MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Shute called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.

Members Present: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute, Mr. Robinson (by phone)

Absent: Ms. Fortier

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Elizabeth Hale, West Shore said she is concerned that we are pushing away some of the responsibilities that we have and that there could be improvement on the way these responsibilities are being handled.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said that Mr. Breternitz commented at the recent local government committee meeting that the local jurisdictions should be responsible for prioritizing their own air quality mitigation fees. Also, she would like to know what the changes are between the various maps that have been issued and how they will be analyzed in the Regional Plan. In addition, what sizes of properties are being proposed to be turned over to the local jurisdictions?

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said proposed changes will allow significant increases to the urban boundary. Also, recreation does not currently allow for residential use or Tourist Accommodation Units, but under the new proposal it will. She asked what area was added on the map adjacent to Northstar and suggested staff provides an overlay of the new maps onto the existing. She asked how many acres in the basin have been affected by this new zoning for residential and Tourist Accommodation Units when density has increased from 15 units per acre to 40 and how the EIS going to analyze the supply of entitlements that are constantly available. Also, she suggested that TRPA publicize the Regional Plan in the newspaper so the public is better informed of the proposed changes.

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizens Action Alliance said his comments relate to the fireside chats given by Joanne Marchetta. He is concerned about statements being made to the public that the Regional Plan Update has no increase in growth. The bonus units in the plan, (Land Use-2) should be evaluated and modified if necessary.
by the Governing Board to maintain adequate commodities for anticipated redevelopment; there are no limits to renewing TAU bonus units. There are zoning changes that are significant by changing conservation to recreation and then allowing TAU’s and residential uses in recreational property.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said she has not seen any offsets for more parking, cutting trees, coverage, etc. in the proposed plan.

Mason Overstreet said Friends of the West Shore would like to request a thirty day extension to the comment period of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Carl Young said the League to Save Lake Tahoe also supports a thirty day extension to the comment period of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Aldean moved approval. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES & ACTION SHEETS FROM PRIOR MEETING (S)

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 10, 2012, minutes as presented with minor clerical corrections. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 24, 2012, minutes as presented with minor clerical corrections. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 26, 2012, minutes as presented with minor clerical corrections.
Mr. Shute abstained.
Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 31, 2012, minutes as presented with minor clerical corrections. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the February 1, 2012, minutes as presented with minor clerical corrections. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 24, 2012, action sheets. Motion carried unanimously.
Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 26, 2012, action sheets. Mr. Shute submitted his dissents to staff and requested they be included with the action sheets. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the January 31, 2012, action sheets. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the February 1, 2012, action sheets. Motion carried unanimously.

V. PLANNING MATTERS

Mr. Stockham provided an overview of today’s topics of discussion.

Discussion on a Biomass Prohibition

Mr. Patching provided an introduction to the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Marchetta said she wants to be clear that staff’s position on this is that we did not feel it was appropriate at the staff level to make a categorical statement about uses that should be excluded in the basin. We felt that it was a Board function to debate that type of categorical exclusion on use.

Ms. Aldean said it is somewhat of an exaggeration to say that we do not have scientist on staff. She asked if staff has consulted with the Tahoe Science Consortium (TSC).

Ms. Marchetta said she cannot answer the details to what degree we may have consulted with scientist at the TSC, and said staff can follow up on that. On one hand, you do not want pile burning in the basin because of air quality complaints, but what are the options to control air pollutants.

Mr. Stockham said the existing TRPA Code has regulations related to biomass facilities which are attached to the staff summary as attachment “D.” The recommendation from Mr. Patching as I understand it is to regulate biomass based on electricity output which is one approach. Code as it is written focuses on the pollutants and sets limits on those pollutants and from a policy stand point, focusing on the amount of the pollution generated may be more effective than the amount of electricity generated.

Mr. Shute said in the staff report it specifies that any emissions that exceed the
levels in table 65.1.6-2 would require that a project be denied, but the language in sub item 2 says anything that exceeds those limits shall be considered to have a significant adverse environmental impact; which would then mean an environmental review document but not denial.

Mr. Stockham said the last sentence in sub item 2 says “new stationary sources that have a significant adverse environmental impact shall be prohibited.” As we understand it they work together to prohibit any emissions above those limits.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Liz Harrison, Nevada Division of State Lands is speaking on behalf of both State Lands and the Division of Forestry. She said they do not support a flat prohibition of potential sites; and facility operations should be evaluated on an individual bases for impacts of the environment, economy, traffic and infrastructure given specifically proposed technology and feedback sources. As the technology continues to advance the cleaner the operation becomes.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said she does not have a problem with using the word “prohibition” because as the science improves we can amend things.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore said he endorses previous comments made by Mr. Patching. He said this is the perfect opportunity for TRPA to collaborate, and work with the community. He urged staff and the committee to consider their comments.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said burning is burning and you will get emissions. It is a long ways out before we can burn wet wood and get emissions that are breathable. Public health is one of TRPA missions and there are a number of inversions in the basin both winter and summer.

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizens Action Alliance said they have done a lot of research on the North Shore about the proposed one to three megawatt biomass facility that was being proposed for the production of primarily electricity. After reviewing documentation for Placer County’s prescribed burns and permits, we saw that there was a discrepancy. The Kings Beach and Tahoe Vista area is where the primary impacts would be felt; there was enough open burning on the average year for 3 days of fuel for that power plant, extending it to Tahoe City, 6 days per year of fuel, and Tahoma 12 days of fuel for a power plant. This is the average amount per year of actual open burning that occurred. He said he supports the proposal to prohibition proposal.

Roger Patching said Mr. McClure has pointed out the reason for the 100 kW sighting and it does not have to do with the production of electricity, it has to do
with the quantity of fuel that is available. All you can feed into a plant is 100 kW, and there is not enough fuel out there. Pile burning is a significant source of air pollution and new technologies, presumably biomass burning that would reduce those impacts should not categorically be prohibited. The fire and forest personal do a good job with prescribed burning, open burning, etc., which is why a power plant would never be sustained. The TRPA previously made the right decision about a biomass facility and we urge you to continue with that decision.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Sevison said he resents the allegations against Placer County for trying to build a facility which was approved by the EPA and to comply with a federal grant they had received. He does not support biomass, but he does support staff’s proposed language. He said he does not agree with tying your hands on the future; if there is ever a chance to build a facility, science and technology would have to show that it can stand on its own ground.

Ms. Reedy said that she takes offense to the name calling during public comment and the offensiveness of the presentation. She said she has been involved in similar power issues with the State of Nevada and in the long run it was not financially viable and it was shut down. She is concerned with people wanting the energy and to live in a certain area, but wanting to be exempt from the things that make it workable. The discussion today is to whether or not to potentially allow for a biomass facility should the technology support it. No matter at what level these are tough decisions, we make them based on the information before us and whether it is a scientist on staff or other scientist it is what we look at. She said she will probably going to support the prohibition because we have more pressing issues and hopefully in the future technology will be better.

Ms. Aldean said “prohibition” presupposes that technology will never improve to such an extent that these facilities are deemed to be environmentally acceptable. We also have an existing ordinance that would have to be amended. The word “prohibition” is too definite and does not entertain future options. I agree with Ms. Reedy that we have a lot of other controversial issues that we are going to be debating. She said is it right that people are restricted from burning in their fireplace or have to buy special stoves that reduce emissions and yet the Forest Service is openly burning. We need to keep an open mind with respect to development of future technologies that might render that unnecessary. She suggested leaving the language in Air Quality-1.6 and would recommend to the Governing Board that we suspend the approval of any additional or further biomass plants pending further research.

Mr. Robinson said that he is against an outright prohibition and agrees with Ms. Aldean’s comments. He said if we keep the existing policy, nothing abrogates the
local and State regulations, they remain there.

Mr. Shute said he supports approval of this proposal because the legitimate reason for a facility would be that it would burn organic material generated in the basin, and it seems that there is not enough material generated in the basin to support this scale of plant. Also, there are legal issues with barring the import of material from other places. If it is said that there is going to be a restriction, it may be unenforceable. I have also had personal experience with biomass facilities in Alameda County, where the people voted to ban biomass facilities because of their toxic emissions as well as air quality emissions. I have not seen a letter like this that represents the unanimity of opinion that this does and it warrants approval. When technology supports this, wording can be modified.

**Mr. Shute moved approval for language as proposed by the environmental organizations.**

**Ayes:**  Ms. Reedy, Mr. Shute  
**Nays:**  Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Robinson  
**Abstain:**  None

Ms. Aldean suggested an alternative motion which would suspend the approval of biomass plants pending the further research and improvement of technology. She does not want to preclude the possibility that there could be a situation in the future where you may have a mini biomass plant, windmills, solar panels, etc., that are specifically designed for individual use.

Mr. Stockham asked if this would be all biomass facilities or the 100kW limit and would there be a size limit. He also asked if this topic should be added to the to-do list.

Ms. Aldean said we have an existing ordinance that would have to be amended to recognize this suspension of approvals. We could add it to our list of priority projects, but I would not establish it as high priority because it is not something which we have a lot of control.

Mr. Stockham said that is fine if it is not on the list, staff just wants clarity on the size limitation for this suspension; which is a form of a moratorium for a period of time. He also asked if it should go on the work program.

Ms. Aldean said her inclination would be not to link it to electricity generation but just make it a suspension of all biomass plants.

Mr. Sevison said the justification for that is you may have a joint facility with natural gas and biomass in conjunction with one another. By having a limitation, it may be counterproductive with a joint facility.
Mr. Stockham said staff understands the intent of the motion to be that we would not process any biomass plants regardless of size.

**Public Interest Comments & Questions**

Roger Patching said he agrees with Mr. Sevison that future technology might be such that it may be warranted. He said a suspension is adequate and we can monitor the situation.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore said he would like to thank the committee for the respect to all the groups and apologized to Mr. Sevison. He said he hopes that there will never be natural gas in Tahoe.

**Ms. Aldean moved approval to suspend the approval of any future biomass plants in the Tahoe Region of any size pending further research to address their environmental impacts.**

Mr. Robinson asked for a roll call vote.

**Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute**  
**Nays: Mr. Robinson**  
**Abstain: None**

Mr. Shute said you can make your points without personal attacks and asked everyone to do that in the future.

Mr. Stockham provided an update on the Code working group. He said work is progressing on developing Code. Mr. Siegel representing California disagrees with some of the policy endorsements that have been made and does not want to participate with this group in Code writing to implement them. Mr. Siegel will write letters as Code updates are released. We will have the Code sections distributed in two bundles beginning later this week. In drafting Codes for the coverage chapter, we uncovered an existing inconsistency between the plan and the Code as it exists today. We believe it is an isolated situation that it applies to and we are not aware of any developments that have been subject to it. In existing Community Plan Area properties that are not currently over covered, the Code currently allows more coverage than the policy plan allows. The plan is to develop Codes in accordance with the adopted policy document as amended by the committee.

**Discussion on Sign Policies-Community Design-2.1.E**

Mr. Stockham provided an introduction to the above.  
**Committee Comments & Questions**
Mr. Shute said under E.1 off premise signs should generally be prohibited. He asked how staff determines whether it is generally prohibited or not.

Mr. Stockham said if this language is endorsed, staff will develop ordinance language to define it in more detail. The intent is to permit way finding and directional signs subject to scenic impact assessment.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

None

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Reedy moved approval for Sign Policies-Community Design-2.1.E as recommended by the local government committee.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Discussion on Air Quality Mitigation Fees-2 Implementation Measure

Mr. Stockham provided an introduction to the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Sevison asked if staff is satisfied with the proposal.

Ms. Marchetta said yes

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said it was suggested at the February 17 local government committee meeting that the list that Ms. Marchetta said was five hundred long be identified so the local jurisdictions know what is of regional significance versus what the local EIP’s are. Mr. Breternitz was adamant that he wants to understand how the committee decides the regional significance and then how the local jurisdictions by into the consensus of that list. Do to staff’s time; this may be an item that could go on the to-do list.

Nicole Gergans, League to Save Lake Tahoe said that an issue has arisen to the League’s attention. When a project is built those fees should go to mitigating those impacts and the concern is whether it is a regional project or local project, it appears the money is going to alleviate past and current impacts not the new ones. With current air quality improvement projects and no more SNPLMA funding, we
cannot fund those projects by creating new development projects that create more impacts and a cycle in which we would need more development with more impacts in order to support programs that alleviated past impacts. The League would be happy to brainstorm with staff for funding for these past impacts, but cannot support putting forth projects with new impacts that the fees would not go to.

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizens Action Alliance said Mr. Breternitz’ statement was clear as distinguished from the proposal which would set up a steady stream of funding to TRPA out of the air quality mitigation funds that go currently to the local jurisdictions. Mr. Breternitz asked why TRPA can’t ask the local jurisdictions for a portion of the air quality mitigation funds when there is a project of regional significance. He is concerned that Mr. Breternitz’ comments were not mentioned in the staff report.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Severson said in the case of Homewood, the improvement of the intersection in Tahoe City as an offsite mitigation was similar to what we are speaking about here. There would be some spillover of funding that goes beyond just the site of a project to a regional viewpoint, so there is other money than just exactly what is associated with a boundary of a project.

Ms. Marchetta said yes Homewood would be similar. She said Mr. Breternitz did ask why TRPA couldn’t go to the local jurisdictions and ask for permission to use mitigation funds. It is because the ultimate obligation to achieve regional environmental threshold standards is TRPA’s obligation. She said that in a world where the source of funding for Regional projects was diminishing, we need to find new ways of doing business, which may be to seek solutions where we could allocate the mitigation funds that we do collect to the most beneficial projects. We need to find ways to fund our alternative transit systems, that is probably going to have the most significant effect on air quality over the long term.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore said he supports Ellie Waller, Nicole Gergans and Dave McClure’s comments. He is concerned with how the local governments are going to handle taking on new projects when they are under budget constraints. He said that he would like to see the list that Ms. Marchetta spoke about and also asked if she could clarify how those decisions will be made.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said the way this is written, I feel we would have to beg the local
governments to cooperate with us to get some of our money back. If the local
governments do not have enough money by trip generation under state law they
can increase those fees themselves and use them for whatever they want. We
have to take a stand that this is money that is generated by this agency for regional
purposes under the Compact and a 50% split was a pretty generous offer. He said
he supports staff’s original proposal.

Mr. Sevison said from a practical standpoint the money comes into the TRPA
and through committees at TRPA we allocate back out the mitigation funds; the
end result will be what you have suggested. The local governments will have to
step forward and get involved in local plans, etc. as partners in administering a
TRPA plan. I do not think it will be a problem, once there is agreement on what
projects are regional in nature and have a high benefit, since some of the local
projects will be regional projects.

Mr. Shute asked if it was correct that if the fee is generated from a project in a
given jurisdiction, that jurisdiction gets that money. It may come through TRPA, but
it is not something we would hold for regional purposes under current policy.

Ms. Marchetta said that has been the rule up until this proposal. The list being
referred to is the EIP project list. Those projects are proposed by the local
jurisdictions which we work closely with and it is almost a year long process of
identifying what are the priority projects. We do this with all of the Agencies in the
basin and we also have a public advisory committee that then similarly advises on
the prioritization of those projects.

Mr. Marshall said as Mr. Stockham made clear at the local government committee
meeting, that the current Code restricts the use of air quality mitigation funds to
the jurisdictions in which they arise. This proposal would be aimed at changing
that current restriction.

Mr. Sevison said this money and any other money that is available is going to
become paramount as time goes, because there so little other money available.

Local and State Representatives Comments and Questions

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said she is not aware of any history where
TRPA has begged the local jurisdictions for air quality mitigation funds and were
turned down. There has never been an opportunity to have that conversation
because Code language is very specific. What the local government committee is
proposing provides an opportunity to have those discussions and that it does not
start it off with an adversarial number placed on what the right split would be.

Brandy McMahon, Douglas County said initially they were concerned with the
language because they are using the money to fund projects such as bus shelters and are also providing funds to the Tahoe Transportation District for transit services. She said that local governments would likely support a project of regional significance if it would help meet the thresholds and have environmental and economic gain for the basin. We want the ability to work with the TRPA through the EIP program on how the funding should be used. Douglas County supports the proposed language from the local government committee.

**Committee Comments & Questions**

Ms. Aldean said she questions why the word “potentially” is being used if the objective is to allow it pending conversations between local government and TRPA. She suggested removing “potentially.”

**Mr. Sevison moved approval for Air Quality Mitigation Fees-2 Implementation Measure as recommended by the local government committee with modifications.**

Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean
Nays: Mr. Shute
Abstain: None

**Discussion on Implementation**

Mr. Stockham provided an introduction to the above.

**Committee Comments & Questions**

Ms. Aldean asked if adaptive management would be a fifth subelement after monitoring and evaluation.

Mr. Stockham said those topics are addressed under the monitoring and evaluation subelement. It could be organized differently if the committee desires.

Ms. Aldean said this is not a static system.

Mr. Hester said when you get to the last new policy that Mr. Stockham was referring to (ME-5), that is trying to capture the adaptive management process and suggested it could be a separate sub heading at that point.

Mr. Stockham said the plan introduction overall features that concept prominently and staff could capture it here more thoroughly.

Mr. Shute said under inter agency partnerships on VII-1, it says “the partnerships needed to perform planning design contract and cost sharing and evaluation are
adapted”, he asked how they are adaptive.

Ms. Aldean said it related to adaptive management and she suggested “changeable” would be a better choice of wording.

Ms. Marchetta said implementation partners change over time, so none of these partnership systems are completely static.

Mr. Shute suggested removing “are adaptive” or “are changeable” and have it read “cost sharing and evaluation can shift over time.”

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said the removal of the sentence on page VII, “it is also a function of this element to indicate a schedule for attaining environmental thresholds consistent with the program strategies and cost specified by the Goals & Policies of the Plan.” That is backwards in terms of what the Compact says. Also, she said throughout this plan, staff has removed all of the threshold language. There is no reference to the Compact language that requires you to comply with the threshold standards. She suggested that threshold standards be added in and restore all of the threshold language that has been removed.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said on page VII-1, IAP-1.2 & 1.3 she would like to better understand what the activities are that will identified; a list of activities that have no substantial effect on land, air space or any other natural resources.

Roger Patching, Friends of Lake Tahoe said he had previously recommended cross referencing so that the public understands better the connection with the thresholds. The most important thing that should be riddled through this document is to attain the thresholds that are not yet in attainment and maintain the ones that are.

Ms. Aldean said there has been similar discussions in Land Use, there was a direct statement regarding the attainment of environmental threshold carrying capacities as part of that introduction. It identifies the achievement of the thresholds as being the primary goal. The intent was to simplify this document and make user friendly. She has no concern with the elimination of the language.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said she agrees with what Ms. Aldean is saying, but in IAP-1.52 on page VII-2, it says “no project may be approved unless it is found to comply with rules, regulations and ordinances.” In the last sentence it says all they have to do is not exceed the environmental thresholds there is no achieving or maintaining.
Mr. Marshall said this is existing language and the findings regarding projects as opposed to plan amendments have to do with exceedence of thresholds.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said he wants that to be clear that this is language from the Compact that pertains to approval of projects, not plan, plan amendments or Code ordinances. In page VII-2, 1.5 it says “no project may be approved”, the text of it says “to ensure that there must be findings to be adopted that ensure that they won’t adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan and not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.” The concept of not exceeding the thresholds is embodied in that policy. He suggested it would be better to put in the heading.

State and Local Representatives Comments and Questions

None

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said the proposed changes are to delete “are adapted and” page VII-1 and putting reference to not exceeding the thresholds in the bold type in IAP-1.5

Mr. Stockham asked if at the end of the small text “and will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded” is the language to be put up in the bold text.

Mr. Marshall said it should read “no project may be improved unless it is found to comply with the Regional Plan, not exceed thresholds.”

Ms. Aldean moved approval Implementation IAP-2 with modifications.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Ms. Aldean said Ms. Waller commented earlier that there was confusion on what the exempted activities are and asked if they were spelled out elsewhere in the plan.

Ms. Marchetta said yes they are and in general, there is a chapter of the Code that outlines the criteria for exempt and qualified exempt activities.

Discussion on Development and Implementation Priorities
Mr. Stockham provided an introduction to the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said on page VII-4, second paragraph where is says “reduction in nutrient loads to Lake Tahoe”, he asked if that should be more broad to include TMDL and all pollutants.

Mr. Stockham said nutrient covers phosphorus and nitrogen and maybe beneficial to add “fine sediment” to be consistent.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said in the same paragraph it is referenced “periodic monitoring of progress toward threshold standards” and asked if the definition of “periodic” needs to be more specific.

Ms. Aldean said you could take it out and it would not alter the meaning.

Ms. Marchetta said we have close to two hundred indicators so they are not all monitored on the same schedule. She said if we removed the word, it would still be equally descriptive.

Ms. Aldean said if you remove the word “periodic” and say “provides for monitoring”, it is at whatever level it is feasible. She suggested we strike it. She suggested modifying the language in DP-1.2 to read “to approve a project on a parcel rated and ranked by IPES the parcel must be served by a paved road, water service, sewer service and electric utility.”

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said in the last sentence where it says “ordinances shall set forth provisions for the waiver of the paved road criteria.” Why would a project be approved that is not on a paved road? This is a water quality issue. She suggested removing the waiver language.

Ms. Aldean asked staff for an explanation on what would constitute waiving that requirement.

Mr. Stockham said it would be a seasonal use type road.

Mr. Marshall said when you include “an electric utility” it may be that everything is served, but do we want to require that everyone obtain their electricity through a utility.
Ms. Aldean suggested the term “electrical service” in order to eliminate the reference to utility.

Lew Feldman said the paved road issue is probably a Forest Service issue on the summer home tracks, and it is my understanding of why it is included in the Goals & Policies.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista has lived on unpaved roads and asked if her home burned down and the County did not do the erosion control project, she would still live on a dirt road. She asked if this is applicable, is a project a home or a project a project.

Ms. Marchetta said the majority of the parcels in the basin were built before this Regional Plan was written. This was written for approval of new projects as of 1987.

Mr. Shute said anyone living on dirt roads that are not putting forth a project, there is nothing to worry about, but a new project would have to be on a paved road unless it has an exemption.

Mr. Stockham said paved roads are generally required by section 32.3 of the Code. There are five items that could permit a waiver.

Steve Buelna, Placer County asked staff if this would have an impact on what Placer County had previously agreed to in revisiting the IPES calculation.

Mr. Stockham said this is a non-consequential deletion and the IPES issue is addressed under the last policy dealing with future work programs.

Mr. Shute said the proposed modifications are to add “fine sediments” in the second paragraph of DP-1 Introduction, and making the corrections suggested by Ms. Aldean in 1.2 and removing “periodic.”

**Ms. Aldean moved approval on the Development and Implementation Priorities with modifications.**

**Ayes:** Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** None

**Discussion on Implementation Goal-DP-2 and related policies**

Mr. Stockham provided an introduction to the above.

**Committee Comments & Questions**
Mr. Sevison asked why you are going from five to four years on the evaluation.

Mr. Stockham said the federally mandated update cycle for the Transportation plan. It is built into the introduction that we would try to sync up plan amendments for the Regional Plan, Threshold and the Transportation plan.

Mr. Sevison asked if it is a formal process or just complying with reporting.

Mr. Stockham said the hope is that the scope of amendments would be more limited because of the frequency of the amendments would be increased. This ties back to the ongoing work program flow chart in the plan introduction.

Mr. Shute asked staff to explain the table DP-2 and the text. He asked if these are the numbers from the five alternatives that are being studied in the EIS. He said he missed that meeting where these were discussed and wanted to confirm that there was not a decision made to select any one of them.

Mr. Stockham said that is correct and presumably before a final plan is adopted, specific numbers will be chosen for each of those topics.

State and Local Representative Questions and Comments

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said Policy DP-2.2, outlining the total numbers of residential units, CFA and TAU’s and DP-2.3, gives policy direction on the annual release of residential allocations and CFA and DP-2.4, gives policy direction related to the recreational uses, but I do not see any policy direction on the allocation of TAU’s.

Mr. Stockham said that was an oversight on staff’s part, the intent would be to deal with this and the other topics under DP-2.3 and in the Implementation Measures in the Land Use element.

Mr. Marshall said he also thinks that TAU’s are unlike residential allocations and CFA in that they were not metered out over time. DP-2.3 went to the metering of development allocations.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe asked if there should be policy language that clarifies that.

Mr. Stockham said actually Mr. Marshall is correct, there basically are no TAU’s to distribute, they are used up and can only be developed through transfers or by earning bonus units with other activities.

Mr. Marshall said there may be some, but they are not held in an allocation system.
There is not an annual allocation of TAU’s for example, where there is for residential and CFA is released over time.

Hilary Roverud City of South Lake Tahoe asked if TAU’s were allocated through the Community Plans.

Mr. Marshall said he would have to explore that.

Lew Feldman said there were a handful of TAU’s allocated in community plans and then there 200 TAU’s set forth in the special projects provision. They were not metered out based on the same criteria that were applicable to residential units and CFA.

Mr. Shute said the intention of this provision is that if performance toward the attainment of thresholds is not what it ought to be, that the rate of release would be reviewed. He feels that should include TAU’S because even if they are not periodic, there is a bonus provision for those.

Mr. Stockham said there are no standard TAU’s with TRPA to distribute in the future.

Mr. Shute said there are bonus TAU’s.

Mr. Stockham said there are bonus TAU’s, but those can only be earned through transfer ratios, etc.; it is a separate system of metering out of new development. He suggested it be addressed under a separate policy.

Mr. Shute asked if there should be a similar provision with respect to all of the density bonus provisions and that those ratios would be revisited if threshold attainment is not being achieved.

Mr. Stockham said bonuses and transfers are dealt with under Goal-3, but Mr. Shute’s suggestion would be a policy difference from what was already discussed.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ann Nichols, said there are bonus units for the set projects, she asked if that a different pool, there are the units that are allotted in each community plan for TAU’s. How many are left from the Community Enhancement Program that have not been used.

Elizabeth Hale said on page VII-9, second paragraph, “TRPA shall consider the need to make adjustments in one or more of the following areas” is a watered down. She suggested replacing “consider” with “make.”
Ms. Marchetta said we are trying to write a one size fits all provision for nine categories of thresholds. To say that we shall make adjustments in these areas; these may not be the areas where adjustments are needed. The discretionary language about we need to consider adjustments in the appropriate areas.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said on the chart of alternatives there are 661 remaining in the plan, and it needs to be studied what the potential of the 600 additional are. If the study results in being too many can that number be reduced? A question from Mr. Sher that if it is in alternative 3, and zero or up to 600 results in a better number, will that number be changed?

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said it is her understanding that there were TAU allocations made to the community plans and that there are 254 unused. I believe that the staff’s proposal in Land Use was that everything that was allocated to community plans in the past would remain. But moving forward in some areas, there will be replacement of community plans with area plans. She suggested some policy language to clarify that.

Mr. Stockham said I think that policy direction is pretty clearly stated under Land Use-2 Implementation Measures. TRPA today does not have TAU’s to distribute aside from the bonus units.

Ms. Aldean asked Mr. Stockham if he is referring to the statement under Land Use-2, where it says “residential bonus units and tourist bonus units that have not been awarded shall be held by TRPA and used for development transfer matches and existing bonus unit programs.”

Mr. Stockham said that one deals with bonus units moving forward, he said some clarification would help on the third open bullet on page II-20, “all allocations and CFA that have been distributed should be retained.”

Ms. Aldean said there are also “all past awards of bonus units to plan areas should be honored regardless of whether or not development approvals within those plan areas have expired”, which is also under Land Use-2.

Mr. Stockham said it does not specifically call out tourist units, but the understanding of that direction is that it is all commodities that have been distributed would stay where they are at.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said that the conservation community worked with staff to produce an alternative Regional Plan and the allocation table that we provided is substantially different than any of these alternatives. We ask that you recognize that and suggested putting their numbers back into your preferred
alternative.

Mr. Stockham said there are 254 remaining tourist bonus units from the 1987 plan. That is the full universe of tourist units that are out there that have been allocated either through the transfer program or to community plans. There are no other TAU’s that are not associated with a development on the ground today.

Mr. Sevion said you have to create the units as you go along, they are not there automatically.

Mr. Stockham said there are two options; the 254 bonus units that can be earned through various mechanisms, aside from the 254, you would have to buy a different tourist accommodation to get those units.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said Ms. Aldean spoke about all past awards of bonus units on page II-20 of Land Use. In Placer County’s preliminary plans of community planning is going to combine plan areas, and asked if we will have different Community Plan boundaries. If there are two separate entities (North Stateline and Kings Beach) that are going to be combined, will the bonus units become one set that they would still have in the new local plan?

Mr. Sevion said initially the bonus units go to the jurisdiction and then will be reallocated out plan by plan.

Mr. Stockham said that is correct.

Mr. Sevion said to answer Ms. Waller’s question, the allocation will be on a community by community bases as part of the community plan.

Mr. Shute said an example that if Kings Beach has 22 TAU’s and Tahoe City has zero and the plans are combined, can any of the 22 be used in the other geographical area?

Mr. Stockham said for purposes of this update they stay where they are at. If there was a proposal to shift them geographically within an area plan that would need to be addressed as part of that area plan.

Ann Nichols said the 90 bonus tourist units on the chart have been reserved or allocated and asked if that is that part of the 254 on page VII-10? She said that North Stateline Community Plan is part of Washoe and Placer County and Washoe County does not want to combine community plans any more.

Mr. Hitchcock said the 90 that Ms. Nichols is referring to are the TAU’s that are assigned to the two CEP projects, Homewood and Boulder Bay which have been
approved. The 90 is not part of the 254. The 254 is unused, unallocated TAU’s.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said in 2.1, “TRPA shall consider the need...” and is watered down from “shall” and suggested “shall consider making.”

Mr. Stockham said in 2.1, the new language would be “TRPA shall consider making adjustments.”

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said on page VII-14, DP-2.4 it says “The development of additional outdoor recreational uses shall be identified in the Code of Ordinances.” She would like to know what additional long range and short range programs.

Mr. Shute asked if the any of those are currently identified in the Code or is it on the to-do list.

Mr. Stockham said this is existing carry over language that would remain unchanged dealing with recreational uses.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean moved approval for Implementation Goal DP-2 and related policies (pages VII-9-17) with modifications.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Discussion on Implementation Goal DP-3 and related policies

Mr. Stockham provided an introduction to the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said in DP-3.1, sub paragraph B, bonuses units shall be prioritized for projects within community plans, town centers, the regional center and the high density tourist district. Other benefits to consider shall include the extent of coverage planned, transportation improvements, water quality improvements and scenic improvements.” She assumes this Code is for reduction in VMT. She has brought this up before about pieces of property that may be located on main thoroughfares that do not fall into one of these categories; but it is strategically placed in terms of availability to essential services, which is something we have not
mentioned. If we want to reduce VMT then she suggested adding to the list of considerations.

Mr. Stockham said Ms. Aldean’s point is one of the reasons that “granted” is replaced by “prioritized.” Under the current Goal & Policies is area plans are authorized to establish transfer ratios for unique situations. He said what Ms. Aldean has described is a unique situation than a general rule.

Ms. Aldean asked staff if the availability of essential services should be added to the criteria as benefits that might be used in evaluation, given location in terms of prioritizing it. “Existing buildings should be removed.”

Mr. Stockham said that would be a good consideration.

Ms. Aldean said in DP-3.3, sub paragraph a, it says “existing commercial floor area may be transferred to designated areas with approval of TRPA. The buildings shall be removed...” This sounds like the buildings that were going to be built using the commercial floor area. She suggested a language modification to say “existing buildings shall be removed” or “the buildings on the sending parcels shall be removed and the site restored.”

Mr. Shute said in DP-3.1, “transfers of residential development and residential development rights to parcels in areas designated as receiving areas shall be encouraged...” He asked what could currently be designated as a receiving area.

Mr. Stockham said hold over community plans, and will ultimately be town centers, regional centers and high density tourist district. Area plans as the policy is written now are authorized to establish alternative transfer ratios, but the justification for those would have to be done with the area plans. There may be additional areas, but are not currently identified.

Mr. Shute said it would have to be in an area that is already semi urbanized or adjacent to such an area. He asked how broad designated areas can be.

Mr. Stockham said there is specific language in the Land Use section. The applicable Wording is, “also allow conforming area plans to establish alternative transfer ratios based on unique conditions in each jurisdiction as long as the alternative transfer ratios are determined to generate equal or greater environmental gain compared to TRPA transfer ratios.”

Mr. Shute asked when soft coverage can be converted to hard coverage under existing rules.

Mr. Hitchcock said currently single family residential structures. It has to be legally
existing soft coverage.

Mr. Stockham said the new implementation measure that was endorsed that allowed 1.B, soft coverage to be converted to hard as well.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said in DP-3.4, page VII-18, “hydrologic area” is removed, and she understands that was decided in the Land Use element, but is bringing it up again that hydrologic zones should not be crossed.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said in DP-3.2.B, page VII-18, there does not seem to be any end in sight. The units that can be granted as bonus units, and in the chart there are units that have already been granted as bonus units and there are other bonus units with no limits on where they can be moved. She suggested this should be rewritten and made clear to what happens where and with what for bonus units.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista asked what approval level of TRPA is required for existing tourist accommodation units to be transferred to designated areas in DP-3.2.A.

Mr. Shute asked what are the criteria for a “designated area” in DP-3.2.A

Mr. Stockham said the receiving areas are defined in Code as it is amended and these are written to reflect the full range of bonus unit opportunities that exist under the current plan. What are being modified under policies that have come to this committee are additional bonus units related to transfer of development rights.

Ms. Aldean said if we are going to change the verbiage in DP-3.3.A to have more clarity as to where the buildings are that need to be demolished. She suggested adding similar language “the buildings on the sending parcel shall be removed.”

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Steve Buelna, Placer County said in DP-3.3.A, there may an instance where you are transferring the commercial floor area off, but perhaps a public service use or another use that does not require CFA would still be in the building. Based on this language the building would still need to be removed.

Mr. Stockham said that was a drafting decision by staff in accordance with the policies on transfers of development rights. To get bonus units which is additional CFA above what you are moving. The requirement under the endorsed policies is to restore the sending sight to a natural condition. It does not prevent the transfer of
CFA, generally bonus units would not be awarded for those transfers if restoration
does not occur. This is consistent with the Land Use policy.

Ms. Aldean said Mr. Buelna has a good point that if there is more than one building
and the requirement that the building they remove and the site restored may only
apply to the building that is donating the CFA; there may be other structures on the
parcel that are not included and suggested clarifying language to say “the impacted
buildings on a sending parcel shall be removed.”

Mr. Stockham suggested modified language for the last sentence to read “buildings
containing the commercial floor area to be transferred from the sending parcels
shall be removed and the site restored.”

Steve Buelna, Placer County said it should also be clarified that it is for the bonus
units so they are not misinterpreted.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said she agrees with Mr. Buelna’s
comments that DP-3.3.A should be clarified to be specific to only when the
transfers associated with a bonus unit match. We want to allow CFA transfers to
occur as they have in the past, where they may not qualify for a bonus unit match.
This policy does not distinguish between transfers where there is a bonus CFA
involved or a 1:1 relocating of CFA. Also, if an area plan were in place, and the
project that involves a transfer, that could be part of the local government project
review. In DP-3.1.B, the new language stating “bonuses shall be prioritized for
projects within community plans...” is language we may get to eventually, but the
history of residential bonus units is that they have been used to facilitate
affordable housing projects and have been a useful tool. Without having a good
understanding of how the Regional Plan relates to the housing needs assessments
that are for the local jurisdictions in California as well as the overall basin wide
housing needs. In DP-3.5, asked if the 1989 level is correct since the IPES line has
changed since then.

Mr. Stockham said in DP-3.5 the language should be updated, so if the IPES line has
dropped, it would be new line as established. He said staff would provide some
modified language.

Mr. Marshall said staff needs to discuss internally prior to providing modified
language.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said in DP-3.3.A a language addition to the end
of the sentence “to a natural condition.” She asked if the existing floor area is with
or without trips.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista asked for a definition “reasonable” in DP-3.4.A, and also
“hydrologic area” has been deleted and there is still dispute if that should happen.

Mr. Shute asked staff what the intention of the language is in DP-3.3.B that Ms. Ames referred to. He said the language is vague.

Mr. Stockham said the intention is to implement the endorsed policies in the Land Use section. Each of the policies authorizes transfers of development and the specific ratios are spelled out in the implementation measures that were already endorsed.

Mr. Shute asked what this adds.

Mr. Stockham said this is not a statutorily mandated element. We wanted to build on the existing structure where there is a policy for each type of transfer program and with those the residential and tourist, there was a hole for CFA and we are trying to fill that hole. An alternative would be to remove these entirely.

Mr. Shute said there needs to be detailed cross referencing or indexing. He said it is too broad.

Mr. Stockham suggested we could add a sentence at the end to the effect of “in accordance with other Regional Plan policies and ordinances.” The intent is not to add any additional opportunities.

Ms. Marchetta said the common theme today about the Statement of policies is not specific. Statements of policy are intentionally general and then they are implemented through implementing Code. Many of the provisions that implement these are already in our existing Code. This is why it was important to bring Code forward with this plan.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance asked what the unit transfer would be, in DP-3.3.B is this an amount of square footage?

Mr. Stockham said units are defined, the CFA is in square foot, tourist units are defined as a unit with size limits, and residential unit is also defined in Code.

Lew Feldman said in DP-3.3, today, this is building on special projects provision; you can apply for CFA under the special projects provision with no match. This is trying to create some opportunity to harvest CFA from somewhere else and leverage it into a further match. If anything, this is constraining the resource because today you do not need to match it to be eligible for the special projects allocations.

Committee Comments & Questions
Mr. Shute said in DP-3.4 on the transfer across hydrologic boundaries, I had dissent ed to that before, so to be consistent, I will do it again. In DP-3.4.A, Introductory Text, to continue to supply coverage is too unconstrained, so I will be voting no. The proposed changes are as follows: In 3.2. A and 3.3.A, “for bonus CFA to be awarded buildings containing CFA to be transferred from the sending parcels shall be removed and the site shall be restored.”

Ms. Aldean asked if staff agrees with adding Ms. Ames suggestion on “natural condition.”

Mr. Stockham said we can do that, but in other places of the plan and code speak to natural or near natural condition and we are developing a definition for restoration that would specify what that entails. “Restored” is intended to a defined term in Code.

Mr. Shute asked if it is referenced in the plan.

Mr. Stockham said if we are going to include it, staff would suggest “natural” or “near natural.”

Mr. Sevison asked if the dialogue would be put in this text or will there be a definition for “restored” elsewhere.

Ms. Aldean said the intent was to add language in the two paragraphs. In DP-3.1, sub paragraph B regarding Ms. Roverud’s concern, Ms. Aldean suggested “bonuses shall first be prioritized for projects within community plans, town centers, regional center and the high density tourist district and will leave the door open for discretionary allocations.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said that would work or her suggestion would be “bonuses shall be prioritized for affordable housing projects or projects within community plans, town centers…”

Mr. Shute said he prefers Ms. Roverud’s suggested language.

Mr. Shute said on DP-3.5 the question was raised whether the January 1989 IPES rating was correct.

Mr. Marshall said staff will need to discuss this to confirm what is correct.

Mr. Stockham said staff will review this on a meeting break

Ms. Aldean said she wanted to confirm that staff had the suggestion for the addition in DP-3.1.B and 3.3.B “inclusion of availability” of essential services.”
Mr. Shute said the following are the proposed changes: In 3.1.B, the addition of “essential services”, in 3.3.A the language modification for the “existing building and restoration to a natural or near natural condition shall be restored. DP-3.5 shall be deferred until staff has further opportunity to review the IPES situation. In DP-3.1.B, “affordable housing.”

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said in DP-3.4 that soft coverage is easily restored, so now calling it hard coverage does not make sense. She said the conversation community has opposed transfers across hydrological areas.

Ms. Aldean moved approval for Implementation Goal-3 and related policies with modifications, excluding policy 3.4, Introduction and subparagraph A
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Ms. Aldean moved approval for Implementation Policy 3.4 Introductory text and subparagraph A
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean,
Nays: Mr. Shute
Abstain: None

Discussion on Implementation Goal DP-4 and related policies

No introduction provided by staff.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said in DP-4.1 it references off-site erosion and run off, what about onsite runoff.

Mr. Stockham said as Code that is in place today, requires a lot of onsite water quality work, this is carry over language. He agreed that onsite could be added.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said in DP-4.2, page VII-21, we say we are going to reduce trips, this does not make sense.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said
Mr. Shute said in DP-4.2 “The cumulative impact of such trips is significant” is a
statement of fact and not a policy.
Mr. Stockham said this is the policy language that supports the air quality mitigation program.

Mr. Shute asked if the fee includes cumulative trips or impacts.

Mr. Stockham said it is quite involved and it is generally related to additional trips or additional air quality impacts from the development. A development is not required to mitigate trips from something that is already on the ground.

Lew Feldman said in DP-4.1.A, page VII-20 the observation was made that implementing onsite and off-site erosion control is appropriate and I agree with that. He suggested that the language should read “implementing onsite and or off-site.”

Mr. Stockham said Mr. Marshall also suggested the same language.

Mr. Marshall said it is important to understand that a tenant of the regulations is that often time’s onsite mitigation will not fully mitigate the impacts of development.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said in DP-4.2 there is no qualifying language about if there is significant impacts, you cannot mitigate everything, but should a project be approved if it has significant impacts.

Coleen Shade, R.O.L Anderson said in DP-4.1 it does not preclude the opportunity to do off-site district wide or an area wide storm water or BMP’s. Even if you did have room onsite, you would want opportunities to leverage district wide types of off-site.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said if someone wanted to build was going to do all onsite treatment then they would be able to get a building permit, but if someone is going to contribute to an area wide project, which could be years out, would they get to build first and treat later? She suggested that this needs to be discussed at the TRPA.

Mr. Sevison said that will be put on staff to decide whether or not there is a greater benefit of having a project take part in a regional update or to do all you can do on site.

Mr. Stockham said to clarify the process, with adoption of this Regional Plan, area wide BMP’s are not authorized anywhere. The programs have to be developed with an area plan and a series of points that have to be addressed and will be evaluated by staff and then by the Governing Board.
Mr. Hester said it could be a situation where in an area wide project; the first development may have to oversize and get paid back later.

Mr. Shute said this is important because we have seen circumstances where developers pay into a fund to improve an intersection, etc., and it does not happen for years or at all. There should be a sense of priority, first is to have the offsite improvements be concurrent with the development of the project. He is concerned that it could get deferred and never happens.

Ms. Reedy said this is going to be an ongoing discussion and will have to be reviewed project by project.

Ms. Marchetta said in order to put the important congestion relieving projects on the ground you have to look at the Basin regionally and the project in one location may alleviate the impacts of a smaller project in another location. We cannot mitigate project by project because our transportation systems are regional and managed at a regional scale.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said that last month there was a condition put in the Homewood permit to restore the site in phase 1. We should look at a time frame not necessarily that it has to be done first, but by putting it in phase 1 to have the TAU site restored, and then it gets done as part of that phase.

Mr. Shute said this is policy dealing with Erosion and not traffic. I understand traffic can be a little more difficult. He suggested that it either be done at the time off-site or that the off-site improvement be a defined improvement that has a schedule and funding for implementation.

Ms. Aldean said if every project contributes small increments it may be years before there is sufficient money to accomplish the objective. There may be existing erosion on site that could mitigated as a result of the development. The development can have a beneficial effect as well, if it is mitigating existing conditions on the ground that is less than desirable. With diminishing funds, the best we can do is to allow private developers to help increase the amount of money available in these in-lieu fee funds so we can accomplish the area wide projects.

Mr. Sevison said there may be opportunities that we could take advantage of in most cases where a project as part of the project mitigation can do there portion of the area wide at the same time and there would be on-site and off-site.

Mr. Shute said he was not suggesting that development could not go forward, but instead if there was an in-lieu payment that it be part of a defined program and not
an unspecified fund.
Ms. Aldean said she misunderstand Mr. Shute’s intent.

Mr. Stockham said the mitigation programs are complex. The last policy of this element, based on prior discussion, staff already has direction on the to-do list to review the water quality and coverage mitigation fee programs.

Ms. Aldean moved approval for Implementation Goal DP-4 and Policies DP-4.1.B and DP-4.2 with modifications, excluding DP-4.1.A.
Ayes:  Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays:   None
Abstain:  None

Ms. Aldean moved approval for Implementation Policy DP-4.1.A with modifications.
Ayes:  Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean,
Nays:   Mr. Shute
Abstain:  None

Discussion on Implementation Financing

Mr. Stockham said there are no substantive changes.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean suggested a word change in FIN-4.2, the third sentence “to prioritize transportation improvement “priorities” should be “projects.”

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Lew Feldman said it appears that the vote was switched; in DP-4.1.A, that policy says you have to mitigate your project and 4.1.B says if you cannot mitigate the project you can pay into a fund which is what he thought Mr. Shute was opposed to. He said Mr. Shute voted to support B and voted against A, and asked if that was backwards.

Mr. Shute said he does not have any objection to contributing to water quality mitigation fund because that may have some other components to it. He was speaking about the project not mitigate its impacts by itself and count on off-site improvements that should be part of defined program.

Lew Feldman said he though A was for mitigating impacts and if you cannot then you would have choices. He said A seems to be a no brainer outcome, unless he misunderstands it. As part of project approval, he interprets A as having to mitigate
Mr. Shute said that off-site could be contributing to a fund that is undefined years from now.

Lew Feldman suggested that the language needs to be clarified. If a project comes forward, if it cannot be demonstrated that as part of the project they are mitigating their water quality impacts either on-site or off-site as part of the project, they would not get approved. The project is going to implement the mitigation on-site and or off-site, not in a future time period, the future time period would be if you cannot do that.

Mr. Shute said that is not what this says.

Ms. Marchetta asked if we had changed it to add on-site.

Mr. Shute said yes.

Mr. Marshall said that Mr. Shute’s objections would not be part of the conditions of approval.

Mr. Shute said his objections are that there is an off-site project as part of it, and does not say when or how that would ever have to be implemented.

Ms. Aldean said the clarifying term is “or.” If you cannot mitigate all the impacts on-site and or off-site in connection with a defined project, then the alternative would be to pay into the water quality fund.

Mr. Shute provided some example language “concurrent implementing on-site and or off-site measures concurrently with the project development.”

Mr. Marshall suggested language “implementing concurrent on-site or off-site erosion.”

Mr. Shute suggested that staff work on some language modifications to be brought back to the committee.

Mr. Hester suggested “concurrent with the impacts from.”

Mr. Shute said if staff returns with language that having the off-site portion of the mitigation be implemented concurrently with the project and we reopen the vote, he said he would support it.

State and Local Representatives
Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe, said in FIN-3.1, Introduction, the new situation with the Lahontan permit including TMDL there would likely be water quality improvements that the local jurisdictions carry out that do not have TRPA as a direct partner and she suggested that the wording “with oversight by TRPA” be moved to the end of the paragraph.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean provided some clerical changes.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

None

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean moved approval for Financing Goals-1, 2 & 3 and related Policies with modifications.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Mr. Stockham provided some alternative language from staff for DP-4.1.A, “implementing on-site and or off-site erosion and run-off control projects concurrent with the impact from the project as a condition of project approval and subject to Agency concurrences as to effectiveness, or.”

Ms. Aldean moved approval to reconsider the original vote on DP-4.1.A.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Ms. Aldean moved approval for DP-4.1.A as proposed by staff.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Discussion on Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Goal-ME-1 and related policies

Mr. Stockham provided an overview on the above.

Committee Comments & Questions
Ms. Aldean asked in ME-3.5, if staff’s intent to bring forward a preliminary recommendation with respect for how they should be prioritized for the Governing Board.

Mr. Stockham said that is correct.

Ms. Marchetta said this is a significant change for TRPA. We are moving away from updating a plan every 20 years and we are going to be setting priorities on an annual basis for the most important areas of the plan that we should focus on and it will become part of the annual budgeting and work plan process. Staff will look to the Governing Board to endorse those recommend priorities.

Ms. Aldean asked if we were going to study was to better accomplish stream environment zone restoration.

Mr. Stockham said it is contained within the coverage management, but we did have a separate one specifically on SEZ restoration strategies that should be added.

State and Local Representatives Comments & Questions

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe, asked if the Appendix will be fluid as all of the Code changes, EIR, etc., this list can be modified.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said flood plains are SEZ’s according to the definition established by the Soil Conservation Service, Bailey, and the 1982 Threshold report.

Ms. Aldean said most lay people make a distinction between the two and this had to do specifically with restoration of SEZ versus long term management.

Coleen Shade, R.O. Anderson said this being an appendix to the Goals & Policies Regional Plan, would that require going back into this document when you amend priorities or do you identify as an implementation measure in this document that you will have this list that would be updated annually.

Ms. Marchetta said she agrees with Ms. Shade’s suggestion.

Mr. Hester said the intent of the statement “the list of projects and order of priority shall be included in the Regional Plan as Appendix I and shall be updated and replaced annually” is for that purpose so it can be updated without having to go through a Regional Plan amendment.
Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club asked that all four elements of a scientific monitoring program be spelled out in this sentence and can provide this information to staff.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista asked what is comprised in “the Multi-Sector Basin Partnership” in ME-3.4.

Elizabeth Hale, ME-3, asked how we are going to handle noise.

Ms. Marchetta said we do monitor noise and will be reporting on the results in the Threshold evaluation report and we probably should come up with a new system.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore said he is looking for the language that is specific to SEZ’s.

Mr. Stockham said we spoke about this earlier that we need to add this item to the list of projects.

Ms. Aldean suggested a clerical change in ME-2.1.

Mr. Marshall said in ME-3.4 we were going to change “the Multi-Sector Basin Partnership” to “a Multi-Sector Basin Partnership.”

Mr. Shute said in ME-1.3, TRPA shall adjust the Regional Plan periodically on the basis of information reported in the periodic threshold evaluation report in one or more of the following areas, and asked if that is a complete list.

Mr. Stockham said he questions the value of having the 1-5 list or say “update the Regional Plan. That is carry over language from the old plan.

Mr. Marshall said on Page VII-9 DP-2.1 he list says one or more...it could just be several of the following areas. He asked if we had this in an earlier discussion.

Ms. Aldean said it was in the Implementation Element Introduction.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute suggested leaving it in DP-2.1 and remove it from this policy as Mr. Stockham suggested.

Mr. Shute said in ME-1.3, it would stop with “TRPA shall adjust the Regional Plan periodically on the basis of information reported in the periodic threshold evaluation report.” In ME-1.2, it says “based on the results of updated studies and information TRPA shall prepare a threshold evaluation report.” He asked if that was
happening on a regular basis as stated in 1.1.

Mr. Stockham said this appears to be a mistake made in drafting. Policy 1.2 as it was written addresses the topic of modifying thresholds based on the report.

Ms. Reedy said you are trying to capture if something came up in between the four years that a change could be made.

Mr. Stockham said the intent of the package is we would do a threshold evaluation every four years, the results of the evaluation may support changes to the Regional Plan, and how we are monitoring and reporting is unachievable, we would adjust the attainment standards.

Mr. Shute asked if ME-1.1 have the four year language in it.

Mr. Stockham said that 1.1 says we will do the threshold evaluation and 1.2 says based on that we may adjust the attainment standard. In 1.3, based on that we may adjust the Regional Plan.

Mr. Shute said the four years is important.

Mr. Stockham said we can reference that consistently throughout the policy.

Ms. Aldean suggested in 1.1 “the agency shall prepare threshold evaluation reports based on updated studies and information every four years to evaluate the status and trend...” and 1.2 the reports have been done and prepared the evaluation and now action would be taken to consider changes to the threshold standards.

Mr. Marshall provided modified language as suggested by staff for DP-3.5. We are updating the reference to the IPES rating above the January 1989 level. There are several uses for the IPES rating and line. There is a relative sensitivity notion so generally 4-7 is non-sensitive and lots with scores above 7 the IPES line which was 726 were considered non-sensitive. This has to do with a movement of allocations and the intent is that this is a buildable notion. Whether or not the IPES parcel is below the IPES line as it moves, you would not want to transfer allocations to unbuildable lots your lot needs to be buildable to transfer allocations to it. Instead of saying “above the January 1989 level”, staff suggested the last sentence would read “has a buildable IPES rating” and delete “above the January 1989 level.”

State and Local Representatives Comments & Questions

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe asked for clarification on the date in the middle of the paragraph.

Mr. Marshall said it defines what the formula is instead of the actual number.
Mr. Stockham said the proposed language for DP-3.5 would read as follows: Starting in the middle of the text “however no allocations shall be transferred to any parcel that is below the current IPES line for the jurisdiction of the receiving parcel.” At the end of the paragraph “the receiving parcel is in the land capability districts 4-7 or has a buildable IPES rating.”

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean moved approval for DP-3.5 with modifications.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Discussion on Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Policy ME-1.1

Mr. Stockham provided staff’s proposed modifications.

Committee Comments & Questions

None

Public Interest Comments & Questions

None

Ms. Aldean moved approval for ME-1.1 with modifications and including the modifications proposed by staff for the Introduction excluding ME-3.1.A.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Discussion on Monitoring and Evaluation 3.1.A

Mr. Shute asked if the SEZ restoration study was added to the priorities list.

Mr. Stockham said yes and it would read “evaluate SEZ restoration strategies and identify possible amendments to Regional Plan policies and or the development code.”

Mr. Shute said this constitutes the preliminary list of priority projects that can be changed under the language in 3.5.

Mr. Stockham asked if the language was already covered in a motion.
Mr. Shute said yes.  
Discussion on Draft Maps 1-6

Mr. Stockham provided an overview on the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Reedy said she is concerned because Ms. Fortier is not present today and this is a direct impact for her constituency.

Mr. Sevison suggested that this could be a starting point because as we go through the community plans there will be a lot of detailing that needs to be done.

Mr. Stockham said he has met with the local jurisdictions reviewing maps. There was one concept of maybe an additional map prepared for areas being looked at for possible changes. What I believed was decided is that we were adjusting the Land Use policies to be more clear and map changes to be done with the area plans.

Ms. Aldean said a change that we made with Van Sickle State Park and the adjacent private land had to do with the redevelopment plans for the corridor in the Stateline area. She said we have opened Pandora’s box with allowing one map change using this process. She asked if there were extenuating circumstances that mandated that we do that now as opposed to do it as part of an area plan.

Mr. Stockham said there are distinctions, and there is one Land Use change that has been opened because it is a regionally significant area. There is only one high density tourist district and there has been extensive ongoing planning involving these lands that were initially recommended to go to recreation. We felt there was some merit because it is fundamental to the most urbanized hub. How that is different is that every town center etc. has some boundary changes. If we were to entertain all of them we would have hundreds.

Ms. Aldean asked Ms. Roverud what is compelling the City to move forward so quickly.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said there is some confusion about what is being requested. We met with TRPA staff and identified some mapping areas errors and some suggestions to change the Land Use classifications to be more in line with what the existing plan area statements and community plans allowed. The City also requested some minor changes that reflected what the properties are actually being used for currently. There was confusion in what was being presented, it is difficult to tell where the changes had been made and today we
were given different maps and these are to the scale of what we were originally reviewing when we had the conversations. There are some things that are in here that are not clear on these and we should take the time to look at this map. We agree with where we want to go, but would like to discuss the boundaries of the new overlays.

Mr. Stockham said he wants to make clear at a policy level what staff has recommended. There may be map corrections on going that are needed and recommends that existing plan area statements as adopted currently remain in effect until replaced by an area plan; and any changes to this map be done after area plans which would also carry forward to the center boundaries.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said it is recognized that the plan area statements and the community plans which are our zoning maps do not change through this process. This is a Land Use classification map and these are different than what is specifically in the plan area statements in terms of what are allowed uses, etc. TRPA historically has not had a Land Use classification map.

Ms. Reedy asked if changes are made to these parcels, do they gain value. She is concerned that if we make a decision now that we are doing something that effects people on the ground and may not have enough information.

Mr. Stockham said these changes would change a residential land use classification to mixed use, which is generally recognized as an up zoning which would increase the property value.

Ms. Aldean said the map would have to be approved the by the Governing Board as part of the Regional Plan update, so we would have time for local jurisdictions to review. She asked if we were to tentatively recommend adoption would that be sufficient to give staff the flexibility to make some additional changes before it goes to the Board.

Mr. Stockham said if it is a discrepancy we should fix it and land use changes are a different matter. If we are going to include the additional land use changes in the preferred alternative it would need to be considered in the EIS. In alternative 4 of the EIS is doing extensive parcel level land use changes; the scope of analyzes of the EIS does not preclude adding in additional properties and re-designating them with the update.

Mr. Shute said he supports the staff recommendation because if you open it up to potential plan changes that are a part of the area plan process where would you stop.
Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said she is concerned with the language is written for recreation. With the definition of recreation, she does not want to see additional tourist accommodation units.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore said he is confused because there are several parks, for example Sugar Pine is now zoned as recreation and Emerald Bay Vikingsholm and it is conservation. He asked what the difference it.

Mr. Stockham said these maps reflect how the existing adopted plan area statements categorized different areas.

Steve Teshara, Sustainable Community Advocates suggested the language at the bottom right be moved to the top of the changes.

Jim Silveira, El Dorado County said they have mapped eight geographical areas that are year round full time residences and this map is showing Camp Richardson as recreation, part of Fallen Leaf Lake, etc. He said this needs to be fine-tuned because it will affect their zoning.

Mr. Shute said we have limited ourselves to discussions of this Land Use Map, and there are a number of inaccuracies. With that and the absence of Ms. Fortier maybe we should not go much further with the South Lake Tahoe portion of the discussion.

Mr. Stockham said each plan area statement goes into a lot more detail on individual parcels than this generalized map is showing. He asked that you please contact Mr. Hitchcock with any mapping errors.

Ms. Aldean suggested adding a disclaimer that the map may contain errors due to the scale.

Mr. Stockham said likes Mr. Teshara’s suggestion that organizationally we could make it clearer that plan area statements govern.

Ms. Reedy said it seems that if the maps are that important to go into the Regional Plan it needs to be correct.

Mr. Stockham said staff thought they had all corrections, but if Mr. Silveira has additional ones, staff can make corrections.

Ms. Aldean said she is assuming that a person can bring up smaller sections of this map to see their individual parcel.
Mr. Stockham said yes and staff could post a more detailed zoomed in maps.

Ms. Aldean suggested also adding to the map “for additional information on individual parcels please go to the TRPA website.”

Mr. Sevison asked about, He said it would be helpful if there were at some level to designate the publically owned parcels so it helps sort out the buildable from the unbuildable.

Mr. Hester asked if Mr. Sevison is talking about where development rights have been transferred off.

Mr. Sevison said if there were more depth into the map it would see that there are not a lot of buildable parcels available.

Mr. Hester said staff put in a grant proposal with the City and the Counties to set up a tracking and monitoring system and we could generate a map to show where there are or are not development rights.

Mr. Stockham said in addition to the Regional Plan Maps there are a series of maps that are part of the Code of Ordinances, including and IPES map and that would be an option of where to have that more detailed map.

Discussion on Draft Ratios Transfer of Existing Development Map-2-6

Mr. Stockham provided an overview of the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked if a larger fold out could be put in the Regional Plan.

Mr. Stockham said we have larger maps available on the website.

Ms. Reedy said most individuals would be using the computer to research information on parcels.

Mr. Stockham said this is all GIS based data.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Elizabeth Hale, said the angular lines between El Dorado and Placer County with the brown area seems to be way out.

Mr. Stockham said those are private lands that have not been acquired by a
governmental agency and are shown as getting a transfer bonus.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said that it is good policy that went into this map, but it is difficult with this map to verify and have comments on whether this map is accurate or not.

Coleen Shade, R.O. Anderson said on maps 2 & 3 and possibly map 6 that if these are used more for graphically illustrating how these systems work; if you use something that is more of a landscape type instead of a map then it would better represent the intent for the different types of ratios.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said on map 2 the ratios there is an unintentional consequence of not having the Tahoe Keys to have an incentive to clean up with a 1:1 ratio.

Mr. Hester said the same data that makes up the zoomed in screen is the same data that makes the generalized map. He suggested putting a disclaimer on the map for detailed parcel information that an individual would be directed to the website.

Coleen Shade, R.O. Anderson said on a land use map in the overarching document would not be appropriate to have a disclaimer on the policy directive map, but she suggested to direct individuals to TRPA’s GIS.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore said he is concerned with the inaccuracy of the maps.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said the maps that have to do with the transfer ratios could be in the Code and not in the Regional Plan.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista said on map 4, the transit proposed map the town is called out as Kings Beach, but the water borne looks like it is going to Tahoe Vista and this should be clear as to where it is actually going.

Mr. Stockham said this is supposed to reflect the Regional Transportation Plan and staff will review the data. Staff is not sure if a hub has been determined.

Mr. Sevison said the intended hub is going to be the Conservancy property located in Kings Beach to the right of the green line coming down on the map, between the Cal Neva point in the middle of where the houses are shown.

Elizabeth Hale asked if the water borne transit would be going to the dock on Grove Street. She also asked where the parking area would be. Mr. Sevison said the parking areas probably will be designated as part of the
community plan.

Ms. Marchetta said we are moving to the level of project planning in this discussion. This is intended to generate some conceptual maps at a regional scale.

Ms. Aldean suggested we reference the maps as being “conceptual only.”

Steve Teshara, Tahoe Transportation District Board said the conceptual suggestion is accurate even though there are a number of maps that show the water borne on it, there has not been a decision on the routing.

Mr. Shute said that we can label as conceptual with a reference as to where you can get more detail on the website and put them all in the Regional Plan. Another suggestion is any maps that are not needed to describe the Regional Plan could be put in the Code of Ordinances. He said he does not have a preference.

Ms. Aldean asked if there is any compelling reason why they should be part of the Regional Plan other than the first map.

Ms. Marchetta said staff will review the accuracy of the maps if there are errors in the map they will be corrected.

Ms. Aldean said if it is in the Regional Plan Update you would have to amend the plan to change this document. If there is some language in the Regional Plan that would allow you to amend the document, then perhaps we can find the compromise that would give us the flexibility, but would allow us to integrate these into the master plan.

Mr. Stockham said that is what staff is suggesting.

Mr. Hester said we have taken some of these maps and showed them to people who are not familiar with them and the picture has been worth a thousand words to show the concepts.

Mr. Shute he asked the committee if it is sufficient to label these conceptual maps with a reference to the website for further information and having them as part of the Regional Plan.

Ms. Aldean suggested incorporating language as we did with respect to the preliminary list of work priorities so if they are incorporated into the Regional Plan we could amend them.

Mr. Hester said staff will work on language for the maps.
Ms. Aldean moved approval for Maps 2-6 with modifications.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Discussion on Code Work-Certified Contractor Program

Mr. Stockham provided an overview of the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked if the Engineers of the Certified Contractor’s would be engaged by TRPA and not the individual pursuing the land capability challenge.

Mr. Stockham said staff would intend have people needing to qualify to be on a list that TRPA would maintain and have to approve.

Mr. Shute said if staff is not going to be doing anything to flush this out right now then why do we need to address it now.

Mr. Stockham said because the Code of Ordinances as written now in several sections strictly requires that staff do an analyzes, the change would be to say staff or Certified Contractor.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Lew Feldman said for a project this base information sometimes gets in the que at TRPA and a building season can be lost because of the work load. This would be a pass through expense and seems to be long overdue and encourages the committee to embrace this.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said the City supports the idea of streamlining the project review process and the Code change that is necessary. She asked if the development of the Certified Contractors program following the adoption of the Regional Plan should be put on the to-do list.

Mr. Stockham said if this is endorsed, it would be added.
Jim Silveira, El Dorado County said with this recommendation and the MOU that El Dorado County has would change the MOU in respects to the work the County currently does.

Mr. Stockham said no, this is intended over the long term to provide and additional opportunity for streamlining and there is no intent to change the MOU.
Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Reedy moved approval for the Certified Contractor’s Program.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Discussion on Relocation of Accessory Commercial Uses

Mr. Stockham provided an overview of the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked staff to clarify paragraph 2 on page 7. She said she thought we were talking about commercial primary uses.

Mr. Stockham said they are generally tourist primary uses and is existing Code language.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Elizabeth Hale asked how many businesses would be relocated to the sidewalk.

Mr. Stockham said there are not very many of them and would be concentrated with redevelopment in the tourist districts.

Nicole Gergans said the League to Save Lake Tahoe is concerned with this proposal because our understanding is that there is a difference in designation of CFA from accessory floor space.

Lew Feldman said the area targeted is a fairly narrow and not a very vibrant streetscape. Recent projects that have accessory space have been analyzed and the amount of accessory space has been determined to be consistent with a resort hotel would typically have and is important because the ITE trip manual includes trip generation. These businesses are penalized because they are not allowed to advertise or have a separate entrance and would like to see this Code language not be so restrictive. He encourages the committee to approve staff’s recommendation.

Mr. Shute asked why Mr. Feldman said it is limited to the Casino core.

Lew Feldman said language says “created before January 1, 2013” and that is the streetscape where we are trying to bring things forward. I do not see too many other circumstances where this would apply.
Brandy McMahon, Douglas County said she supports staff’s recommendation because it will lead to what Douglas County wants to do with the South Shore Vision Plan. They are concerned with item 2.D. with regards to signage because previous conversations were that signage would be developed with area plans.

Mr. Stockham said the Regional sign ordinances prevail until they are superseded by a sign package in an area plan.

Coleen Shade, R.O. Anderson she gave some examples of where there are accessory restaurants that are not in a core area; North Tahoe Marina restaurant, Chambers Landing, Camp Richardson. She suggested that the language be modified by removing the date and add to the language that has to do with the impacts.

Mr. Sevison said the boats on the lake that serve food may also fall under this.

Hilary Roverud said the City of South Lake Tahoe supports the direction of this as we are trying to promote better design in the urban areas and relationships with the businesses. She suggested language be added to reflect relocating an accessory use to the front of the parcel where it would have a relationship to the sidewalk and pedestrian area.

Mr. Shute asked what the process would be to do this with the TRPA today.

Mr. Stockham said as it is written, it would be part of a redevelopment application.

Mr. Shute asked if there would be a review of impacts such as traffic.

Mr. Stockham said fundamentally he is not envisioning how there would be an impact because this is an existing use and is limited to relocating existing uses. Redevelopments of any significance all have an extensive process.

**Mr. Sevison moved approval for Relocation of Existing Accessory Commercial Uses.**

**Ayes:** Ms. Reedy, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute, Mr. Sevison  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** None  
**Absent:** Mr. Robinson

**Discussion on the Elimination for the Requirement for Original Signatures on Documents**

Mr. Stockham provided an overview for above.

**Committee Comments and Questions**
Ms. Aldean asked if that is only for certain documents, applications specifically.

Mr. Stockham said that is correct.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

None

Committee Comments and Questions

Mr. Sevison moved approval for staff’s recommendation to eliminate the Requirement for Original Signatures on Documents.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Robinson

Discussion to Allow Removal of Large Trees if Necessary for EIP Projects.

Mr. Stockham provided an overview for the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked what type of review process does and EIP go through for approval.

Mr. Stockham said it depends on the scope of the project.

Mr. Marshall said it is not exempt from any standard review procedures that we go through.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Coleen Shade, R.O. Anderson said she supports this recommendation.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Sevison moved approval to Allow Removal of Large Trees if Necessary for EIP Projects.
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Robinson
Discussion on Require Tapered Transition for Single-Family Home Driveway Widths

Mr. Stockham gave an overview for the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

None

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said in general the City supports the proposal, but if TRPA is trying to stay at the regional level why are they regulating the width of a driveway.

Jim Silveira, El Dorado County said these diagrams and dimensions that are stated in the Code would be in conflict with El Dorado’s Code.

Mr. Stockham said currently TRPA and local government rules both apply. Although, we are trying to stay at the regional level, however, we regulate every square foot of coverage in the region.

Ms. Aldean said have of this is existing Code language, she suggested either striking it or amend it.

Mr. Shute said we are trying to remove ourselves from small matters and he would not have an issue if this is deleted from the Code or having a standard that local governments have to follow.

Ms. Reedy asked if it were to be moved to be stricken, TRPA would then just be looking at coverage overall.

Mr. Stockham said some already endorsed policies allow area plans to have comprehensive coverage management strategies. These micro level coverage requirements can be replaced by alternative programs under area plans.

Ms. Reedy asked if removing this have an impact on threshold attainment.

Mr. Marshall said we have very detailed instructions on particularly coverage issues on design requirements. The intent was not to remove it, but to close a loop hole.

Mr. Stockham said he does not agree that this is complex, but keep in mind we have on work program a comprehensive relook at the coverage management strategies. Staff is apprehensive of taking out one section of an existing Code without reviewing all the implications. Also the EIS is well underway and would
have an impact if make changes at this point.

Mr. Shute said an important item to look at is all the annoying things that irritate the public and do not have an environmental benefit.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said this policy as it exists today in the Code is not related to coverage.

Mr. Marshall said he disagrees and this is directly related to a coverage issues.

Steve Buelna, Placer County said it has been previously determined by TRPA staff that this also relates to lengths of driveways also. He encourages staff to review what the deletion of this would impact.

Mr. Shute asked for a motion to delete the whole subject matter and direct staff to return with recommendations.

Mr. Marshall said the subject matter is defined as what?

Mr. Shute said with the driveways.

Mr. Sevison said the coverage issue takes precedence and disagrees with Mr. Marshall. He said that BMP’s are another issue for coverage.

Mr. Stockham said coverage caps the maximum amount of square footage you can cover. This tells what the minimum amount that is necessary to get to the driveway without trampling the soil. If we do not have a rule like this people will put in two strips of pavement.

Ms. Aldean asked if the local jurisdictions if they have a minimum width for driveways.

Steve Buelna said Placer County has a minimum of nine feet for single family dwellings and they do allow tandem for single family residences.

Jim Silveira, El Dorado County, said theirs are 8’ minimum.

Brandy McMahon, Douglas County said they have a design manual with standards for driveways and how this will work with our area plans.

Mr. Stockham said the local jurisdiction could propose that theirs applies and could be endorsed through the process. He said this is a current requirement.

**Ms. Reedy moved approval to delete the language to Require Tapered Transition**
Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Robinson

Mr. Marshall said we have identified what the issue is in terms of creation of additional coverage when there are no TRPA minimum standards and staff will work with our environmental consultants.

Mr. Stockham asked if this is for the single family driveway width standard only.

Ms. Reedy said this is for the single family.

Discussion to Reorganize Rules of Procedure

Mr. Stockham provided an overview of the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said some of those were deferred because there was some controversy about them and there is no list here.

Mr. Stockham said that is the purpose of putting them in here so they go out for a 60 day review process under the EIS.

Ms. Reedy asked if these were provided to the committee previously. Did we pull out the ones that were perhaps disputable and were left with a core group that were not?

Mr. Stockham said that was the full Governing Board during the Code reorganization work. Any topic that had disagreements were removed to provide additional review time.

State and Local Representatives

None

Public Interest Comments & Questions

None

Committee Comments & Questions
Mr. Sevison moved approval to Reorganize Rules of Procedure.
Ayes:  Ms. Reedy, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean, Mr. Shute
Nays:   None
Abstain:  None
Absent:  Mr. Robinson

Discussion on Assorted Clarifications of Text

Mr. Stockham provided an overview of the above.

Committee Comments & Questions

*Tape Missing*

State and Local Representatives

None

Public Interest Comments & Questions

None

Ms. Aldean moved approval for the Assorted Clarifications of Text.
Ayes:  Ms. Reedy, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Aldean
Nays:   Mr. Shute
Abstain:  None
Absent:  Mr. Robinson

Mr. Shute asked about this vote if it is the majority of the members or majority of those present.

Mr. Marshall said it would be a majority of your voting quorum. You do have considerations regarding the mixture of your committee that you can decide whether or not you want to have that is representative of a passing vote.

VI.  PUBLIC COMMENT
None

VII.  ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Shute adjourned the meeting at 4:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.

[Signature]