TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 10, 1987, in the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Round Hill, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that the chief planning officers from local governments within the Tahoe Basin will meet from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. to discuss the community planning process.

June 1, 1987

By: [Signature]
William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
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II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
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   D. APC Members

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Alice Becker called the May 13, 1987 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:40 a.m.

Members Present: Ms. Huber, Mr. Renz, Ms. Jamin, Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Becker, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Glab (present at 9:50 a.m.), Mr. Hansen (present at 9:55 a.m.), Mr. Poppoff (present at 9:55 a.m.), Mr. Harper, Mr. Combs (present at 9:55 a.m).

Members Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bedard, Mr. Van Wagenen

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. David Ziegler, Chief of Long Range Planning, advised that Executive Director Bill Morgan was in transit from Flathead Lake, Montana and would not be at the APC meeting. Mr. Ziegler would be in charge of the staff's presentations. Item V(g) (report on activities of the special task force on rehabilitation fees and land banking programs) should be postponed. Discussion on the Waterborne Feasibility Study (item V F.) is to be scheduled for after the lunch break so the consultants can be present.

MOTION by Mr. Harper with a second to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. DeMello asked that "cumulative" be stricken from the second to bottom line on page 13 of the April 8 minutes and "will" be changed to "would" on the bottom line of page 13.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve the April 8 regular meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PUBLIC HEARING

A. To Consider Amendments to Plan Area Statements (PAS), Including Specifically, But Not Limited To, the Following: PAS 070A, 080, 089A

Principal Planner Corson Barrett explained that the second trailing amendment of the PASs had been acted on already by the APC with the exception of certain issues raised by the Park Cattle Company on PASs 070A, 080, 089A. Using wall displays, Mr. Barrett described the configuration of these PASs and explained that the proposed plan attempts to recognize existing land use patterns. In developing the PAS concept and priorities for development, staff's first priority was existing developed urban areas. The second was existing urban or
subdivided areas that are disturbed. The third was vacant, undisturbed land within subdivided areas; the last choice was raw, undeveloped areas. Mr. Barrett explained the physical characteristics of PAS 080 (item 1 in staff summary) which caused the area to be classified by staff as "Conservation" and Mr. Gordon DePaoli's request, on behalf of Park Cattle Company, that 246 acres be included in adjacent Plan Areas (Nevada South Stateline Resort Area, Kingsbury Commercial, and Middle Kingsbury Residential). Mr. Renz agreed with Mr. DePaoli's request, explaining that this was one of the few areas with development potential and good land capability in Douglas County. For this reason, alone, the area should not be considered in a Conservation category.

Mr. Gordon DePaoli, for the Park Cattle Company, distributed a copy of a map showing the subject Plan Area Statements and explained that the Park property was located between a tourist area, a commercial area and a residential area. When the potential uses for the property were planned in 1971, TRPA did take into account what uses surrounded the property; that concept has pretty well been lost in the PAS process. Consideration should be given to allowing high density residential housing somewhere in this area because of its proximity to the major employment center. By adjusting boundaries at this time, the Agency is not in any way approving a project. Unless portions of this property are placed in other Plan Areas, there is never going to be an opportunity to show whether land capability, access and utilities are adequate to support a project. With regard to the open space required for the Park Tahoe/Caesar's project, only 16 acres of the entire 246 acres must remain open. Insofar as the SEZ and land capability are concerned, there has been consistent disagreement with these classifications. Unless the meadow area is irrigated, it is not a naturally occurring wet area. Land capability should not be the controlling factor in placing lands in Plan Area Statements. The code provides tough, adequate regulations that preclude development on low capability lands; there is no need to zone an entire low capability area Conservation in order to prohibit development. Much of this property, as pointed out by staff, does have good capability and should be recognized. Just because property has not developed to date is no reason to put it at the bottom of the development list. It is important to look at the location of this property and to give consideration to what the plan hopes to accomplish, particularly in 089A. This is an area that should have employee housing, affordable housing, and employee parking, and the request is that consideration be given to modifying the boundaries of 089 to take in some of 080 and modifying 076 and 078 as well.

Mr. Harper suggested that, instead of dividing up PAS 080 and combining it with other Plan Areas, a new Plan Area be created (080A) to contain the better land capability areas within the existing 080; this area could be looked at for an expanded Community Plan. He totally disagreed with the argument that previously existing zoning should automatically be continued. Zoning is a privilege, not a right. He would like to see further study of what transitional types of uses could be proposed by Park Cattle Company for this area. The current Conservation designation places an extreme limitation on the property and is too broad.

Mr. Ziegler reminded the APC that all the Plan Area Statements are dominated by an infill philosophy; new development is to be directed to already existing developed areas. In reviewing the Community Plan process, the boundaries of the Plan Area Statements and Community Plan (CP) can be looked at again. Staff can integrate the study of this area with the study of the Lower Kingsbury Grade,
the Nevada Stateline, and Round Hill areas. The pros and cons of different development schemes can be studied as they relate to VMT, air quality, scenic resources, SEZs, water quality, traffic, circulation and housing. Targets can be set in terms of restoration goals, VMT reductions. If this area is recognized as a new PAS or as a special area within another PAS, the Community Planning process will still have to occur. It is not clear what would be solved by recognizing this area as a special area at this time. Mr. DePaoli suggested all these studies can be conducted to determine whether this property is Conservation or something else. No project is being approved now; all that is being done is to open the door.

Mr. Hansen asked to see a plan or map delineating what Park Cattle Company would propose for PAS 080. This should ultimately be carried out in conjunction with Douglas County's Community Planning effort.

Mr. Ziegler advised the APC that watershed work done in 1983 showed the Edgewood Creek and Burke Creek watershed to be more covered than what the Bailey system would allow. This is largely a function of how much steep and 1A lands are in this area. Edgewood Creek does flow through the northern corner of this property and is a major drainage. In the Community Planning process, there will be a requirement to look for SEZ restoration opportunities, and Edgewood Creek is a likely target. Carrying capacity of the watershed is an issue.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, second by Mr. Hansen, with regard to PAS 080 (item 1) to bring back a plan that addresses uses and boundaries and their relationship to surrounding areas - either in the form of a draft Planning Area Statement, or an expansion of the Community Plan boundary to encompass this area.

Mr. Hansen suggested that his intent was for the Park Cattle Company to come back to the APC in June with a plan showing what specific boundary adjustments they favor in relation to the PASs and the CP. Mr. Harper urged that staff be involved with this planning process.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Glab, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Harper, Mr. Combs, Ms. Becker
Nays: Ms. Huber, Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Poppoff
Abstain: Ms. Unsicker
Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Van Wagenen, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bedard

Mr. Barrett suggested that items 1., 2., 3., and 5., all relating to PAS 080, could be deferred under Mr. Harper's motion.

Using the wall maps to clarify his remarks, Mr. Barrett explained staff's position that portions of PAS 080 be designated as "scenic view corridor." Mr. DePaoli asked for clarification of the term. Requiring private property to be maintained for a public purpose is a burden that should not be imposed on private property. Mr. Renz suggested that this designation should not preclude development but would require that consideration be given to views in the design of any project. Mr. DePaoli asked that this be made clear. Mr. Ziegler explained that the intent is to maintain views from Highway 50.
MOTION by Mr. Harper to maintain the staff's language that the scenic view corridor designation be kept in PAS 080. Second by Mr. Hansen. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Hansen, that the Edgewood Water Company facilities (PAS 080, item 6) be an allowed rather than a special use.

Mr. Barrett explained that staff agrees with Mr. DePaoli's request but would like some clarification so that the policy is clear that Edgewood Water Company, which is classified as a public utility center or local public health and safety facility, is an allowed use. The intent is not that such uses be allowed anywhere in the Plan Area. Within the whole watershed area, such uses will be special uses.

Mr. Harper amended his motion to approve the request that Edgewood Water Company be an allowed use but that other such uses will be considered special uses. Mr. Hansen concurred. The motion carried unanimously.

With regard to item 7 (PAS 080), Mr. Barrett explained Mr. DePaoli's concern that, although Special Policy #3 states that a developed campground should be considered, no additional capacity for such use has been assigned. Staff does not recommend allocating Persons At One Time (PAOTs) until the Community Plan for this area has been completed. The APC's Recreation Committee is also working on the whole recreation issue. No APC action is necessary at this time.

With regard to item 8 (PAS 080) and Mr. DePaoli's suggestion that the PASs should not mandate implementation of improvement programs not yet adopted by the Board, this is a concept that runs through all the PASs. Some of these programs include the water quality improvement plan, the highway improvement plans, stream zone restoration, and the scenic restoration program. These programs must go through a public hearing and adoption process. Deleting these references at this time will have repercussions in many other Plan Area Statements. Mr. DePaoli suggested it was a mistake for TRPA, or any agency, to mandate something that it has never seen. The fair way is to develop the plans and then to mandate them to the different Plan Areas.

MOTION by Harper, with a second by Mr. Hoefer, to approve the staff recommendation mandating implementation of certain as yet unadopted improvement programs in PAS 080. The motion carried with Ms. Unsicker abstaining.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen, with a second by Mr. Harper, to approve Mr. DePaoli's request that Planning Consideration #2 (PAS 070A) be expanded to recognize the fact that Edgewood Golf Course ponds have acted as siltation basins and have assisted in the reduction of pollutants entering Lake Tahoe from Edgewood Creek. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Barrett explained that item 10 (PAS 070A) refers to a special policy requiring that a fertilizer management program shall be initiated at the golf course and the golf course redesigned to provide for natural buffers of vegetation along the creek and pond area wherever possible. As part of the overall SEZ restoration program, the intent here is to increase the effectiveness of streams and ponds as buffers and treatment facilities. Mr. DePaoli explained he was not objecting to the fertilizer management program; he was objecting to mandating the golf course to redesign wherever possible. This
will create problems any time Edgewood wants to do anything at all. Mr. Ziegler explained that this was really a reaffirmation of the Goals and Policies which suggest that golf courses within SEZs should be looked at for redesign possibilities to, for instance, increase setbacks from streams and encourage riparian vegetation. Ms. Becker suggested that the policy be reworded to provide that when the applicant redesigns the golf course these criteria shall be taken into account. Mr. Ziegler explained that the policy is really more of a guideline.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer to disapprove the request to modify the Special Policy #1 which suggests that Edgewood Golf Course be redesigned. (The motion is to approve staff's language.) Second by Mr. Hansen. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to recognize the facilities of the Edgewood Water Company (item 11, PAS 070A) as allowed uses (as requested by Mr. DePaoli). The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Barrett explained staff's position on Mr. DePaoli's request that eating and drinking places be an allowed use. This will make it clear that the bar and restaurant facilities at the golf course are allowed as a primary use. (PAS 070A, item 12). Mr. DePaoli explained that the bar and restaurant operate at times of the year which do not coincide with the golf course. If special findings cannot be made for these facilities as special uses, then they will be forced to operate only when the golf course is operating. There is no problem for the pro shop to remain a special use; it is seasonally used and its hours are very close to those of the golf course. Mr. Hansen suggested that the existing eating and drinking establishment be recognized as an allowed use; anything new would be a special use. Mr Ziegler suggested that staff work on language for the APC's consideration after the lunch recess.

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve Mr. DePaoli's request (PAS 080A, item 13) that water intake lines be an allowed accessory structure. The motion carried unanimously.

With regard to item 14 (PAS 070A) and the request that additional outdoor recreation development should be allocated due to its location adjacent to a major tourist center, Mr. DePaoli explained that the Park Cattle Company has no plans to develop anything in this Plan Area other than a golf course. If there is a potential here for additional outdoor recreation, PACTs should be allocated. It appears, however, that there are not enough to go around, so they can't be allocated to areas that may not use them. Mr. Barrett recommended that this item be deferred until after the Recreation Committee completes its work. Chairman Becker concurred. No action was taken.

MOTION by Mr. Glab, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve Mr. DePaoli's request (with staff concurrence) that PAS 089A (item 15) expressly state that structures housing gaming under a nonrestrictive license are permitted and conforming uses. The motion carried unanimously.

With regard to item 16 (PAS 089A), Mr. DePaoli explained he had no trouble giving recognition to the fact that this area is part of the Caesar's Tahoe/Park Tahoe project. He was objecting to the policy requiring this whole area to be maintained as a scenic view corridor and historic site. Action on PAS 080
should suffice on this point. Second, there is no need to call the entire 16 acres (Friday Station and surrounding land) an historic site. The policy recognizing open space should speak only to the property that is recorded as open space. The historic site is actually in PAS 080. Ms. Becker explained that the National Register recognizes just the building as historic. Mr. Barrett asked that this be continued until after lunch so that staff can work on compromise language.

With regard to item 17 (PAS 089A), Mr. DePaoli explained that there is a special designation here for employee housing. The definition of employee housing is that it be residential units owned and maintained by a public or private entity for housing employees of said public or private entity. Where would such housing go in this Plan Area? The major employers in this area probably don't have any land that would be available for such housing. By listing multiple residential as a permissible use in the area, the Agency is opening the door for someone who doesn't employ people to provide that kind of housing. The code now requires that employee housing must be provided by the employer. Without allowing for multiple family housing as a permissible use, it is not likely it will occur. This may be a code problem. Mr. Barrett suggested that Park Cattle Company owns the only vacant land; if Caesar's needs employee housing, he would imagine that something could be worked out between Caesar's and Park Cattle. Mr. Ziegler suggested that the appropriate way to handle this is through a technical cleanup of the code of ordinances. Chapter 18 indicates that employee housing is to be owned and operated by the employer. It is possible for employee housing to be owned and operated by a third party with some restrictions or CC&Rs to ensure its use by employees. This is a code problem. Staff does not envision this part of PAS 089 as a residential area in the typical sense.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to retain the language in PAS 089A (item 17) and to make changes with regard to employee housing at the code level. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion, with a second by Mr. Hansen to approve Mr. DePaoli's request, with staff's concurrence, that vehicle storage and parking should be an allowed rather than a special use in PAS 089A (item 18). The motion carried unanimously.

After some discussion it was determined there was no need for APC action on item 19 since sport assembly is already listed as a special use.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to retain language in PAS 089A (item 20) mandating implementation of improvement programs that have not yet been adopted by the Governing Board. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ziegler advised that Agency Executive Director Bill Morgan would be making a determination on when these matters would be taken to the Governing Board for final action. Chairman Becker pointed out that APC action had been deferred on items 1, 2, 3, 5. Items 12 and 16 would be taken up after lunch.

Ms. Becker asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on these or any other Plan Area Statements. Since there was no one, Ms. Becker recessed the public hearing to later in the afternoon.
The meeting recessed for a lunch break from 11:50 a.m. to 1:15 p.m. Members present after lunch: Glab, Combs, DeMello, Popoff, Hoefer, Dodgion, Hansen, Becker, Huber, Renz, Jamin, Unsicker, Harper (present at 1:35 p.m. during discussion on item V F.).

Chairman Becker reopened the public hearing on Plan Area Statements.

Mr. Barrett distributed copies of a 5/13/87 document entitled, "APC Recommended Changes." With regard to item 12 (PAS 070A), it is proposed that the Edgewood golf course restaurant and bar be considered as allowed uses, although any other restaurants elsewhere in the PAS will be special uses. The pro shop will be left as an accessory use. A special policy shall be added to PAS 070A and 080 recognizing the Edgewood Water Company as an allowed use pursuant to Chapter 18 and the Permissible Uses section in the PASs. The third item on the handout applies to item 16 in the APC packet material and provides that Special Policy #1 in PAS 089A be amended to provide for continued maintenance of the open space as officially recorded in Douglas County. Any activities taking place on the Caesar's Tahoe property should be viewed in light of said open space.

Mr. Barrett suggested there was no need to act on the second item on the handout dealing with the Edgewood Water Company; this material is provided so the APC can see the language which reflects the APC's earlier action.

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion to approve the language proposed by staff and Mr. DePaoli on items 1 and 3 of the handout to address items 12 and 16 of the packet material. Second by Mr. Hoefer. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Jamin advised that there had been an oversight in PAS 114 (Bonanza area close to the Y in the City of South Lake Tahoe) regarding Special Area #1. It would be appropriate for the trailer park to be listed as a special use.

Mr. Barrett concurred.

MOTION by Ms. Jamin to include the trailer park in PAS 114 as a special use. Second by Mr. Renz. The motion carried with Ms. Unsicker abstaining.

Since no one else wished to testify, Chairman Becker closed the public hearing on Plan Area Statements.

V  PLANNING MATTERS

F. Discussion on Waterborne Feasibility Study

Transportation Planner Curtis Jordan presented a status report on the study prepared by JHK & Associates which identifies both opportunities and constraints to implementation of a waterborne system connecting the north and south shore transit systems. This report covers the first three of six tasks to be undertaken. These tasks include, in part, identification of existing services in the Basin, identification of the existing facilities, an inventory of available technology, a determination on the demand for waterborne transit services, and an evaluation of the waterborne transit services and alternatives. What is being presented today is a progress report on the inventory tasks. Mr. Jordan walked the APC members through the report material.
Ms. Huber questioned whether the appendix would identify marinas with pumpout facilities. Mr. Jordan suggested that there was not a lot of detail on this in the document on transportation services. This is not really a guide for the recreational boater. Mr. Ziegler suggested that a point-to-point waterborne facility would have to have restrooms. There should be some provision in the inventory for addressing pumpout facilities.

Additional information on the report was presented by JHK & Associates representatives Mike Connors and David Szplett. The final report will make a recommendation on whether or not it is feasible to have waterborne transit facilities on the Lake. At this point it looks like the recommendation will favor a demonstration project. The final draft report will be completed in the next two weeks.

Mr. Popoff suggested that the report was stretching the definition in saying there are an adequate number of marinas and shoreside facilities around the Lake. Burnt Cedar Beach, Incline Village, and Coon Street are hardly what he would call marinas; they provide only a boat ramp. He would like to see a more realistic view of what a marina is. Mr. Connors responded that in this first draft every possibility was identified. The next phase will provide more detail. There is one marina identified in this report which is feasible to use as a waterborne transportation port; everything else would have to be improved to some extent.

Mr. Popoff commented that the cover letter with the report suggests that the inventory indicates there are quite a few marinas on Lake Tahoe and that shoreside services appear adequate. This is an exaggeration. Second, there are mistakes here. For example, the Carnelian Bay Company does not exist; it is the Sierra Boat Company. Lake Forest, a Coast Guard Station, has a better developed facility than most that are listed, and it is not on the list. The report does not provide a very thorough cataloging of facilities. Mr. Connors responded that JHK would take a closer look at this.

Mr. Glab suggested that the M.S. Dixie is not the largest boat on the Lake as suggested by the report. Also, have weather conditions and the ability to approach some of these docks in all-weather conditions been evaluated? Mr. Jordan responded that this type of analysis had been done by a subcontractor. Mr. Glab asked if anything was being done to determine willingness to pay or what the breakeven point would be as far as financing these transit programs. Mr. Connors suggested that determining how much a person would be willing to pay for such a service was somewhat subjective at this point. This will ultimately have to be a judgment call of the Governing Board. His firm could present information on what would need to be subsidized versus what the ridership estimate would be. Mr. Glab suggested that the consultant look at number of operable days for the transit system plus alternatives for days that are not operable.

Discussion followed, with staff and the consultants responding to questions on boat types, laws regulating waterborne vessels, performance speed, wave action’s effect on suspended sediments, funding for such facilities, incentives for use, and a future operations plan. Ms. Jamin suggested that the consultants contact an operator who, a year ago, did studies to determine the financial feasibility of operating a hover craft on the lake. Mr. Glab suggested that drafts be listed for all vehicles. This is a critical feature. Mr. Hansen
asked that the report address connecting bicycle paths from Camp Richardson to Meeks Bay by ferry.

Mr. Curtis finished the presentation by advising that the final draft report would be available in two weeks. It will be sent either in the June packet or in advance of the packet mailing.

D. Status Report by Recreation Committee on Review of Recreation Element

Mr. Jon Hoefer, member of the Recreation Committee, explained that the intent of his presentation was to set forth the Committee's findings to date and to ask for APC comments before the Committee proceeds further. The Committee first started discussing Persons At One Time (PAOTs), a measurement of recreation use set forth in the Goals and Policies. Early on it was found that there were not enough to go around. The Committee then turned its attention to establishing areas of agreement. These are as follows: 1) recreation is "big" at Lake Tahoe, and not enough attention is being given to plan for it; 2) public agencies have looked at opportunities but not demand or integration; 3) the states and Forest Service view PAOTs as a reservation; 4) urban recreation lacks a reservation (not much land has been set aside for it); 5) PAOTs in the Goals and Policies should apply to state and federal lands; 6) do not assign any targets or limits to urban recreation at this time; 7) urban recreation is defined as those facilities operated to serve local residents (softball, soccer, pools, baseball, etc.); 8) while the plan does have some capacity set aside for ski areas, ski areas are different and should be treated differently; this already recognized to some extent because of the requirement for a master plan; 9) marinas should be treated differently; no allocations or inventory for an allocation to marinas were made from the PAOT capacity, so no capacity is recognized for these uses; 10) RV parks, campgrounds and overnight facilities on state or federal lands also lack capacity; until some other system is devised, it should be recognized that no capacity has been assigned these uses; this should be done by either a master plan or case-by-case review process; 11) recognize that there is much overlap between outdoor and urban recreation, and an overlap between what federal, state and local governments provide; and 12) for the present, use the five-year recreation plan required by the Goals and Policies Plan as the clearinghouse for integrating all recreation activities until a better system is developed.

Discussion followed on the Recreation Committee's findings with regard to recreation and, in particular, the subject of PAOTs, cross country skiing, dispersed recreation, what to do with recreation projects in the interim, the charge of the committee to look not just at PAOTs but at a better way to develop a recreation plan for the Basin. Mr. Hoefer explained that there needed to be an in-depth study of recreation, after which a decision will be made on whether PAOTs will fit in. Mr. Renz asked if, under the Committee's recommendation, an RV park, for example, would be subject only to the normal project review process. TRPA Planner Jean Shaffer suggested that the normal project review process in compliance with the Plan Area Statement would be one avenue in the interim; the easier approach would be to address the RV park in the Community Planning process. The Committee, in the long term, would like to provide some means for additional flexibility in assigning capacities that are available or in defining the capacities themselves. It should be noted that, when the Forest Service and State Parks were consulted on the number of PAOTs they foresaw needing, their reservations were based on rather long-term projections - in some
cases as much as 50 years. These entities are very reluctant to relinquish any of this capacity. Mr. Hoefer explained that at this time the Committee is recommending there be no limit on urban recreation. Because there will be people in the Basin who feel there should be a limit, there will be a need to begin to define it through a more elaborate study program. Ms. Shaffer reminded the APC that the Goals and Policies do not speak to PAOTs for urban recreation; capacity for this type of recreation is to be provided by the municipality which is developing the uses.

Mr. Ziegler asked for clarification on the difference between what is being proposed and what is in the code, PASs, and Goals and Policies. Mr. Hansen responded that, in his opinion, the PAOTs are a reservation for future use on federal and state lands; urbanized recreation is controlled by Goals and Policies and other Agency programs and does not need reserved allocation. Mr. Hoefer explained that PAOTs speak to outdoor recreation. The Committee was trying to clarify what is considered outdoor recreation and determined it is that which is provided by state and federal entities. The PAOTs were applied to that. It is recommended that urban recreation not be subject to that same system. Also it is recommended that marinas and some other recreation uses (golf courses) which could be viewed as outdoor recreation or could be viewed as urban recreation be treated on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Harper suggested that it was inappropriate in the PASs, except for outdoor recreation where state and federal agencies are involved, to assign PAOTs. It is suggested that PAOTs be taken out of PASs where state or federal interests are not involved. He agrees that recreation projects be looked at on a demand basis, and he would support the idea of a five-year recreation program. He would fully endorse the Committee's agreements, with emphasis on item 1 and 12.

(Mr. Renz left the meeting at 2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Dodgion asked what the effect of not requiring PAOTs for RV parks or marinas and other recreation-type uses would have on the scenarios addressed in the Regional Plan EIS. Mr. Ziegler agreed that this was a concern and would require staff to review its previous analyses. It appears that staff may have to start a process over again which it is only now wrapping up. Mr. Hansen disagreed and suggested that the PAOTs are assigned to the Federal and state lands. What is left is urbanized recreation, and that is absolutely controlled by the Regional Plan. Marinas are now controlled by master plans and attendant environmental assessments. He did not believe that there would be an impact on the EIS because the PAOT number does not change. Mr. Dodgion suggested he could see a large difference between RV parks, campgrounds and community softball fields. Lumping them all together will cause a real problem with the EIS. There will be a need to reassess what activities in the Goals and Policies were covered by the concept of PAOTs and how they were addressed in the EIS. Mr. Hoefer responded that this has not yet been explored but will need to be addressed. Mr. Harper suggested, then, that direction be given to determine the assumptions that went into the EIS's PAOT figure. It appears that staff did not look at PAOTs purely from the standpoint of federal and state facilities but intended to look at them in a much broader sense.

Mr. Ziegler suggested it would be good direction for the Committee in making its recommendations to always be checking back to the Goals and Policies and the EIS and its scenarios so it is known what the correlation is at any given time.
(Mr. Poppoff left the meeting at 3:10 p.m. during the following discussion. Members Present: Glab, DeMello, Hansen, Hoefer,Dodgion, Becker, Huber, Unsicker, Jamin, Combs)

C. Status Report on Community Planning Process

Referencing Chapter 14 (Community Plans) in the APC packet, Mr. Barrett explained the mechanics of the Community Planning process. After discussion on the status of planning in each jurisdiction and costs of the process, it was determined that a meeting would be scheduled among the individual local planners to discuss commitments and local needs.

(Mr. Combs and Mr. Hansen left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.)

A. Status of Implementation of Regional Plan Package

Mr. Ziegler reminded the APC that the Goals and Policies have been adopted. The Plan Area Statements and the first set of trailer amendments have been adopted by ordinance. The second set of trailer amendments are now in the works. Mr. Morgan will be making a determination on how he wants to proceed with these. At the May 6 and 7 special Board meeting, those chapters of the Code of ordinances which are considered a priority in relation to settlement of the litigation received first reading; staff has been meeting with the plaintiffs on the dismissal document.

Agency counsel Susan Scholley explained that second reading on two groups of the ordinances has been scheduled for the regular May meeting. A large number of ordinance chapters received first reading at the special meeting on May 6 and 7, and the rules require a four-week period between first reading and ordinance adoption. Waiver of this four-week requirement is scheduled for action at the May 27 meeting. If the Board does not waive this requirement, the ordinances will be scheduled for second reading in June. Because the ordinances become effective 60 days after second reading, the worst case scenario is that the core chapters of the code would be on line and in effect at the end of August. Mr. Morgan is currently proposing that June 1 be the effective date of the Regional Plan, and the Board will be considering an ordinance to that effect in May. In order to avoid a lapse of time between the effectiveness of the Regional Plan and the ordinances, the settlement document will use the power of the federal court to direct implementation of the ordinances immediately upon the effective date of the Plan. The settlement document is currently being drafted and will be presented to the Board in May for action. It is hoped that there will be a hearing date before the judge in early June.

With regard to status of the Regional Plan, Mr. Ziegler explained that with the first and second reading of ordinances the opportunity is available to start working on amendment of the 208 Plan. The 208 Plan was adopted in 1981 (Ordinances 81-4 and 81-5), and staff is studying what needs to be done to amend it. Questions regarding implementation of coverage policies this summer (nonconforming coverage, excess coverage, coverage over coverage, and coverage reductions) are still unanswered.

B. Discussion on Chapters 7, 15, and 45 of the Code of Ordinances

Mr. Barrett explained that staff is still working on these chapters. The packet
material includes some criteria that might be used to determine if TRPA review is required for special events. Ms. Unsicker suggested that not all events conducted by nonprofit organizations should necessarily be exempt from review. Mr. Barrett explained that the real test of whether a project is to be reviewed is an assessment of its impacts. Mr. Harper suggested that staff stick with its criteria for review of special events and not attempt to identify which specific groups will be reviewed and which will not. This latter approach leaves the door open for too much discussion and disagreement. Ms. Jamin suggested that the code appears to permit the garage sales which occur in the City every weekend. As long as they meet all the City's requirements (signs, public right-of-way, etc.), the City does not regulate their duration. Staff may want to look at this. In order to treat profit and nonprofit organizations the same, the Agency may want to send out letters to service organizations asking what special events they are scheduling for the year. The Agency will then have this information on file so a determination can be made on the events' impacts.

Mr. Barrett explained that staff will be coming back to the APC with redrafts of these chapters.

E. Discussion on the Regional Transportation Plan Update

Chairman Becker noted that the material on this topic had been sent in the APC packets. Mr. Ziegler explained that the update was nominally due to Caltrans last November. Caltrans has been very understanding about the deadline in view of the workload caused by efforts to end the litigation on the Regional Plan. Now that the ordinances have had first reading, staff will be concentrating its efforts on getting the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update in circulation prior to the next APC meeting. A good presentation and discussion will be scheduled for the June APC agenda. Those APC members who are specifically interested in transportation are asked to submit verbal or written comments to Leif Anderson or Jim Brennan as soon as possible for incorporation into the update. Staff is also available for presentations to interested groups. Mr. Glab suggested that staff contact the casinos to encourage cooperative transit systems for casino customers.

VI REPORTS

A. Staff - no report

B. Legal Counsel

Ms. Scholley advised that the court had signed several stipulations since the last APC meeting. Twenty-two provides for a 1987 building season and allows 300 allocations for residential structures, minor additions to existing commercial development, releases the first 67 case-by-case approvals that have been held up by the injunction, and permits other private and public service projects. The twenty-third stipulation provides for an exemption for the interim service agreement. This will allow for additional flights at the South Tahoe Airport this summer along with implementation of numerous mitigation measures. The twenty-fourth stipulation currently before the court exempts phase one of the Ski Incline master plan.

C. Public Interest Comments - none
D. APC Members

Mr. Harper advised he would have a substitute sitting in for Washoe County in June. The Tahoe Bond Commission is meeting June 27 and 28 and will, as part of its meeting, conduct a field trip to view erosion control projects. It became evident at the last meeting in March that the number of lots forecasted for purchase by bond monies has been substantially downgraded because of the fact that the 1980 appraisals, upon which the law is based, will cut the volume of lots to about half. The current estimate is that between 300 and 400 lots can be purchased. The amount of money earmarked for property purchase is $23.5 million.

Mr. Hoefer advised that the wheel tracks caused by a fleet of vehicles driving across the Rabe Meadow is going to be repaired. This activity, which was done by a film company in February, was never approved by the Forest Service, and the movie company will be paying for the restoration. There was still some snow on the meadow when the damage occurred, and the grass is now beginning to grow up. In the winter time, the ruts will be evident for a long time. Ms. Scholley advised that normally the agency would require a permit for this kind of activity and would never have approved this in a stream zone. She would check with the Compliance Division to see whether the Agency has taken some action.

VII CORRESPONDENCE - none

VIII PENDING MATTERS - none

IX ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Julie D. Frame
Administrative Assistant

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (702) 588-4547.
June 2, 1987

To: APC

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Public Hearing to Consider Amending the Regional Plan Maps

Staff is proposing the following amendments to the Regional Plan Overlay Maps:

1. Create an overlay showing scenic units at a scale of 1" = 2000'.
   
   Reason: No such overlay existed; scenic units used in evaluating scenic thresholds were mapped only at a scale which was incompatible with the Regional Plan Overlay Maps.

2. Create an overlay showing historic resources at a scale of 1" = 2000'.
   
   Reason: The historic resources map adopted in April, 1984, by the Governing Board is at a scale of 2" = 1 mile. In order to make this information compatible with the Regional Plan Overlay Maps, a change in scale is needed. Also, two residential districts earlier designated by the TRPA as historic districts are proposed for removal from the historic resources overlay. This change is proposed due to the desires of the residents of those districts not to be designated historic.

3. Create an overlay showing prime fish habitat at a scale of 1" = 2000'.
   
   Reason: The prime fish habitat map adopted in April, 1984, by the Governing Board is at a scale of 2" = 1 mile. In order to make this information compatible with the Regional Plan Overlay Maps, a change in scales is needed. Also stream inlets identified as having important habitat value have been designated on the overlays. These streams are identified in Chapter 54, Section 4.A.2, Code of Ordinances. The source of this information is the 1972 Joint Study between California and Nevada fish and game departments.
4. Create an overlay showing the transportation noise corridors for CNEL at a scale of 1" = 2000'.

Reason: The noise corridor information presently exists in Figure 3 of the adopted Regional Goals and Policies at a scale of approximately 1" = 3 miles. In order to make this information compatible with the Regional Plan Overlay Maps, a change in scales is needed.

Staff will begin this public hearing with a brief presentation regarding these proposed amendments. If you have any questions concerning the agenda item please contact Gordon Barrett or Andrew Strain at (702) 588-3296.
MEMORANDUM

June 1, 1987

To: The Advisory Planning Commission
From: The Staff
Subject: Distribution of Final EIS, Placer County Criminal Justice and Administrative Center

The public review/comment period for the above document closed on May 9, 1987. The consultants are currently preparing responses to the comments received. It is anticipated that the final EIS will be ready for distribution to the APC at the June 10, 1987 APC meeting. A short presentation will be made by staff.

No action is requested at the June 10, 1987 meeting; however, Agency staff will schedule the matter of a recommendation of technical adequacy on the subject document for the July 8, 1987 APC meeting. If you have any questions, please contact Rick Angelocci of Agency staff at (702) 588-4547.
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AGENDA ITEM V B.
June 2, 1987

To: APC

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Discussion on Processing the Remaining Unadopted Chapters of the Code of Ordinances

Although the main bulk of the Code has been adopted, there still are some chapters of the Code that are required to be completed. The following is a list of those chapters.

Chapter 7  Temporary Uses and Structures and Special Events
Chapter 10 Structures Housing Gaming
Chapter 15 Redevelopment Plans
Chapter 24 Driveway and Parking Standards
Chapter 26 Outdoor Advertising Standards
Chapter 28 Natural Hazard Standards
Chapters 41-44 Subdivision Standards
Chapter 45 Parcel Line Adjustments and Consolidations
Chapter 92 Certification of Private Transportation Services
Chapter 94 Scenic Highway Corridors

The above chapters of the Code are at various stages in drafting and none have been released for public hearing purposes, except for the driveway provisions of Chapter 24. Also there has been no environmental documentation prepared for the subject chapters, with the same exception.

At this time the staff would propose that the APC resume its role in the review of ordinances. This review would include the above chapters and any trailing amendments that may come along.

The process would be for the staff to prepare drafts for APC review and recommendation, however, some of the Chapters such as 7, 24 and 26 may require early APC input in the preparation of the draft and require committee work.

At this time it is staff's preference to process the remaining chapters as a batch with one environmental document and a completion date of January 1, 1988. Other factors such as the litigation settlement, the South Lake Tahoe priority on redevelopment, project review needs for sign standards, and APC recommendations may change the staff's preference.
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MEMORANDUM

June 2, 1987

To: APC Members

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Discussion on Regional Transportation Plan Update

At the May APC meeting, the staff reported on the status of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. Staff stated that the RTP was in administrative draft form and required additional internal staff comments. On April 29, the staff distributed the administrative draft RTP and accompanying EIS to the APC. The staff is in the process of incorporating the final internal comments into the draft documents. It is anticipated that revised copies of the documents will be available at the APC meeting.

Staff will be prepared to discuss the documents with the commissioners at the June APC meeting.

If you have any questions, contact Jim Brennan or Leif Anderson at (702) 586-3296.

AGENDA ITEM V D.
June 2, 1987

To: APC Members

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Discussion on Draft Waterborne Transportation Feasibility Study

Enclosed with the packet is the draft Waterborne Transportation Feasibility Study. At the May APC meeting, TRPA staff and JHK & Associates presented a progress report on the Study, and solicited comments from the commissioners. Since that time, with assistance from TRPA staff, JHK & Associates has further expanded the inventories of existing services, facilities, and technology.

In addition, JHK & Associates has performed demand estimation modeling, completed an evaluation of waterborne services, and has outlined management and financial options. This information is presented in the draft Study.

JHK & Associates, with their subcontractor (Winzler and Kelley) is continuing to research vessel technology, and will present a progress report to the commissioners at the June meeting.

The evaluation process has shown that a waterborne transportation system could be developed for the Lake Tahoe Basin. There are a considerable number of marina facilities on the Lake and ten locations were identified as feasible waterborne transportation terminals. However, each facility would require some type of improvement. These improvements range from minor changes to the docking facilities to extensive dredging on an annual basis.

Several vessels already operate various waterborne services on Lake Tahoe, although none of the existing vessels exhibits all of the operating characteristics needed for an effective waterborne system. A number of acceptable vessels are available, although the purchase price ranges up to approximately $3 million.

The system operating cost is estimated at between $13 and $22 per passenger trip. The cost per passenger for a conventional fixed route transit system is approximately $5 per passenger trip. The cost of a demand responsive transit system could range from $5 to $10 per passenger trip. The figures indicate that a daily, fixed route waterborne transportation system is a marginally viable alternative for Lake Tahoe. A passenger fare at this level is prohibitively high and the passenger demand will be minimal without some form of passenger subsidy. The waterborne transit system has the potential for providing a region-wide VMT reduction between 4.5% and 8.7% of the TRPA's goal of 170,000 vehicle miles traveled on a summer day.

If there are any questions on this agenda item, contact Leif Anderson or Curtis Jordan.
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MEMORANDUM

June 2, 1987

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Appointment of Committee Charged With Updating Criteria for Ski Area Master Plans

A small work group to draft the criteria for ski area master plans has been assembled. This work group presently consists of the following persons:

Rob Hunt, Incline Village GID
Rick Skinner, California Attorney General's Office
Tom Martens, League to Save Lake Tahoe
Larry Hoffman, Preservation Council and ski areas
Stan Hansen, APC, Heavenly Valley, ski operators
Ron Alling, Heavenly Valley
Virgil Anderson and Robert McDowell. U.S. Forest Service
Sachi Itagaki, Lahontan RWQCQ
Dick Pyle, Soil Conservation Service
Jean Shaffer, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

The work group had the first meeting on May 19. The work group expressed the opinion that in view of the importance of the master planning process the members of the work group should be appointed to the task by the TRPA.

The work group is requesting that the APC recommend the appointment by the Board of the above-listed group. The APC may recommend additional members if so desired.
MEMORANDUM

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Distribution Policy for Commercial Allocations Outside Community Plans and Inside Unadopted Community Plans

The Governing Board has asked the APC to consider and provide advice on the following matter:

Code Provisions:

Chapter 33, Section 33.C of the Draft Code of Ordinances provides for the distribution of 40,000 square feet of commercial floor area allocations outside of community plan areas and 36,000 square feet inside community plan areas which have not yet been adopted. The Code requires these allocations to be distributed on a first-come, first-served basis to those projects receiving TRPA approval with not less than one-half of the total allocations being used for expansion of existing commercial developments. No single commercial project may be allocated more than 4,500 square feet of commercial floor area within a 10 year period. In addition, the rate of allocation to projects outside community plans will be checked at two year intervals to ensure that the rate is less than an average of 5,000 square feet per year.

Issues/Concerns:

1. The distribution system for these allocations as provided in the Code does not assign any certain allotments to individual local jurisdictions. Those projects that are approved first will receive the allocations, regardless of which jurisdiction the project is located in. Therefore, it is possible that not all jurisdictions will receive their fair share of the allocations.

2. Since the allocations are not to be issued until the proposed project(s) are approved it is possible that a situation could arise where two or more projects are scheduled on the same agenda for approval with only enough remaining allocations to approve one project.
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AGENDA ITEM 5.G.
3. The Code provides for all allocations to be distributed on a first-come, first-served basis. This situation could place an unreasonable burden on Agency staff in determining which project qualifies for the next available allocation. It will be necessary to clearly define what qualifies each project's priority. The "application received" date may not always serve as a method of establishing priority due to possible incomplete applications. The "complete application" date also could have problems as the staff member(s) making the determination could receive more than one complete application on the same day.

Alternatives:

A. Jurisdictional Allocation Distribution:

1. Establish an equal allotment of all available allocations to each jurisdiction, i.e., outside community plans - 10,000 square feet to each jurisdiction.

2. Establish a percentage allotment of all available allocations to each jurisdiction based on the adopted community plan allocation schedule as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Allocation* Percentage</th>
<th>Alloc. Outside** Community Plan</th>
<th>Alloc. Inside** Community Plan (pre-adoption)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.L.T/El Dorado</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11,120 sq. ft.</td>
<td>10,008 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>16,640 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14,976 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>7,240 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6,516 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40,000 sq. ft.***</td>
<td>36,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on established proportionate share of commercial allocations allotted to jurisdictions for future distribution to community plans.

** At least 50% of total allocations to be used for expansion of existing commercial development.

*** Rate of allocation subject to 5,000 square foot average limitation.