 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the **Advisory Planning Commission** of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at **9:30 a.m.** on **Wednesday, May 12, 2010** at the **TRPA Offices**, located at **128 Market Street, Stateline, NV**. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

May 5, 2010

Joanne S. Marchetta
Executive Director
All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

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. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Recommendation of Amendments to TRPA Code Chapter 51 and Related Chapters, Prohibiting the Unauthorized Mooring of Vessels in Lake Tahoe  Page 1

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Recommendation on Scheduling Buoy Placement Limit Line Amendments for Future Consideration  Page 9

B. Discussion on Regional Plan Update Conservation Milestone  Page 35

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. General Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Meeting called to order at 9:37 a.m.

Members present: Mr. Goldberg, Mr. Greene, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Krause, Mr. LeFevre, Mr. Loftis, Mr. Maurer, Mr. McIntyre, Ms. McMahon, Mr. Plemel, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Riley, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Upton, Ms. Garcia

Absent: Mr. Angelocci, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Kuchnicki, Mr. Donohue

Mr. Smith arrived at 9:45 am

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No public comment.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Upton moved to approve minutes

Motion carried unanimously, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Goldberg, and Mr. Loftis abstained.

V. Agenda Item V.A. Recommendation of Amendments to TRPA Code Chapter 51 and Related Chapters, Prohibiting the Unauthorized Mooring of Vessels in Lake Tahoe. This agenda item was removed from the agenda.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Tahoe Science Program Briefing

Zack Hymanson presented the Tahoe Science Program.

Commission Comments & Questions:

Ms. Merchant asked where local government fits into the management system.

Mr. Hymanson stated local government was not involved in planning, but it was involved in monitoring and data analysis related to stormwater and fuel reduction.
Ms. Merchant commented that she did not see recommendations on implementation measures and asked if there would be recommendations.

Mr. Hymanson stated that in his presentation information was in 8A and 9, synthesis, results and interpretation leading to recommendation.

Ms. Merchant commented she was glad to hear discussion points on integration were an important point in going forward.

Mr. Hymanson commented on the need to develop an effectiveness monitoring model on a project-by-project basis at the local government level.

Ms. Merchant stated she was glad to hear the need to involve local governments in a project-by-project basis.

Mr. Goldberg stated he disagreed because the individual impacts of a project would be lost and that information was needed.

Mr. Hymanson stated on-the-ground impacts were implementation monitoring, which would remain at the project scale.

Mr. Goldberg commented on the need for smaller scale information for water quality. He asked why SNPLMA Round 11 funding was not used to support the TFFT (Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team) or similar project requests.

Mr. Hymanson provided a brief history of the SNPLMA Science Process and explained certain projects were not supported in terms of relevancy.

Mr. Upton commented on the amount of monitoring that was going on without a system of integration and expressed his appreciation that this issue was being addressed. He asked about the progress on developing standard practices for expediting projects for monitoring and adaptive management.

Mr. Hymanson cited the Regional Storm Water Monitoring Program as an example because it will meet the regulatory monitoring information needs when complete.

Mr. Upton asked if a methodology was developed for dealing with consequences from a fire versus allowing a project to proceed with a possible disturbance.

Mr. Hymanson reported literature was developed related to the effects of fuels management on air quality, water quality and soil conservation. There was also more research on the issue.

Mr. Upton stated he would encourage the development of a methodology to address this issue.

Mr. Hymanson stated there was a methodology that was being established for the area, but it would not address all aspects such as smoke impact and was a landscape-level model.
Mr. Romsos added this information would be included to improve the project review process.

Ms. Marchetta added this information was being looked at for inclusion in the permitting and review process.

Mr. Riley stated he liked the asset management analogy to monitoring. He suggested changing the verbiage “cheap” to inexpensive.

Mr. LeFevre commented that one area that the science community could provide assistance to is the science of risk management to evaluate risks and trade-offs.

Mr. Tolhurst commented that there has been a lack of air quality data and provided some examples. He stated more scientific data was needed about where particulate matter was coming from.

Mr. Hymanson stated a presentation could be made in the future regarding current data that provides assistance with that issue. There were also new projects being paid for with round 10 SNPLMA funding that would also provide assistance with this issue.

Mr. Tolhurst suggested developing a good scientific outreach program to better educate politicians.

Mr. Romsos asked for confirmation that recent scientific information presented, such as with the Shorezone project, was sufficient.

Mr. Tolhurst noted that, according to the minutes of the last meeting, he was quite impressed with the scientific data gathered from the last round.

Mr. Greene asked if there would be a switch-over from SNPLMA funding to other sources.

Mr. Hymanson replied yes.

Mr. Greene asked how different agencies can support getting this funding.

Mr. Hymanson commented on the need for different funding sources. He stated there was a science program funding strategy in the Environmental Improvement Program. It was estimated that approximately $91 million was needed over the next eight years to fund the program; 2/3 of which would be used for monitoring; 1/3 for research; and the rest to reporting and data management. They would like half of the funding to be received from the Federal Government; then the State of California, the State of Nevada, local governments, and the private sector. There has been no commitment to receive funding except for funding in the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, which commits $30 million to science and reporting.

Mr. Greene asked if there were other uses for monitoring outside the Basin.
Mr. Hymanson replied yes and reviewed the other uses for monitoring including the use of new technology.

Mr. Romsos added they were looking inward for baseline funding and reassessment of how to best utilize current funding.

Mr. Hymanson stated that another way to fund a science program is to provide a funding reserve for science.

Mr. Goldberg commented that local governments can provide funding if attached to a project.

Mr. Hymanson asked if local governments could provide funding if funding was used to satisfy project level monitoring needs.

Mr. Goldberg had no comment.

Mr. Hymanson commented on the difficulty of taking project-specific funding and having the ability to aggregate it for program level monitoring.

Mr. Goldberg stated that was the purpose of SNPLMA funding.

Mr. Hymanson clarified SNPLMA monitoring does not go through the process of science research.

Mr. Romsos added they were trying to achieve consistency across different efforts.

Mr. Goldberg stated he agreed with Mr. Rosmos’ comments and that the TRPA can develop that monitoring program.

**Public Comment:**

No public comment.

**Commission Comments & Questions:**

Ms. Merchant suggested e-mailing all APC members and the TRPA with quarterly and annual reports, if any, and to provide the most technical information.

Mr. Romsos asked if the Shorezone information provided was sufficient.

Ms. Merchant replied yes and suggested providing SNPLMA reports and information. She commented that the Shorezone information provided was an example of how broad information could be.

Ms. Garcia echoed Ms. Merchant’s comments.

**B. Discussion on Regional Plan Update Transportation Milestone**

Staff member Harmon Zuckerman provided an overview.
Staff member Lyn Barnett presented the Regional Plan Update Transportation Milestone.

Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Greene asked if there would be a preferred alternative.

Mr. Zuckerman stated it would be up to the APC and the TRPA to designate a preferred alternative, but mixing and matching was already occurring and provided some examples.

Mr. Tolhurst commented on required parking for businesses and requested to know if that was being proposed.

Karen Fink stated that would be addressed in Phase Two of the stakeholder meeting process.

Ms. Merchant commented that there was a concern with raising funds on the north shore in alternative 4 and how charging for parking would increase revenue to fund the 15- or 20-minute headways. She noted next year Placer County would be using the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association Transient Occupancy tax for the transit budget and room tax funding would be allocated toward the transit service due to the decline in sales tax. She stated goals should be written as achievements for the future. There were conflicts between the language to incentivize pedestrian-transit oriented development versus traffic flow improvement and transit level of service.

Mr. Maurer commented that the County was in the process of re-writing the zoning code with the draft parking ordinance posted early next week. Regarding Ms. Merchant’s comments about the conflicting demands of transportation, Mr. Maurer stated transportation planning should concentrate on walkable and transit-oriented communities.

Mr. Smith commented that the TMDL and the Regional Plan were coming together on the transportation and air quality elements, especially on the nitrogen load. He stated there needs to be disclosure that the Regional Plan is the lead on nitrogen reductions.

Mr. Zuckerman stated he was trying to get away from the concept that the Regional Plan is a 20-year plan and should be considered similar to the TMDL.

Mr. Upton stated he appreciated the mention of the stress in Alternative 2 on regional transportation and commented on the need for alternate transportation for the area. He stated there was a difference in alternatives between the south shore and the north shore because the north shore provides rail transportation rather than bus transportation. He asked what was meant by “coverage restoration of unused parking capacity”.

Ms. Fink stated they were trying to include more regulatory ways to reach goals in Alternative 4 of getting water quality improvements rather than incentive-based ways.
Mr. Upton suggested providing an example in the future to get a better understanding.

Mr. Barnett stated parking lots that are overdesigned which would physically limit the capacity would be removed.

Mr. Thompson asked how that would be retrofitted.

Mr. Barnett stated that would be addressed in Phase Two, but it would be on a project-by-project basis unless a plan was adopted that would proactively retire spaces through some type of funding source.

Mr. Thompson asked if alternative parking areas would be available for those parking spaces that were eliminated.

Mr. Barnett stated they wouldn't be replaced. Parking spaces would be removed and not shifted to another location.

Mr. Thompson asked if moving additional parking would create more development.

Mr. Barnett stated that was a possibility.

Mr. Zuckerman stated one of the concepts being proposed in Alternative Two was to provide additional commercial floor area for individuals that transfer development out of or retire coverage from sensitive areas.

Mr. Thompson asked if individuals would still receive this incentive even if parking was not removed from a sensitive area.

Mr. Zuckerman stated that would be worked out in Phase Two, but the overall concept is to remove excess hard coverage even in plan areas that are developed for PTOD.

Mr. Upton commented that he would approve of this incentive if included in the incentive program or Alternative 2.

Ms. McMahon asked what was meant by “Phase Two” and when that will occur.

Mr. Zuckerman stated the First Phase was policy level discussion related to the first five milestones, which began in January and would be addressed through June with public meetings to be held for input. Phase Two would begin in November and would be implementation strategy discussions related to the milestones.

Ms. McMahon requested to know beforehand what is expected from the local governments with regards to the timelines and resources, including funding.
Mr. Tolhurst commented on the need for a simple transportation service. A policy was also needed to keep pedestrian-oriented areas opened all-year round.

Mr. Thompson asked if there was enough density to warranty dedications of right-of-way.

Ms. Fink stated that would be taken into consideration in Community Plan updates.

Mr. Thompson asked if a dedication of right-of-way would be requested from individual developers.

Ms. Fink stated that could be considered, but they were thinking of it on the roadways, specifically, such as with a CalTrans or NDOT rights-of-way.

Mr. Thompson commented that increased impacts and wider right-of-way would be needed in public service projects, such as road improvement projects that would include pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Funding for roadway projects also do not include pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

Mr. Barnett stated that was also something to consider on a community-by-community basis.

Mr. Thompson asked if that issue would be addressed in Community Plan Updates.

Mr. Barnett stated it would be.

Mr. Greene stated he was having a hard time understanding the proposal because transportation being proposed was relying on individuals to move into the middle of town and that it did not address transportation on a community by community basis.

Staff member, Nick Haven stated the focus was on providing alternative modes of transportation rather than providing transportation community by community basis.

Mr. Greene commented that he did not see any solutions proposed for communities that do not provide transportation in the winter.

Mr. Haven stated they recognized the mix between public transportation and vehicles, which is why they were proposing to assess the transportation system from a multi-mode level of service (LOS).

Mr. Greene stated it made sense to have transportation that travels around an area, but the issue was funding.

Mr. Haven stated public transit is always heavily subsidized and they were trying to balance a diversification of transportation modes, but public transit would not be available everywhere.
Mr. Greene suggested looking at generating other fees other than parking fees.

Mr. Haven stated they would welcome input regarding other revenue sources.

Mr. Greene asked for information regarding the California Sustainable Community Strategy.

Mr. Haven stated a briefing could be provided at a later date.

Mr. Greene stated he would like to be provided with presentation information before meetings for review.

Mr. Upton stated he did some research and double-decker buses were economically feasible for the area.

Ms. Merchant stated she would like to have a one-on-one meeting regarding this issue for Placer County.

Mr. McIntyre asked how TTD information would be transferred to the TRPA Board notwithstanding the fact that two TRPA Board members were on the TTD Board.

Mr. Haven stated he would hope that Mr. McIntyre would present the TTD’s position when this issue was presented to the Governing Board.

Mr. McIntyre commented that elected officials on the Tahoe Transportation District should be the ones to present this information to the Governing Board.

Ms. Marchetta stated TTD’s position would be included in the fact sheet information presented to the Governing Board, but TTD members would not be required to make a presentation to the TRPA.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Commission Comments & Questions:

Mr. Tolhurst commented on the deficiency of the noise monitor at the South Lake Tahoe Airport. He stated he wanted to make sure there was a policy in place that controls noise at the airport.

Staff member, Charles Emmett reported the airport just recently installed six new monitors a year and a half ago and were monitored continuously for violations with reports sent to TRPA.

Mr. Tolhurst asked about the airport’s standing with regards to noise compliance.
Mr. Emmett stated there was no information from the 2006 report because monitors were not installed at that time, but since then all monitors were put in operation and data is being received.

Ms. McMahon asked what noise mitigation fees would be used for.

Mr. Emmett stated fees would work similar to air and water in that it is to treat off-site noise caused by a project.

Mr. Thompson asked if there would be some guarantee that low-noise pavement would be installed in an area if fees were paid for that area.

Mr. Emmett stated the idea was to use fees in the areas where fees were provided.

Mr. Upton commented that water craft noise testing would be impractical. He suggested having a list of after-market manifolds which would be known not to be in compliance. He stated he protested noise monitoring at the airport because there may be circumstances outside the airport’s control in which noise violations might occur. He also stated he is opposed to the use of the term “prohibit” in the regulatory approach.

Mr. Emmett clarified a fine would be imposed on the individual that was in noise violation and not the airport.

Mr. Upton suggested that be re-stated in the information presented.

Mr. Goldberg asked for brief information on what was meant by “added climate change component to the sub-element”.

Mr. Barnett stated they were proposing to add climate change to the energy sub-element so that climate change could be addressed in the Regional Plan Update.

Mr. Thompson asked if the TRPA would be preparing a climate action plan.

Mr. Barnett stated that was correct and it would be called a sustainability plan in Alternative 2.

Mr. Thompson commented on the APC being allowed to provide assistance in developing TRPA’s climate action plan.

Mr. Barnett reported the climate action plan was being prepared locally on the California side, but not the Nevada side because it’s a California requirement. Therefore, they would tier off the TRPA climate action plan because they wanted to address the issue region-wide.

Mr. Thompson suggested TRPA needs to state the plan is under development.

Ms. Marchetta stated TRPA was approaching climate change issues from a point of view of those areas where there is more controlling jurisdictions. The
focus would be in land use and transportation when it comes to climate change policies.

Mr. Barnett stated carbon trading and similar issues would not be proposed at the regional level.

Mr. LeFevre suggested it be made clear what “wildlife” and “harmful” means.

Mr. Greene asked if there was data that shows wildlife was being harmed by noise.

Mr. Barnett stated they were asked to consider wildlife in the plan because every species is going to have its own particular noise sensitivities.

Ms. McMahon stated she was concerned about the amount of mitigation fees and suggested prioritizing them towards projects that would protect the Lake. She stated that she was also concerned about having too many mitigation fees which would deter individuals from re-developing their properties, which could be beneficial to environmental gains.

Ms. Merchant stated she agreed with Ms. McMahon’s comments. She stated the use of term “basin-wide” in Alternative 2 was inconsistent with the concept of having individual strategies for different communities depending on their needs.

Mr. Emmett stated they were proposing to take a look at the Basin as a whole, but there will be different noise standards for the transect areas. They were trying to avoid having a different standard for a boat on the California and Nevada sides of the Lake.

Ms. Krause stated one of her concerns reading through the proposals was using the California Transit Standards for Nevada roadways.

Mr. Emmett stated there were currently Basin-wide TRPA standards for transportation corridors. TRPA is looking to adopt the most stringent standard in an area.

Ms. Krause expressed the following concerns: 1) there was a crosswalk between scenic, Shorezone, and sign ordinance and other TRPA Codes; 2) how someone is expected to know if they are going beyond a noise standard; 3) who would do enforcement; 4) the banning of seaplanes; 5) how it will be determined which events would not be allowed to take place because of possible violation of noise standard; and 6) that the noise standard will prevent redevelopment projects.

Mr. Emmett clarified the sign and scenic issue is currently in the Code. TRPA has two sets of standards: an overall 24-hour noise standard and a single-event noise standard, which are vehicle-related. There are no TRPA-specific standards. There is no ban on seaplanes, but there would be no new seaplane bases. A vast majority of events do not violate noise standards.
Ms. Rinke stated Ms. Krause’s comments regarding noise standards preventing redevelopment projects was noted and will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Thompson asked about the 1,000-foot distance between off-road vehicle noise and residences in relation to an existing trail on a forest service piece of property that was within 1,000-feet of residences.

Mr. Emmett stated there was no problem with an entrance or access point to a trail within 1,000 feet of residences, but the utilization of an off-road vehicle should be 1,000 feet away from residences.

Mr. Thompson asked if the revision to the noise standard for off-road vehicles would be consistent with state law.

Mr. Emmett stated correct until they cross the state line. Alternative 2 is proposing to have one standard Basin-wide, which would create a more stringent standard in Nevada.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Ms. Marchetta presented the Executive Director’s Report.

B. General Counsel

Ms. Rinke presented the General Counsel Report.

C. APC Members

Ms. Krause reported Don Morehouse would be sitting in for her at the next APC meeting.

Ms. Merchant reported Placer County was working on a focus group to get community input regarding TRPA’s Regional Plan Update. One significant comment was the complexity of sections. The Board of Supervisors approved the design of (the Kings Beach Project). The Lakeside Bike Trail would be setback this summer due to the lack of coverage. She asked about the status of grant funding for Community Plan updates.

Mr. Smith announced the Lahontan Water Board would be holding a meeting today and tomorrow, which would include a Dye Tracer Study proposal presentation that would outline options on how to regulate this study. There would also be a proposed resolution that would recommend the State Water Board fund the continued Asian Clam removal in Emerald Bay. Funding would come from the State’s Clean-Up and Abatement account.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Tolhurst adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.
Requested Action: APC recommendation to the Governing Board on the proposed Code amendments to Chapter 51 establishing mooring requirements in the Region, and Chapter 2, Definitions, defining the term “Mooring” and “Watercraft.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC recommend Governing Board adoption of the attached Resolution (Attachment B) amending Chapter 51 and Chapter 2 of the TRPA Code.

Required Motions: In order to recommend Governing Board approval of the proposed Code amendments, the APC must make the following motions, based on this staff summary and the complete administrative record:

1. A motion to recommend Governing Board approval of the required findings (Attachment A), including a finding of no significant effect; and
2. A motion to recommend Governing Board approval of the proposed ordinance (Attachment B).

Project Description/Background: TRPA staff is proposing a Code amendment to more clearly prohibit the unauthorized mooring of watercraft in Lake Tahoe. This amendment will aid staff’s efforts to eliminate the proliferation of watercraft anchored off shore for long term storage without a legally existing mooring. The Code amendment would require that watercraft be moored to a legally existing mooring such as a buoy, boatlift, berth or slip and would prohibit mooring by means of anchoring for the purposes of storage.

Overnight camping would be allowed provided that overnight camping is permissible in the area. Staff is recommending a 72 hour limit as a reasonable delineation between temporary recreation and long term storage. The 72 hour time limit is consistent with Nevada law. For clarification purposes, staff is also recommending new definitions for the term “Mooring” and “Watercraft.” In addition, a clean-up of subsection 51.2.H is being recommended to clarify that residential and tourist accommodation uses are prohibited; and to use the term “watercraft” instead of “vessel.” These changes will provide greater clarity for the public and increased consistency with the shorezone amendments adopted in October 2008.
Contact Information: If you have any questions please contact Gordon Barrett at (775) 589-5219 or via email at gbarrett@trpa.org.

Attachments:
- Required Findings (Attachment A)
- Amending Ordinance 2010-** (Attachment B)
- Code Amendments (Attachment B, Exhibit 1)
Required Findings for Chapter 51 and Chapter 2 Ordinance Amendments

Program Amendment Findings

Chapter 6 Findings: The following findings must be made prior to amending the Code of Ordinances which constitutes a Regional Plan Amendment.

1. Finding: The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.

   Rationale: The purpose of the proposed Code amendments are to ensure that the enforcement of unauthorized mooring is conducted consistently and effectively throughout the Lake.

2. Finding: That the project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

   Rationale: The proposed amendments are intended to aid in the protection of environmental thresholds.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state and local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region, whichever are strictest, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V (d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

   Rationale: The proposed amendments are intended to aid in the protection of air and water quality.

4. Finding: The Regional Plan and all of its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

   Rationale: See Findings 1 and 2 above.

Ordinance 87-8 Findings: Section 2.40 of Ordinance 87-8 requires the following findings be made prior to adopting the proposed Code amendments.

1. Finding: The amendments are consistent with the Compact and with attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.

   Rationale: The proposed Code amendments are designed to aid in the protection of environmental standards and assist in attainment of thresholds by prohibiting unauthorized mooring.
2. **Finding:** That the amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment or maintenance of the thresholds.

   **Rationale:** See 1 above.

3. **One of the following findings:**

   a. There is a demonstrated conflict between provisions of the Regional Plan package, and the conflict threatens to preclude attainment or maintenance of thresholds; or

   b. The provision to be amended has been shown through experience to be counter-productive or ineffective and the amendment is designed to correct the demonstrated problem and is an equal or better means of implementing the Regional Plan package and complying with the Compact; or

   c. Legal constraints, such as court orders, decisions or Compact amendments, require amendment of the Goals and Policies or Code; or

   d. Technical or scientific information demonstrates the need for modification of a provision of the Goals and Policies or Code; or

   e. The provision to be amended has been shown, through experience and time, to be counter-productive to or ineffective in attainment or maintenance of the thresholds; or

   f. Implementation of the provision sought to be amended has been demonstrated to be impracticable or impossible because of one or more of the following reasons:

      (1) The cost of implementation outweighs the environmental gain to be achieved;

      (2) Implementation will result in unacceptable impacts on public health and safety; or

      (3) Fiscal support for implementation is insufficient and such insufficiency is expected to be a long-term problem.

Finding ‘d’ is the most applicable.

   **Rationale:** These amendments are clarifications of existing regulations regarding mooring on Lake Tahoe.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE 2009 –

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTERS 51, PERMISSIBLE USES AND STRUCTURES IN THE SHOREZONE AND LAKEZONE, TO INCLUDE SUBSECTION 51.2.I., OVERNIGHT MOORING AND CHAPTER 2, DEFINITIONS, TO INCLUDE THE DEFINITIONS OF MOORING AND WATERCRAFT AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.00 Findings

1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance 87-9, as amended, which ordinance relates to the Regional Plan of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) by amending the Chapter 51 and Chapter 2 of The Code of Ordinances, in order to further implement the Regional Plan pursuant to Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

1.20 The proposed amendments are amendments to the Shorezone Program which was the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which was processed, reviewed and certified by TRPA in accordance with the substantive and procedural provisions of Article VII of the Compact, Chapter 5 of the Code and Article VI of the Rules of Procedures.

1.30 The Advisory Planning Commission (APC) has conducted a public hearing on the amendments and recommended adoption. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. At those hearings, oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.

1.40 Prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Governing Board made the findings required by Chapter 6 of the Code and Article V(g) of the Compact.

1.50 The Governing Board finds that the amendments will continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that achieves and maintains the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.

1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.00 Amendment of the Code of Ordinances, Chapters 51 and 2, to add Subsection 51.2.I., Overnight Mooring and Chapter 2, Definitions, of the TRPA Code of Ordinances.
2.10  Subsection 6.60 of Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, is hereby further amended as set forth in Exhibit 1, dated April 28, 2010, which attachment is appended hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 3.00  Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to affect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion thereof is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances shall not be affected thereby. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code of Ordinances are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.00  Effective Date

The provisions of this ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances shall be effective immediately after its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held May 26, 2010 by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

Allen Biaggi, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Governing Board
Amendments

Amendments to clarify existing Code, establish mooring requirements and define the term “Mooring” and “Watercraft.”

1. Clean-up of existing language and to establish mooring requirements.

   51.2.H Residential and Tourist Accommodation Uses and Related Vessels Watercraft Prohibited in the Lakezone and Shorezone: The use of vessels watercraft for residential and tourist accommodation purposes uses on lakes and lagoons in the Region is prohibited. It is prohibited to launch, maintain, or moor vessels watercraft designed or used for residential or tourist accommodation uses in the lakes and lagoons in the Region. Vessels Watercraft with more than 700 square feet of improved interior floor area are presumed to be for a residential and/or tourist accommodation use, and the burden is on the owner/operator to rebut the presumption by clear and convincing evidence in the event the use or mooring of the vessels watercraft on lakes and lagoons in the Region is challenged. Occasional overnight camping on a vessel watercraft designed and used for recreational boating that may include ancillary residential amenities (e.g., sleeping cabin, cooking facilities) is not prohibited but shall only occur where expressly allowed by regional, state or federal authorities and in compliance with Subsection 51.2.I.

   51.2.I Overnight Mooring: Watercraft moored overnight in the lakezone, shorezone, and lagoon areas of the lakes within the Region shall be moored to legally existing buoys, boatlifts, slips, berths, boat hoists or other watercraft storage facilities, except for the following:

   (1) Mooring of construction watercraft for purposes of and use during TRPA authorized construction activities,
   (2) Mooring of public service watercraft for health and safety purposes, or
   (3) Mooring of watercraft for occasional overnight camping purposes for up to 72 hours.

2. Define “mooring” and ‘watercraft” in Chapter 2 Definitions

   Mooring: Any device used to secure watercraft in the lakezone, shorezone, and lagoon areas of the lakes within the Region, by means of cables, anchors, or lines.
Watercraft: A waterborne vessel of any type or size including, but not limited to, boats, barges, ferries, yachts, houseboats, floating homes, kayaks, rafts, canoes and seaplanes.
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 5, 2010

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Recommendation on Scheduling Buoy Placement Limit Line Amendments for Future Consideration

**Requested Action:** The APC is requested to review the information in this staff summary and Attachments A through G and make a recommendation to the Governing Board as to the need for further amendments to the Buoy Placement Limit Line (Buoy Line) for Governing Board consideration this summer.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the APC recommend that the Governing Board direct staff to bring forward an amendment for Governing Board consideration amending the Buoy Line for the north end of the Glenbrook Bay area.

**Required Motion:** To make a recommendation, the APC must make the following motion, based on this staff summary and the complete administrative record:

1) A motion to recommend Governing Board direction to staff to further consider an Code amendment amending the adopted Buoy Line to extend the Line lakeward to include those buoys located at the north end of the Glenbrook Bay area with in the Line.

**General Background:** At the time of the Buoy Line adoption in December of 2009, members of the public testified that the Buoy Line should be extended in certain areas primarily to provide safe anchorage in low water conditions. Some of the testimony related to site specific areas and some related to the belief that the Buoy Line should provide at least 10 feet of mooring depth during low water conditions in all locations in the Lake. As a result of this testimony, the Governing Board directed staff to review all known areas where existing or proposed buoy locations are outside of the adopted Buoy Line and report back to the Board in May of 2010 on the need for additional Buoy Line amendments. The May reporting date was chosen to allow time to schedule amendments, if they were needed. Most buoys were permitted in the August-October period of 2009. The permits requiring buoy relocation to meet current location standards have condition requiring relocation within one year of the approval date. This schedule for consideration of amendments would give TRPA the opportunity to adopt amendments if needed before August.
The environmental analysis completed for the Buoy Line indicated that, in the worst case, 1,985 buoys would be inside of the Buoy Line, and 715 would be outside the Buoy Line and thus subject to relocation.

Thus, the focus of this report is to analyze site specific areas and to consider if they merit a Buoy Line amendment. Staff took the following actions in conducting its analysis:

1. Staff reviewed the TRPA GIS data including new GPS data from applicants.
2. Staff was aware of two applicants who desired to extend the Buoy Line beyond 600 feet.
3. Staff met with government permitting agencies and reviewed potential areas.
4. Staff met with stakeholder representatives, including the environmental community representatives.
5. Staff reviewed potential areas warranting Buoy Line amendments.
6. Staff scheduled a discussion with the APC to review the potential Buoy Line amendment areas.

Based on the input received from these sources to date, staff identified the following areas for consideration. Figure 1 provides a location map for the areas considered and the attachment that contains the analysis.

1. Attachment A – South of Tahoe City Area
2. Attachment B – North End of Glenbrook Bay Area
3. Attachment C – Logan Shoals Area
4. Attachment D – East End of Incline Area
5. Attachment E – Tahoe Vista Area in the National Avenue Area
6. Attachment F – Tahoe City to Dollar Point Area
7. Attachment G – Kings Beach Area
Figure 1 Location Map
Criteria for Amendment: The standard findings and environmental documentation findings for a Code amendment apply to a Buoy Line amendment. There are no Buoy Line specific findings required to be made to amend the Buoy Line. The following is a summary of the rationale presented for adoption of the Buoy Line and the exception as provided in the December TRPA staff summary.

The adopted Buoy Line establishes a maximum distance for the placement of single use buoys at 6,213 feet lake bottom elevation, but not inward of 350 feet lakeward of high water, nor further lakeward than 600 feet of high water (buoys moored at this distance must be located such that watercraft moored to these buoys cannot drift further than 600 feet lakeward of high water). The Buoy Line therefore follows the 6,213 foot elevation contour between 350 and 600 feet from high water, and imposes a maximum distance consistent with TRPA’s no wake zone.

In adopting the Buoy Line, TRPA chose not to set the line lakeward of 600 feet except for one exception. The 600 foot limit corresponds to TRPA’s no wake zone, and is supported by both the U.S. Coast Guard and the Nevada Department of Wildlife. The one exception sets the Buoy Line at approximately 1,000 feet from high water in the Tahoe City area, where two legally existing piers currently extend 1,050 feet from high water. The APC and Governing Board believed this exception was appropriate given that there are two exceptionally long piers in this area, and people generally navigate around these piers (i.e., navigate in waters more lakeward than 1,000 feet in order to avoid the existing piers). Because of the shallow shelf in this area, this exception is consistent with better navigation and safe mooring of watercraft.

In order to evaluate the merits of the proposed amendments, staff needed to develop criteria for evaluation. Based on the rationale for the original Buoy Line adoption described above, staff developed the following criteria. Staff then evaluated Attachments A-G potential amendments based on the required ordinance, threshold and environmental document findings plus the following criteria developed by staff. If the analysis affirms 1 through 4 below, staff is supportive of pursuing an amendment.

1. There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone.

2. The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line.

3. Current exceptions in the Code cannot address the safety concerns.

4. The amendment better promotes both navigational safety and safe mooring.

Analysis: In Attachments A-G, staff has provided preliminary reports based on the criteria listed above. The analysis, maps, and photos are based on the current TRPA data base. It is staff’s belief that there is enough information contained in the Attachments to determine which proposals merit further TRPA resources for consideration. The Buoy Line is well founded and its unanimous adoption was based on numerous hearings, supporting documents, and stakeholder review. The analysis supports the December action; however, there may be ground for minor adjustments.
Additional information could change the analysis and the Attachments state what additional analysis might be needed. Staff’s concern is that most of the proposals will need a significant amount of “further information” if TRPA is to pursue all of these. Based on the information at hand, consideration of all the proposals would require significant staff time, TRPA cost, environmental documentation, and public hearings, it would not be likely that all proposals could be completed for action by the end of July nor would they result in adoption.

It should be noted that TRPA not continuing to pursue the proposals does not preclude any applicant from submitting an application pursuing any of these proposals.

If you have any questions concerning this agenda item, please contact Gordon Barrett at (775) 589-5219 or gbarrett@trpa.org.

Attachments
Attachment A – South of Tahoe City Area
Attachment B – North End of Glenbrook Bay Area
Attachment C – Logan Shoals Area
Attachment D – East End of Incline Area
Attachment E – Tahoe Vista Area in the National Avenue Area
Attachment F – Tahoe City to Dollar Point Area
Attachment G – Kings Beach Area
Attachment A
South of Tahoe City Area

Proposal: Some stakeholders suggested TRPA eliminate the South of Tahoe City Area Buoy Line extension exception and have no exceptions. On the following maps, see the red line for the adopted Buoy Line and the black dashed line for proposed line.

Area Description: This area is the one adopted exception to the 600’ limit for the Buoy Line. The Buoy Line in this area is at approximately 1,000 feet from high water for approximately a half of mile in the Tahoe City area, where two legally existing piers currently extend 1,050 feet from high water. See site plan map and photo.

Staff Analysis: The adopted Tahoe City exception is supported by criteria staff has developed for review of these types of amendments. The record indicates that this extension was supported by TRPA APC and Governing Board and most our partner agencies. TRPA staff does not recommend amending the Buoy Line to 600’.

Number of Buoys Affected: 24 buoys would have to be relocated including the 6 buoys that require relocation under the adopted line.

Lake Bottom: Shallow, coble, spawning habitat

Wave Hazard: Moderate

Based on the original action, staff is evaluating pursuing the amendments on the following criteria:

Additional Information Needed: None

Probability of Making TRPA Required Findings: High

Estimated Level of Environmental Documentation: IEC

There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone: Yes because of two piers.

The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line: Yes.

Current exceptions (if line is moved to 600’) in the Code can not address the safety concerns: No exceptions are allowed past 600’.

The amendment (to go back to 600’) better promotes navigation safety and safe mooring: No
Attachment B
North End of Glenbrook Bay Area

Proposal: An applicant suggested that the Buoy Line be moved lakeward to approximately 800’ in the North End of Glenbrook Bay Area. On the following maps, see the red line for the adopted Buoy Line and the black dashed line for proposed line.

Area Description: In this area, the adopted Buoy Line is at 600’ from shore moving toward 350’ in a cove area at the north end of Glenbrook Bay. There is generally sufficient depth but the lake bottom is variable due drifting sand. See site plan map and photo.

Staff Analysis: The initial assessment indicates TRPA staff should pursue this amendment if the bottom conditions are as represented by one of the applicants who has a State Lands permit for 800’ buoy location. TRPA staff may have better information as to bottom conditions if a site visit can be performed before the APC meeting. Staff is tentatively recommending pursuing this amendment.

Number of Buoys Affected: 10 buoys would not have to be relocated.

Lake Bottom: Shallow, sandy bottom, and drifts

Wave Hazard: High

Based on the original action, staff is evaluating pursuing the amendments on the following criteria:

Additional Information Needed: More accurate contour information for entire cove, wave pattern analysis, lake bottom analysis, navigation analysis.

Probability of Making TRPA Required Findings: Moderate

Estimated Level of Environmental Documentation: IEC

There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone: There are historical pilings at the south end of the cove and the land form of the cove might inhibit high speed boating.

The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line: Need to evaluate.

Current exceptions in the Code can not address the safety concerns: Correct for some buoys.

The amendment better promotes navigation safety and safe mooring: Need to evaluate.
Attachment C
Logan Shoals Area

Proposal: A stakeholder suggested TRPA move the Buoy Line lakeward to approximately 800’ in the Logan Shoals Area. On the following maps, see the red line for the adopted Buoy Line and the black dashed line for proposed line.

Area Description: In this area the adopted Buoy Line is variable from 600’ moving toward 350’ on a rocky point in the Logan Shoals Area. There is generally sufficient depth; but, the lake bottom is variable due rock formations. See site plan map and photo.

Staff Analysis: The initial assessment indicates there is a reason to locate the Buoy Line beyond the natural rock formations; however, it appears there no existing buoys located beyond the Buoy Line at this time. TRPA staff may have better information as to bottom conditions if more information is submitted about the local conditions before the APC meeting. At this point staff is not recommending any amendments.

Number of Buoys Affected: According to our GPS data, there are no existing buoys beyond the Buoy Line. Staff is not sure why buoys would have to be relocated.

Lake Bottom: Shallow, sandy bottom, large rock formations, feed and cover habitat

Wave Hazard: High

Based on the original action, staff is evaluating pursuing the amendments on the following criteria:

Additional Information Needed: More accurate information for entire cove is needed, including contours, wave pattern analysis, lake bottom analysis, navigation analysis.

Probability of Making TRPA Required Findings: Moderate

Estimated Level of Environmental Documentation: IEC

There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone: Coast Guard buoys and natural rock formations tend to establish a line further than 600’.

The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line: Need to evaluate.

Current exceptions in the Code can address the safety concerns: Uncertain

The amendment better promotes navigation safety and safe mooring: Need to evaluate.

Agenda Item No. VII.A.
Attachment D
East End of Incline Area

Proposal: Stakeholders suggested TRPA move the Buoy Line lakeward to approximately 600’ in the East End of Incline Area. On the following maps, see the red line for the adopted Buoy Line and the black dashed line for proposed line.

Area Description: In this area, the adopted Buoy Line is at 350’ in a cove area at the east end of Incline Village. There is generally sufficient depth; but, the area is subject to some of the largest waves on the Lake. See site plan map and photo.

Staff Analysis: The initial assessment indicates there is a reason to locate the buoys beyond the Buoy Line; however, the Code has provisions to allow buoys in such circumstances to locate out to 600’. Staff does not recommend a Buoy Line amendment since the current buoy locations may be addressed by exceptions.

Number of Buoys Affected: 19 buoys are outside 350’ and within 600’; but, would not have to be relocated if using exceptions provision.

Lake Bottom: Shallow, sandy bottom, and drifts.

Wave Hazard: High

Based on the original action, staff is evaluating pursuing the amendments on the following criteria:

Additional Information Needed: Accurate contour information for entire cove, wave pattern analysis, lake bottom analysis, navigation analysis.

Probability of Making TRPA Required Findings: Moderate

Estimated Level of Environmental Documentation: IEC

There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone: No man made structures but the cove might inhibit high speed boating

The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line: Need to evaluate

Current exceptions in the Code can not address the safety concerns: Exceptions can address these concerns.

The amendment better promotes navigation safety and safe mooring: Need to evaluate.
Attachment E
Tahoe Vista Area in the National Avenue Area

Proposal: An applicant suggested TRPA move the Buoy Line lakeward to approximately 800’ in the National Avenue Area of Tahoe Vista. On the following maps, see the red line for the adopted Buoy Line and the black dashed line for proposed line.

Area Description: In this area the adopted Buoy Line is at Elev. 6213 between 600’ and 350’ in a cove area to the east of National Avenue. There is generally sufficient depth but the lake bottom is variable due drifting sand. See site plan map and photo.

Staff Analysis: The initial assessment indicates there is no reason to locate the Buoy Line beyond the lake bottom 6213’ limit. It there is a need to locate buoys further out, the current Code allows consideration to relocate out to 600’. It appears there are buoys located beyond the Buoy Line in this area. TRPA staff may have better information as to bottom conditions if more information is submitted about the local conditions before the APC meeting. Staff is not recommending pursuing this amendment at this time.

Number of Buoys Affected: 16 buoys are outside the current Buoy Line but within 600’ and 19 are within the proposed line and 600’. 8 buoys are outside the proposed line.

Lake Bottom: Shallow water in foreshore, sandy bottom, drifts.

Wave Hazard: High

Based on the original action, staff is evaluating pursuing the amendments on the following criteria:

Additional Information Needed: Accurate contour information for entire cove, wave pattern analysis, lake bottom analysis, navigation analysis.

Probability of Making TRPA Required Findings: Moderate

Estimated Level of Environmental Documentation: IEC

There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone: No man made permanent structures but the cove and buoy fields might inhibit high speed boating.

The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line: Need to evaluate

Current exceptions in the Code can address the safety concerns: Exceptions can address 10’ depth (Elev. 6213) concern.

The amendment better promotes navigation safety and safe mooring: Need to evaluate.

Agenda Item No. VII.A.
Attachment F
Tahoe City to Dollar Point Area

Proposal: A stakeholder requested TRPA move the Buoy Line lakeward to approximately 1000’+ from Tahoe City to Dollar Point. On the following maps, see the red line for the adopted Buoy Line and the black dashed line for proposed line.

Area Description: In this area the adopted Buoy Line is at 600’ because of shallow water. There is generally sufficient depth in high water conditions, but not in low water conditions. See site plan map and photo.

Staff Analysis: The Tahoe City to Dollar Point proposal is not supported by the criteria. This amendment along with the Kings Beach amendment would require a rethinking of the Buoy Line criteria and at least an Environmental Assessment. Staff is not recommending this amendment.

Number of Buoys Affected: 42 buoys would not have to be relocated. If the goal is to relocate all buoys to 6213, approximately 109 buoys could be relocated lakeward.

Lake Bottom: Shallow, coble and soft rock bottom, and spawning area.

Wave Hazard: Moderate

Based on the original action, staff is evaluating pursuing the amendments on the following criteria:

Additional Information Needed: Accurate contour information for entire area, wave pattern analysis, lake bottom analysis, and navigation analysis.

Probability of Making TRPA Required Findings: Low

Estimated Level of Environmental Documentation: EA

There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone: No man existing permanent made structures; but, shallow water might inhibit high speed boating.

The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line: Need to evaluate.

Current exceptions in the Code can not address the safety concerns: Correct

The amendment better promotes navigation safety and safe mooring: Need to evaluate.
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Attachment G
Kings Beach Area

Proposal: A stakeholder suggested TRPA move the Buoy Line lakeward to approximately 800’ from Hwy 28 to Brockway in the Kings Beach Area. On the following maps, see the red line for the adopted Buoy Line and the black dashed line for proposed line.

Area Description: In this area, the adopted Buoy Line is at 600’ in shallow water going to 400’ in the Brockway area. There is generally sufficient depth in high water conditions, but not in low water conditions. See site plan map and photo.

Staff Analysis: The Kings Beach proposal is not supported by the criteria. This amendment along with the Tahoe City to Dollar Point amendment would require a rethinking of the Buoy Line criteria and at least an Environmental Assessment. TRPA staff sees no evidence that this area needs an amendment.

Number of Buoys Affected: 57 buoys would not have to be relocated. In the Brockway area, 18 of these buoys are within 600’.

Lake Bottom: Shallow, sandy bottom.

Wave Hazard: High

Based on the original action, staff is evaluating pursuing the amendments on the following criteria:

Additional Information Needed: Accurate contour information for entire cove, wave pattern analysis, lake bottom analysis, navigation analysis.

Probability of Making TRPA Required Findings: Low

Estimated Level of Environmental Documentation: EA

There are permanent structures or physical features which require watercraft to navigate in waters more lakeward than 600 feet and the additional area is functionally equivalent to the no-wake zone: No man existing permanent made structures but shallow water might inhibit high speed boating.

The Coast Guard or other appropriate agencies of jurisdiction would not require additional navigational markers or lighting to delineate the new Buoy Line: Need to evaluate

Current exceptions in the Code can not address the safety concerns: Correct for 18 buoys in Brockway. The remaining can be addressed with exceptions to 600’.

The amendment better promotes navigation safety and safe mooring: Need to evaluate.
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 5, 2010
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Discussion on Regional Plan Update Conservation Milestone

Requested Action: No action is required.

Discussion: This is a discussion of the Conservation Milestone (which is scheduled for the July APC/Governing Board meeting). The topics to be discussed are the proposed plan alternatives for Fish and Wildlife, Soils, Vegetation, Monitoring and Evaluation and Shorezone Sub-elements. Staff will make a brief presentation on the topics involved, the differences between the alternatives, and the major changes (to the existing Regional Plan) that are being proposed. The APC will essentially act as a stakeholder in the Regional Plan Update process, providing staff with advice and engaging in collaboration to develop solutions where possible. Staff will record the main issues raised at the meeting for inclusion in the Conservation Milestone's FactSheet.

If you have questions concerning this particular agenda item please contact Harmon Zuckerman, Regional Plan Update Director, at (775) 589-5236 or hzuckerman@trpa.org.