NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on March 14, 2007, at the office of TRPA, located at 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on Wednesday, March 14, 2007 commencing at 9:30 a.m., at the same location, the Tahoe Transportation Commission will have a joint meeting with the Advisory Planning Commission. The agenda will be as follows: 1) Public Interest Comments; 2) Approval of Minutes, (Enclosed in APC Packet). 3) Discussion and Recommendation Regarding the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) Roles and Responsibilities; (see Item VI.A); 4) Member Comments of the Commission, consisting of representatives from the following agencies: El Dorado County, Douglas County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe, the LTBMU, the TTD, one member of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, a representative of a transit service provider and non-voting Members from NDOT and Caltrans.

March 7, 2007

John Singlaub
Executive Director
AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item not listed on the agenda may do so at this time. Public comment on Public Hearing items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PLANNING MATTERS – Joint Meeting of the APC and the TTC

A. Discussion and Recommendation Regarding Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) Roles and Responsibilities

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Recommendation for Apportionment of 50,000 Square Feet of Commercial Floor Area Pursuant to Subsection 33.3.D(1)(c) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

   Status of Lay Member Appointments (APC member list attached)

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Called to order at 9:45 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Combs, Mr. LeFevre, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Harper for Ms. Krause, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Mauer, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Riley, Ms. Schmidt, Mr. Kuchnicki for Ms. Sertic, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Zuckerman

Members Absent: Mr. Harris, Mr. Poppoff,

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Harper moved to approve the agenda; however it was decided to take the Item VI.A as the first item.

The motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No Public Comment.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The January 10th minutes were approved with correction.

The January 17th minutes were approved as presented.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Discussion Regarding Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) Roles and Responsibilities.

Chair Tolhurst summarized the roles of the TTC and TTD that had been discussed at the TTC meeting earlier. The TTD will assume responsibilities over the TTC to make it a more capable of making recommendations to the TMPO. The TTD will do the implementation and the TTC will do the planning. The TTD as an organization needs to have more public input. Additional members to the TTD will be brought up for approval at the next meeting. Perhaps someone from the Forest Service and someone from APC.

Mr. Harper stated that this did not mean there was any dissatisfaction with the APC, and the Tahoe Transportation effort, but felt the planning process could be implemented in a more effective and efficient manner. He said he was prepared to make a commitment as stated in the letter, to prepare a subcommittee of TTD
members and if they can get together with APC for an action item proposal to be presented to the Governing Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Colin West of the USFS has been in the basin since 1995, and has been active in transit and transportation issues since he believes the visits to the public land contributes to the traffic problems. This makes this important to the Forest Service. Prior to that he was with Caltrans, public works and implementing agencies. He stated that TRPA is not an implementing agency, but a planning one. He feels an organization is more effective if involved in both planning and implementation. He supports the plan of combining the planning and implementation will have things happen faster around the basin.

Leif Andersen of is the non voting NDOT member of the TTC. He states that there are models around Nevada of larger MPO’s that do both planning and implementation. He said he feels like a foster child as a member of TTC, it does not seem to have a home. If TTC does not know where it belongs, under APC or TTD, it is hard to work to solving the transportation problems in the basin.

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

Chair Tolhurst stated that TTD should come up with a proposal and volunteered to be a member of the sub-committee.

Mr. Harper recommended Steve Teshara, and would like to invite Colin West or Ms. Hoefer, and the new representative from Caltrans.

ACTION ITEM

Nick Haven to coordinate to bring back a recommendation to next month’s APC meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS


Staff member indicated that there is a memo to change the staff summary, that Memo is attached to the minutes.

Mr. Brockett the consultant for Heavenly made a presentation, copies can be found at http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=4&tabid=291).

In the discussion pertaining to the Amendments to Plan Area Statement 086 and 087, concerns were raised on item #3. It was suggested that it not be removed. Mr. Zuckerman stated that the PAOTS should not be expanded without the expansion of the CTS service and that if there is a transfer of PAOTS to the Nevada side, there
would be a need to re-allocate the bus route. Mr. Harper stated that the CTS has met
the test and how would that be quantified, it is too open ended. He felt the reason
that item #3 was deleted was that the statement was moot, since Heavenly had gone
above and beyond in its contribution to the bus system and its share of the ridership
and that Heavenly should not be held responsible for the entire CTS.

Mr. Tolhurst was concerned about the parking for locals and that there needed to be
a coordinated transit policy to resolve those issues.

PUBLIC COMMENT

John Friedrich of the League to Save Lake Tahoe did not agree in PAS 087 there
should be a removal of the prohibition of new parking. He stated it would open the
potential for expansion for additional parking. The other concern was that the
prohibition at Edgewood Creek to avoid any new impacts was not lifted until the Forest
Service completed their watershed study. It appears there are some flaws in the
model, there are some improvements above the parking lot but still problems below.
He would suggest choosing the alternative that had the least environmental impact
and risk. TRPA’s own code only allows removal of old growth trees only if necessary
and there are no feasible alternatives. If it is to be lifted, the minimal amount of
development be allowed to impacts on the SEZ’s and seral growth. This is one of the
few areas that alternatives do exist to protect the fragile watershed. He asked that the
Alternative with the least amount of impact be chosen. He would ask that an
amendment be added that the minimum disturbance should be allowed in that
watershed to avoid direct impact, especially to later seral and the SEZ’s. If the
prohibition would be lifted there should be increased mitigation.

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

Chair Mr. Tolhurst was concerned in item three coordinated transit policy, like the parking
issues, the system is not working, the problem is not solved.

Mr. Strain of Heavenly responded that it is in their best interest to improve the CTS for
their guests. The system has continued to improve. It has added four new buses and
the system is free to everyone.

A motion was made to recommend to the Governing Board to approve the amendments
to the Plan Area Statements.
The motion was seconded and voted unanimously.

SUMMATION OF THE COMMENTS OF BOARD MEMBERS

Jim Lawrence asked about the how the mitigation would affect the high meadows and
the “old growth” areas and was told that the USFS had no plans for any treatment of
the meadows. He also suggested that the initial environmental documentation would
encompass what would come out of Pathway with the TMDL’s. He voted for the
recommendation of approval to the GB without favoring an alternative.

Lee Plemel stated that they, (APC), would be shortsighted if they did not consider the
long term benefits of the trade-offs in this Master Plan as it applied to the long term
benefits to the SEZ as opposed to the concern for the “Old Growth”. He also asked if this would include fire protection benefits and was informed that it would. He voted for the recommendation to the GB for approval, but did not recommend an alternative.

Teri Jamin stated that Heavenly obviously had addressed the concerns of the neighbors since there were none here. She recommended approval of the Master plan to the GB and that she would leave the selection of an alternative to them and, had no recommendation for an alternative.

Jane Schmidt voted to recommend the approval of the Master Plan to the GB, but did not favor an alternative. Ms. Schmidt stated that she did not see the need for the APC to vote at the project level since most members outside of APC have the capability to review the projects.

Bill Combs stated that in the past the APC had been able to request project review and that was part of the reason that he was “hung up” on not having any discretion on the selection of the alternative. He was not in favor at this time of Alternative 4, however, he voted for recommendation of approval of the Master Plan to the Governing Board.

Doug Smith for Ms. Kemper stated that adaptive management was the key component and that the Master Plan needs to incorporate the TMDL requirements. Mr. Smith had noted that there were technical clarifications necessary in the documents but on the whole the Lahontan staff believes the rewrite is adequate and comprehensive. The consultants had worked closely with Lahontan staff in preparing the documents.

Peter Mauer had concerns about supporting approval of the Master Plan without official recommendation of an Alternative. He did vote to recommend the approval of the Master Plan without favoring an alternative. He supports minimizing the impacts on the environment and did not think that an articulated lift was a good idea.

Mike LeFevre stated that he approved in principle of the Master Plan and would recommend its approval to the GB. He stated that he would leave the alignment and specific details to the Governing Board.

Alan Tolhurst state that there were two bad choices, he agreed that we must save the old growth, specifically the high ridge Bristlecones, but that most of the forest had been harvested in the 1880’s. He was more sensitive to soil disturbance than the 24” trees. He prefers Alternative 2 because he has had a great deal of input concerning the larger amphitheater. He questioned if all of the impacts had been analyzed and if there was adequate mitigation in the Master Plan. Mr. Tolhurst voted to recommend the approval to the GB.

Robert Jepsen voted to recommend the approval of the Master Plan to the GB and supports Alternative 4. He stated that in the past the APC could ask to have projects brought to APC and would like to have that looked into in the future.

Mike Riley voted to recommend approval of the Master Plan and supported Alternative 4, he did not feel that Alternative 5 fit the triple bottom line.
Mike Harper voted to recommend the approval of the Master Plan and felt that Alternative 4 had the best balance. He also stated concern that APC no longer had the capability of reviewing on the project level.

Ron McIntyre voted to recommend the approval of the Master plan and felt that Alternative 4 had the greatest net benefit. He also stated that he confident that Heavenly had the capabilities to do all of the required mitigation. Mr. McIntyre stated that he appreciated the way in which the presentation was handled and asked to have the pros and cons of an “articulated” lift described.

Jason Kuchnicki for Ms. Sertic, stated that he wanted to thank Heavenly and their consultants for a job well done. He supports Alternative 2 except for the old growth provisions. He encouraged staff to outline the impacts of Alternatives 2, and 4. 4A does not meet the needs of Heavenly and is concerned about the trade offs of old growth and SEZ’s and ground disturbance. He was pleased with the ratio of the mitigation that could go as high as 5:1 and that possibly 40 acres could be restored. He also thought that it was a good concept to be able to restore runs 9 and 10 as gladed runs. Mr. Kuchnicki asked for an explanation of forest enhancement, Garth Holling explained that it was described in Section 38 of the document, but briefly it would clear the Lodgepole trees that the other trees could grow faster, and eliminate debris that have developed over time to change the ground cover, it would replicate what a “natural” fire would do. He also asked about the affects on wildlife if the old growth was removed and the affects with mitigation. He was told that there is no sensitive wildlife species in the area and that the birds and animals would move to the enhanced areas, those would include the Northern.Goshawk and the spotted Owls. Jason felt that Heavenly had gone above and beyond what the USFS would do and it have a left a naturally occurring event over 150 years and stated that Chapter 3A shows the model that identifies what would happen over time. Mr. Kuchnicki did feel that there should be additional environmental analysis.

Harmon Zuckerman stated that Heavenly had done an excellent job in their preparation of the documents. He was however, concerned about the amount of disturbance to the soil; 15 cubic yards would amount to 2 acres of disturbance. He suggested that the amphitheater could be expanded at a later date from 1100 to 2300. He did feel that we should ask more questions, for example the negative impact of towers and the removal of the towers. Mr. Zuckerman voted to recommend approval of the Master Plan and favored Alternative since it was the most “gladed” and had the least clearing. He did suggest that the monitoring and mitigation measures be placed into the Master Plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Renee Smokey of the Washoe Tribe stated that there were eleven generations living on the eastern and western shores. She thanked John Singlaub for attending a meeting. She states there is not mention of the historical, medicinal remains of the Tribe. The air, land, water, animals and the Tribe have lived around the tributaries. She said was looking forward to working closely with the TRPA in these projects.
John Friedrich of the League stated he was concerned of the narrow range of alternatives. The sixty additional acres is a substantial development potential. This plan relies on strong mitigation and adaptive management practices. There have been improvements, but he would need assurance there would be no negative impacts. He would prefer the idea of linking future development to the performance. All of Phase One would have to be tested for no negative impacts and that should be moved into the monitoring plan. Any reports of the monitoring would be approved by the Governing Board and APC and be open to the public.

John Haefer, a retired forester, used to sit on the APC. He states that most of the area is old growth forest; it is unfortunate it is not shown in the EIS. Large trees do not make an old forest. Most of Heavenly is developed in old forest. It is now fragmented, wildlife lost, and biological integrity lost. Mitigation can not mitigate the loss. Even the “gladed” ski runs will have removed large trees to further compromise the forest stand. He was not in favor of a “gladed” ski run and the EIS was negligent in protecting old growth forest.

Michael Hogan, a soils scientist has worked closely in this process with the League, the Forest Service and Heavenly. In most EIR’s there is not adequate teeth to quantify impacts, it is an ongoing issue. He produced a handbook for ski areas entitled Sediment Source Control and this goes beyond that. A great deal has been put into this plan, probably the best plan he has seen in an EIR to date. It give accountability, totally adaptive, if something does not work, allows adapting to reach end goal. He stated plans are great however, but reality can interfere. Make sure the plan is implemented and it will be a good plan to prevent erosion. He said it is an exciting plan, and it is a clear idea on how to make things better.

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

APC COMMENTS – SEE ABOVE

A motion was made to recommend to the Governing Board to certify the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for Heavenly Mountain Resort. The motion was seconded and voted unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ed Ferranto, Tahoe Area Sierra Club, he stated they are charted to influence environmental and community plans. A Heavenly customer had already caused a huge disturbance by starting the Gondola fire. He stated that their objective is to save old growth trees. In the public interest he suggests that the APC chose either Alternative 1 or Alternative 5.

John Haefer stated that they should not forget the old growth. Some are less than 24” in diameter, that standard was set for trees at lower elevation. The target should be to increase old growth trees. It will be compromised by taking out the trees. How can it be mitigating when it takes fifty years to get them back. He states destroying trees is going in the wrong direction.

Carol Chaplin, South Shore Chamber and Pathways forum member. She states she is familiar with the mountain and the Master Plan. She feels the Heavenly Master
Plan process appears to be an example of the “Triple Bottom Line”. The staff, experts have worked together in a public and private partnership for improvements to move forward for the environmental goals. This is a model plan to be looked at seriously and approved.

John Friedrich, the League to Save Lake Tahoe states that the Alternatives will increase the amount of development by twenty percent. Some of it had been approved in the ’96 Master Plan. Currently the Edgewood Creek area has development prohibition and is starting to show signs of improvement. He said that it is important in being cautious to have the least direct new impact on that area that is a steep slope and degraded. He suggests approving Alternative 5 or 4aA. In monitoring the effectiveness and mitigation measure on Phase One, there should be a public comment hearing after the report is made known.

Lew Feldman, Attorney, stated that he has seen significant improvements with the latest ownership. However, Heavenly is still a world class site with third world attributes... The original plan was badly laid out and this is an opportunity for making the corrections to bring Heavenly up to a world class facility. There is a fine balance between the skier and the environment. He stated to thrive economically; we must protect the Lake and the environment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

A motion was made to recommend to the Governing Board to approve the proposed the Heavenly Master Plan Amendment 2005. The motion was seconded and voted unanimously.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Discussion on Pathway 2007 Proposed Regional Plan Framework.

Staff member John Hitchcock gave the presentation of the Proposed Regional Plan framework. (The presentation is included in this packet). TRPA is looking to create a foundation to implement strategies in partnering in EIP projects. To create one Regional Document that will improve the quality of this destination area.

APC member Mr. McIntyre was not sure how the Place Based would give them an opportunity to ratify their work. He stated that Placer County was very much interested in being involved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lew Feldman, Attorney, stated that he complimented John for his efforts and that the vision was long overdue. The forum was looking forward to simplification of the process.

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

NO ACTION REQUESTED
B. Discussion on Pathway 2007 Proposed Regional Plan Framework.

Staff member John Hitchcock introduced the consultant, Darin Dinsmore who presented the proposed Regional Plan Framework. (The presentation is attached).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Lew Feldman, Attorney, states he does support the Place-Based idea, he feels it is perceived to be for demonstration projects. If they do not fit in code it is not simple, fast. It is unrealistic to anticipate code amendments to happen rapidly.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

NO ACTION REQUESTED

VII REPORTS

A. Executive Director
   The two items recommended by the APC at the last meeting were passed by the Governing Board.

B. Legal Counsel
   No report.

C. APC Members

Vice Chair Jamin adjourned the meeting at 4.50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Danna Meyer
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

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.
Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Plan

Environmental Thresholds
Regional Vision/Guiding Principles
Goals and Policies
Land Use System
Implementation Strategies
Partnerships

Local Jurisdiction Input

Technical Data

Public Values

Thresholds

Place-Based Vision

Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Plan
Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Plan

- Consolidate Vision, guiding principles, ETCC, goals and policies, and implementation into the Regional Plan
- Implement Smart Growth Principles in plan policies:
  - Compact, mixed-use development
  - Pedestrian oriented
  - Accessible transit
  - Housing choice
  - Green buildings and sustainable development
  - Accessible recreation opportunities
Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Plan

- Develop new tools to address place-based concepts for supporting higher density/intensity in appropriate areas
- Develop new incentives to promote development in appropriate areas through redirection of development
- Add more illustrations and graphics
- Develop supporting plan goals and policies for implementing Environmental Improvement Projects
- Collaborate with our partners in defining roles and responsibilities for plan implementation to achieve desired goals
- Use transect planning as a tool to develop updated land use classification system
- Update non-urban areas to be consistent with USFS land classification system
- Provide for consistent land uses between TRPA’s and local jurisdiction’s plans
- Consolidate plan areas
- Concentrate our planning efforts on appropriate urban areas to implement place-based concepts for supporting higher density/intensity/mix of land uses while achieving environmental goals
- Provide a flexible process for developing area-specific regulations for unique form and community character issues (i.e., community plans, master plans, specific plans)
- Create a user friendly format for land use areas through the use of illustrations and maps
Urban Core/Town Center

Bijou/Al Tahoe is designated as an Urban Core/Town Center. The intent of this designation is to provide commercial, residential and public services to the Region. Development within Bijou/Al Tahoe should promote development of a compact, pedestrian oriented town center consisting of an employment center, vibrant mix-use areas, and residential living environment. It should encourage pedestrian oriented development within walking distance of transit opportunities at densities and intensities that will help to support transit usage and town center businesses.

Standards

Density
1. Minimum 10-15 Units/Acre within Mix-Use Overlay Zone

Height
Minimum 2 stories/Maximum 3 stories in Mix-Use Overlay Zone

Parking
1. Minimum 1 space/1000 sq. ft.
2. Parking-in-Lieu fee option available

Lot
1. Minimum FAR

Coverage
1. Maximum 70% Coverage

Design
1. Window-Door-Window Concept
2.

Special Policies

1. Only commercial retail uses permitted on ground floor
2. Residential uses within the Mix-Use Overlay Zone only permitted as part of a vertical mix-use development.

Uses

Residential - Single family residential, multifamily residential, employee housing

Tourist Accommodation - Timeshares, Hotels and Motels.

Public Service - Government centers, Colleges and schools, Local public health and safety facilities.
Streamlined and responsive Code
Use plain English
Remove redundancy and inconsistent standards
Provide flexibility where appropriate
Develop an e-Code
Update standards to be consistent with updated Regional Plan
Add illustrations as appropriate
### Potential Transects Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilderness</th>
<th>Roadless</th>
<th>General Conservation</th>
<th>Developed Recreational Other Uses</th>
<th>General Urban Mix Use</th>
<th>General Town Center Mix Use</th>
<th>Urban Core/Tourist Mix Use</th>
<th>Special District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Development and Minimal Resource Management and Infrastructure</td>
<td>No Development and Minimal Resource Management and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Minimal developed Recreational Uses Accessible via Transit and Bicycle Connections</td>
<td>Developed Recreation Uses Accessible via Transit and Bicycle Connections</td>
<td>Single-Family Zones with access to Transit, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Connections</td>
<td>Single-Family Multi-Family Zones with access to Transit, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Connections</td>
<td>Smart Growth Principles: Walkable Community Centers, Commercial and Residential Mix-Uses, High Density, Public Amenities, Transit Centers, Pedestrian Connections, Community Plans</td>
<td>Industrial and Public Service Special Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Use Strategies

|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|

### Land Coverage

| Minimal less than 1% | Minimal | Bailey | Bailey or 20-35% on Non Sensitive lands with Soil Conservation Plan | Bailey or 35-60% on Non Sensitive lands with Soil Conservation Plan | Bailey or 40-60% on Non Sensitive lands with Soil Conservation Plan | Bailey or 50-75% on Non Sensitive lands with Soil Conservation Plan | Bailey or 20-35% on Non Sensitive lands with Soil Conservation Plan |

### Height

| NA | NA | Base + | Base + | Base + | Base + | Base + | Base + |

### Scenic Threshold

| No Development (1) | Visually Non-Evident (1) to Visually Subordinate (2) | Visually Subordinate (2) | Visually Co-Dominated (3) | Visually Co-Dominated (3) | Visually Co-Dominated (3) | Visually Co-Dominated (3) | Visually Dominated (5) |

### Scenic Roadway Type

| Natural | Natural | Natural | Natural | Natural | Natural | Natural | Natural |

### Roadway Unit Community Design Strategy

| NA | USFS Building Guide | USFS Building Guide |

### Scenic Shoreline Type

| NA | Natural Shoreline | Natural Shoreline |

### Shoreline Unit Community Design Strategy

| NA | VisMag | VisMag |

### Scenic Roadway Type

| Natural | Natural | Natural | Natural |

### Roadway Unit Community Design Strategy

| NA | USFS Building Guide | USFS Building Guide |

### Scenic Shoreline Type

| NA | Natural Shoreline | Natural Shoreline |

### Shoreline Unit Community Design Strategy

| NA | VisMag | VisMag | VisMag | VisMag | VisMag | Form Based | Form Based |

### General Design Standards

| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

### Smarth Growth Principles:

- Walkable Community Centers
- Commercial and Residential Mix-Uses
- High Density
- Public Amenities
- Transit Centers
- Pedestrian Connections
- Community Plans

### Smarth Growth Principles:

- Industrial and Public Service Special Design

### Smarth Growth Principles:

- General Design Standards

### Smarth Growth Principles:

- General Design Standards

### Smarth Growth Principles:

- General Design Standards

### Smarth Growth Principles:

- General Design Standards
REGULATORY STRATEGIES

System Structure
  • Enforcement and Incentives
  • Maintenance

REGIONAL VISION

Regional Plan

DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Criteria
  • Process
  • Projects

Pathway 2007 • Regional Visioning
Project Calendar

Key Dates
Planning Working Group Work Sessions - Feb 21 (Kickoff), March 13, April 2 (North Shore), April 3 (South Shore), May 15, June 19 & 20 (Pending Funding)

Core Planning Team Lunch - Feb 21, March 13
North Shore Public Workshop - April 2
South Shore Public Workshop - April 3
Forum Workshops - April 5, May 17
Governing Board/APC Joint Work Session - April 11, May 23
Healthy ecology has:
- An evolutionary capacity to heal itself.
- A spiraling, complex growth pattern of birth and death cycles.
- Community, engineered and natural systems evolving together.
South Shore Demonstration Project Case Study
Key Findings

- **Regulations**
  - Right-of-way design
  - Shared parking and reduced parking requirements
  - Development standards

- **Thinking outside the lot line**
  - Water quality projects (BMPs) that work at a district scale
  - Transit-oriented design

- **Rewarding good behavior**
  - Incentives for projects that support community-building and environmental objectives

- **TRPA, Pathway Partners and local jurisdictions as co-investors for a net gain**
  - Match incentives and resources for rewarding good behavior
Purpose of Case Studies

• **Understanding how to achieve a “net gain”**
  – Environmental improvements
  – Economic feasibility
  – Social objectives

• **Testing existing and potential changes to regional and local regulations**
Demonstration Program

Criteria • Process • Projects
Initial Requirements
(as confirmed by Public and Planning Work Groups)

• The process is a partnership between TRPA, local jurisdictions and implementation partners.

• The priority project areas are within established Redevelopment Project Areas and Community Plan Areas where there is strong public support for reinvestment.

• Projects are not parcel specific, but should focus across property lines to create places that demonstrate a net gain in the environment, community and economy.
Schedule

Step #1 - Launching the Program
1. **February 21**, Joint PWG and CPT kickoff work session
2. **March 13**, Joint PWG work session

Step #2 - Identifying Opportunities
3. **April 17**, Partner work session
4. **May 15**, PWG work sessions

Step #3 - Shaping Potential Projects
5. **June 18-19**, local jurisdictions site visits (unfunded)
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Called to order at 8:30 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Combs, Ms. Hoefer, Ms. Jamin, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Maurer

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Tolhurst moved to approve the agenda.
Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No Public Comment

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Tolhurst made the motion to approve minutes.
Motion carried.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

No Public Comment

VI. Role and Responsibility of Tahoe Transportation Commission

Staff member Nick Haven gave a presentation concerning the background and history of the Tahoe Transportation Commission. It was originally conceived as a policy advisory board to the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, and was intended to provide staff with input on transportation plan and programs. (Two slides are included). The TTD, as in Article 9, is charged with implementation of the Regional Transportation System. The members are outlined in the Compact. Currently Washoe County sends its Planning Manager, Placer County sends its Transit Manager, El Dorado, Douglas and CSLT send elected officials, Steve is the at large member. Andrew Strain is the South TMA member and Ron McIntyre is the North TMA member. NDOT and Caltrans have nonvoting members.
TTD provides gap transit funding, has authority to do contracting accept and administer funds. Desire to have independent staff, at one time there was. They do have independent counsel. They have adopted the 2007 goals to fund various projects. Ca has passed two initiatives that has freed up funding for Highway 50, Kings Beach and to move forward on the relocation of Highway 89.

TTC chair Mr. Tolhurst stated that he would like to expand the membership to include more public representation. The function needs to address the planning and public input. He sees problems in getting people around the lake.

Mr. Combs brought up the question arose on how to expand membership without going outside of the Compact to include more public membership. He would be in favor of bringing in the USFS, NDOT and Caltrans as voting members. He would recommend choosing between two and four public members and if there is an interest of the APC of the having their public members as well. He would like to see the representative from the tribe to be reactivated and encouraged.

Public Comment

Steve Teshara is the at large member of the TTD and has been on the Board of Directors since 1999 and has attended TTD meetings since the 1980’s. He agrees that the public process is not laid out very well. Before the process was laid out well, there was a technical advisory committee. Currently they require a dedicated TRPA staff person to provide agendas, materials, etc. There has been an expressed commitment from Douglas, El Dorado Counties, and the city to be more participatory. He was surprised that this was not an action item for today, but he would come back with a defined list of people for the TTC. Article 9 was amended in the 1990's to add more responsibilities to the TTD. It is the only part of the Compact that can be passed by the two states without being ratified by Congress. It added responsibilities and two members and made the two state DOTS non-voting.

TTC chair Mr. Tolhurst expressed concern about adding lay members to the TTD not familiar with transportation matters. Perhaps have a core group meet first and then the larger group meet directly after.

Ms. Hoeing stated that the Forest Service fully supports the letter that was submitted and hoped that the process would happen quickly with the various projects that are going to be coming up quickly.

VII. MEMBER REPORTS

None
VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Tolhurst adjourned the meeting at 9:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Danna Meyer
Clerk to the Board

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.
March 5, 2007

TO: Advisory Planning Commission
    Tahoe Transportation Commission

FROM: TRPA Transportation Staff

SUBJECT: Recommendation on Resolution Modifying the Representation and Role of the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) to reflect its advisory responsibilities on transportation issues to the TRPA Governing Board and the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO)

Requested Action APC: Review and recommend approval of the attached TRPA resolution modifying the representation and role of the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) to reflect its advisory responsibilities on transportation issues to the TRPA Governing Board.

Requested Action TTC: Review and recommend approval of the attached TMPO resolution modifying the representation and role of the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) to reflect its advisory responsibilities on transportation issues to the TMPO Governing Board.

Staff Recommendation: Staff is recommending approval of the resolutions modifying the representation and role of the Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) to reflect its advisory responsibilities on transportation issues to the TMPO and TRPA Governing Boards.

Discussion: As a follow up to the February APC and Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) meetings, and meeting of the established TTD and APC subcommittees on this topic, discussions have led to a recommended proposal regarding the structure and representation of the Tahoe Transportation Commission. The proposal identified by the parties recommended the following:

- Return the Commission functions to be part in parcel with the TTD
- Compact identified District make-up remains unchanged
- US Forrest Service remains represented on TTC
- Caltrans and NDOT seats remain non-voting
- Addition of two citizen-at-large members to be selected by TMPO (Vacancies do not count against quorum)
- Washoe Tribe remains on TTC if participation is assured
- Local jurisdiction representatives are appointed to TTD and TTC (can be different reps)
Modify the Representation and Role of the TTC as an Advisory Body to the TRPA and TMPO

These elements are included in the supporting TRPA and TMPO resolutions that would enact the changes identified.

Staff will bring forward the recommendation from the March 9, 2007 TTD Board meeting on this proposal at the APC meeting, as it is not available before the mailing of this staff report.

Background: The Tahoe Transportation Commission (TTC) was conceived as a transportation policy advisory body to the TMPO and TRPA. It is designed as part of the metropolitan planning process and is intended to provide staff with direct input on transportation plans and programs, offer proactive public participation through its meeting noticing requirements, and to provide the TMPO Board time necessary to address the full range of complex and interrelated transportation issues facing the Lake Tahoe Basin.

If there are any questions on this item, please contact Nick Haven at (775) 588-4547.

Attachments:  A  TRPA Resolution 07-__
              B  TMPO Resolution 07-__
WHEREAS, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) was established under Title 23, Section 134 USC, designated by Governor Miller of Nevada and Governor Wilson of California on October 27, 1999; and

WHEREAS, the TRPA on July 28, 1999, adopted TRPA Resolution 99-17 establishing the Tahoe Transportation Committee (TTC), and TRPA resolution 06-02 re-establishing the TTC to become a subcommittee of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission to develop proposed transportation programs, plans and projects for submission to the TMPO for approval, to provide a forum for the cooperative process required for metropolitan planning organizations, provide for a proactive, inclusive public participation program, serve as a forum for input and involvement of a technical advisory committee structure, and to provide input into transportation staff responsibilities and performance; and

WHEREAS, as created by TRPA Resolution 06-02, TTC membership consists of one representative from each of the six local governments sitting on the APC (El Dorado County, Douglas County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe), the LTBMU representative on the APC, the Tahoe transportation District (TTD) representative on the APC, and the following non-APC members: one member of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, one at-large member representing a transit service provider, one non-voting representative from each of NDOT and Caltrans, and any members to be added by majority vote of the TMPO Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, the Compact establishes the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) as a special purpose district to own and operate a public transportation system managed by a board of directors consisting of one member of each of the local jurisdictions, one member from each of the transportation management associations, and one member at-large; and

WHEREAS, given that the meetings of the TRPA Governing Board consist of a wide variety of issues related to the protection of Lake Tahoe, while the meetings of the TTD Board of Directors consists of issues related only to transportation, it is appropriate to utilize a portion of the meeting of the TTD as a forum for an extended deliberative and cooperative decision making process required under Title 23 Section 134 USC; and

WHEREAS, the separate body proposed for this purpose is the Tahoe Transportation commission (TTC); and
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency hereby re-establishes, in cooperation with the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Tahoe Transportation Commission with membership consisting of one representative from each of the six local governments (El Dorado County, Douglas County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe), one representative designated by the Forest Supervisor of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit of the US Forest Service, one representative designated by the two Transportation Management Associations, the TTD citizen at-large member, one representative designated by the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, two at-large members designated by the TMPO Governing Board representing north and south shores respectfully, one non-voting representative from each of NDOT and Caltrans, and any members to be added by majority vote of the TMPO Board of Directors; and

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of March 2007 by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, by the following vote:

Ayes:
Nays:
Abstain:
Absent:

_____________________________
Julie Motamedi, Chair
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
TMPO Resolution No. 07-__

Re-establishment of the Tahoe Transportation Commission

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) was established under Title 23, Section 134 USC, designated by Governor Miller of Nevada and Governor Wilson of California on October 27, 1999; and

WHEREAS, the TMPO on July 28, 1999, adopted TMPO Resolution 99-16 establishing the Tahoe Transportation Committee (TTC), and TMPO resolution 06-01 re-establishing the TTC to become a subcommittee of the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission to develop proposed transportation programs, plans and projects for submission to the TMPO for approval, to provide a forum for the cooperative process required for metropolitan planning organizations, provide for a proactive, inclusive public participation program, serve as a forum for input and involvement of a technical advisory committee structure, and to provide input into transportation staff responsibilities and performance; and

WHEREAS, as created by TMPO Resolution 06-01, TTC membership consists of one representative from each of the six local governments sitting on the APC (El Dorado County, Douglas County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe), the LTBMU representative on the APC, the Tahoe transportation District (TTD) representative on the APC, and the following non-APC members: one member of the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, one at-large member representing a transit service provider, one non-voting representative from each of NDOT and Caltrans, and any members to be added by majority vote of the TMPO Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, the Compact establishes the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) as a special purpose district to own and operate a public transportation system managed by a board of directors consisting of one member of each of the local jurisdictions, one member from each of the transportation management associations, and one member at-large; and

WHEREAS, given that the meetings of the TRPA Governing Board consist of a wide variety of issues related to the protection of Lake Tahoe, while the meetings of the TTD Board of Directors consists of issues related only to transportation, it is appropriate to utilize a portion of the meeting of the TTD as a forum for an extended deliberative and cooperative decision making process required under Title 23 Section 134 USC; and

WHEREAS, the separate body proposed for this purpose is the Tahoe Transportation commission (TTC); and
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency hereby re-establishes, in cooperation with the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Tahoe Transportation Commission with membership consisting of one representative from each of the six local governments (El Dorado County, Douglas County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe), one representative designated by the Forest Supervisor of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit of the US Forest Service, one representative designated by the two Transportation Management Associations, the TTD citizen at-large member, one representative designated by the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, two at-large members designated by the TMPO Governing Board representing north and south shores respectfully, one non-voting representative from each of NDOT and Caltrans, and any members to be added by majority vote of the TMPO Board of Directors; and

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 22nd day of March 2006 by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

Julie Motamedi, Chairman
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
MEMORANDUM

March 7, 2007

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Recommendation for Apportionment of 50,000 Square Feet of Commercial Floor Area Pursuant to Subsection 33.3.D (1) (c) of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Proposed Action: Recommend the Governing Board adopt the attached resolution (Attachment A) establishing the apportionment of 50,000 square feet of Commercial Floor Area (CFA) for each jurisdiction to use within adopted Community Plans.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the APC recommend to the Governing Board, adoption of the proposed resolution (Attachment A) which sets the apportionment of 50,000 square feet of CFA for each jurisdiction as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background: In accordance with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Subsection 33.3.D (1), a maximum of 150,000 square feet of CFA shall be allocated to projects within an adopted Community Plan, and disbursed according to that Plan. More specifically, 33.3.D (1) (c) requires that 50,000 square feet (of the 150,000 SF) shall be apportioned “based on a ranking comparison of the jurisdictions performance on the approved Five-Year Water Quality and Air Quality EIP Lists within the jurisdiction between January 1, 2002 and December 1, 2005.” The jurisdictions’ performance is measured against their expenditure or commitment of funds to eligible projects.

The criteria to determine which projects and expenditures/funds qualify for consideration to determine the jurisdictions rank include:

1. Eligible Projects must be on the Five-year Water Quality and Air Quality EIP lists for January 1, 2002 through December 1, 2005.
2. Projects must be:
   a. Completed; or
   b. Funded (irrevocable commitment) and approved as of December 1, 2005.
      i. A project shall be considered funded if:
         1. approved by the local jurisdiction and have funding assigned; or
         2. project is bonded; or
         3. project is contracted out.
      ii. A project shall be considered approved if:
         1. local jurisdiction approval prior to 12/1/05; and
         2. TRPA approval prior to 12/1/05.

3. Total Dollars spent
   a. All public and private funding for project costs should be included.
      Eligible funds consist of “hard” dollars spent on project improvements, as well as engineering and design costs. Staff work and time spent attending meetings should not be included as project costs.

The total dollars spent/committed by the local jurisdiction which translates into the ranking score found above are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Dollars Spent/Committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>$43,804,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>$35,807,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
<td>$18,898,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>$17,904,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>$8,418,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Review Committee: The PRC members raised two issues regarding the disbursement and future use of this CFA. The first concern is that the CFA awarded to the local jurisdiction should not dissolve when the TRPA Regional Plan is amended. Members felt that this CFA should be counted on, regardless of the status of the Regional Plan, until it is used for project implementation.

The second issue was in regards to the ability of the local jurisdictions to administer the allocation of the CFA. Currently, local jurisdictions recommend allocations to projects which then receive a permit from TRPA (most delegation MOUs authorize the permitting of small scale projects of 2,000 SF or less). There is the desire on the part of the local jurisdictions to allocate the CFA to projects within their respective jurisdiction, given proper zoning and an approvable project and not be limited to projects within community plans. The subject code section anticipates the CFA to be allocated within adopted Community Plans; however there are provisions within Chapter 33 that allow for CFA to be allocated to projects outside of an adopted community plan, given that a local jurisdiction system exists to facilitate the implementation of EIP projects outside of community plans (subsection 33.3.D (2)).
Environmental Documentation: Staff has prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the proposed resolution and proposes a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE).

Requested Action: Motion to recommend to the TRPA Governing Board, adoption of the proposed resolution (Attachment A) which sets the apportionment of 50,000 square feet of CFA to each jurisdiction.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this agenda item, please direct your inquiry to Peter Eichar, AICP at (775) 589-5259 or peichar@trpa.org.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION 2007-__

RESOLUTION TO APPORTION 50,000 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL FLOOR AREA

WHEREAS, Chapter 33 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances was amended October 25, 2006 to extend the deadlines allocating various development commodities, including Commercial Floor Area; and

WHEREAS, the Performance Review Committee which includes one member from each local jurisdiction, was consulted for the final ranked order for apportionment of 50,000 square feet of Commercial Floor Area; and

WHEREAS, the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission held a duly noticed Public Hearing on March 14, 2007 to consider and recommend to the Governing Board the ranked order for apportionment of 50,000 square feet of Commercial Floor Area; and

WHEREAS, the TRPA Governing Board also held a duly noticed Public Hearing on March 28, 2007 to consider the ranked order for apportionment of the CFA.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board, based upon the recommendation of the Advisory Planning Commission, TRPA Staff and substantial evidence in the record, hereby apportions 50,000 square feet of Commercial Floor Area to each local jurisdiction to be permitted in accordance with TRPA Code Subsection 33.3.D, and other applicable provisions of the Code, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of SLT</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passed and adopted this 28 day of March 2006, by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

______________________________
Julie Motamedi, Chairwoman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
### Lay Members*  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>John Upton (pending appointment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>Alan Tolhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>Leo Poppoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson City</td>
<td>Robert Jepsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>Richard Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>Mike Riley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compact Representative**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Planning Director</td>
<td>Bill Combs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County Planning Director</td>
<td>Eva Krause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County Planning Director</td>
<td>Peter Maurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Lake Tahoe Planning Director</td>
<td>Teri Jamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson County Planning Director</td>
<td>Lee Plemel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County Planning Director</td>
<td>Harmon Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahontan CEO</td>
<td>Lauri Kemper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB Office of the Ombudsman</td>
<td>Kathleen Quetin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV Division of State Lands CEO</td>
<td>Jim Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDEP CEO</td>
<td>Kathy Sertic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS CEO</td>
<td>Mike LeFevre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other*  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Ron McIntyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Jane Schmidt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Appointed by Governing Board  
**Department CEO or Designee  

2 Year Terms  
Governing Board Appointment not required