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NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, October 14, 1987, at 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.

October 5, 1987

By: W. A. Morgan
William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Finding of Technical Adequacy, Final EIS for the Round Hill to Stateline Substation 120 KV Transmission Line, Sierra Pacific Power Company

B. Discussion and Action on the Recreation Committee Findings

C. Discussion on Recommendation of Incline Village Postal Committee

D. Status Report on Regional Transportation Plan and EIS

E. Discussion of Possible Amendment to Chapter 20 [Subsection 20.5.B(4)] and Chapter 25 [Subsection 25.2.B]

F. Status Report on Development of Code 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 94 – Scenic Highway Corridors
   Chapter 96 – Road Closures
   Design Review Guidelines

G. Report on Status of Identification of Indicators and Time Schedules Pursuant to Chapter 32 (Regional Plan and Threshold Review), Code of Ordinances

V REPORTS

A. Legal Counsel

B. APC Members

C. Public Interest Comments
VI  CORRESPONDENCE
VII  PENDING MATTERS
VIII  ADJOURNMENT
MEMORANDUM

October 5, 1987

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Finding of Technical Adequacy; Sierra Pacific Power Company, Roundhill to Stateline Substation 120kv Transmission Line EIR/EIS

Attached to the APC packet please find a copy of the final EIR/EIS for the above-referenced project. The 60 day public comment period began on April 20, 1987 and closed June 18, 1987. Copies of the draft EIR/EIS were distributed to the APC by mail on April 28, 1987.

The draft EIR/EIS evaluated four alternative routes (A-D) for the construction of a 120kv transmission line between the Roundhill and Stateline substations. The proposed project includes minor work at the Roundhill Substation, expansion of the Stateline Substation, and construction of approximately four miles of overhead transmission line.

Provided the mitigation measures recommended in the document are incorporated as part of the project, the preferred route (Alternative C) will not result in any significant environmental impacts. Agency staff has reviewed the draft and final EIR/EIS and recommends that the APC find the subject document technically adequate and further that the APC recommend to the Governing Board certification of the document.
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AGENDA ITEM IV. A.
MEMORANDUM

October 6, 1987

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: APC Recreation Committee Findings and Recommendations

An APC Recreation Committee was appointed to study allocation of capacity for development of recreational facilities. The committee findings and recommendations based on the study are contained in the attached report. The committee requests the APC to approve the report and recommend to the Governing Board that the recommendations be accepted.

If you have any questions, please call Jean Shaffer at (702) 588-4547.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE APC RECREATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Report Contents:

I. Introduction
II. Relation to Goals and Policies
III. Overall Recreation Recommendations
IV. Urban Recreation Recommendations
V. Dispersed Recreation Recommendations
VI. Developed Recreation Recommendations
VII. The Five Year List
VIII. Rules Concerning PAOTs
Attachment A. Overnight PAOT Pool Criteria

I. INTRODUCTION

The adoption of the Plan Area Statements and the Code of Ordinances describing the recreational capacity of persons at one time (PAOT) assignment as both a target and a limitation prompted considerable concern, especially among local recreation providers. Several expressed the opinion that they had not received their fair share in the allocation of available PAOTs. As a result, an APC committee was appointed to study the use of PAOTs. The committee and a number of interested members of the community have been meeting regularly to study recreation allocation and develop this set of recommendations.

The term PAOT came from the U. S. Forest Service which uses the term to measure the normal design capacity of its recreation facilities. The term is not intended to apply to peak use which occurs occasionally.

The capacity for developed recreation identified in the Goals and Policies was primarily developed through the state and federal agencies. Therefore, the committee recommends that the PAOT targets/limitations on recreation capacity should apply primarily to state and federal lands. Exceptions, which include dispersed recreation, downhill skiing facilities, overnight facilities, and marinas, are addressed in detail below.

The Goals and Policies refer to the use of PAOTs only in relation to preserving a fair share of the Basin's capacity for specified developed outdoor recreation. The Goals and Policies state that public service and facility capacity for urban recreation is to be acquired and managed by local government or service districts. Therefore, the committee recommends that PAOTs should not be required for urban recreation unless further study identifies a need to do so.
The committee viewed flexibility as essential in the allocation of PAOTs, but still desires to maintain stability in the allocations. The committee recommends that pools of unallocated overnight and day use PAOTs be made available for private parties to use for developed recreation projects or in Plan Areas where no PAOTs have been assigned. The Plan Areas Statements should be amended to provide for the creation of the PAOT pools. The five-year recreation list should provide a method for keeping account of how all the available PAOTs are used, and how many remain available from both those preassigned in the PASs and the pools.

II. RELATION TO THE GOALS AND POLICIES

The Recreation Element of the Goals and Policies makes it very clear that three major categories of recreation, dispersed, developed, and urban, are to be provided in the Tahoe Basin. While recreation as a whole was given a high priority, no priorities were set among the three categories.

The Recreation Element does not distinguish clearly between the types of facilities which may be considered as developed or urban recreation. The difference is that urban recreation and developed outdoor recreation are intended to serve different publics. It is important to view urban recreation as an amenity and service for local residents, both permanent and temporary. As such, urban recreation does not draw people into the basin. Development of many types of developed outdoor recreation improvements on state and federal land, on the other hand, may attract visitors to the basin. Thus, each should be subject to different reservations and limitations.

Dispersed recreation may be provided by either state, federal or local agencies. Since dispersed recreation requires little or no developed support facilities, the limitation for dispersed recreation should be the resource or land capability. Targeted miles of trail are included in the Plan Area Statements.

The committee recommends the following practices in the allocation of PAOTs:

1. **Dispersed Recreation**: Dispersed recreation and supporting facilities should not be subject to PAOT limitations.

2. **Urban Recreation**: Public recreation facilities operated by local governments or private entities (except overnight facilities, downhill ski facilities, visitor information center and, marinas and boat launching facilities) should be considered urban recreation and not subject to PAOT limitations.

3. **Developed Outdoor Recreation**: All overnight facilities, marinas and boat launching facilities, visitor information centers, downhill ski facilities, and all developed day use facilities operated by the states' Departments of Parks and Recreation and federal agencies should be considered as developed outdoor recreation and should be subject to PAOT limitations.

The findings and recommendations in this report are consistent with the Goals and Policies.
III. OVERALL RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Goals and Policies (Developed Recreation, Goal #1, Policy 3) estimate that 11% of the recreational capacity may be developed in the first 5 to 10 years of the Plan. This should be regarded as a minimum of development. Development of 25% of the reserved capacity within 5 years should be encouraged, since under-development of recreational capacity leads to deterioration in quality. Specific committee findings and recommendations with summaries for urban, dispersed, and developed outdoor recreation follow.

IV. URBAN RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Urban recreation is an important element in the quality of life for local residents. Urban-oriented recreation is chiefly provided by local governments to serve the recreational needs of the community, both residents and tourists. Local governmental providers of urban recreation in the basin include the counties, the city of South Lake Tahoe, and some public utilities and improvement districts. Some urban recreation services may be provided by private enterprise.

While there may be some overlap between the types of facilities considered as urban and developed outdoor recreation, such as beaches and playing fields, urban recreation should be defined as those facilities provided by local or private interests primarily to serve local needs. Locally-operated recreational facilities acquired via the California Tahoe Conservancy should also be classified urban recreation.

Urban recreation should not require the allocation of PAOTs. The capacity to serve urban recreational needs should be reserved by the local governments and TRPA. To determine the demand and capacity required for urban recreation facilities, local governments should be encouraged to prepare local master recreation plans. These master plans would then be integrated into a Basinwide five year recreation plan.

Urban recreation projects should be subject to the five year recreation list (Ch. 33.6) at least until the local recreation master plans have been approved.

SUMMARY:

Urban Recreation Uses: Urban recreation is defined in Chapter 2, and the uses are listed in the table of primary uses in Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances. Urban recreation includes recreation centers, participant sport facilities, sport assembly, and day use areas not operated by state or federal agencies.

PAOT Limitations: Urban recreation shall not be subject to PAOT limitations.

Five Year Recreation List: Urban recreation projects should be subject to the five year list unless exempt through an approved master plan.

Master Plans: Local recreation providers are encouraged to prepare master plans.
V. DISPERSED RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a strong demand for dispersed recreation by both visitors and residents throughout the year. Forest Service data indicate that dispersed recreation use in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit is over one million user days per year. In addition, areas managed by the states of California and Nevada, the counties, the city of South Lake Tahoe, and several utility districts in the region offer dispersed recreation.

There are over 200 miles of trails existing in the Basin. Another 278 miles of trails have been targeted in the TRPA Plan Area Statements for future development. Trails are used for hiking, riding, and cross country skiing, and many constitute a destination in themselves. Other trails are intended chiefly to offer access to points of interest in the back country or to undeveloped campgrounds.

Dispersed recreation is not without environmental impacts which need to be mitigated. Parking and access are a continuing problem for a number of dispersed recreation areas. The Regional Plan recognizes the need for mitigation and support facilities for dispersed recreation including trailheads, access trails, restrooms, and safe water supplies. Some protective measures may be necessary to prevent damage in heavily used areas.

PAOT allocation should not be required for dispersed recreation or support facilities. Listing of dispersed recreation on the five year recreation list is not required. Support facilities for dispersed recreation should be subject to the five year list and integrated into the five year Basinwide recreation plan.

SUMMARY:

Dispersed Recreation Uses: Dispersed recreation includes hiking, jogging, primitive camping, nature study, fishing, cross country skiing, rafting and kayaking, swimming, and similar uses requiring little or no development of facilities. Vehicle use of designated roads or routes is also considered dispersed recreation. Dispersed outdoor recreation is defined in Chapters 2 and 18 in the Code of Ordinances.

PAOT Limitations: Dispersed recreation activities and support facilities should not be subject to PAOT limitation.

Five Year Recreation List: Dispersed recreation activities should not be subject to the five year recreation list. Support facilities and mitigation work are subject to the five year list.

Master Plans: Master plans are not required for dispersed recreation but are encouraged where appropriate.

VI. DEVELOPED OUTDOOR RECREATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Developed outdoor recreation is an economic mainstay of the Tahoe Basin. The Regional Plan requires the reservation of a fair share of the total Basin capacity for developed outdoor recreation. Reserved capacity for developed outdoor recreational uses may not be preempted for other purposes.
The adopted fair share for additional developed outdoor recreation facilities is 6,114 PAOTS in overnight accommodations, 6,761 PAOTS in summer day use facilities and 12,400 PAOTS in winter day use facilities. The uses for these PAOTS are discussed later in this section.

Developed outdoor recreation projects are regional in nature (rather than urban recreation provided mainly for local residents' use) and tend to draw visitors into the Basin. They include state parks and recreation areas and federal facilities. They also include the uses specifically listed in the Goals and Policies under Developed Recreation such as visitor centers, marinas and boating facilities, downhill ski areas, and overnight recreational facilities.

The Regional Plan estimates that 11% of the additional capacity might be developed in the first five to ten years of the plan, depending chiefly upon the availability of public and private funding. A large degree of flexibility must be left to the entities implementing the plan to accommodate the vagaries of grants, budget appropriations, bond issues, and the availability of private investment.

Although state and federal agencies are the main providers of developed outdoor recreation, the private sector should be encouraged to offer public recreation to the extent that it is feasible, needed, and compatible with the Plan Area Statements and environmental thresholds.

Developed outdoor recreation projects are subject to PAOT allocation requirements. They are also subject to the five year recreation list unless they have approved master plans. Bike trails, because they are being encouraged as alternative transportation, should not be subject to PAOTS.

Summer day uses: Summer day use PAOTS should be pooled and not assigned to specific Plan Areas. Public developed outdoor recreation uses proposed by private enterprise should be able to draw on the PAOT pool.

Summer day use PAOTS will be used chiefly by two major types of recreation: (1) regional recreation as provided by the states and the Forest Service, and (2) boating facilities (launching ramps and marinas). These uses have been identified as growth inducing. Of the available pool of 6,761 PAOTS, 2,000 should be targeted for expansion of boating facilities, based on a survey of the marinas. Marina operators supplied information on their present use and projected levels of expansion. All available slips were rented this summer. Photographs taken in the afternoon on Labor Day weekend (9/6/87) show that on a high use day about one third of the boats occupying commercial facilities may be in use at one time. The committee recommends three persons per boat should be assumed. Therefore, the PAOT allocation for marinas should be one PAOT per slip, based on slip use alone. Additional uses at marinas could raise the number of PAOTS required, but this should be addressed through the marina master plan criteria.

In addition to the PAOT allocation, marinas require an approved master plan before expansion can be permitted. An alternative method for measuring marina capacity may be derived in the process of developing the criteria for marina master plans. Marinas in community plan areas must be consistent with community plans.
Winter day uses: Winter day use PAOTs are reserved for downhill ski area expansion. These PAOTs have been and should remain allocated in the PASs. Ski areas require an approved master plan before expansion can be permitted.

Overnight uses: A pool of 1,000 overnight PAOTs for campgrounds, group facilities, and RV parks should be established which private developers may be eligible to draw from and which can be used in Plan Areas where no PAOTs for additional overnight facilities have been assigned. (The committee recommends the criteria in Appendix A for establishing eligibility to draw on the pool of PAOTs for overnight facilities.)

SUMMARY:

Developed Outdoor Recreation Uses: Developed outdoor recreation as defined in Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances includes beach recreation, boat launching facilities, cross country ski courses, developed campgrounds, golf courses, group facilities, off road vehicle courses, outdoor recreation concessions, marinas, recreation vehicle parks, riding and hiking trails, rural sports, skiing facilities (downhill), snowmobile courses, undeveloped campgrounds, and visitor information centers. Permissible uses are listed in the Table of Primary Uses, and each use is defined in Chapter 18 of the Code of Ordinances.

PAOT Limitations: PAOTs should be allocated for developed outdoor recreation facilities according to the following standards:

1. Developed campgrounds, group facilities, and recreation vehicle parks require overnight PAOTs. Most of the overnight PAOTs are assigned in the PAS. Unassigned PAOTs from the pool may be allocated to projects in any Plan Area where the proposed project is a permissible use.

2. Skiing facilities (downhill) require winter day use PAOTs. These PAOTs are assigned in the PAS.

3. Visitor information centers and off-road vehicle courses require summer day use PAOTs.

4. Marinas and boat launching facilities require summer day use PAOTs.

5. Beach recreation, outdoor recreation concessions, golf courses, and rural sports not operated by urban recreation providers require summer day use PAOTs.

6. Riding, hiking, and bicycle trails (and their supporting facilities) and undeveloped campgrounds do not require PAOTs.

7. New regional cross-country ski and snowmobile courses should be planned in conjunction with existing or new summer day use facilities to promote their year round use. PAOTs should apply only to new summer day use capacity.

Five Year Recreation List: Developed recreation except riding and hiking trails are subject to the five year list unless they have approved master plans.
Master Plans: Master plans are required for downhill skiing facilities and marinas. Master plans are encouraged for the other uses where appropriate.

VII. THE FIVE YEAR LIST

The five year list pursuant to Chapter 33 should be a component of a five year recreation plan which would integrate recreation development until a Basinwide recreation program is established.

1. The list should contain the list of proposed recreation projects. If applicable, it should include the project PAOT requirement.

2. The list should include Plan Area maps with the location of proposed projects.

3. The list should include the assignment of all PAOTs by PAS for summer day use, winter day use (ski facilities), and overnight use.

4. The list should include the pools of PAOTS available for summer day use and overnight use.

5. The list should contain a running tally from project to project or amendment to amendment of the available PAOTs assigned in the PAS.

6. The list should contain running tallies of the PAOT pools available for summer day use and overnight use.

For informational purposes only, the status of recreation projects which are exempt from listing should be provided with the list. The information should be updated annually. Master plans should be reevaluated periodically.

VIII. RECOMMENDED RULES CONCERNING PAOTS

1. Definition of PAOT (people at one time): the number of people that a recreation use is designed to accommodate at a given time, a measurement of recreational design capacity. Instantaneous capacity is another term with a similar meaning which is sometimes used in recreation planning.

2. Winter day use PAOTs should apply to downhill ski facilities and should be subject to the 12,400 PAOT target/limitations as set forth in the PAS. Ski areas should be subject to the master plan requirements of Chapter 16. PAOT capacity for ski areas should apply to the design capacity taking into consideration access limitations of parking and transit, lift capacity, ski run capacity, ticket sales and other factors set forth in the TRPA ski area master plan guidelines.

3. Summer day use PAOTS should apply to state park and recreation areas, and federal lands for developed recreation facilities: day use areas, beach recreation, marinas and boat launching facilities, golf courses, off-road vehicle courses, outdoor recreation concessions, rural sports, and visitor
information centers. Locally or privately developed public day use facilities, other than marinas and boat launching facilities, and visitor information centers, should be considered urban recreation and not subject to PAOT limitations. The master planning process for marinas should address consistency with the capacity targeted for marinas and boat launching facilities.

4. Overnight PAOTs should apply to developed campgrounds, group facilities, and recreation vehicle parks. Local governments and private operators should be eligible to draw on a pool of 1,000 PAOTs through established criteria which focus on the need for provision of outdoor recreation. The pool would consist of PAOTs previously assigned to various Plan Areas where the Forest Service had long range plans for overnight facilities. These facilities have been identified as unlikely to be funded within the next twenty years, so the Forest Service agreed that those PAOTs could be made available as a pool. Overnight uses which would function as tourist accommodation units should be eligible for the provisions relating to the transfer of tourist accommodation units.

5. Properties acquired by the California Tahoe Conservancy for local operation should be considered urban recreation and not subject to PAOT limitations.

6. Dispersed recreation and supporting facilities should not be subject to PAOT limitations.

7. When PAOTs are used as targets/limitations in the five year list or PAS, it should be understood they refer only to additional capacity which did not exist on the effective date of the Regional Plan.

8. When PAOTs are used for transfer purposes, it should be understood they refer to the legally existing use for the applicable category of winter, summer, or overnight recreational use.
ATTACHMENT A

Criteria for Determination of Eligibility for Allocation of Overnight PAOTs for Privately Developed Campgrounds, Group Facilities, and Recreational Vehicle Parks

The purpose of PAOTs is to reserve and allocate capacity in the Basin for developed outdoor recreation. Ordinarily, outdoor recreation facilities operated by local municipalities and private enterprise are provided for local residents and incidentally for tourists and are not subject to PAOT limitations.

Overnight facilities, while they may be used by some local residents, are chiefly directed at users coming from outside the basin. Such facilities have significant environmental impacts and are, therefore, subject to certain limitations.

Developed outdoor recreation overnight facilities operated by public agencies or nonprofit organizations are limited by the number of PAOTs which are available for that development. A privately developed facility serving a comparable outdoor recreational need and otherwise meeting the same site development standards as publicly owned developed campgrounds, group facilities, or recreational vehicle parks shall be subject to overnight PAOT allocations. Overnight visitor accommodations not meeting the test as developed outdoor recreation shall be subject to the tourist accommodation allocation limitations in Chapter 33.

A pool of 1000 overnight PACTs has been reserved for use in Plan Areas where developed campgrounds, group facilities, or recreational vehicle parks are permissible uses but no overnight PAOTs have been assigned. The pool of overnight PAOTs was derived from PAOTs which had previously been requested by the Forest Service, but which are unlikely to be funded for development within the next twenty years. Privately developed facilities shall be eligible to draw on the pool provided they meet the following criteria for developed outdoor recreational facilities:

1. The facility (developed campground, group facility, or recreational vehicle park) shall be consistent with its definition in Chapter 18;

2. The site must provide or be restored to a substantially natural setting, compatible with its surroundings. That impression must be retained to the extent feasible after development. (Examples include the Tahoe Valley and El Dorado Campgrounds);

3. The site facilities shall be designed primarily for outdoor use and furnish such equipment as tables, fire pits, and other outdoor living amenities; and

4. The site must offer access to outdoor recreational opportunities such as hiking trails, public beaches, and fishing.
MEMORANDUM

October 6, 1987

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Discussion on Recommendation of Incline Village Postal Committee

The Incline Village Postal Review Committee has recommended that a new enlarged main post office be constructed to meet the needs for improved postal delivery service in Incline Village. Currently, the existing post office in Incline Village is not able to meet the existing demand for postal services. There is a waiting list for post office boxes with approximately 300 patrons using a general delivery address, at this time. The building currently being used for the post office cannot be expanded. The Postal Review Committee has met with representatives of the U.S. Postal Service and has reviewed several alternatives for improved postal delivery in the Incline Village area. In addition, the Postal Review Committee has conducted a survey of postal patrons in Incline Village to determine their desires for mail service improvements.

The Incline Village Postal Review Committee was formed in response to the drafting of a proposal for the use of neighborhood delivery centers in Incline Village. The Committee is composed of residents of Incline Village. During the past several months, the Postal Review Committee has met with representatives of the Postal Service, Washoe County and TRPA staff to discuss the various alternatives for postal delivery. The Postal Service has made several presentations explaining their policies in regard to postal delivery in residential areas and the characteristics of, and requirements for home delivery (door-to-door and rural box delivery), cluster boxes in neighborhoods, neighborhood delivery centers and expanded, or new central postal facilities.

A survey of post office box holders in Incline Village was also conducted by the Committee to help determine the desires of the residents of the area for improved postal services. Of the 5,350 survey forms placed in the post office boxes at the Incline Village post office, a total 1,035 forms were returned (20%). The survey showed that only 27.7 percent of the responses favored home delivery, cluster box delivery, neighborhood delivery centers or no change at all. An enlarged main post office and additional space at the existing post office was favored by 72.3 percent of the respondents.
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Following their review of the information given to them, and because an expansion of the existing post office is not possible, the Incline Village Postal Review Committee recommended that a new main postal facility be constructed. They recommended that the new facility be built to the north of Highway 28, in the vicinity of Village Boulevard. The U. S. Postal Service concurs.

TRPA staff has reviewed the recommendation of the Postal Review Committee and has reviewed TRPA plans and programs for consistency with the recommendation. The 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin identified a system of sub-stations to be built in the City of South Lake Tahoe. As an alternative, the Air Quality Plan identified home delivery as a means of reducing vehicle trips.

The Postal Service prepared the USPS Action Plan in 1983. This Action Plan was developed in response to the TRPA Governing Board's concern regarding the implementation of home mail delivery within the Tahoe Basin. The Action Plan called for the construction of neighborhood delivery centers (NDC) as a preferred alternative to home delivery. The Action Plan sought to reduce VMT in the Tahoe Basin, however, the emphasis of the Action Plan is on the South Shore area. Incline Village was identified in the Action Plan as a possible site for an NDC. The Action Plan did not identify the number of facilities to be built in Incline Village, nor did it identify any specific locations.

The Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, Goals and Policies, calls for a change in mail delivery mode. The Goals and Policies sets as a goal the obtaining of Basinwide neighborhood mail delivery. Consideration shall be given to other alternative delivery modes that may be appropriate for certain locations in the Basin. Based on the Postal Service Action Plan, NDCs are estimated to reduce between 45,000 to 55,000 VMT upon full implementation.

The draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the Lake Tahoe Basin includes Basinwide neighborhood mail delivery as a goal and sets as a policy, the implementation of the Postal Service Action Plan. In the event that neighborhood delivery is not shown to be successful, the RTP states, as a policy, that the Postal Service shall be encouraged to implement home delivery within defined urban areas of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Action Element of the RTP calls for the continued implementation of the Postal Service Action Plan. Several service areas, including Incline Village, are to be studied for suitable NDC locations. The Action Element also calls for an evaluation of the success of existing NDCs to determine the need to establish home mail delivery service in the urban areas of the Basin.

Preliminary staff analysis indicates that the construction of a new main postal facility in Incline Village would not be consistent with adopted TRPA Goals and Policies. Staff has not conducted an analysis to determine the impacts of a new postal facility on VMT or traffic volumes at intersections and along the highway corridors. This analysis cannot be completed until a site has been identified.

10/6/87
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Staff feels that the Incline Village Postal Review Committee recommendation for a new postal facility needs to be discussed by the APC, and that possible mitigation measures and alternatives to this recommendation be developed for further consideration.

This agenda item is for discussion only. No action is being sought from the APC at this time. If you have any questions in regard to this agenda item, please contact Leif Anderson at (702) 588-3296.
September 17, 1987

Mr. William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

Dear Mr. Morgan:

Attached is the report requested by you from the Incline Village Postal Committee as well as the letter dated September 3, 1987 to the Director Customer Service for the Reno Post Office.

After a careful review of their recommendation for a new postal facility to serve the community of Incline Village, I find that of all the alternatives offered, they have reached a reasonable conclusion. Their conclusion and recommendation has strong support from the majority of the community and will allow the U. S. Postal Service to serve the community with the best possible postal service.

The Postal Service desires to be an asset to the community in providing safe, reliable mail service. We also have a desire to be a part of improving the environment of the areas we live and work in. With all of these considerations, I concur with the Incline Village Postal Committee findings and request your concurrence and approval to pursue a location for a new postal facility at Incline Village.

We would appreciate your response no later than Friday, September 25, 1987.

Sincerely,

Jack D. Wilkins
MSC Manager/Postmaster
Reno, NV 89510-9998

Attachment
A REPORT TO THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

By the Incline Village Postal Committee

This letter/report by the Incline Village Postal Committee (hereafter referred to as the IVPC) is prepared for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as a result of a meeting held in the IVPC office September 11, 1987.

There is some urgency in this program in that the current mail facility has proven inadequate to meet the needs of the population of Incline Village.

The IVPC was formed at the behest of the U. S. Postal Service. The members were chosen at an open city meeting held June, 1987 at which eighty (80) citizens of Incline Village were in attendance. A committee comprised of eight (8) members chosen by voting precinct and geographical areas was formed to meet the needs of the community and the regulations of the U. S. Postal Service and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

The IVPC is comprised of non-paid volunteer members who have devoted considerable time and energy to bring this project to its present state. We trust our recommendations will not fall on unresponsive regulatory ears.

At a number of meetings in 1987, all forms of mail delivery were reviewed by the committee; cluster boxes, rural free, NDC's. Representatives of the county road department and the public works department (engineering division) made presentations orally or in writing regarding future forms of mail delivery and the problems that could result from these forms of delivery.

Consequently, after review, the committee decided to consult with the community regarding the community's needs and desires for postal service. To that end, the committee developed a survey which was placed in all post office boxes in Incline Village. Twenty percent of all boxholders responded to the survey. The overwhelming majority of people indicated a desire for a new, enlarged main post office facility.

After the survey was completed, the committee then began investigating ways to meet the criteria set by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency regarding their goals and policies which are: Fewer vehicle trips; less VMT; less traffic congestion; and improved air quality.

The committee believes a change in the site of the existing post office will meet the criteria by reducing vehicle trips and minimizing traffic congestion, thereby improving air quality. It would also eliminate thousand of vehicle trips that currently pass by the elementary school in Incline Village, increasing the safety of the children.
A summation of our findings was made available to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency in a letter to the U. S. Postal Service dated September 3, 1987 and reviewed in a Tahoe Regional Planning Agency meeting of September 11, 1987 (letter attached). The site recommended in our letter of September 3 meets all of the criteria set forth by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and is a site that would best serve the needs of the community.

You can count on our continued support and active participation until such time that an equitable solution can be expeditiously arrived at.

Bob Kellerer, Chairman  
Retired Captain Incline Village Sheriffs Substation

Keith Skytta  
K & K Management

Linda Stern  
Realtor  
Owner, Stern Publishing Company

Fred Blauth  
Retired Businessman

Tom Barker  
U. S. Postal Service Employee

Paula Schlegelmilch  
Northern District Director  
Nevada Federation of Republican Women

Richard Newhall  
Retired Consulting Industrial Engineer
September 3, 1987

Thomas C. Coburn, Jr.
Director, Customer Services
U.S. Postal Service
2000 Vassar Street
Reno, Nevada 89510-9996

Dear Tom:

The Incline Village Postal Committee, as directed by our postal users survey, recommends to your organization that steps be taken to provide additional box rental facilities with full service support in the form of a new main postal facility.

The postal committee, mindful of the need to reduce vehicle miles traveled to receive postal services, would recommend the following site for placement of the new facility. The location is on the southeast corner of Village and Northwood Boulevards and is approximately four acres in size.

It is north of Highway 28 and is more centrally located than the present facility. The site allows access without traveling through an elementary school zone, it is on a secondary artery, and will not effect traffic flow on Highway 28. The land is fairly level and not situated in a stream zone. It has buildable land capability.

We estimate 70%-80% of the permanent and seasonal population frequent this area several times a week. In addition, access to this area could be gained by two secondary roads.

We appreciate this opportunity to serve our community and help the postal service. We look forward to joining with you in your presentation to the T.R.P.A.

Sincerely,

THE INCLINE VILLAGE POSTAL COMMITTEE

Bob Kellner, Chairman
Linda Stern
Fred Blauth
Keith Skytha

cc: Jack Wilkins
Diane Cornwall
P.M. Incline

Tom Barker
Paula Schlegelmilch
Richard Newhall
MEMORANDUM

October 6, 1987

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Status Report on Regional Transportation Plan and EIS

At the June, 1987 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission, staff distributed copies of the Administrative Draft of the Regional Transportation Plan update. Since that time, staff has received a number of comments from the commissioners, and from other interested parties.

Where appropriate, these comments have been incorporated into the document. The RTP update, and its companion Environmental Impact Statement, are currently undergoing final in-house review, and will be sent to the printer shortly. If printed copies are available, staff will distribute the draft RTP update and draft EIS at the October, 1987 APC meeting.

Both documents will be in circulation a minimum of 60 days. The commissioners will be asked for a final recommendation at the January, 1987 APC meeting.

If there are any questions on this agenda item, please contact Leif Anderson.
MEMORANDUM

October 5, 1987

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Proposed Amendments to Subsections 20.5.B(4) and 25.2.8 of the Code of Ordinances

Recently staff learned of an unanticipated problem in the ordinances that may be counter productive to the objective of remedying existing water quality problems. As currently written, a project that is intended primarily to correct a water quality problem is subject to the excess land coverage mitigation program unless the project is required to be done by TRPA. The only means by which TRPA requires a project (or modification) is as a condition of approval of a related project or as a result of a mandatory action plan pursuant to Chapter 9. Chapter 25 requires retrofitting the project area as a condition of approval, apparently whether the project is in itself a BMP or whether it is required by TRPA. The consequence is that some projects benefitting water quality that would be done voluntarily are being deferred because of the extra expense involved.

The proposed amendments would allow a project that is primarily intended to improve water quality to be exempt from both the excess land coverage mitigation program and the BMP retrofitting requirements.

Proposed Amendments:

Subsection 20.5.B(4) Add:

The following categories of projects, if not carried out in conjunction with another type of project, may be exempt from the land coverage mitigation program:

a) Installation of erosion control facilities
b) Restoration of disturbed areas
c) SEZ restoration
d) Underground storage tank installation, removal, or maintenance
e) Hazardous waste spill control or prevention facilities
f) Sewage pump-out facilities for RVs or boats.
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Subsection 25.2.B Add:

(3) The following categories of projects, if not carried out in conjunction with another type of project, may be exempt from the requirements of Subsection 25.2.B(2):

a) Installation of erosion control facilities
b) Restoration of disturbed areas
c) SEZ restoration
d) Underground storage tank installation, removal, or maintenance
e) Hazardous waste spill control or prevention facilities
f) Sewage pump-out facilities for RVs or boats.
MEMORANDUM

October 6, 1987

To: APC

From: Staff

Subject: Status Report on Development of Code Chapters

The status report is a follow up on the chapters of the Code presented to the APC at the September APC meeting. Based on the APC discussion and later events, the staff has revised the content and schedule of some chapters. The current status for each proposed chapter is as follows:

Chapter 7 - Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities

This chapter is under review by the APC subcommittee. The committee has been joined by numerous interested parties. The chapter has been the subject of much debate. It appears that a committee-recommended draft will be before the APC in November. A December adoption is anticipated.

Chapter 10 - Structures Housing Gaming

This chapter has been drafted and sent to various interested parties. Staff has received comments from two gaming attorneys. A redraft is being prepared and a meeting will be scheduled among the interested parties to discuss the ordinance. This chapter may be before the APC at the November meeting. A December adoption is anticipated.

Chapter 15 - Redevelopment

A draft version of this chapter has been prepared, however, it will take more work. The group involved with the South Lake Tahoe redevelopment project will be reviewing the draft on October 19. A polished draft and an environmental assessment are due at the end of October and will be presented to the APC for comment in November. It is anticipated that this chapter will require an EIS which means final hearings on this ordinance will occur no sooner than February 1988.

Chapter 24 - Driveway and Parking Standards

This chapter is drafted and local jurisdictions are being consulted. This chapter is scheduled for APC review in November.
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Chapter 26 - Outdoor Advertising Standards
Design Review Guidelines

These two documents have been combined into a "scenic package" along with the Scenic Restoration Program and Scenic Highways chapter. The staff is currently working on a program to bring the entire package with an EIS to hearing in the spring of 1988.

Chapter 94 - Scenic Highway Corridors

This chapter is being incorporated into the scenic package and probably will become part of Chapter 30 - Design Standards.

Chapter 96 - Road Closures

This chapter is being withdrawn from consideration at this time. It is the staff's opinion that adequate regulation of road closure will occur though existing ordinances and MOUs with local government and state highway departments.
MEMORANDUM

October 6, 1987

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Report on Status of Identification of Indicators and Time Schedules Pursuant to Chapter 32 (Regional Plan and Threshold Review), Code of Ordinances

Chapter 32 of the Code of Ordinances establishes a process to identify the means and time schedules for attaining and maintaining the environmental thresholds (and other applicable local, state, and federal standards) pursuant to the requirements of the Compact and the Goals and Policies. The process is a rigorous one, similar to the process TRPA is required to follow annually to document progress toward attainment of the federal carbon monoxide standard.

For each threshold (or applicable local, state, and federal standard) TRPA must identify a corresponding indicator, target attainment dates, interim targets and evaluation intervals, and applicable compliance measures and document the effectiveness and adequacy of the compliance measures.

The following is a brief summary of the provisions of Chapter 32:

32.3.A Indicators. TRPA shall identify indicators for each threshold, with appropriate measurement standards (i.e., units of measurement). The indicators may be regional or sub-regional.

32.3.B List. TRPA shall maintain a list of the indicators.

32.3.C Current Status. TRPA shall list the status of each indicator and, where reliable data are lacking, shall identify a program and timetable to provide reliable data.

32.3.E Additional Factors. TRPA shall identify and report on the status of additional factors (i.e., factors in addition to the listed indicators) which may be useful in evaluating threshold attainment and maintenance.
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