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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on ___________ October 13, 1982 _________ at
____________ 9:00 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: ___________ October 4, 1982 _________

By: ___________ Randall C. Sheffield _________
Randall C. Sheffield
Chief, Long Range Planning
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV APPEALS - Pursuant to Ordinance 81-5 Case by Case Review
   A. Buchbinder/Elegant, Lot 17, Block H, Geraldine Drive, Incline Village
      Unit #1, TRPA File #81-1392

V PLANNING MATTERS
   A. Regional Plan - Issues and Strategies

VI REPORTS
   A. Public Participation Program for Regional Plan
   B. 208 Status Report - Highway 50 Erosion Control Program, Nevada

VII RESOLUTIONS
   A. Draft Resolution for Lynne Smith

VIII CORRESPONDENCE

IX PENDING MATTERS

X ADJOURNMENT
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

September 8, 1982
9:00 a.m.

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Mike Harper called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Mr. Harper welcomed Mr. Andrew Sawyer of the California Water Resources Control Board as Mr. Hampson's designee to the APC, and introduced Mr. Vern Rosse of the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources serving as Mr. Dodgion's alternate for the September meeting.

APC Members Present: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush (arrived at 9:15), Mr. Smith, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Rosse, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart (arrived at 9:50), Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Harper

APC Members Absent: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mr. Randolph, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES - July 14 and 15, 1982

The following corrections were noted:

Page 2, paragraph 9 "It shall be a goal to reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient thresholds for primary productivity and transparency" should read: Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient thresholds for primary productivity and transparency.

Page 3, paragraph 8 "The last motion to amend returned discussion to the original motion by Ms. Bogush with second by Ms. McMorris" should read: The last motion to amend returned discussion to the original motion by Ms. Bogush with second by Ms. McMorris, as amended by Mr. Goodenow and seconded by Ms. Shellhammer.

Page 4, paragraph 11 "MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Hallam to amend the second paragraph of the standard to make it a policy direction to amend the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality guidelines" should read: MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Hallam to amend the second paragraph of the standard to make it a policy direction to amend the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality guidelines where there is a direct hydraulic link between surface water and ground water.
Page 5, paragraph 7, "Regional Visibility. There was no discussion on this category" should read: Regional Visibility. There was discussion on this category. (Delete the word no).

Page 5, paragraph 1, "MOTION by Mr. Renz with second by Mr. Combs to delete the second paragraph of the Carbon Monoxide threshold and make part of one of the implementation measures of the General Plan" should read: MOTION by Mr. Renz with second by Mr. Combs to delete the second paragraph of the Carbon Monoxide threshold and make it part of one of the implementation measures of the General Plan.

Page 5, paragraph 4, "MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz that the reduction in wood smoke emission by 15% be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to be dealt with in the Region Plan as an implementing measure for the threshold of the 171 kilometers" should read: MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to adopt regional visibility thresholds as follows:

Achieve 171 kilometers (103 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Achieve 97 kilometers (58 miles) 90% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Further, that the wood smoke emission to be reduced by 15% is to be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to be dealt with in the Regional Plan as an implementing measure.

Page 6, paragraph 5, "It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to encourage a reduction of wood smoke emissions by 15 percent and suspended soil particles by 30 as measured by particulate concentrations" should read: It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to encourage a reduction of wood smoke emission by 15 percent and suspended soil particles by 30 percent as measured by particulate concentrations.

Page 7, paragraph 6, "Natural pervious surface shall meet the limits as defined in the Capability Classification, Bailey, 1974 to be applied on a geomorphic, watershed or areas wide basis" should read: Natural pervious surface shall meet the limits as defined in the Capability Classification, Bailey, 1974 to be applied on a geomorphic, watershed or areawide basis.

Page 7, paragraph 9, MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Smith to accept the threshold as recommend by staff. Mr. Renz stated that he voted Nay.

Page 8, paragraph 3, "MOTION by Mr. Hansen with second by Mr. Bidart that the APC certify the technical adequacy of the Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment project" should read: MOTION by Mr. Hallam with second by Mr. Bidart that the APC certify the technical adequacy of the Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment project.

Page 9, paragraph 4, "To add a number 4 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the yellow pine forest, seral other than mature" should read: To add a number 4 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the yellow pine forest in seral stages other than mature.
APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 8, 1982

Page 9, paragraph 5, "To add a number 5 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the red fir forest seral other than mature" should read: To add a number 5 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the red fir forest in seral stages other than mature.

Page 9, paragraph 7, "A nondegradation standard to preserve the plan communities shall apply to stands of native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold. This does not preclude management practices" should read: A nondegradation standard to preserve the plant communities shall apply to stands of native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold. This does not preclude management practices.

Page 10, paragraph 5, "MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Hansen to accept as recommended by staff the threshold standard with the exception of deleting the Major transportation corridors standard and the following paragraph add: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan that the definition of location and decibel levels of a transportation corridor be addressed" should read: MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Hansen to accept as recommended by staff the threshold standard with the exception of deleting the Major transportation corridors standard and the following paragraph add: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan that the definition, location, and decibel levels of a transportation corridor be addressed.

Page 10, paragraph 6, Ms. Smith was not present at this meeting, and the record should reflect that Dr. Unsicker voted aye.

Page 11, paragraph 6, "MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Renz that the APC accept the threshold as originally written in the EIS the Soil Conservation Service "T" factors for acceptable soil loss by soil type in the Lake Tahoe Basin sets the allowable amount of soil loss from an area or watershed area without impacting the productivity of the soil and that the "T" values be adopted for that purpose" should read: MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Renz that the APC accept the threshold as originally written in the EIS. The Soil Conservation Service "T" factors for acceptable soil loss by soil type in the Lake Tahoe Basin sets the allowable amount of soil loss from an area or watershed area without impacting the productivity of the soil and that the "T" values be adopted for that purpose.

Page 13, paragraph 4, "MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to amend the first motion to add that it shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to support in response in addressed filed evidence state and federal efforts to reintroduce the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout" should read: MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to amend the first motion to add that it shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout.

Page 14, paragraph 10, "Establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation available to the public lands" should read: Establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation use on the public lands.
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Page 15, paragraph 3, "Mr. Overeynder gave a brief outline as to what, in staff's opinion, the roll of the APC was" should read: Mr. Overeynder gave a brief outline as to what, in staff's opinion, the role of the APC was.

MOTION by Ms. Shellhammer, with a second by Ms. Sparbel, to adopt the minutes of July 14 and 15, 1982 as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

DISPOSITION OF MINUTES - Corrections to Minutes of August 11, 1982

Page 3, paragraph 1, the last sentence "Mr. Randolph suggested that Nevada and Alpine Counties be invited to join the Technical Team" should read: Mr. Randolph suggested that Nevada County be invited to join the Technical Team. Mr. Hansen also suggested that Alpine County be invited to join the Technical Team.

Page 2, paragraph 6, discussion was noted that Ms. Shellhammer raised the issue of the presence of the federal agencies in the planning process.

Page 4, paragraph 2 last sentence should read: The APC members discussed the issues and suggested that a sixth category entitled Implementation Strategies, be included to address socio-economic issues and indicated that they will review them further at the September meeting.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph, with a second by Mr. Smith, to approve the minutes of August 11, 1982, as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Regional Plan Development

Randy Sheffield, Chief of Long Range Planning, introduced Ms. Lasta Tomasevich who has joined the Agency as the Public Involvement Coordinator. She will coordinate the program effort of public involvement during the next few months with the local agencies for the in-Basin public hearings and conduct out-of-Basin public hearings.

Mr. Sheffield announced that the Steering Committee will meet on September 15, 1982 at 10:00 a.m. in the Board Room at the TRPA office to review the Scoping Report for the Regional Plan. He noted some Technical Resource Team members were present to participate in the APC meeting and/or provide written comment if they could not attend.

Gordon Barrett, Senior Planner, presented the Regional Plan Scoping Report and asked the APC members for direction on streamlining the review process, emphasizing the key dates for accomplishing the tasks within the 1982-83 timeframe. The latter part of October will be the target date for scheduling the public hearings for input to suggested alternatives. Discussion then focused on issues and goals.
Mr. Smith suggested a change in wording to the Non-threshold Issue, Goal number 1 to read: "Develop a land use plan that will provide orderly growth and development consistent with the environmental thresholds", and amended by Mr. Sawyer who added "provide opportunities for orderly growth...". Mr. Sawyer questioned why the goals are being defined at this stage since goals were defined for the thresholds, which the Governing Body did not approve. Mr. Sawyer stated he did not feel it is appropriate to try to define goals again, and recommended focus should be directed toward achieving the thresholds, specific policy direction of the Compact, and that the issues are appropriate to present, but premature at this time to try to resolve. Mr. Sheffield responded that the primary reason goals had been established was to insure that the issues, thoughts and desires of the Governing Board, the Advisory Planning Commission and the public are dealt with as the plan effort proceeds.

Mr. Randolph commented the goals are just a rephrasing of the issues, the concerns have been covered, and he suggested the APC address the issues at the present time. Ms. Bogush agreed, stating that when the Board originally considered the work program for the thresholds, citizen participation was deferred to the regional planning process, as there may be additional suggestions during the citizen participation and public forums which can be translated into draft goals at that time. Mr. Barrett clarified it is staff's intent to present to the Governing Board in September the major issues and the goals that have been raised which need to be addressed and receive feedback at that time.

Ms. Shellhammer asked what the legal requirements are for setting up a Regional Plan in the Tahoe Basin; if it will be similar to or different from the other government agencies and various utility districts, and how it will be synchronized to be accomplished. Mr. Sheffield stated that the legal requirement is the Agency adopt a Regional Plan that shows attainment and maintenance of the environmental threshold carrying capacities, and provides opportunities for orderly growth and development. The inter-relationship with other planning entities is identified in the Compact and planning efforts will be coordinated with the entities involved.

Mr. Sawyer suggested that staff prepare a matrix which shows the legal requirements which need to be addressed to comply with the Compact in conjunction with the elements that are required to be included in the Regional Plan. Mr. Combs commented that the required elements for the California side for implementation of a Regional Plan would be met if all the proposed elements are incorporated. Discussion followed pertaining to the local entities which may have a stronger or more restrictive plan than the Regional Plan.

Ms. Mary Shallenberger, California Office of Planning and Research, stated that during the development of thresholds, the public did not feel their views were being solicited. Ms. Shallenberger felt that the Regional Plan Scoping Report should have gone to the Steering Committee prior to the APC review. Ms. Shallenberger further stated that the Agency should make sure the public has an opportunity to provide input.

Ms. Sparbel commented she did not think it necessary to take an issue and repeat it as a goal, but if there is a goal which addresses a problem/concern it should be discussed as it could be valuable in defining parameters of direction in the Regional Plan. Mr. Smith suggested that a list of issues, generated to date, should be presented to the public giving them the opportunity for input and comment, then the list could be expanded at that time.
Mr. Barrett outlined the non-threshold format in evaluating the issues which go beyond the thresholds. Mr. Dennis Winslow, CTRPA Executive Director, stated that the priority facing the APC is to consider the implications of carrying through with the thresholds, how it will be achieved to maintain the numerical values set by the Governing Board, if options are available, and emphasized that the thresholds do define a clear direction of the issues, and staff should not become bogged down with the goal statements. Mr. Harper responded that the APC is aware of the concerns, but there are certain items, issues, and subjects that may have been bypassed in the threshold process but will have to be addressed in the Regional Plan.

Mr. Sawyer suggested that the title "Non-threshold Issues and Goals" be changed to "Additional Issues and Goals" in case of an overlap between thresholds and issues. In addition, the specific elements of the Regional Plan, as set forth in the Compact, as well as the requirements of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act will need to be addressed. Ms. Bogush added that during the last year, time was spent focusing on the statutory requirements, but now it is time to focus direction on the additional categories. Ms. Sparbel recommended that the sequence of events should be decided.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to address just the issues, and not the goals, at this meeting. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Rosse, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Harper

Nayes: Ms. Sparbel

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf

Mr. Harper clarified the intent of reviewing the issues/goals effort is to make sure when the alternatives are constructed, and provided to the general public, that nothing may have been missed or perceived to have been missed in the threshold project, and to make sure there is a complete package for the staff to develop, with the assistance of the APC and the Steering Committee, for the alternatives that need to be preliminarily reviewed and adopted in November.

Ms. Shellhammer suggested the non-threshold issues and goals be referred to as "Issues and Goals Relating to the Regional Plan".

The APC members discussed and generally agreed to the following amendments and or changes in the wording of the issues. Those not listed were generally accepted as written.

Issue 1. Changed to: What are the Proper Amounts, Types, Locations, and Timing of Activity/Development Within the Region?

Goal 1.a. Changed to an Issue: How Can the Conflicts Between the Land Capability System and the Existing Land Use Pattern be Resolved?

Issue 1.b. Changed to: What Opportunities for Economic Growth Should be Provided for Within the Regional Plan?
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Issue 2.a. Changed to: Can the Regional Plan be Developed to Provide a More Healthy Economy?

Issue 2.c. Changed to: What Incentives or Disincentives Should be Used to Achieve the Goals and Thresholds of the Regional Plan?

Issue 3.c. Changed to: What are the Proper Geographical Allocations of Scarce Resources?

Issue 5.a. Changed to: Can the Transportation System be Designed to Attain the Environmental Thresholds and Still Accommodate Transportation Needs Generated by the Selected Land Use?

Issue 6.c. Move to a separate category: How can Public Health and Safety, and Social Well Being be Provided for in a Way that is Consistent With the Environmental Thresholds and the Directives of the Compact?

Mr. Randolph expressed concern that the chart pertaining to the environmental thresholds and goals needed to be amended. Mr. Combs suggested that another goal be added to the chart entitled "Public Health, Safety & Welfare".

Mr. Barrett presented the staff recommendation for the Plan Content and Governmental Coordination which included topics required of local plans that will help insure coordination between local and Agency plans. Also included were sub-elements with recommendations referring to adopted thresholds and the Implementation Element to insure coordination of implementation strategies.

Mr. Barrett clarified for Ms. Sparbel that commercial activity, although not listed, came under the heading of the Land Use Element (population) and possibly under Development Management. Mr. Combs suggested that under the Land Use Element, sub-element number 4 should be changed to Natural Hazards/Public Safety.

Ms. Bogush questioned why some of the sub-elements under Land Use could not be included under an additional element. Mr. Sheffield quoted Article V of the Compact which identifies the five elements in the Regional Plan. Legal counsel has advised that the Agency adhere to those five only. However, a sixth element, the Implementation Element is proposed to be added. The Agency has drafted broad general standards pertaining to planning implementation and governmental coordination asking for commitments from the local entities to fill in the details of implementation.

Mr. Harper expressed that he is concerned about the area of private lands as the TRPA is designated as both the planning and implementation Agency. It should not be the intent of the Agency to supplant any local entity to regulate and enforce its rules and regulations. Mr. Harper, speaking for Washoe County, felt that each local entity is in a position, both financially and legally, to do the job under the direction of the Regional Plan. Mr. Sawyer stated there are elements of the land use plan where TRPA will have to be the primary agency for planning and implementation. In other areas it will be a more relaxed approach in drafting criteria for local agencies. There is legal authority to apply the same controls to public agencies as to private parties and in some instances it is appropriate.
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The APC members recommended that "private and public lands" be eliminated from the wording except for Air and Water Quality. "Implementation" will be eliminated, and the wording will read "The TRPA will set broad regional criteria with local governments".

Staff also drafted a list of planning techniques to be utilized in the range of alternatives and alternative scenarios to be considered in the framework of the Regional Plan. Mr. Sheffield clarified that staff has just begun to develop the whole aspect of alternatives and ranges/options to meet the thresholds. The APC suggested some variations, i.e., consider conservative alternatives, no growth and no action alternatives.

V   REPORTS

A. Delegation of Responsibility to APC

Resolution 82-12 delegating certain project review authority to Agency staff, subject to appeal to the Governing Body, and delegating authority to the APC to consider appeals of certain staff decisions, was passed by the Governing Board at the August 26 meeting. This Resolution will become effective 30 days from that date and the APC will review the staff summary of such appeals with recommendations/appropriate action commencing with the October 13 meeting.

B. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

Mr. Sheffield reported that the Governing Board adopted the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region on August 26, 1982 after an intensive one year effort to prepare.

D. Public Interest Comments

None

E. APC Members

Ms. Bogush stated that, as discussed previously with staff, concerning the tight deadlines for mailing the agendas and the possibility of changing the meeting dates for either the Governing Board or APC, asked if there were any other options the APC members could consider. Mr. Sheffield responded that in the past there were supplemental mailings to the Governing Board, particularly for the threshold reports, and the APC could consider this as a feasible option. This option would give staff time to prepare/rewrite the APC's recommendation to the Governing Board for their review.

Mr. Renz reported that the sub-committee meeting to set the EIS guidelines had been postponed until after the adoption of the thresholds.

Ms. Bogush stated that Rick Heitkemper will not be available to serve on the sub-committee, due to a change in his work schedule.

Mr. Harper requested that staff prepare a resolution for Lynne Smith thanking her for serving on the Advisory Planning Commission. Mr. Harper announced that Vice Chairman Randolph will chair the October APC meeting.
C. 208 Status and Case-by-Case Review

Dave Ziegler, Senior Planner, reported that the third quarter progress report which was due in July to the Environmental Protection Agency had been mailed on September 8, 1982.

On August 24, 1982 an evaluation meeting of the 208 program was held with EPA, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, the Lahontan Board, the California State Water Resources Control Board, and Agency staff. The main issue that needs to be resolved in the near future is the relationship of 208 planning to the Regional Plan update. The work plan calls for site specific management plans for stream zones and high hazard lands. EPA and the states feel very strongly that the 208 update and the Regional Plan update are one in the same and should be meshed together. Another key part of the issue is the role of local government and the work load. It was suggested at the evaluation meeting to wait and not try to resolve this issue until the scoping of the Regional Plan update is complete and staff has had time to review the budget and the schedule of the 208 work plan. Another issue discussed was the status of the work element for erosion and runoff control strategies. TRPA is contributing approximately $59,000 to this effort and the Lahontan Board is contributing approximately $67,000. Staff has concerns about this work element, such as the direction needed, timing of this element, scheduling, and the monitoring approach. Part of the effort is to evaluate Best Management Practices (BMP's), and yet do before and after monitoring. Mr. Ziegler stated these problems can be worked out by having an indepth evaluation session which is scheduled for September 16 with the Lahontan Board to try to resolve these problems in a direction that is acceptable to everyone. The third issue was how the 106 funds provided by Nevada is being expended.

Staff has been concentrating on assisting local governments with development of remedial projects. The work program focuses on evaluation and enforcement of conditions for project approval of new development. Review at staff level of this issue has been scheduled to try and get it resolved. Direction is towards taking the water quality planning staff and re-orient the activities to get into the area of evaluation and enforcement in keeping with the work plan.

Mr. Ziegler also stated that the Agency is using the data base to do analysis and reports. Staff is looking at the feasibility of taking the data base off of the Brown and Caldwell computer facilities and move it to another computer facility where staff will have direct access, possibly by December. Staff has mapped every part of the Basin. Computerized in the data base is information on zoning, traffic zones, soil type, land capability, geomorphic units, precipitation, watersheds, and land use for different types of analyses among the variables.

Mr. Ziegler briefly outlined the evaluation efforts pertaining to case-by-case review. Evaluation tasks completed to date included: a five-person team visited 32 lots in Nevada to evaluate their buildability looking at the installation of temporary and permanent BMP's, the status of vegetation, the amount of coverage, soils and construction on both high hazard (1-3) and better capability (class 4-7) lots. Staff prepared case studies and data summaries for all 32 lots. A three-person team visited seven subdivisions in Nevada to become familiar with the work of the Subdivision Review Team, looking at vegetation,
coverage, soils, and construction in the subdivision. Staff will assess the cumulative impacts of the case-by-case review policy which will be done through the use of the geographic data base and modeling techniques being developed at present, in addition to evaluating outside mitigation measures, administrative impacts, social economic impacts, consistency of the case-by-case review policy with the thresholds, and look at and evaluate alternatives to case-by-case. A draft report will be available for the APC in October.

Mr. Ziegler clarified for the APC that cumulative impacts, through the use of modeling of the geographic data base, measures loads coming off of a watershed. Then it is backed up into the watershed and responsibility assigned for that load to the various land uses in the watershed. Theoretically, the impact of building on a single lot in a certain land capability has an impact. To analyze a determined number of houses on land capability would be the cumulative impact on the Lake. Gary Shellhorn, Senior Planner, stated that focus of this report is water quality which is the primary concern of evaluating, analysis, and addressing the impacts.

Mr. Ziegler presented background information of the criteria used by the Subdivision Review Team for evaluating case-by-case lot review and impacts in California. Ms. Nora Shepard, Assistant Planner in Project Review, described the case-by-case procedure, which is a two step process which involves rating of the sub-divisions with regard to the criteria as adopted in Ordinance 81-5. The Subdivision Review Team was formed in 1981 and rated all of the subdivisions in Nevada. They looked at road placement, drainage, maintenance of vegetation, downstream impacts, stable cuts and fills, internal drainage, access to lots, and overall land coverage, with regard to this criteria.

The rating classification of the subdivisions with regard to this criteria is "Needs Further Evaluation", "Potentially Adequate", or "Adequate". If a subdivision is rated as Potentially Adequate or Adequate, the Agency will accept applications for individual lots within the subdivision. If an area is rated Needs Further Evaluation, the Agency cannot accept applications in those areas, unless the property owners or groups of individuals within the subdivision wish to upgrade the area. They can submit a plan of the area to appeal the subdivision rating which will then be re-reviewed.

The next step is the actual review of the application. A basic plot plan must be submitted with a topographic map and a rough drawing of the proposed building with coverage calculations. If the application meets the lot review criteria, staff will work with the applicant to mitigate the potential impacts of the project. The applicant will then submit more detailed plans for review and approval. If the application initially does not fit within the criteria set forth in the lot review criteria, staff rejects the application indicating the reasons in writing and the applicant has the right of appeal to the Executive Director. If the applicant wishes to appeal the staff decision, a field inspection is scheduled with the Executive Director, and then a meeting with the applicant to discuss why staff felt the project application was considered a high risk with regard to the criteria. If the Executive Director concurs with the initial staff determination, the applicant can appeal to the Governing Board. If the project can be mitigated with staff being satisfied that it is not
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a high risk, then it proceeds to the Board through the normal process with recommended approval. Ms. Shepard further described the criteria utilized to determine the impacts of development on an individual lot such as proximity to stream or wetland, runoff potential, land stability, and vegetation which are rated as either low, moderate or high risks in each category.

The APC members will receive a staff summary for each appeal application and staff will give a short presentation indicating the problems and on what basis the application was rejected by the Executive Director.

Ms. Shepard clarified on-site mitigation which deals with the parcel, specific problems on and immediately around the parcel, road frontage, road cuts, fills, drainage problems, and infiltration of runoff which the applicant is required to do on-site to mitigate the project to the extent possible. An off-site mitigation fee is charged for every case-by-case application based on the amount of coverage the applicant is proposing. The mitigation fee is put into an off-site mitigation fund which is returned to the county. Ms. Shepard pointed out that sometimes more extensive mitigation measures are required than outlined in the BMP's.

VI RESOLUTIONS

None

VII CORRESPONDENCE

At the beginning of the meeting Mr. Harper read letters from Mr. Lew Dodgion, State of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection designating Mr. Vern Rosse to serve as his alternate for the September 8, 1982 meeting, and the letter from Mr. Roy Hampson, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board appointing Mr. Andrew H. Sawyer as his designee effective immediately, and accepted Mr. Sawyer's financial interest statement form 730.

VIII PENDING MATTERS

None

IX ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Hansen with a second by Mr. Renz to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (916) 541-0249.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Dailey
Secretary II
Buchbinder/Elegant, Appeal of Staff Decision Pursuant to Lot Review Criteria, Case-by-Case Review of Single Family Dwelling, Lot 17 Geraldine Drive, Level 1A, Washoe County, APN 125-232-06, TRPA File #81-1392

Applicant: Harris Buchbinder/Ira Elegant/Foster Engineering

Project Description: The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story single family dwelling with a 2 car garage. A driveway and garage is proposed to be cut in with retaining walls as stabilization. No substantial cut would be required for the balance of the structure.

Project Location: Lot 17, Geraldine Drive, Incline Village Unit #1

Site Description: The subject parcel is an uphill lot with a slope of approximately 10% across the building site. There is a large road cut which is in excess of 15 feet in height. The soil is very rocky in nature and the site is moderately well vegetated.

Land Use District: Low Density Residential (LDR)

Land Capability Classification: Level 1A, MsE and UmP soil types

Land Coverage: Total Lot Size 14,000 sq. ft. Allowable Coverage 2,800 sq. ft. (20% of total lot size) Proposed Coverage 2,784 sq. ft.

Building Height: Proposed: 30ft. Permitted: 35 ft.

Project History: The application was received in November of 1981. The site was field checked in December, 1981. Based upon a preliminary staff review, the project was considered a high risk with regard to land stability. Concern was also raised regarding the runoff potential due to the rocky nature of the soil. This preliminary decision was appealed to Philip Ovreynder, Executive Director. He concurred with the staff determination.

At the appeal hearing, the possibility of a zero setback parking pad was discussed. This concept would minimize the cut by eliminating the driveway. Foster Engineering determined that a minimum of a 15 foot cut would be required for this alternative. Staff contends that this amount of excavation is excessive and classifies the project as a high risk with regard to land stability.

The applicant now wishes to appeal this determination of high risk with regard to land stability.

Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures: The Case-by-Case Lot Review Criteria have been applied to the subject parcel. Staff finds that the parcel is considered a high risk with regard to at least one of the four criteria.
Proximity to a Stream or Wetland: Low Risk. There is no stream environment zone on or adjacent to the subject parcel.

Runoff Potential: Moderate to High Risk. The soil is extremely rocky in nature. This is evident in the cut slope adjacent to Geraldine Drive. The cemented substratum, characteristic of the MsE soil type, appears to be very close to the surface. This could result in a lack of infiltration capacity. Additional information, such as percolation tests, would be required to accurately assess the infiltration capacity.

Land Stability: High Risk. The nature of the parcel is such that excavation for the required off street parking is excessive. A minimum of a 15 foot cut is required. According to the criteria this is considered access difficulties and is a high risk. Further, the rocky nature of the soil would create excavation difficulty.

Vegetation: Moderate Risk. The site is currently well vegetated. Because of the rocky nature of the soil, however, revegetation of disturbed areas may be difficult.

Consistency with Applicable Plans, Ordinances, Regulations and Standards: Prior to approval of this project, the Governing Body must make written findings pursuant to Article VI(b) of the Compact regarding consistency with applicable plans, ordinances, regulations and standards of federal, state and regional agencies. The staff has analyzed applicable elements for consistency and has made the following findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable Elements</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Side Land Use Ordinance</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Side General Plan and Sub-Elements</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA 208 Water Quality Plan</td>
<td>Inconsistent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Division of Environmental Protection Air Quality Plan</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Air Quality Standards</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This project is inconsistent with the 208 Water Quality Plan since it is not within the parameters of the Lot Review Criteria.

Project Analysis and Issues for Discussion: Agency staff finds that the impacts resulting from the proposed project are excessive and cannot be minimized to an acceptable level. The project does not fit within the parameters of the Case-by-Case Lot Review Criteria.
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APC AGENDA ITEM IV A.
Required Actions and Findings: If the Board wishes to approve the project, the following findings must be made:

A motion for approval of the project based on the following findings and foregoing conditions recommended by Agency staff:

I

1. Pursuant to Article III(g) of the Compact, the project complies with the Regional Plan, ordinances, rules and regulations of the Agency.

2. Pursuant to Article VI(b) of the Compact, the project is consistent with the applicable plans, ordinances, regulations and standards of federal and state agencies relating to the protection, maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality in the Region.

3. There is substantial evidence in the record supporting the foregoing findings.

II

1. Findings pursuant to Section 12.10 of Ordinance 81-5 that the subdivision in which the subject parcel is located has been reviewed by the planning team and has been determined to be "Potentially Adequate". This determination therefore allows parcels in this subdivision to be eligible for case-by-case review.

2. Findings required by Section 12.22 of Ordinance 81-5:

   A. That the subject parcel has been reviewed with respect to all potential effects upon water quality of the construction of a single family house. Such review includes the factors of vegetative cover, proximity of the project to a stream or wetland, runoff potential and land stability as set forth in the "1981 Case-by-Case Lot Review Criteria". Based upon this review, the lot has been determined to be "buildable" and therefore eligible for case-by-case review.

   B. That the construction, work, use or activity proposed thereby will not adversely affect the quality of water within the region, and that it is in accordance with the Handbook of Best Management Practices, and the Plan and all other applicable plans, ordinances, rules, regulations and policies of the Agency.

   C. That the project will mitigate, below levels of significance, the cumulative adverse effects upon water quality of development of land within land capability districts 1 through 3 for purposes of issuance of a permit under Section 12.00 and the making of a finding of no adverse effect on quality of water in the region under this subsection.
3. Findings required by Section 12.22(a) and (b) of Ordinance 81-5:

A. The project may individually and cumulatively contribute to continued erosion and nutrient increases causing degradation of Lake Tahoe.

B. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project, including application of construction or contribution toward construction of offsite remedial erosion control measures which will offset any anticipated adverse effects. These measures constitute changes or alterations required in or incorporated into such project which avoid or reduce the significant adverse environmental effects to a less-than significant level pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.

III The standard conditions of approval (Attachment D).

IV. The following special conditions:

1. The applicant must contribute to an offsite mitigation fund. This fee is based on the proposed coverage in excess of that allowed by land capability and must be paid prior to the issuance of a TRPA permit. The mitigation fee is $7,972, as calculated below:

   | Capability Level | 1A |
   | Lot Size:        | 14,000 sq. ft. |
   | Allowed Coverage by |
   | Land Capability: | 140 sq. ft. |
   | Proposed Coverage: | 2,784 sq. ft. |
   | Coverage in Excess of |
   | Land Capability:  | 2,608 sq. ft. |
   | Mitigation Fee:  | $7,972 |

2. The applicant shall redesign the project to include a zero setback parking pad with stairs leading to the main structure other than for the parking area.

3. Other than for the parking area, foundations and utility trenches shall be hand dug.

4. Final details of the drainage plan shall be approved prior to TRPA permit issuance.
MEMORANDUM

October 4, 1982

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Regional Plan - Issues and Strategies
          Agenda Item V A.

Attached is a tentative list of issues we feel are important concerns in development of the Regional Plan. A preliminary set of strategies developed in response to the issues is also included. This listing represents further refinement of the issues and alternatives discussed with the APC at the September meeting.

The issues and strategies will be presented to the public in a series of workshops beginning October 13 and carrying through to the 28th. We will seek review of the issues and strategies and ask the public to suggest additions that staff may have overlooked.

Staff will use the attached as the basis for a "dry run" of the upcoming workshops. We will ask the APC to provide feedback on both the presentation and content.
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Attachment
LAND USE

Issues:
1. What is the appropriate rate, amount, type, and location of development?
2. How can low and moderate income housing be provided?
3. How can unacceptable noise be eliminated?
4. How can risks from natural hazards, e.g. flood, fire, be minimized?
5. How can air quality be improved?
6. How can water quality be improved?
7. What is appropriate building and community design?
8. 
9. 

Strategies (not mutually exclusive):
A. Development and housing
   a. Allow market place to determine growth rates, type of development, etc., and provide housing
   b. Establish a growth management system to regulate:
      - growth rate, e.g. two percent per year
      - amount, e.g. 500 units per year
      - type, e.g. residential vs. commercial; public vs. private
      - location, e.g. within existing subdivided areas
   c. Allocate fair share housing requirements within the region
   d. Redevelop existing developed areas
   e. 
   f. 

B. Noise
   a. Modify equipment and vehicles
   b. Regulate hours and location of use
   c. Zone land for compatible uses
   d. Buffer transportation corridors, e.g. with vegetation
   e. Modify traffic, e.g. prohibit trucks at certain hours
   f. 
   g. 

C. Natural hazards
   a. Restrict development in hazardous areas, e.g. avalanche areas, steep slopes, flood plains
   b. Require building modifications to minimize potential damage
   c. 
   d. 

D. Air quality
   a. Reduce pollution from out-of-Basin sources
   b. Reduce wood smoke by 15%
   c. Improve the vehicle fleet, e.g. auto-emission controls
   d. Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and make other transportation improvements (see Transportation)
   e. 
   f. 
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E. Water quality
   a. Restrict development on high hazard lands
   b. Utilize Best Management Practices (BMP's)
   c. Maintain and restore Stream Environment Zones (SEZ's)
   d. Redevelop problem areas - reduce coverage, revegetate
   e. Reduce atmospheric pollution (see Air and Transportation)
   f. 
   g. 

F. Community design
   a. Allow market place to determine design and development pattern
   b. Establish uniform design standards for new development in the Basin
   c. Adapt design standards to specific conditions and locations
   d. Upgrade existing development
TRANSPORTATION

Issues:
1. What can be done to reduce traffic congestion (especially on Highway 50 and in Tahoe City)?
2. How can impacts on air quality and noise be reduced?
3. How can vehicle miles traveled (VMT) be reduced by 7% on Highway 50 and by 10% Basin-wide?
4. How can transportation linkages to and within the Basin be expanded and made more efficient?
5. 
6. 

Strategies (not mutually exclusive):
A. Make existing transportation system more efficient, e.g. road widening and re-alignment, timed traffic signals

B. Construct new roads, e.g. Loop Road, bypass roads in Tahoe City, and North Stateline

C. Develop and expand public transportation system, e.g. non-motorized transportation: air, water, bike, pedestrian; light rail for South Shore; integrate bus service with air, AMTRAK, and ski shuttles

D. Use incentive/disincentive measures, e.g. Basin user fee, mail delivery

E. Regulate land use, e.g. limit new development in congested areas that generates high traffic volumes

F. 

G. 
CONSERVATION

Issues:
1. What can be done to minimize soil erosion and the loss of soil productivity?
2. How can vegetation, including rare and endangered species, be preserved and enhanced?
3. How can wildlife and fisheries, including rare and endangered species, be preserved and enhanced?
4. How should open space be managed?
5. How can the scenic quality of the Basin be restored and maintained?
6. How can Stream Environment Zones (SEZ's) be preserved and restored?
7. What uses should be permitted in the shorezone?
8. How should historic landmarks be preserved?
9. What can be done to promote energy conservation and provide for alternative sources of energy?

Strategies (not mutually exclusive):

A. Soil and vegetation
   a. Apply land capability system
   b. Reduce overcoverage, e.g. move or remove development, redevelop
   c. Apply Best Management Practices (BMP's) to new and/or existing development
   d. Apply Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)
   e. Minimize or prohibit development on high hazard lands
   f. Manage forests and other vegetation, e.g. selective cutting, burning, protection of riparian vegetation
   g. Manage grazing, e.g. location and intensity of use
   h. Review development on building sites, e.g. permitted amount of vegetation removal, use of non-native vegetation, revegetation
   i. 
   j. 

B. Wildlife and fisheries
   a. Regulate development and uses in wildlife habitat disturbance zones, e.g. new construction, public access
   b. Control non-native species, e.g. dogs
   c. Establish standards for piers, buoys, and marinas, e.g. location, size and design, amount of disturbance
   d. Establish minimum in-stream flows and restrict manmade structures in and diversions from streams
   e. 
   f. 

C. Open space and scenic resources
   a. Define types of open space and permitted uses in each
   b. Determine need for additional open space, criteria for evaluation, and acquisition priorities
   c. Determine permitted uses in scenic roadway and shoreline units
   d. Establish design review standards for scenic units, e.g. height limits
   e. Improve scenic quality of existing development through screening, painting, redevelopment
   f. 
   g.
D. Stream Environment Zones (SEZ) and Shorezone
   a. Preserve SEZ through TDR, zoning, buffer, etc.
   b. Restore SEZ through purchase/donation, removal of structures, revegetation, etc.
   c. Determine permitted uses in SEZ, e.g. passive recreation, grazing
   d. Incorporate TRPA Shorezone Plan into Regional Plan
   e. Determine permitted uses in the shorezone and their location
   f. Determine appropriate locations for public access to the shorezone
   g.
   h.

E. Historic landmarks
   a. Establish criteria and procedures for designating historic landmarks
   b. Preserve landmarks, e.g. restricting demolition, state and federal designations
   c.
   d.

F. Energy
   a. Coordinated recycling program: newspapers, aluminum cans, etc.
   b. Establish energy performance criteria for new buildings
   c. Develop policies on wind, solar, and other alternate energy sources
   d.
   e.
RECREATION

Issues:
1. What is the appropriate type, amount, and location of outdoor recreational uses?
2. How can natural resources be protected from over-use?
3. What can be done about incompatible uses, e.g. cross-country skiing and snowmobiles?
4. What is a fair share allocation of natural resources and public services between recreation and other uses in the Basin?
5. What criteria should be used to designate areas for public park expansion or acquisition (if any)?
6.
7.

Strategies (not mutually exclusive):
A. Recreational uses
   a. Investigate demand for recreational facilities, land
   b. Maintain existing recreational facilities (status quo)
   c. Redevelop existing facilities to meet thresholds, maintain capacity
   d. Expand recreational capacity
   e.
   f.

B. Over-use/incompatibility of use
   a. Regulate intensity, timing, type, and location of use where necessary to protect resources
   b. Expand or redirect area of use to reduce use intensity
   c. Separate incompatible uses, e.g. by location, time, etc.
   d.
   e.

C. Fair share allocations
   a. Allocate first priority to public agencies
   b. First come, first served
   c.
   d.

D. Criteria for designating parks
   a. Suitability for varied recreational use
   b. Location and access
   c. Present lack of development
   d. Topography, climate, aspect, and effects on use
   e.
   f.
PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Issues:
1. Should facility capacity constraints or the land use plan determine the extent of development?
2. What is a fair share allocation of limited public facility capacities among different users?
3. Should conservation or facility expansion be emphasized in meeting needs for additional capacity?
4. What can be done to provide for public health and safety?
5. 
6. 

Strategies (not mutually exclusive):
A. Capacities and the land use plan
   a. Use land use plan to set capacities
   b. Review proposed facility expansions for conformance with plan
   c. Use capacity constraints to set limits in land use plan
   d. 
   e. 
B. Fair share allocations
   a. Public vs. private, e.g. allocate to public based on percentage of Basin owned by public
   b. Residential vs. commercial, e.g. single family homes vs. motels
   c. Different types of public, residential, commercial
   d. First come, first served
   e. 
   f. 
C. Conservation vs. expansion
   a. Give priority to conservation
   b. Allow expansion without conservation
   c. Allow expansion, conditional upon conservation
   d. 
   e. 
D. Public health and safety
   a. Provide necessary services - police, fire, garbage, education, and social services
   b. 
   c.
IMPLEMENTATION

Issues:
1. What is the most effective balance of responsibility among agencies for planning and implementation?
2. What can be done to maintain and promote social well being and economic stability as the Regional Plan is implemented?
3. What is an acceptable time frame for attaining thresholds?
4. How should threshold attainment and plan implementation be monitored and evaluated?
5. What will it cost to implement the Regional Plan, who will pay, and how?
6.
7.

Strategies (not mutually exclusive):
A. Responsibility
   a. TRPA
   b. Local governments
   c. Other agencies
   d.
   e.

B. Socio-economic factors
   a. Use market demand to drive growth and provide economic stability
   b. Develop a plan to meet thresholds with socio-economic factors secondary
   c. Develop a growth management system which promotes sustained economic stability and social well being
   d. Develop programs to foster economic stability and social well being, e.g. housing bureaus, redevelopment agency
   e.
   f.

C. Timing
   a. Determine how long it will take to attain thresholds under each plan alternative
   b. Determine cost for each
   c.
   d.

D. Monitoring and evaluation
   a. Determine agencies' responsibility for monitoring and evaluation
   b. Develop a monitoring system and what items to monitor
   c. Determine appropriate time frame for periodic review and update of plan and thresholds
   d.
   e.
E. Cost
  a. Determine cost of different strategies
  b. Select priorities for funding, e.g. strategies which are most cost
effective, most socially acceptable, most reliable
  c. Examine financing options
     1. Public funds, e.g. state appropriations, grants, revenue sharing,
        bond issues
     2. Users of the Basin, e.g. parking fees, license fees, use charges
     3. Prime beneficiaries, e.g. improvement districts, assessment
districts, development fees
  d.
  e.
MEMORANDUM

October 4, 1982

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Nevada Department of Transportation Erosion Control Study, Highway 50 Stateline to Spooner Summit, Agenda Item VI B.

The Agency received the preliminary erosion control study by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) for the Highway 50 corridor from Stateline to Spooner Summit as a condition of approval for the recent overlay project on that section of Highway 50. The study basically lays out a plan to minimize or eliminate erosion within the NDOT highway right-of-way. The plan utilizes a broad spectrum of treatment practices but primarily concentrates on slope stabilization with the toe-slope retaining walls and revegetation. The steeper and rocky slopes have rock riprapping and wire mesh proposed to stabilize the slopes. The drainage system focuses on rock lining and silt settling basins at the outlet of most culverts and the use of drop inlets and standpipes for many of the cross-drain culvert inlets. Additional right-of-way would be required in order to reshape some cut slopes and relocate salt/sand storage facilities. The total cost of the project is estimated to be $8,000,000. There is no funding committed to this plan at this time. The present NDOT budget and budget priorities do not include any money for erosion control along Highway 50 in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Possible funding sources include additional money from the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Forest Service, Burton-Santini Program, Environmental Protection Agency, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, or budget add-on for NDOT. None of these sources have been contacted concerning the possibility of providing funds. NDOT will further address funding sources, cost estimates and prioritization when the final report is submitted. The final report is to be submitted to the TRPA for review and approval by December 1, 1982.

The staff is convening a review committee to evaluate and comment on the preliminary plan on October 26, in order to brief the TRPA Governing Board at their regular October meeting. The review committee will be comprised of personnel from TRPA, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Forest Service, Nevada State Environmental Protection Agency, and Douglas County. The Advisory Planning Commission members are invited to attend this 9:30 a.m. meeting.

Comments from the review committee and Governing Board will be given to NDOT in early November in order for them to finalize the plan for final submission on December 1, 1982.
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TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 82-14

WHEREAS Lynne Smith, hereinafter referred to as Lynne, was appointed on January 2, 1981, to the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to serve as the representative to said Commission for the Lahontan Region of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board; and

WHEREAS said appointment by the Executive Officer of the Lahontan Region was made in recognition of Lynne's long-standing desire to protect, concern for, and knowledge of the unique qualities and resources of the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS said appointment was made pursuant to amendments to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact which called for the establishment of a Tahoe Regional Planning Agency with the power to establish environmental threshold carrying capacities and to adopt and enforce a regional plan and implementing ordinances to achieve and maintain such capacities; and

WHEREAS, during her tenure on the Commission, Lynne steadfastly worked to improve, protect and enhance the quality of Tahoe's water, air, land and wildlife, and to ensure that the Tahoe of the future would retain the irreplaceable and unique environmental and ecological values for which the Region has become so famous; and

WHEREAS when the name "Smith" is now called during a vote count or roll call, only one voice - not two - will respond; and

WHEREAS Lynne has submitted her resignation from the Advisory Planning Commission effective August 30, 1982;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does hereby commend Lynne for her service to the Agency and hopes that her efforts on behalf of the protection and wise use of the Tahoe Region will continue.

PASSED and ADOPTED this thirteenth day of October, nineteen hundred and eighty-two.

STANLEY C. RANDOLPH, Vice Chairman
Advisory Planning Commission

DRAFT