties are lacking the initiative. Mr. Shellhorn then went over the draft outline for the APC explaining the procedures of the ordinance with regard to the phases consultation, notice, planning and compliance.

Mr. Sawyer brought up the question that if you give a party an opportunity to develop a plan and comply and if they do not comply staff will prepare a plan for compliance, wasn't staff leaving themselves open to having staff doing all the work.

MOTION by Mr. Pyle with second by Mr. Hansen that this draft outline of the Remedial Erosion and Runoff Control Ordinance is adequate to begin preparation of an ordinance. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Meder asked if there were any other items that needed to come before the APC at this time and if not could the other items on the agenda be deferred until the February meeting. Executive Director Philip Overeynder stated that Senior Planner David Ziegler would prepare and send out a written report on the status.
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report on the 208 Plan and commented that the Steering Committee meeting will be held on January 20, at 9:30 a.m. at the TRPA office. Mr. Overeynder also mentioned that on January 21st staff was having a financial manager come in to give a seminar to get some assistance on financial strategies, and mentioned that all APC members were invited to attend.

VI REPORTS

A. Public Interest Comments - None
B. APC Members

Ms. Bogush mentioned that the City of South Lake Tahoe and the County Board of Supervisors had their joint meeting and that what came out of this meeting was some recommendations for the Environmental Threshold Study

VII RESOLUTIONS

VIII CORRESPONDENCE

IX PENDING MATTERS

X ADJOURNMENT

The APC adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon A. Fick
Secretary II
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 2, 1982

TO: Advisory Planning Commission
FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Transfer of Development Rights, 1982 Building Season

Staff has been working with CTRPA on short-term issues related to transfer of development rights (TDR). Our immediate objectives are:

(1) To ensure that the existing California-side transfer system functions effectively in the 1982 building season; and

(2) To familiarize TRPA staff with existing ordinances and procedures in anticipation of the eventual transfer of responsibility from CTRPA to TRPA.

Our discussions to date have identified three issues which will require staff attention in February. The following paragraphs summarize these issues and our recommended actions:

Expiration of CTRPA Urgency Ordinance

The City of South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, and El Dorado County all have ordinances in place pertaining to the allocation of building permits for the '82 building season. But CTRPA's urgency ordinance, which sets up guidelines for transfers, expires in May, 1982. The CTRPA Board has directed staff to ensure that there are no gaps in the transfer system and to prepare a new ordinance. TRPA staff will work with CTRPA on the new ordinance.

Permanent Lot Retirement

When lot owners transfer building allocations from high-hazard lots to low-hazard lots, they must permanently surrender their development rights. They can accomplish this by direct donations of high-hazard lots, open space easements, or lot consolidations. TRPA staff will assist CTRPA staff on development of detailed policy in this area.

Verification of Land Capability

Before CTRPA can approve any transfers, it must verify the land capability of both lots in the field. Some questions have come up regarding the land capability system in the areas of geomorphology, mapping, and land capability challenges. TRPA and CTRPA staff will work together to answer these questions prior to the beginning of the building season.

cc: Dennis Winslow, CTRPA
Andrew Sawyer, SWRCB
Wendell McCurry, NDEP
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 2, 1982

TO: Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Status Report on 208 Plan

Staff mailed the APC a progress report on our water quality program in late January. This memorandum summarizes recent additional activity in three areas: development of financial strategies, evaluation of BMP's, and remedial erosion control.

Financial Strategies for Plan Implementation

TRPA hosted a 1-1/2 day seminar on financial strategies for plan implementation on January 21 and 22. EPA Headquarters paid for the seminar through its Financial Management Assistance Program (FMAP). The seminar leader, Larry Scully of Peat-Marwick-Mitchell, stressed the importance of integrating financial planning into each step of the planning process. He also emphasized the need for good problem identification and follow-up monitoring in convincing local decision-makers to support water quality programs. Staff has copies of the seminar materials available for your review.

Since staff is committed to develop a financial program under the 208 work plan, TRPA has been studying the possibility of funding a contract on potential funding sources. Staff would also like to investigate the possibilities for integrated financing of water quality and transportation programs. On February 1, TRPA staff met with representatives of the City, Caltrans, CTRPA, and the Tahoe Transportation District to discuss a possible scope of work. The group concluded that any study should focus on regional sources of funding and legal issues related to the TRPA Compact, and that the group should reconvene in 2-3 weeks after the staffs have conducted further research.

BMP Evaluation

On February 9, TRPA will hold a meeting of an ad hoc committee to discuss BMP requirements, infiltration systems, and runoff calculations for single family dwellings. Similar to the work of the ad hoc committee on stream environment zone BMP's, the group will attempt to resolve issues that affect either project review and enforcement or the revision of the general plan. Staff will give a report on the meeting at the February 10 APC meeting.

Remedial Erosion Control

Staff has continued to work with the local jurisdictions to outline solutions to existing erosion problems and use existing mitigation funds "on the ground" as soon as possible. Also, in California, staff is encouraging local government to
apply for matching funds from the State Assistance Grants. Washoe, Douglas and Placer Counties all have either current or pending projects. The City of South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County have also made significant progress, which is especially encouraging since their efforts are crucial to the success of the STPUD Mitigation Task Force. To assist the Task Force, TRPA staff has offered to prepare watershed-by-watershed strategies for the 17 watersheds in the City and El Dorado County, concentrating first on developed areas.

Staff will attend a meeting with the City, CTRPA, and the Lahontan Board later in February where the attendees will attempt to reach an agreement to proceed with the El Dorado Beach project, which already has completed the design phase.

Staff also met with representatives of the El Dorado County Planning Department and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board on February 1 to discuss development of conceptual plans for remedial erosion control projects which could lead to applications for State Assistance Grants. TRPA will assist the County with their conceptual plans and work with them to utilize mitigation funds collected during the '81 and '82 building seasons.

Conclusion

Staff will report on further progress in these areas at the February 10 meeting. If you have any questions or comments on this memorandum, please contact Gary Shellhorn or Dave Ziegler of the Long Range Planning Division.

sf/
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
STAFF SUMMARY

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Development of the 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin

I. Introduction and Background:

The purpose of this memo is to obtain direction from the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and Governing Board concerning selection of a preferred alternative for the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/1982 Air Quality Plan, establish a series of milestones for developing and implementing those measures that will be included in the final EIS/1982 Air Quality Plan, and to determine if a date should be established for attaining the state air quality standards.

At the January, 1982 Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board meetings staff gave a presentation concerning the status of the development of the 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Basin. The APC and Governing Board generally concurred with the recommendations staff outlined in the memo and gave additional direction to staff in order to insure coordination between the Clean Air Act and the requirements of the Compact. This presentation discussed the following points:

1. Possible delay in development of an Air Quality Plan until after the Environment Threshold Study has been completed. The APC and Governing Board directed staff to develop the draft EIS/1982 Air Quality Plan.

2. Determine how to deal with implementation of Mass Transit Improvements and Measures to Encourage Ridesharing. The Board directed staff to develop a hybrid of the two options presented, which would establish an objective for a reduction in traffic volume and specific measures that would be implemented before the TRPA Transportation Plan is adopted.

3. Establish a preliminary schedule for implementation, ordinance and policy development with respect to the control measures. The APC and Governing Board generally concurred with staff's recommendation.

4. Discuss the control measures staff is reviewing in developing the Air Quality Plan to determine if the Board objects to any, and to determine if any other measures should be included in the Air Quality Plan. The APC and Governing Board generally concurred with the list of measures staff is reviewing.

II. Potential Control Strategy Alternatives for the Areas Exceeding the Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Standards:

The purpose of this section is to present potential alternatives for solving the carbon monoxide air quality problem at those locations where the standards are exceeded within the Basin. In developing the Air Quality Plan, most major roads within the Basin were analyzed to determine the extent of the air quality problem.
Figure 1 shows the locations where the state and federal carbon monoxide standards are predicted to be violated within the Basin in 1987. The major assumptions are that the state and federal automobile emission standards will not be changed significantly and the traffic volume will increase 4% per year to 1987.

Carbon monoxide is a tasteless, odorless, and colorless gas which is slightly lighter than air. It affects humans by replacing oxygen in the blood stream and therefore reducing the availability of oxygen to the body.

Carbon monoxide is the product of incomplete combustion of all types of fossil fuels. In Tahoe, combustion of gasoline by automobiles contributed over 94 percent of the total carbon monoxide in the Basin in 1977. Carbon monoxide also disperses fairly rapidly but more emissions are generated when automobiles travel at lower speeds. As a result, carbon monoxide concentrations closely follow traffic patterns and the highest concentrations occur in areas with traffic congestion. In addition, although there are generally more cars in the Basin in the summer, carbon monoxide emissions are greater in the winter because lower temperatures causes less complete combustion of gasoline.

In addition to more emissions being generated in the winter due to lower temperatures, meteorological conditions that occur during the winter also trap carbon monoxide close to the ground. Higher concentrations occur during stable atmospheric conditions associated with nocturnal radiation inversions and low wind speed. These conditions occur during the evening and early morning on most nonstorm nights from October through April. As a result of these considerations, the highest concentrations of carbon monoxide occur from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. during the winter.

In general, there are three methods for reducing carbon monoxide emissions generated from automobiles. These methods include reducing emissions emitted from automobiles, reducing the number of vehicle trips or increasing the speed of automobiles. Reducing emissions from automobiles can be accomplished by automobile emission standards and an inspection and maintenance (I/M) program. The number of vehicle trips can be reduced by measures such as mass transit improvements or mail delivery, while increasing the speed of automobiles can be accomplished with traffic flow improvements.

Reducing the number of vehicle trips is more effective than traffic flow improvements for two reasons. First, there are fewer automobiles and therefore less emissions being generated. Second, reducing trips has the same effect as traffic flow improvements because with fewer automobiles on the road system they operate at higher speeds.

Traffic flow improvements improve the operational characteristics of the road system and therefore increase the speed of automobiles. Traffic flow improvements include adding turn lanes, turning movement restrictions, lane use restrictions, and signal modifications. The amount of emissions generated from automobiles is very sensitive to speed. This is shown below for emissions generated from the 1987 fleet of automobiles.
Figure 1
Areas Predicted to Violate the Federal 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Standard in 1987

LAKE TAHOE

SOUTH LAKE TAHOE

The Federal 8-hour carbon monoxide standard is 9ppm.

= Areas violating the standard.
Some of the measures staff is reviewing can be analyzed to estimate their effectiveness in decreasing carbon monoxide emissions while others cannot. Those measures for which estimates can be made include an I/M Program, Traffic Flow Improvements and Mail Delivery.

For Transit Improvements and Measures to Encourage Ridesharing, an objective that assumes a 7% reduction from the projected 1987 traffic volume on the U.S. 50 Corridor will be established. This reduction was based upon limiting the projected growth of traffic by 1987, which currently assumes a rate of 4% increase a year in the volume of traffic. This objective was primarily developed from the Highway 50 Corridor Study completed by JKH & Associates in 1979. To achieve this objective, the Air Quality Plan would provide specific control measures or improvements that can be implemented before the Transportation Plan is adopted. In addition, the Air Quality Plan would include possible mass transit systems that will be evaluated in the development of the transportation element of the General Plan. Staff feels that this objective is reasonable based on the continuation of the following occurrences since 1978:

1. The ridership of STAGE increased 27.3% from February, 1978 to February, 1981.

2. The ridership of the Heavenly Valley Service increased 45% between February, 1979 and February, 1981.

3. The private sector has improved the various jitney services operating in the South Shore since 1979.

4. The Casino's have improved transit service from areas outside the Basin.

5. The Compact states that where increases in the capacity of the transportation system are required, the Agency shall give preference to providing such capacity through public transportation.

The measures that cannot be quantified to show an improvement in air quality include Parking Management, Reduce Cold Start Conditions - Public Awareness Program, Driver Advisories, Staggered Work Hours, Indirect Source Review and Idling Restrictions. However, these measures are still important to the overall program.

The staff recommendation is that the Board adopt the following as the preferred alternative in the draft EIS/1982 Air Quality Plan:

Measures that Reduce Emissions from Automobiles

Inspection/Maintenance Program
Reduce Cold Start Conditions - Public Awareness Program
MEASURES THAT REDUCE TRIPS

Mass Transit Improvements
Measures to Encourage Ridesharing
Mail Delivery

MEASURES THAT IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW

Staggered Work Hours
Driver Advisories
Parking Management
Traffic Flow Improvements

PROJECT REVIEW MEASURES

Indirect Source Review
Idling Restrictions

Table 1 is a matrix that shows the control measures discussed at the January APC and Governing Board meetings that reduce concentrations of carbon monoxide and improvements in air quality that can be expected if they are implemented. Not all the work has been completed and refinements may be made to these estimates. However, the work should be completed prior to the APC meeting. The preliminary results show that the carbon monoxide air quality standard probably cannot be attained in the Stateline area unless there are substantial traffic system modifications. Staff intends to explore the effectiveness of these potential modifications in the Air Quality Plan, but will defer action until adoption of the transportation element of the General Plan. Possible transportation system modifications include various Loop Road alternatives, and the concept of a pedestrian mall on U.S. 50 with a bypass around Stateline.

III. Staff Suggestion Concerning the Development of a Schedule for Developing and Implementing Those Measures Included in the Staff Recommended Preferred Alternative:

Table 2 is staff's suggestion concerning the development of a schedule that lists the major steps required to develop and implement those measures included in the staff recommended preferred alternative. In addition, all the measures adopted in the final Air Quality Plan will require TRPA Governing Board approval through either the project review process, or development of an ordinance, policy, program or plan.

IV. ATTAINMENT DATE FOR STATE AIR QUALITY STANDARD OPTIONS:

Both the ARB and Nevada Environmental Commission have adopted a 6 ppm 8-hour average high altitude carbon monoxide air quality standard for the Lake Tahoe Basin. This standard is one third more stringent than the Federal 9 ppm 8-hour standard. The Clean Air Act has established a required attainment date for the Federal standard of December 31, 1987. However, there is not an attainment date associated with the state standards. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) has requested that the 1982 Air Quality Plan establish an attainment date for the state standards. As a result, staff needs direction from the Board concerning this issue. Possible options include the following:
### Table 1: Control Strategy Alternatives

**Modified 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations in Parts per Million for 1987 Using a Four Percent Growth Factor in the Traffic Volume**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Alternatives</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Control Measures:</strong></td>
<td>Maint. Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Projected Automobile Emission Standards for 1987</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Urbanized Area I/M Program</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Urbanized Area I/M Program and Implementation within El Dorado and Douglas Counties</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Individual Intersection Modifications</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Mail Delivery</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Transit Improvements</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combinations of the Individual Control Measures:**

| A. Urbanized Area I/M Program and Individual Intersection Modifications (A+B+D) | --- | --- | 11.0 | --- | --- | 10.1 | 11.0 | 17.2 | --- | 10.6 | 8.5 | --- |
| C. Urbanized Area I/M Program and Mail Delivery (A+B+F) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D. Urbanized Area I/M Program and Transit Improvements (A+B+G) | --- | --- | 10.6 | --- | --- | 9.7 | 10.5 | 18.1 | --- | 10.4 | --- | --- |

<p>| L. Urbanized Area I/M Program Plus Implementation of I/M in El Dorado and Douglas Counties and Individual Intersection Modifications (A+C+D) | --- | --- | 9.8 | --- | --- | 8.5 | 9.3 | 15.3 | --- | 9.1 | 5.0 | --- |
| N. Urbanized Area I/M Program Plus Implementation of I/M in El Dorado and Douglas Counties and Mail Delivery (A+C+F) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O. Urbanized Area I/M Program plus Implementation of I/M in El Dorado and Douglas Counties and Transit Improvements (A+C+G) | --- | --- | 9.1 | --- | --- | 8.3 | 9.2 | 15.9 | --- | 9.2 | --- | --- |
| P. Individual Intersection Modifications and Mail Delivery (A+D+F) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q. Individual Intersection Modifications and Transit Improvements (A+D+G) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Alternatives</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maint. Station Dunlap Raising Ridge Carrows Tulare Ok Tahoe Sonora Fire Sta Travel Lodge Crest V Stln.CA Stln.WV R.Tahoe WTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Computerized Traffic Signalization System and Mail Delivery (A+B+C+F)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Computerized Traffic Signalization System and Transit Improvements (A+B+C+G)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Mail Delivery and Transit Improvements (A+G)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Urbanized Area I/M Program, Individual Intersection Modifications, Mail Delivery, and Transit Improvements (A+B+C+D+E+G)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Urbanized Area I/M Program, Computerized Traffic System, Mail Delivery and Transit Improvements (A+B+C+E+G)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Urbanized I/M Program plus implementation in El Dorado and Douglas Counties, Computerized Traffic System, Mail Delivery and Transit Improvements (A+C+E+F+G)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Urbanized I/M Program plus implementation in El Dorado and Douglas Counties, Individual Intersection modifications, Mail Delivery and Transit Improvements (A+C+E+F+G)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2**

**Major Milestones for Developing and Implementing the Measures**

**Included in the Staff Recommended Preferred Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection/Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Cold Start Conditions</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to Encourage Ridesharing</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Delivery</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staggered Work Hours</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Advisories</td>
<td>OD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Source Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>OD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idling Restrictions</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial Revenue Study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development of TRPA Transportation Plan</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing bus frequencies</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving timed transfers</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving reliability of the system</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving coordination</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving coordination with bicycle and pedestrian access</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving coordination with inter-regional public transportation</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adding bus shelters and turnouts along U.S. 50.</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adding ski storage devices to buses</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing airport and casino service</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing bus passes and schedules to motel and hotel patrons</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving the marketing program</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improving Service to Heavenly Valley</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Light Rail Mass Transit System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fixed Guideway Mass Transit System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All Existing Transportation Plan and Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent upon action taken by the California State Legislature

FS - As part of TRPA Transportation Plan

FS - As part of TRPA Transportation Plan
## Control Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Flow Improvements</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- South Avenue Extension</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the South Lake Tahoe WTE intersection</td>
<td>1983 PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the Tahoe Keys and U.S. 50 intersection</td>
<td>1984 FS PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the Sierra Boulevard and U.S. 50 intersection</td>
<td>1985 FS PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the U.S. 50 and Al Tahoe Blvd. intersection</td>
<td>1986 FS PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the O'Malley/Carson and U.S. 50 intersection</td>
<td>1987 PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the U.S. 50 and Ski Run Blvd. intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Installation of a free right turn lane at the U.S. 50 and Wildwood Ave. intersection for traffic turning onto Wildwood Ave. from U.S. 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the U.S. 50 and Pioneer Trail intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the U.S. 50 and Park Ave. intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intersection modification at the U.S. 50 and Stateline Avenue intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Installation of a pedestrian/vehicle separation between Sahara Tahoe and Ceasar's Casinos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Computerized traffic signalization system</td>
<td>1982 PD PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing free right turn lanes</td>
<td>1984 PD PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Widening driveways to expedite right turn movements</td>
<td>1985 PD PI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FS** = Further Study - If any measures are found not to be feasible, substitute measures will be developed.

**PD** = Program or Plan Development

**OD** = Ordinance Development

**PI** = Proposed Implementation Date
- Establishing a deadline consistent with the federal deadline
- Establishing a deadline beyond the federal deadline
- Deferring any decision until the General Plan is updated so that any deadline would be consistent with any established in the General Plan for the Environmental Thresholds
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 1, 1982

TO: Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Status Report on the Establishment of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

The Steering Committee for establishment of environmental threshold carrying capacities met January 20, 1982 to discuss environmental components, associated parameters, and the methods for measuring each. This was the packet provided the APC on January 13.

The Steering Committee basically concurred with the listing but directed staff and the consultant team to explore recreation and visual thresholds further. We are currently working with these components and will have more to report later. Minutes of the Steering Committee meeting will be made available to the APC February 10.

The Governing Board discussed environmental threshold carrying capacities at their January 28 meeting. Clarification of terminology and threshold ranges were the primary concerns expressed. It was also agreed the Board would need to set aside more of their meeting to understand and keep abreast of the process. The Board felt it should also hear from more of the public and will open the February Governing Board meeting for public input. Staff will present an update of the establishment process beginning at 1:30 on February 24, followed by a two or three hour period for the public to comment on thresholds. The meeting will be held at the Chateau in Incline Village and will take the place of the originally scheduled February 26 Steering Committee/Core Group meeting.

AGENDA ITEM IV. E.
DRAFT OUTLINE:

REMEDIAL EROSION AND RUNOFF CONTROL ORDINANCE

I. Findings

-- TRPA to implement adopted 208 Plan it is necessary to adopt this ordinance for remedial erosion runoff and control problems

-- timely implementation of remedial controls is necessary to maintain water quality at current levels and to reverse the process of degradation of water quality

-- ordinance establishes procedures, and provides for enforcement

-- provisions of this ordinance are in accordance with the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact

-- appropriate public hearings conducted as required by law

-- Provisions in the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan for prioritization and cost effectiveness of erosion and runoff control treatment practices shall be a basis for scheduling and implementing remedial erosion and runoff control projects

-- The TRPA 208 Work Plan for updating the Agency’s Water Quality Management Plan calls for coordination with the cities and counties within the Lake Tahoe Basin to develop management strategies on the various land capability classes and problem areas as part of the Problem Assessment component.

II. General Provisions

-- Compliance: Operation of basin-wide remedial program shall be in compliance with this ordinance; action plans shall be required for problems on a priority basis; TRPA will provide technical assistance and stress voluntary compliance with erosion and runoff control standards; where responsible parties fail to take acceptable action after sufficient time period, TRPA may take enforcement actions in accordance with the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact

-- interpretation and severability

III. Definitions

IV Procedures

A. Consultation

-- TRPA will participate in meetings with various local associations, groups, governments and the state agencies which have administrative or legal jurisdiction in areas with in the Tahoe Basin to coordinate remedial erosion and runoff control efforts.
TRPA will provide assistance to the various entities involved with remedial erosion and runoff control to aid in development of priorities for treatment to be consistent with the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan.

TRPA with consultation and coordination of those entities directly affected by remedial actions will develop priorities for erosion and/or runoff control, on a watershed basis for each county or city. The priorities for treatment practices shall be based on reduction of sedimentation, controlling runoff, and insuring cost effectiveness.

B. Notice

Based on the prioritizations developed after consultation with entities affected the Governing Board may issue notices to the entities responsible for remedial erosion and/or runoff control.

C. Planning

Those entities responsible for remedial controls must develop acceptable action plans (per part V of this ordinance) within specified time limit set by the notice. All action plans are subject to Governing Board approval.

TRPA staff would provide technical advice on action plan preparation and process requests for mitigation fee funds.

Action plan must be consistent with any applicable State or Federal discharge permit; approval of an action plan by the Governing Board does not constitute a permit to discharge to surface of ground waters.

D. Compliance

If the responsible entity fails to submit plan within time limit, TRPA staff will prepare a plan for approval of both the responsible entity and the Governing Body.

If staff fails to reach agreement with responsible entity on the action plan, responsible entity could appeal to TRPA Executive Director.

If appeal to Executive Director fails to produce an acceptable action plan, responsible entity will be asked to appear to a show-cause hearing before the Governing Body.

After show-cause hearing, Governing Board will direct staff to define an action plan for the responsible entity.

If the terms of the final action plan are not met by the responsible entity, the Governing Body may direct staff to initiate enforcement action.
V. Required Plans and Investigations

-- Those entities who are unable to abate erosion or runoff problems promptly or on a voluntary basis upon receipt of notice must submit an action plan specifying:

1) control measures to be used
2) time frame for completion
3) financial commitments
4) off-site impacts

VI. Inspections

-- After approval of action plan, TRPA staff will conduct periodic inspections to verify compliance with the Plan

VII. Standards

-- Responsible parties will base action plans on TRPA BMP Handbook; occasionally with Governing Body approval

VIII. Violations

-- Failure to comply with compliance provisions of this ordinance constitutes to misdemeanor; responsible parties are subject to enforcement action under Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Article VI, parts j, k, and l
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 11, 1982

TO: STPUD Mitigation Task Force

FROM: Dave Ziegler, Chairman
       Water Quality Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Status of Water Quality Activities

The Water Quality Subcommittee met on January 11 and February 1 at the Timber Cove Lodge to develop a detailed mitigation approach in the area of water quality. At the first meeting, the discussion focused on potential funding sources and erosion-control projects. The second meeting focused on issues affecting erosion-control efforts and a tentative game-plan for the next few months. The following paragraphs summarize the discussion:

Funding Sources

The State of California has made $10 million available for erosion-control projects in the Tahoe Basin through its State Assistance grants. The Lahontan Regional Board administers the grants. The State share is 75 percent for erosion control and revegetation and 50 percent for drainage problems.

The Santini-Burton Bill theoretically could provide funds to units of local government to carry out erosion control projects, in addition to its main purpose of direct land acquisition. The subcommittee does not know the exact status of Santini-Burton funding, but Andy Sawyer (SWRCB) does not believe any funds will be available for local erosion control projects in Federal fiscal year 1982 or 1983.

A third source of funding for erosion-control is the mitigation funds which TRPA and units of local government collect from those building new houses or commercial facilities in the Basin. By the end of the '82 building season, the funds for the City and El Dorado County could approach $200,000. Ideally, they could use these funds as local match for state assistance grants.

The final source of funds is local government public works budgets. The subcommittee did not receive estimates of average public works budgets for the City and El Dorado County. STPUD itself can also dedicate funds to erosion control projects (see below).

Potential Projects

The subcommittee identified three erosion-control projects which have progressed to the design stage. These are (1) the completion of the El Dorado Beach project by the City of South Lake Tahoe, (2) STPUD's Cold Creek project, and (3) STPUD's Heavenly Valley Water Tanks project. Although the subcommittee discussed some other potential projects, they did not agree on any other specific ideas.
MEMORANDUM
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Issues

The subcommittee discussed the issue of whether the State of California could help local governments accept some of the financial risk of participating in erosion control projects. The risks could result from cost over-runs, or from lower-than-anticipated mitigation revenues. Andy Sawyer (SWRCB) said it would be difficult politically for the State to protect Tahoe jurisdictions from such risk. He said, however, that local governments could use in-kind services and future mitigation fees as local match.

The subcommittee also discussed whether, in some cases, assessment districts would be a viable means of collecting revenues. Several members mentioned problems they had encountered with this concept in the past. Two past problems have been unrealistically high assessments and problems presented by vacant lots. Nevertheless, assessment districts have potential in some heavily-developed watersheds.

The subcommittee also discussed the role that waste discharge requirements (WDR's) play in the mitigation program. Andy Sawyer indicated that the State could re-open WDR's "for cause" in cases where mitigation strategies might conflict with existing WDR requirements.

Tentative Game-Plan

The subcommittee agreed that, if possible, the City should move quickly to complete the El Dorado Beach project. An application for State matching funds is now under preparation. STPUD is also moving ahead with the Cold Creek and Heavenly Valley projects.

To help organize conceptual planning that will eventually result in additional mitigation projects, TRPA will begin to prepare watershed strategies, based on past 208 problem assessments which TRPA is now updating. TRPA will focus initially on the developed watersheds in the City and El Dorado County, and will look to all the members of the subcommittee to provide detail for the strategies. TRPA staff will present a sample outline and several draft strategies at the upcoming meeting of the mitigation task force. It is important to note that these strategies will address both technical and financial problems and approaches.

Conclusion

If you have any questions or comments on this status report, please contact me, or Gary Shellhorn, at (916) 541-0249.

/sf
MEMORANDUM

March 1, 1982

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: March Agenda Information

No APC packets will be mailed this month; written and oral information will be presented at the March 10 meeting.
NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on March 10, 1982 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: March 1, 1982

By: [Signature]

Randall C. Sheffield, Chief
Long Range Planning Division
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT

   Tahoe City Public Utility District, Relocation of Bean Water Intake Line,
   Cedar Point, Placer County, APN 83-500-13, TRPA File #81147

V PLANNING MATTERS

   A. Transfer of Development Rights
   B. Development of 1982 Air Quality Plan
   C. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

VI REPORTS

   A. Public Interest Comments
   B. APC Members

VII RESOLUTIONS

VIII CORRESPONDENCE

IX PENDING MATTERS

X ADJOURNMENT
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

February 10, 1982
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chairman Stan Randolph called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 10:15 a.m., and determined that no quorum for action existed.

APC Members Present: Mr. Milam, Mr. Combs, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph

APC Members Absent: Mr. Renz, Mr. Harper, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Smith, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Meder

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Since a quorum was not present, Vice Chairman Randolph stated that the items on the agenda would be discussed for information only.

III. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The minutes would have to be continued as no action could be taken until a quorum was present.

IV. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Report on City of South Lake Tahoe/El Dorado County Joint Planning Effort

Chief Planning officer for the City of South Lake Tahoe, Ann Bogush outlined the joint planning efforts as discussed in April, 1981 in joint session with the El Dorado County Supervisors and City Council, and the feasibility of combining the two planning processes of the City's General Plan Update and the County's Area Plan. In December, 1981 both the City Council and County Board of Supervisors accepted the recommendations and want to present them for review to the Governing Board. Ms. Bogush pointed out that the report contains lead and support roles for both local and regional governments in current and future Tahoe Basin planning.

Ms. Bogush presented a chart depicting the agency that has the final authority in a decision and designated as having the lead role, and other agencies that have input on a decision which are in a support role to the lead agency. The chart showed that there is a great deal of duplication of planning efforts with the City, County, and regional agencies. Ms. Bogush pointed out that the findings of this duplication is a waste of fiscal resources, decision-maker's time, staff time, and creates conflicting regulations for every development project on the South Shore. The chart also represents the ideal designation of which agencies would be lead and support when the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study and Regional Plan Update is complete in June, 1983.
Ms. Bogush stated that this duplication of planning efforts should be eliminated, but that in some cases a simple lead/support designation was not always applicable, and that three alternative approaches for these situations had been recommended as follows: (1) local input into the detailed regional plan that regionals implement; (2) general regional plan which is consistent with the local plan that locals implement; and (3) the local input into the detailed regional plan that the locals implement. This approach requires an adequate planning staff at the City and County levels; a spirit of cooperation between local agencies; and support of local agencies to take responsibility for planning issues according to regional policies. The recommendation to the Board is to approve a resolution of commitment of the City of South Lake Tahoe with regard to involvement in and commitment to the process of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency’s Environmental Threshold and Carrying Capacity Study, along with the resolution from El Dorado County Board of Supervisors recognizing this commitment.

Chief Planning Officer for El Dorado County, Ken Milam pointed out that in order to implement the adequate planning staff and support commitment, it will have to be budgeted so that the planning program can be carried through which is evidenced by the resolutions that were passed and adopted by both the City Council and the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Milam followed up on the report for the City/County joint planning projects short range (1981-82) as follows: City Design Guidelines Revision/County Sierra Design Guidelines which are used in architectural review for new construction, i.e., buildings, signs, and landscaping appearance. City staff is currently reviewing this and draft joint hearings will be held to review and adopt these guidelines. In terms of the Housing Element, Mr. Milam pointed out that in response to a State mandate both the County and the City are obligated under California law to do other things that are not necessarily covered by the Compact. Under the new set of guidelines for housing element revision, the City has revised their element and on a short term it has been adopted and currently awaiting State certification. The County is in the process of completing their element and will be ready for hearings in the next month or two and coordination of the content of both County and City elements will take place. During this period joint data is being collected for the City General Plan Update and County Area Plan, and watching the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity Study to find out how much and the kind of data from the advanced planning division is being collected so that this material can be used to prepare a joint update between City and County for land use element.

Mr. Milam stated that the long range planning efforts (1982-83) will be proposed to the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors to do a Basin wide County update to the general plan along with the City’s general plan update. The main emphasis will be land use which is tied to the open space element, recreation, seismic safety, public safety and noise elements. These joint projects will use a joint citizens committee; joint public hearings, and joint final plan with support from a City/County planning team for adoption of the plan. Mr. Milam noted that the opportunity for a responsible approach to the planning efforts should be consistent when adopted, which can be utilized in the regional plan.
Short discussion followed, with Andy Sawyer of the State Water Resources Control Board pointing out the emergency disaster preparedness that both the State Board's Water Quality Plan and the TRPA Water Quality Management Plan call for a spill contingency plan, primarily to deal with hazardous substance spills and also the possibility of oil spills. There is a need for a comprehensive plan that coordinates all of the agencies that will be involved and he asked that it be considered in the disaster plan.

Chief Planning Officer for Placer County, Bill Combs, concurred that the County's general plan needed updating so that it would dovetail with the TRPA's general plan, and it looks promising that it will be taking place.

Mr. Randolph complimented the presentation given by Ms. Bogush and Mr. Milam stating that it was very timely to start consolidating the expertise in all of the areas. He commented that with the shortage of funds, the coordination and integration of agencies would have to be consolidated.

It was agreed that this report would be presented to the TRPA Governing Board for their review.

**B. Transfer of Development Rights**

Senior Planner, David Ziegler, stated that staff has been working with CTRPA on short term issues related to transfer of development rights and the immediate objectives are to ensure that the existing California side transfer system functions effectively in the 1982 building season; and to familiarize TRPA staff with existing ordinances and procedures in anticipation of the eventual transfer of responsibility from CTRPA to TRPA.

Mr. Ziegler pointed out that local governments will be involved in both the short term and long term issues. It is recommended that the two existing CTRPA Urgency Ordinances for the City of South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, and El Dorado County, pertaining to the allocation of building permits and the guidelines for transfers, be consolidated under one ordinance upon expiration in May, 1982, for the California side of the Basin by CTRPA. For the 1983 building season it will be TRPA's responsibility.

The second issue is permanent lot retirement as it relates to the transfer of development rights. When lot owners transfer building allocations from high hazard lots to low hazard lots, they must permanently retire their development rights on the existing low capability high hazard lots. There are several options, such as direct donations, open space easement, or lot consolidations which are presently being looked at, and the development of a detailed policy with TRPA staff assisting CTRPA.

The third issue is the verification of land capability. As soon as the lots are drawn in the random selection process, it will be necessary for a team to go out and field check every lot to verify the land capability. This will be a major work load and the timing will depend on the weather which could cause some delays for the lot owner in getting his lot verified.
Mr. Ziegler noted that in terms of heavy research for the long range planning efforts would not be presented until May or June, or until the short term issues have been addressed. Hopefully the threshold study will point out concise transfer of the development rights system, and it is anticipated that in the new General Plan Update the TDR System will be a comprehensive California and Nevada system.

Mr. Combs asked if TRPA anticipates adopting the regulations that CTRPA has in effect for the 1983 building season. Mr. Ziegler stated that the local governments, at present, have left the implementation of the 208 Plan up to the regional agencies and he felt that no radical changes will occur for the 1983 building season, however, the entire ordinance will be looked at very closely.

Executive Director, Phil Overeynder, clarified that the environmental thresholds will deal with how many resources there are to allocate and will define which resources are in scarcity and, once the thresholds are adopted, a fairly good assessment of which elements will be in scarcity and those are the ones that will be dealt with in a transfer system.

Mr. Milam asked for elaboration on the open space easement approach and Mr. Ziegler stated that more research would have to be done. The problems, as he understands, are two-fold. One being that local governments are not happy with open space easements because of the administrative burden and the other problem being the question of how permanent are open space easements, and the language involved to try to make it permanent will have to be carefully considered and researched.

Mr. Combs recommended that in rewriting the ordinances it be recognized that a reasonable period of time be considered for delays due to weather conditions, or unusual circumstances.

Brief discussion followed between Ken Milam, Dennis Winslow and Andy Sawyer clarifying field verification of land capabilities/classifications.

C. Status Report on 208 Plan

Dave Ziegler summarized the progress report on the water quality program and recent activity in the following areas. Progress has been made in the financial strategies for plan implementation to accompany the technical strategies in that discussion of a joint financial study that would involve TRPA, the Tahoe Transportation District, and possibly the City of South Lake Tahoe. Mr. Ziegler stated that the study would include the feasibility of bringing up to date changes that have occurred since Proposition 13 and State law that could affect the Agency's funding. Funding sources that could support both the Water Quality Program and the Transportation Program should be considered.

In January of this year TRPA hosted a day and a half seminar on financial strategies for plan implementation, and in early February met with representatives of the City, CTRPA, the Tahoe Transportation District, Caltrans and discussed the idea of a joint financial study. Two points were derived from the meeting: 1) focus on regional sources of funding rather than local governments; and 2) there are numerous legal issues regarding the powers of the Bi-State Agency. The Agency's legal counsel, Gary Owen, has indicated that there are some very tough legal questions surrounding the ability of the TRPA or TTD to obtain funding and these issues should be resolved first.
C. Status Report on 208 Plan (continued)

The second item discussed was the BMP evaluation involving the requirements, infiltration systems, and runoff calculations for single family dwellings. An attempt to resolve issues that affect either project review and enforcement or the revision of the general plan will be made. Mr. Ziegler presented some of the technical information for evaluation.

Mr. Hansen commented on the impact of existing properties and asked how the problems with storm water drainage would be handled. Mr. Ziegler stated this is an important issue that will have to be carefully looked at. Senior Planner, Gary Shellhorn, pointed out that many of these programs that have been discussed at this stage are difficult to comprehend, but he feels that the end result will be remedied, such as the City is working on a redevelopment process, the mitigation fee schedule and broad remedial correction, will either deal with retrofitting incorporating incentives for people who do it on their own or provide some financial assistance for those that do come in and retrofit. Mr. Hansen pointed out that over the years these ideas have been discussed, but what really needs to be done is implementing them, and it becomes frustrating when that burden is placed on the builder. Mr. Overeynder stated that the whole objective is to raise the funds to build the erosion control projects and incentives has been discussed; ordinance requirements to have the ability to enforce, and as the process progresses working with local governments and both state agencies to work on practical solutions for implementation; this is where the emphasis is placed in this program at this point. Mr. Hansen also pointed out that the problem of inspection and maintenance is a key issue and should be looked at.

Mr. Ziegler continued with the third item of remedial erosion control, listing a draft of new projects with existing erosion problems as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County, Kingsbury Grade</td>
<td>Critical area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>No specific project identified at this time, but will present a conceptual plan to the TRPA in March with road improvements, drainage and slope stabilization, and energy dissipation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson City</td>
<td>No specific projects at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Department of Transportation</td>
<td>A commitment has been received to look at erosion control on U.S. Highway 50 resurfacing project from Stateline to Spooner with a preliminary plan due in March and a final plan in December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>Three applications received at Lahontan requesting state assistance grants for erosion control projects at Tahoe Park Heights, Fox Street and Ward Creek Blvd., for approximately a third of a million dollars; the locals share, figured at twenty-five percent, would be about $79,000. Also interested in two future projects, Rubicon Ave. and Dollar Point areas but have not applied for financial assistance as yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Status Report on 208 Plan (continued)

El Dorado County

No specific projects identified at present, but after meeting with the County, there are some in early planning stages.

City of South Lake Tahoe

Working with the City for conceptual plans for the El Dorado Beach project which needs to be stabilized at the east end of the beach with an application to the State Board for grant assistance in the amount of a quarter of a million dollars.

Caltrans

Preliminary State Transportation Improvement Plan computer printout indicates approximately seven erosion control project in the Basin.

U.S. Forest

Presently has an on-going road closure program each summer to try to close 20 miles of dirt roads that are not being used in the National Forest. Also, an on-going program with Heavenly Valley which is a cooperative effort to provide technical assistance for erosion control in the ski area each summer; and follow-up monitoring on all projects.

Soil Conservation Service

In cooperation with the Soil Conservation Districts by providing continuing assistance at the Zephyr Heights/Marla Bay project. Also some monitoring assistance at the Kingsbury Grade project, in addition to the on-going planning programs.

South Tahoe Public Utility District

Has two projects, one at the Cold Creek Water Treatment Plant and the other at the Heavenly Valley water tanks for erosion control.

Douglas County Sewer Improvement District

Doing some construction site rehabilitation and general erosion control strategies for properties.

Mr. Ziegler then outlined the tentative management strategies for each watershed, starting with a description of each, size, land capabilities, existing structures; identify the problem(s) with a field inspection; develop a conceptual plan; record of implementation for past, present and future; and do an on-going evaluation of the situation for each watershed. The main involvement of TRPA will be the description, problem identification and the evaluation, working with local governments for the conceptual plans and keeping track of implementation.

Discussion followed pertaining to the technical, financial and legal aspects for these programs.

Mr. Combs suggested a meeting to include the locals with the technicians who are involved with designing the projects to exchange ideas and the methods to proceed.
D. Development of 1982 Air Quality Plan

Senior Planner, Dale Neiman, presented the report to obtain direction from the APC and Governing Board members concerning a preferred alternative for the Draft EIS 1982 Air Quality Plan, and also to present a series of milestones for developing and implementing those measures that will be included in the final EIS. Mr. Neiman briefly outlined the approaches for mass transit improvements, the potential control strategy alternatives for the areas exceeding the carbon monoxide air quality standards, the measures that reduce emissions from automobiles by reducing automobile trips and improving traffic flow.

Mr. Neiman stated that the preliminary results of the analysis show that carbon monoxide air quality standards possibly cannot be obtained in the state wide area unless there is substantial traffic system modifications. Staff intends to explore the effectiveness of potential traffic system modifications, but will defer action until the transportation element has been adopted.

Mr. Overeynder stated that because of the severity of the problem, along the Highway 50 corridor, this outline is an estimated effectiveness of the control strategies and that in order to get close to attainment of the standards it is necessary to include all the measures that have been evaluated. He said it is important to note that staff is reluctant to give a detailed analyses until the environmental thresholds have been established.

Discussion followed which addressed the objectives, ranges, legal issues and financial issues involved for developing and implementing the measures.

E. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

Randy Sheffield, Long Range Planning Chief, briefly updated the APC members of the status for the establishment of the environmental threshold carrying capacities, noting that the January Newsletter has been mailed out; also noting that at the January 20, 1982 Steering Committee meeting there was concurrence of the items of environmental components, associated parameters, and methods for measuring each. Mr. Sheffield stated that input from all members of the Technical Resource Team has been requested and about eight responses have been received to date. He also stated that the Governing Board will set aside more time during their monthly meetings for public input into the threshold establishment process. The Governing Board will be briefed at the February 24th meeting, beginning at 1:30 in the afternoon, on the establishment of standards to meet specific environmental values in the development process, and looking at levels of development within the general planning phase.

V. REPORTS

A. Public Interest Comments - none

B. APC Members

Mr. Richard Pyle of the Soil Conservation Service announced that an erosion control practices pictorial book is available to the various government agencies, and he hopes that the planning and building departments will find them useful.
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VI. RESOLUTIONS

None

VII. CORRESPONDENCE

None

VIII. PENDING MATTERS

None

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The APC meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Dailey
Secretary II