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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on March 9, 1983 at
9:30 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, 1983

By:

Philip A. Overeynder
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Mechanisms to Convey APC Recommendations to Governing Board and Role of Advisory Planning Commission

B. Other

V APPEALS

Deal/Soeller, Appeal of Staff Decision to Reject Application for a New Multiple Use Pier, Washoe County, APN 123-250-03 and APN 123-250-04, TRPA File #82331

VI PUBLIC HEARING

To Consider the Environmental Impact Statement and Amendments to the Regional Plan

VII PLANNING MATTERS

A. Nonattainment Redesignation of the Lake Tahoe Basin Portion of Placer County Pursuant to Federal Clean Air Act

B. Scope of Work for Regional Plan Design Review Requirements

VIII ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS, DETERMINATION OF TECHNICAL ADEQUACY

A. Proposed Amendments to the Subdivision of Brockway Springs of Tahoe, Pursuant to Settlement of Litigation, Placer County

B. Round Hill Village, Douglas County

IX REPORTS

A. Public Interest Comments

B. APC Members

X RESOLUTIONS

XI CORRESPONDENCE

XII PENDING MATTERS

XIII ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

March 1, 1983

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: APC Minutes for February 9, 1983, Agenda Item III

Due to the time constraints of working on the EIS of the Regional Plan the February 9, 1983 APC minutes are not included in this packet, but will be provided to you separately.

/md
Mr. Jim Reed, Chairman
TRPA Governing Board
717 K Street - Suite 405
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Jim,

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule on Wednesday to have lunch with Ann and me. Hopefully we can continue to meet over lunch or breakfast when items of interest or concern warrant such a meeting.

I would like to recap the understandings reached Wednesday in order to make sure we left the table with the same message.

APC/TRPA Communications

The attached exhibit was agreed to as a basis for transmitting APC action to the governing board. Phil agreed to place administrative items on Thursdays of the two-day meeting to provide maximum time for staff summary of APC's actions. APC will endeavor to meet or closely follow the staff's deadline for transmitting information on major planning items. If need be, APC will transmit under separate cover this latter item. On routine planning items, a member of APC will be present to answer board inquiries, but will not make a presentation. On major planning items, the APC chair, vice-chair or designee will request time to make a formal presentation.

Projects

It was agreed that APC does not have authority to approve or disapprove projects. Therefore, it was my understanding that when the EIS was before the APC for a recommendation on adequacy the project would also be discussed. This would provide to the APC an opportunity to have a complete package to review. Action by the APC would consist of a recommendation on the EIS and technical comments/suggestions regarding the project.
Regional Plan Process

As we discussed at lunch, the APC will make an effort to transmit its comments to the board in a more frequent and timely manner. Local entity members of the APC have agreed to sponsor public workshops concerning the Regional Plan EIS. This, as I am sure you are aware, must be coordinated soon. With regard to regularly-scheduled meetings, APC will attempt to hold forums regarding the Regional Plan EIS at locations other than where the governing board will be meeting. This should provide a wide-ranging opportunity for citizens to have access to the public input process.

Appointments

As I understand it, the APC will be expanded to accomplish a balance between in- and out-basin lay members. Also, an effort will be made to set the planning commission’s membership in February or no later than March.

Again, thank you for meeting with us for lunch. Please do not hesitate to contact me when items of mutual interest arise.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Harper
APC Chairman

MAH/MBT

Cc: Ann Bogush
Chief Planning Officer
City of South Lake Tahoe
P. O. Box 1210
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95705

Att: (1)
Routine Matters

- Staff will include summary of APC discussion, issues identified, and decision in staff's report to the Governing Board

- Language included in the report will be cleared by one of the following APC members:
  
  Glenn Smith  
  John Renz  
  Ann Bogush  
  Germaine McMorris

- An APC member will be present at the Governing Board meeting to respond to questions

Major Planning Matters

- APC chair or designee will prepare a separate APC report to the Governing Board

- APC report will be distributed separately from the Governing Board packets, due to deadlines

- Chair or designee will make presentation at Governing Board meeting

APC AGENDA ITEM IV A.
Deal/Soeller, Appeal of Staff Decision to Reject Application for a New Multiple Use Pier, Washoe County, APN 123-250-03 and APN 123-250-04, TRPA File #82331

Appellant: I.C. Deal and C.P. Soeller

History: The TRPA Governing Board adopted a policy to not accept any new applications for multiple or single use piers at their regular meeting of July 23, 1981. To date, no new pier applications have been accepted. The applicant submitted an application to construct a new multiple use pier on December 9, 1982. On January 5, 1983 Agency staff wrote the applicant a letter rejecting the subject application on the grounds that it did not comply with the Governing Board's existing policy on acceptance of applications. On January 13, 1983 Agency staff received a letter from the applicant requesting an appeal of the staff's decision before the Governing Board.

Appeal: The appellant has not stated the merits of his appeal.
MEMORANDUM

March 1, 1983

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Public Hearing on the Environmental Impact Statement for Adoption of a Regional Plan, Agenda Item VI

Agency staff will discuss Regional Plan development and the EIS prepared to disclose the consequences of implementing Plan alternatives. The public will be provided the opportunity to comment on the impact statement as the March 9 meeting is a noticed public hearing.

RCS: md
MEMORANDUM

February 28, 1983

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: The Staff
Subject: Redesignation Request for Attainment Status
Under the Federal Clean Air Act, Agenda Item VII A.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designated the entire Lake Tahoe Basin as a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide on March 3, 1978. This designation was requested from the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP).

Since 1978, air quality monitoring and modeling data have shown that the carbon monoxide air quality problem is limited to the U.S. 50 Corridor in South Lake Tahoe. This information is included in the Federal Air Quality Plan adopted by the Governing Board in August, 1982. As a result, the Placer County Board of Supervisors has formally requested redesignation of Placer County to attainment.

Agency staff discussed this issue with the APC in November, 1982, and the APC directed staff to proceed with the request at that time. Staff prepared a resolution to process the request and brought it back to the APC for consideration at the January 12, 1983 meeting. Stan Randolph felt that it may be premature to take action in January because information being collected by the Air Resources Board in the South Shore area may show that the standard is being exceeded in Placer County. Stan Randolph also stated that any new information would be provided to staff and Placer County for review. The APC passed a motion to defer consideration until March, 1983.

In January, Agency staff received a letter from the Placer County Air Pollution Control Officer regarding this matter. The letter was included in the February packet and discussed at the February APC meeting. Staff was also informed that the ARB will be conducting a carbon monoxide monitoring program on the North Shore. Staff requested that the Air Resources Board provide any new information of the monitoring by February 25, 1982. As of this date, staff has not received any information. Action on this redesignation request should, therefore, be postponed until the results of the monitoring program are known.

Attachment

DN:md

APC AGENDA ITEM VII A.
Amend the quality standard for carbon monoxide. Standard for carbon monoxide that takes into account the nature of the pollution control devices and the ambient air. The California Air Resources Board has not adopted this standard. Whereas, the State of California, through the State Air Resources Board, is responsible for the adoption of standards for the protection of public health and welfare. Whereas, the California Air Resources Board has adopted the following air quality standard for carbon monoxide: (i) 0.08 parts per million. Whereas, the adoption of this standard is in the public interest. Therefore, be it resolved that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency hereby adopts the following air quality standard for carbon monoxide: (i) 0.08 parts per million.
MEMORANDUM

March 1, 1983

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
FROM: Agency Staff
SUBJECT: Regional Plan Design Review Requirements, Agenda Item VII B.

As discussed at prior APC meetings, the TRPA is directed by the Compact and adopted thresholds to set forth design review requirements for the region. The task of drafting such requirements has been delegated to the local planners. Agency staff has agreed to draft a scope of work to give the planners direction in completing this task. Attached is a draft scope of work for APC review and comment.

GWB:md

Attachment
REGIONAL PLAN DESIGN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

SCOPE OF WORK

The intent of this outline is to set forth the specific subject areas to be addressed under a regional design review program. The intent of the requirements is to be regional in nature yet specific enough to insure that the Agency meets the mandate of the specific threshold requirements and the more general requirements of the Compact. The subject areas are as follows:

I OBJECTIVES

A. Insure preservation of the natural features and qualities of the region, provide public access to scenic views, enhance the quality of the built environment, and maintain community identity.

B. Preserve and enhance the natural environment, the scenic and visual character, and the beauty of the region.

C. Insure that man-made structures are compatible with the natural, scenic, and recreation values of the region.

D. Coordinate the TCFA design review requirements with those of local governments and other regulatory authorities.

II DESIGN CRITERIA

A. Site Design - Requirements for the arrangement of indoor and outdoor spaces in relationship to a specific use and the surrounding community. This includes, but is not limited to: form, set backs, circulation, parking, special mountain/snow criteria, energy conservation, and grading and drainage.

B. Architecture - Requirements for the construction or modification of structures. This includes, but is not limited to: height, bulk, color, texture, material, special mountain/snow criteria, and energy conservation.

C. Signs - Requirements for outdoor advertising. This includes, but is not limited to: size, height, location, number, color, materials, and lighting.

D. Lighting - Requirements for outdoor lighting. This includes, but is not limited to: intensity, source, type, height, movement and color.

E. Landscaping - Requirements for placing of vegetation and open space. This includes, but is not limited to: plant types, plant protection, plant maintenance, and locations and amounts of open area.

F. Standard Conditions - A recommended list of special conditions for projects throughout the region to insure implementation of these requirements.
III SPECIAL APPLICATIONS

A. Redevelopment - Requirements for redeveloping or rehabilitating substandard urban areas. This includes, but is not limited to: site design, architecture, timing, minimum size, project qualifications, and use determinations.

B. Historical - Requirements for modification or development of historical structures, sites, or districts. This includes, but is not limited to: restoration of historical structure criteria, specifications for identification of architecturally significant structures, and special standards for historical districts.

C. Public Facilities - Requirements for the appearance of public facilities and their accessory uses. This includes, but is not limited to: highways and transit facilities, utility location and specifications, schools, and governmental facilities.

D. Special Area - Requirements of design review specific to neighborhoods, planning areas, or other unique areas. This includes, but is not limited to any special criteria need to preserve and enhance unique community characteristics.
MEMORANDUM

March 3, 1983

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to the Subdivision of Brockway Springs of Tahoe, Pursuant to Settlement of Litigation, Placer County,

This item is scheduled for this month to review the technical adequacy of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Brockway Springs of Tahoe. Comments collected will be included in the response document incorporated in the final EIS and will be before the APC in April for certification.

This focused EIS has been prepared in accordance with Article VII of the TRPA Compact in order to assess the potential environmental consequences of the project that would be authorized by approval of a proposed settlement of litigation in the pending Placer County Superior Court lawsuit entitled Brockway Development Co., Inc. et al vs. CTRPA, et al. The subject site is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the community of Kings Beach, Placer County, California. The alternatives considered include proceeding with a previously approved 100-unit, 7-story, condominium tower on a 7-acre portion of the site. In lieu of the 100-unit tower, the proposed settlement (the project) would permit 52-new units to be constructed in 17 lowrise clusters for a total of 55 residential units on the entire remaining 21-acre site. (3 older residential units to be retained). The EIS identifies several potential environmental consequences as well as a range of mitigation measures.
MEMORANDUM

March 3, 1983

TO: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: Agency Staff

SUBJECT: Certification of Environmental Impact Statement, Round Hill Village, Douglas County, Agenda Item VIII B.

This item is before the Advisory Planning Commission for comments on the Draft EIS. Comments received will be responded to in the final EIS which will be brought before the APC at the April meeting for Certification of Technical Adequacy.

A Draft EIS has been prepared concerning the application submitted by Elks Point at Tahoe, Ltd. to the TRPA for a proposed development at Round Hill Village. This EIS conforms to the federal environmental provisions of NEPA and the requirements of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

The EIS is intended to evaluate the significant environmental effects of the project, to consider alternatives to the project, and to identify possible methods to mitigate or avoid undesirable impacts. This EIS focuses attention on those primary impact categories defined by TRPA as requiring analysis. Other topics which may warrant consideration (e.g. availability of water rights) have been specifically excluded from the EIS, and may be addressed by TRPA staff during project review. The impact categories addressed within this EIS are as follows: Community Development; Economic, Financial & Fiscal; Traffic, Circulation and Transportation; Public Facility & Service; Hydrology; Air Quality; and Visual.

The purpose of the Executive Summary is to present a brief capsule summary of the following topics:

- The principal facts relating to the proposed project.
- The character of the Alternatives selected for comparative evaluation.
- A summary of the identified impacts of the Project/Alternatives, and proposed mitigation measures.
- A guide to the sections of the EIS text in which specific topics are presented in greater detail.

The Executive Summary is in no way a substitute for the Draft EIS text as a whole, but is intended to provide an overview of the analyses and conclusions it contains.
RESOLUTION OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO STAN RANDOLPH
FOR SERVING AS VICE CHAIRMAN
OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

WHEREAS, Stan Randolph has served as the Vice Chairman of the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency since February 11, 1981; and

WHEREAS, Stan has been a consistently strong and articulate spokesman in bringing forward the perspective of the Air Resources Board in the area of regional decision making in the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, Stan has worked diligently, often in the face of seemingly overwhelming adversity, to attempt to improve the air quality in the Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, Stan has carried out his service as Vice Chairman with gavel in hand on several occasions in chairing the Advisory Planning Commission in a conscientious and responsible manner;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Advisory Planning Commission does hereby extend its appreciation to Stan Randolph for his service as Vice Chairman.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency on this ninth day of March, 1983.

MICHAEL HARPER, Chairman