TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

North Tahoe Conference Center
Kings Beach, California

November 15, 1995

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman John Upton called the regular November 15, 1995, meeting of the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to order at 9:35 a.m. and asked Ms. Baldrica to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Ms. Baldrica (for Mr. DeLany), Mr. Waldie, Mr. Cronk, Mr. Wynn, Ms. Hagedorn (present at 10:30 a.m. during item VII.C.), Mr. Severson, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cole, Ms. Bennett, Mr. Chinarusti (for Mr. Westergard), Ms. Neft, Mr. Bradhurst, Mr. Upton

Members Absent: Dr. Miner, Mr. Neumann

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Ms. Karen Van Epps, a Tahoe Vista resident and business owner, described traffic and congestion problems caused by multi-uses and pedestrians at the National Avenue and Highway 28 intersection. She submitted a document which described the nature of the problem and possible solutions. She asked the Board for support in working with the Nevada postal division to relocate post office parking away from the intersection and assistance in looking elsewhere for a relocated TART bus terminal.

Mr. Severson endorsed Ms. Van Epps’ efforts to relocate parking for the post office. This was a real problem area, and he encouraged staff to do what it could to redo the circulation pattern in this area.

Executive Director Jim Baetge advised that TRPA’s transportation staff was working with the Postal Service and with the Community Plan group on these issues.

Mr. Don Kornreich, an Incline resident, discussed a letter he had sent Board members urging the Basin Impact Fee (BIF) be placed on the agenda for discussion. He was concerned if something was not done soon this item could not be taken up at the next session of the Nevada Legislature and would be delayed until at least the year 2000. He had received a response from Executive Director Jim Baetge suggesting that the BIF was being handled in other ways. The effort to obtain $100,000 through the legislative packet for the purpose of studying funding mechanisms for regional public transportation was unlikely to succeed for several years. It was a mistake to depend on the $100,000. He would like to see funding available in the next two years to improve Tahoe’s environment and to provide funding to support TRPA. On another matter, Mr. Kornreich advised he had reviewed the Shoreszone RIS and would submit his comments to staff along with comments on the North Shore RIS.
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IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Wynn to approve the October 25, 1995, meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Upton noted there was a memo in the packet material asking for a continuance of item VII.A. (amendment of the Regional Plan, Man-Modified Determination, Hock, Douglas County) so that adequate notice could be provided to affected property owners.

MOTION by Mr. Sevison to approve the agenda as proposed and with continuance of item VII.A. The motion carried unanimously.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Sevison asked that the record show an abstention for him on item 1 (adoption of ordinance to amend Plan Area Statement 013, Watson Creek).

Ms. Bennett and Mr. Chimarusti asked the record to show a negative vote for them on item 4 (Tanager Complex, subdivision of post-1987 project in Washoe County).

Chairman Upton noted that five Nevada votes were needed to approve Nevada projects. Item 4 would not have sufficient votes to carry. He directed that item 4 be taken off of the calendar and acted on separately.

MOTION by Mr. Wynn to approve items 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 on the consent calendar. The motion carried with Mr. Sevison abstaining on item 1.

(Following are items approved on the consent calendar: 1. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 013, Watson Creek, to Add Local Public Health and Safety Facilities as a Special Use (Ordinance No. 95-13); 2. El Dorado County Department of Transportation Trout Creek Culvert Replacement and Erosion Control Project, Martin Avenue, El Dorado County Project 520-106-95; 3. Squaw Valley Sport Shop, Secondary Storage, Special Use Determination, Placer County APN 94-190-12; 5. Robert Dutton, Land Capability Challenge, Washoe County APN 125-561-09; 6. R. Bryan Sedway, Land Capability Challenge, Washoe County APN 125-132-13)

4. Tanager Complex, Subdivision of Post-1987 Project, Washoe County APNs 132-222-09 and 132-222-10 (consent calendar item 4)

Associate Planner Paul Nielsen briefly described the proposal to subdivide a 4-unit multi-family post-1987 project located on Southwood Boulevard. The property was owned by Mr. Jay Naimsith. The project was approved last year; however, construction had not yet commenced.

Ms. Bennett explained that her objection was in line with concerns addressed on an ongoing basis regarding affordable housing. A committee was now looking at affordable housing issues and a moratorium on further subdivisions. She felt this project was opportunistic on the part of the property owner, and it
was inconsistent with values she felt were important to the Basin as a whole. This was the basis of her objection.

Mr. Wynn noted that the staff was recommending approval on this proposal, and the project was timely in coming to the Board this month. To push a moratorium up a month from the December deadline on this type of proposal was penalizing the applicant.

Attorney Robert Spitzer, on behalf of the owner, noted the application was within the rules. The Board was bending the rules by moving the moratorium up a month and a half.

Mr. Cole reiterated his position on the affordable housing issue and the need of a fair share assumption by local governments in the Basin. Although the project was located in an affordable housing area, a moratorium on developments like this was not scheduled to take effect until the end of the year. He did not disagree with Ms. Bennett that this may be opportunistic, but the rules currently allowed approval to occur. He would have some anxiety in voting against it based on that premise alone.

Ms. Bennett explained that she was hoping her vote in opposition would simply be seen as a protest vote. Because she was joined by Mr. Chimarusti, Mr. Westergard's appointee, and realizing the project would not pass because of Dr. Miner's absence, she reluctantly withdrew her objection to the project.

**MOTION** by Mr. Wynn to approve the Tanager Complex subdivision of a post-1987 project. The motion carried with Mr. Chimarusti voting in opposition.

**VII. PUBLIC HEARING**

B. Notice of Circulation, Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan (CP) and Draft EIR/EIS

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett explained that the comment period on this plan and EIS would close December 4. Approximately 60 days were then needed for the Community Plan Team, staff, and consultant to prepare the response to comments. The plan and EIS would be coming to the Board for final action in February or March. Simulations and wall maps were available for the Board review.

City Planning Director Teri Jamin explained the objective of the CP team was to create a series of villages in the plan area and to establish buffers between the districts. She presented information on the goals and content of each of the four districts: 1) town center with concentrated public service and government center complex; 2) the Harrison Avenue District with pedestrian-oriented businesses in a vintage Tahoe style; 3) the Lucky/Payless area with an intensification of commercial uses; and 4) the Bijou district with increased commercial and tourist accommodations. Ms. Jamin presented more information on transportation, recreation, drainage improvements and commercial allocations for the areas and responded to Board member questions about parking, tourist accommodation uses, SEZ restoration, and incentives.
Mr. Barrett noted that Chapter 3 of the draft EIS contained a summary of the impacts. At this time the plan and EIS found there would be no unmitigated impacts; the plan met all the targets. The EIS contained a list of capital improvements, proposed coverages, and uses. The issues raised by the APC at an earlier hearing related to signalization near the Highway 50/Johnson Boulevard intersection; uses on the site of the Lake Tahoe Community College; whether St. Theresa's Catholic church/school should be in or out of the plan; and the potential conflict caused by the proximity of the ball fields and the heavy traffic on Rufus Allen Boulevard. The plan and environmental document would go to the Planning Commission and City Council for action and then come to TRPA.

Ms. Jamin explained that the Planning Team participants included Bill Conlin, a local accountant; John Wynn, the former director of the Chamber of Commerce; Mary Avila, a real estate agent; Frank Auten, representing the Senior Citizens; Hal Cole, a Council member and contractor; Joseph Hansen, a business owner; and Guy Lease, president of the Lake Tahoe Community College; Steve Winters, an office building owner. There was an attendance requirement for members of the planning team.

No one wished to comment in the public hearing on the plan or environmental document. Chairman Upton closed the public hearing.

Executive Director Jim Baetge spoke strongly in favor of TRPA not acting on the CPs until local governments had acted first. He hoped there was support for this on the Board.

Mr. Upton agreed so long as local governments could be pretty sure that there would not be a lot of modifications at the TRPA level.

C. Notice of Circulation, U.S. Forest Service North Shore Project Draft EIS

Associate Planner Paul Nielsen advised that the comment period for this document started October 20 and would conclude December 19. The analysis addressed 20,000 acres of Forest Service land extending from Tunnel Creek to the Truckee River. Of the 20,000 acres, approximately 8,000 were proposed for treatment in all the alternatives. The activities would include fuels treatment (prescribed burning and slash treatment), vegetation management (thinning), road closures of up to 40 miles of road, and 1.5 miles of stream habitat improvements. The plan also addressed Defensible Fuels Profile Zones (DFPZ), a concept which called for setting aside a quarter mile strip of forest located around urban areas where vegetation management would be more intense. The table in Chapter 2, page 3 set forth the statistical comparison of the alternatives.

Mr. Joe Oden, the Forest Service project planning team leader, noted that number 2 of the 3 action alternatives was the preferred alternative since it provided the most balanced approach to achieving the goal of good land stewardship. The alternatives could be changed slightly in the final EIS which would be distributed in February. Mr. Oden presented more information on alternative 2 and advised that the Forest Service was conducting a field trip and workshop on the project on November 16.
Chairman Upton opened the public hearing.

Mr. Don Kornreich noted he had turned in three pages of comments on the plan; he was impressed by the quality of the study; implementation would take a lot of money. He was concerned that more work was not proposed for the Incline community. The perceived lack of funding had kept the project at a scale that he did not think was adequate.

Since there were no further public comments, Chairman Upton closed the hearing.

D. Draft EIS for the Lake Tahoe Shoreszone Development Cumulative Impact Analysis

Deputy Director Jerry Wells reminded the Board that in October it had extended the comment period on the document to December 4. The public/private shoreszone partnership group met on Monday, November 13, and unanimously requested that the comment period be extended once again. On November 14, the Shoreszone Policy Committee of the Governing Board met and agreed to grant the extension to January 24 to allow two more public hearing opportunities. Staff would handle the extension administratively; Board action would not be needed. Staff had not planned a presentation today but only a public hearing to take comments.

Chairman Upton opened the public hearing. Since no one wished to comment the hearing was closed.

Mr. Wells explained that approximately 30 people had showed up at the first public/private shoreszone meeting, and the committee would be narrowed down to 12 to 15 people. The partnership group would meet again December 4 at 2:00 p.m.

E. Notice of Circulation, Placer County and Washoe County Community Plans and Draft EIS

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett distributed a map of the affected areas and a summary sheet outlining the agenda for the presentation.

Referencing the wall maps, Placer County Planner Bill Combs outlined the geographic areas of the plans beginning at Carnelian Bay and extending to Tahoe Vista, Kings Beach Industrial, Kings Beach, and North Stateline. The backdrop areas were the subject of Placer County's general plan update. The process had been ongoing for a number of years, and the purpose was to coordinate local planning efforts with those of TRPA. The plan was consistent with state law for mandatory elements and with the TRPA thresholds. The Kings Beach group had met at least 50 times over four years in a real grass roots process. The Planning Commission had conducted a number of public hearings and had given conceptual endorsement to the plan. The Commission and Board of Supervisors would be acting on the environmental document, and TRPA Board action would follow. There were no major issues in the plans because the process had been a real consensus effort by everyone. The plan document was distributed a year ago, and the Board recently received the environmental document. Kings Beach was to receive 40,000 square feet of commercial, Tahoe
Vista 7,500, Carnelian Bay 2,000, and Kings Beach Industrial 13,000. The award of commercial allocations was keyed to environmental improvements.

Washoe County Planner Romary Woodbeck noted the team began its work in 1988; the area plan prepared by the team was adopted in 1989; and the preliminary conceptual community plan was adopted in 1990. Since then details had been fleshed out in four different CP areas: 1) North Stateline done in conjunction with the Placer County team, a family destination resort area with almost 20,000 square feet of new commercial floor area, 45 bonus tourist accommodation units; and 50 residential units for affordable or employee housing. 2) the Highway 28 to downtown Incline area, a pedestrian friendly area with service and industrial uses on the periphery; the plan called for 23,000 square feet in additional commercial coverage and 100 residential bonus units. 3) Incline Village tourist area with the Hyatt, the new college site, and the recreation center; there were few vacant areas here and no big changes; the plan called for an additional 10 residential bonus units and 12,000 square feet of commercial floor area with the floor area possibly being transferred out due to lack of space. 4) Ponderosa Ranch, industrial/storage and public service area with highway landscape improvements and new theme park attractions at Ponderosa Ranch. The area would have 45 bonus tourist accommodation units and 50 residential bonus units for employee or affordable housing and 16,500 square feet of new commercial space. The planning team had discussed having this area provide satellite parking for people wanting to visit the East Shore along Highway 28.

Mr. Barrett explained the comment period would end January 9, 1996, for the environmental document. The EIR/ETIS certification was scheduled for Board action in April 1996. Commercial allocations were available only through December 1995. The 1996 threshold evaluation would determine what commercial allocations would be available in the future.

Mr. Bradhurst suggested that, since the Community Plans had taken so long to complete, people should not be penalized in obtaining the commercial floor area allocations. The earliest the allocations could be granted for the Washoe County CPs would be April or May of 1996, and he favored an extension of the deadline.

Mr. Barrett noted that the plans contained a summary of all impacts. This document was a complex one, and because there was a concerted effort to get all the plans and documents out, there were remaining issues which had not been resolved. These involved North Stateline signs and having a scenic package that would offset the increased signage. A consultant was being hired now to score the scenic units in which the casinos were located and to show there was a mitigation package to offset the impacts.

Chairman Upton asked that staff in the near future put on a scenic workshop for the Board members. This had been done previously, but there were a number of new Board members who would benefit from such a presentation.

Mr. Barrett explained that another issue related to treatment of the dunes in the Tahoe Vista area. The RH soils were mapped as stream zone/water influence zones, although they were not exactly the same as a high water area. The lands, however, were fragile. The remapping showed that the strip of land
between the highway and the Lake was either wet or sand dunes. This was an unresolved issue.

Another issue related to the fact that all previous CPs had a trigger project which would be completed prior to release of commercial allocations. In the Washoe County plans, however, that mechanism was not present. If the Board agreed that Washoe County had since 1987 already implemented a significant major stream zone restoration or scenic roadway project the project could be counted and floored in. The team did not vote on this because sufficient detail was not available to include it and the issue of an irrevocable commitment was not raised until the end of the planning process in the North Stateline plan. Staff felt strongly that before release of the allocations there should be a major commitment to some set of environmental improvements. Mr. Barrett suggested he did not feel there would be a problem with this since there were numerous improvement projects that had been done in the Incline area which may qualify.

Mr. Barrett explained that the last unresolved issue related to the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and the estimated, substantial increases in North Stateline, Incline Village Tourist, and Ponderosa. Generally when residential and tourist units were transferred into an area, there were trip increases. A big increase was caused by the relocation of Sierra Nevada College to the Incline Tourist plan area. While the EIS analysis of CO found there was no problem with air quality, there was a problem with the amount of VMT being generated. The targets set out in the preliminary plan established the VMT goals. The EIS found that for three of the community plans there would need to be a reduction in development to reduce projected VMT. The total target reduction in all plans was 14,486 vehicle trips. If the Board looked at the plans cumulatively, it could determine that the VMT impacts were a wash. There were problems, however, taking the plans individually. Options included changing the arbitrary targets, reducing development to meet the targets, or looking at the total package and averaging out the reductions across the whole area. Some areas would have increased VMT; others would have reduced VMT.

Mr. Wynn suggested that the problem with looking at the impacts cumulatively over the whole area meant that there were specific problem areas caused by a concentration of cars.

Mr. Cole suggested there was a basic flaw in the concept because community plans were designed to concentrate development to achieve certain goals. Yet by achieving these goals, traffic hot spots were being created. There was a basic lack of logic. He questioned the validity of the concern with VMT, a measure of air quality. Realistically what was happening was increased VMT along with improved air quality from the cleaner vehicle fleets. He questioned whether VMT was a valid measurement tool.

Mr. Upton commented that the VMT targets were arbitrarily assigned based on a different logic. This was a case where TRPA made the right land use decision in relocating the college, as an example, closer to available housing, only to find that it had created a problem with other measurement standards. Perhaps there needed to be a reanalysis of VMT in terms of traffic congestion, not air quality. Air quality was not the problem.
Mr. Bradhurst described Washoe County's efforts to address air quality problems and suggested the focus should not be on VMT be rather on Level of Service and traffic congestion. There was no logic if VMT was tied to air quality and air quality was improving.

Mr. Bostge explained that, while the threshold evaluation would deal with all these issues, VMT related not only to air quality but also to water quality and nitrogen contribution to the Lake and Lake clarity. He urged the Board not to discard the VMT issue too rapidly.

Mr. Barrett showed before and after slides of the Kings Beach, Tahoe Vista, and Carmelite Bay areas and responded to Board member questions.

(Mr. Wynn left the meeting at 11:50 a.m.)

Mr. Upton opened the public hearing.

Mr. Don Kermreich commented that the four community plans addressed less than 30 percent of the total Incline Village/Crystal Bay area. In discussing erosion control, storm water control and VMT, the Board needed to look at the total community. On the issue of VMT, if there were ever a revenue-generating system that could allocate $1 million for Incline Village, almost all future VMT growth could be stopped. The concern was not so much with air quality but Level of Service. The $1 million could add another 30 route miles of bike paths, ten park and ride lots for the public, and at least 20 12-passenger vans. The planning process had been going on for seven years now; and in an attempt to get something done within the time frame set forth by the planning staffs, the planning team was perhaps impatient and may have approved things that would not originally have been approved. He hoped that any future updates would be done by the community and not TRPA and Washoe County. As far as commercial allocations, he was under the impression that Washoe County and TRPA would give some credit for some of the $1.5 in mitigation improvements now underway.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairman Upton closed the hearing.

Mr. Chimarusti suggested that getting local government approval prior to adoption of the Community Plans was an admirable goal but the Board needed to be reminded that the process had gone on for a long time and had sometimes gotten bogged down at the local level. It may be advisable in some cases for the process to move forward with an approval; amendment could always occur later on as needed. At least CPs would be in place. He had met with the Nevada Legislature in the past on the issues surrounding the Douglas County Community Plan, and changes were made in how the process would be pursued because it was taking so long. Some Board members felt that TRPA should not make major changes to CPs after local approval had been granted. That was fine so long as the plans were consistent with the adopted Goals and Policies. The Board was not in a position of surrendering its authority in that area. There were staff members on the various planning teams who were hopefully advising the teams on what TRPA’s requirements and ordinances were. On the subject of VMT and on behalf of Mr. Westergard, Mr. Chimarusti reminded the Board of Mr. Westergard’s earlier, numerous warnings that some of the decisions being made on VMT were going to come back and affect future
decisions; it seemed that TRPA was getting into that position as predicted. It was a difficult problem.

Mr. Sevison commented that one of the things pushed by local governments was consistency between TRPA and the Counties and the City. If TRPA were to approve the plans up front, the local jurisdictions could modify and change them once they took over the process. The plans may not then be consistent with TRPA's plan. TRPA staff was guiding the planning teams to ensure consistency with Agency plans and helping in the drafting of one plan - easy to enforce and easy to manage. He encouraged the Board not to change the process and have TRPA act first on the plans.

Mr. Chimarusti noted he was not suggesting a change in the process, only that the Board recognize that if it was getting bogged down the process could be addressed in an alternative way.

Chairman Upton recessed the TRPA meeting and convened the meeting of the RTFA for action on the next agenda item.

VIII. MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (RTFA)

A. Resolution Allocating FY 1995-96 Local Transportation Fund (LTF) ($349,994) to Placer County for TART Operations

Associate Planner Bridget Mahern presented the staff summary, noting that the Finance Committee had recommended approval. TRPA's administrative and planning fees had already been taken out of the $349,994. The full $349,994 would be going to Placer County.

MOTION by Mr. Sevison to adopt the RTFA Resolution No. 95-12 allocating LTF to Placer County for TART. The motion carried unanimously. (Members present: Cole, Sevison, Bradhurst, Neft, Bennett, Waldie, Heller, Cronk, Hagedorn, Baldrica, Chimarusti, Upton)

Chairman Upton adjourned the RTFA and convened the TRPA Governing Board.

IX. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Authorization for Executive Director to Execute Master Agreement Administering TRPA and State Agency Agreement for Federal-Aid Projects

Associate Planner Bridget Mahern explained the agreement between Caltrans and TRPA was to administer any federal aid programs administered through the State of California. In the past when TRPA received state subvention funds for planning purposes, TRPA had an MOU with Caltrans that would outline the use of the funds. Because TRPA no longer received such funds, the MOU had become unnecessary. Because the planning funds that replaced the subvention funds were a mix of state and federal funds, there needed to be some means of receiving the federal funds. The agreement would not necessarily establish the process for TRPA receipt of funds but laid the groundwork for future documents which would be appended to the master agreement.
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MOTION by Mr. Sevison to approve the staff recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to enter into the agreement as proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

X. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND BOARD ACTION

A. Finance Committee

2. Receipt of October Financial Statement and Check Register

MOTION by Ms. Bennett to receive the statement and register as recommended by the Finance Committee. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Receipt of FY 1994-95 TRPA Audit

Finance Committee Chairman Kay Bennett explained that the audit report was not yet available so action was continued to December.

4. Policy for Use of Trolleys Outside the Tahoe Basin

Ms. Bennett explained that the Committee recommended adoption of the policy proposed by staff for use of trolleys outside the Basin.

Ms. Bennett advised that the Committee had also discussed disposition of the $15,000 in abandoned securities held by TRPA. The Committee would be looking at a process to ensure that property owners who paid a security as a part of a project approval would agree that it was their responsibility to reclaim the security within a certain period of time once the work had been completed. If not claimed, the securities would be used by TRPA for other purposes. The Committee favored using the money for educational purposes, as well as leverage for additional funding.

MOTION by Ms. Neft to approve the proposed policy for use of trolleys outside the Basin as proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Legal Committee

2. Bitterbrush Settlement Fund Expenditure for Emergency Access Improvements

Finance Committee member Jerry Waldie reported that the Committee accepted staff's recommendation, which was concurred in by applicant's counsel, to postpone further action on the settlement fund pending further deliberations on their part to resolve still unsettled issues. Everyone seemed optimistic that ultimately Bitterbrush would be settled. A lot of progress had been made. Agency Special Projects Attorney Susan Scholley was to be complimented for her efforts.

1. Report on Committee Meeting

Mr. Waldie reported that on the C. C. Myers enforcement matter staff had asked for parameters in the settlement proposal involving the illegal alteration of an existing pier and the necessity of converting the pier to a multiple use
pier to permit the illegal alterations. There were several issues involved here, including the extent of the fine for the illegal activity. The committee referred the matter back to staff with a recommendation that the fine was half of what it should be. Secondly, there was a discussion on making the pier more compatible with scenic requirements. The applicant's consultant indicated his client was resisting doing anything other than staining one of the two boat houses on the pier. The Committee recommended painting, removal of the stairs and the railing.

MOTION by Mr. Severson to continue the Bitterbrush matter to a future meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Capital Financing Committee Report

Executive Director Jim Baetge advised the Board that TRPA staff member Carl Nasty, the Gaming Alliance and the League representatives had spent time in Washington, D.C. last week working on the legislative and funding package. Based on this visit, the Capital Financing Committee would need to look in December at revisions to the 1996 legislative packet. Presidential appointee Peter Chase Neumann had sent a letter to Nevada Senator Harry Reid regarding a visit by President Clinton to Tahoe and also urging reorganization of the Western Federal Regional Coordinating Council. This committee was originally established in the 1970s to assist with development of thresholds. The new focus would be to assist with achieving thresholds. Senator Reid felt positive about this effort.

D. Rules Committee - no report

E. Shoreszone Policy Committee

Committee member Kevin Cole reported that the comment period on the Shoreszone EIS was extended to the January meeting. The Committee determined yesterday that it would use this process as an opportunity to do a very comprehensive review of the shoreszone ordinance; it would not be a piece meal action. It would be done in the light of streamlining; and, as a result, it would not be a quick process. The general feeling of the committee was that it should be done right. There would be some issues that could not necessarily be solved through the process, such as the fish spawning issue and impacts on it. The group would move ahead, however, and try to accumulate the necessary information to deal with the omitted topics in the future. The committee did not want to keep postponing dealing with the shoreszone policies because of the lack of information on a few specific items. Shoreszone issues were very thorny ones that had always been shoved into the background because they were so complex. It would not be an easy process.

Mr. Baetge explained that because of the complexity of the issues the timeline for regulatory changes would take until the end of 1996. The issues were not easy ones. The committee would meet at least once a month for several hours to go through the issues. The comments he had received on the draft environmental document had been very complimentary. The general feeling was that it covered the issues and was very thorough.
F. Core Policy Statement Committee Report

Mr. Upton explained that there was a lot of active discussion at the November 14 committee meeting. At the next meeting, the committee would be putting together a summary statement for consideration by the Board in December and adoption possibly in January. The staff would be looking at where such a statement would fit in with the whole structure of the Agency between now and the next meeting and whether environmental work was needed. It may be helpful to have the materials provided at yesterday’s committee meeting available for the full Board.

Executive Director Jim Baetge commented that until the November 14 meeting it was unclear to him exactly where the core policy was headed. It appeared that the effort focused on Goals and Policies, not on guidance to staff. What the committee was proposing at this moment could lead to changes in the Goals and Policies and, in fact, thresholds. The reason he wanted this brought forward was that it should be of interest to the full Board, not a few committee members. He personally felt that going rapidly on this was foolish. He did not want to rush the Board into adoption, because it was extremely important that the full Board understand and know where it was going. He wanted the Board to know that he did not necessarily share the feeling that what was in place was unworkable or unwieldy.

Mr. Upton asked staff to provide him with a copy of the Goals and Policies so that he could correlate the statement with what was in the policy document.

Mr. Cole reiterated his appreciation to Mr. Wynn and Ms. Urza for bringing this forward because it was a valuable exercise. He was pleased that because of the adoption of Community Plans there was staff available to work on the core statement. He agreed that it was important for all Board members to fully understand what they were being asked to do. As an individual Board member he wanted to fully understand the ramifications of what the Board was doing. This was critical.

Ms. Bennett echoed Mr. Cole’s concerns and commented that the core policy really should mirror Article I of the Compact, that it be comprehensive in the areas it addressed, specifically the Compact mandate for TRPA as a planning agency with adopted thresholds. It was interesting to see how the core policy was getting to be more and more focused. It caused one to really think about the bistate compact and what TRPA was mandated to do.

Mr. Waldie commented that most of the people on the committee were not clear on where the process was going. One thing he did not want the committee getting into at this stage was a major revision of the existing Goals and Policies. It would be helpful for him as a member of the Board to see where these platitudes - which essentially they seemed to be - could possibly be inconsistent with the Goals and Policies. It would be important to know if they were inconsistent with Goals and Policies. Then, it might suggest that the Goals and Policies may require some action of the Board. He would like to know the consequences and impact of changes. The committee was at a stage where it needed to know what legal consequences confronted the Agency and what allocation of resources was needed to address the legal consequences. If there were any Goals and Policies inconsistent with the platitudes, he would
be surprised. If there were, then it would require an allocation of considerable time and effort on the part of staff to address them. What was needed at the next committee meeting was more direction on what resource commitments were needed for particular courses of action.

Mr. Baetge reminded the Board that the Agency's budget had been cut; this cut would affect the work plan. Mr. Barrett had finished work on the shoreside and on the North Shore CPs and would be redirected to work on the core statement. He would provide the Board with the information being requested. It was easy to develop a statement that was consistent with everything. He was not sure, however, why the Agency would do that. What staff would bring to the Committee and Board was where there were deviations. For example, setting of priority thresholds was a deviation. Staff needed to be able to tell the Board what the cost would be. If the capital funding program did not get going to accomplish thresholds, the whole game would be lost. He would hate to see TRPA spend the next two to three years arguing changes in the Goals and Policies.

Mr. Waldie suggested that he never perceived this core statement effort as a major wholesale revision of any of the codes. He was not suggesting that the Agency necessarily back off of that but he wanted to know more specifically what was being done.

Mr. Upton suggested the November 14 meeting was focused and active. The readiness with which the Committee carried it forth would be a function of the degree of attention to the whole intertie. He could see a focused offsite in January or February, depending on how fast the rest of the analysis came along. At issue was what affect the product may have on the way the Agency did business. On the other hand, in terms of getting the maximum productivity out of the Agency in the next few years, it could make a good contribution. He would not want the opportunity of this kind of focus on the issue to pass.

Mr. Baetge agreed that an offsite may be the best approach.

Mr. Chimarusti suggested it was his understanding the original Goals and Policies were assembled and approved as a part of the Consensus Workshop process. There were a lot of people involved in the process, and there was a fair amount of "bloodletting." The process was time consuming and litigious. He cautioned the Board against plunging back into that particular morass, since that war had already been fought. He had not participated in this core statement discussion previously but he had read about it in the newspapers. It was a real dangerous path to head down. There was so much out there that needed TRPA's attention and staff time; TRPA had limited financial resources available.

Mr. Cole explained that the committee agreed yesterday that there were some semantics involved. The way he had been looking at this was more along the lines of a mission statement. It would not necessarily be in conflict with what TRPA was already doing. It was a simple statement that people could look at and know TRPA's mission.

Mr. Chimarusti reminded the Board that it had already drafted a mission statement at an earlier retreat. It was time to move on.
Ms. Hagedorn suggested that Mr. Upton at the December Board meeting have a statement of purpose back from the Core Committee and have the Board sign off then and there before going any further with this. TRPA had declining resources and still a lot to be done. The Board should know what would need to be sacrificed to go into this process which six months down the road it may or may not agree with. It may be a use of resources the Agency could not afford. She strongly suggested the committee come back with a purpose and a mission and a timeline so that the Board could either sign off on it or not.

Mr. Chimarusti asked whether court proceedings and approval were necessary if TRPA chose to redraft the Goals and Policies.

Agency Counsel R. J. Nicolle responded that this would not be necessary. Findings would have to be made to amend the Goals and Policies, however. There was always a potential for litigation with a redraft of the Goals and Policies.

Mr. Upton suggested that the process was a step beyond the mission statement; it was rather an Agency set of administrative principles of operation. It was helpful for him in preparing for the November 14 Committee meeting to go back to the original paper prepared by Mr. Wynn and Ms. Urza in light of the comments made in the last few months. He agreed that he would need to sit down with Mr. Baetge to discuss this prior to the next committee meeting.

G. Retirement Committee Report - meeting scheduled for noon recess

XI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Mr. Baetge advised the Board that the Coordinated Transit System agreement had been signed earlier in the week. This was one of the biggest and most important things that the South Shore had seen in many years. It called for a public/private partnership, with $1 million of private funds right up front. It would multiply quickly, and implementation was starting right away.

Mr. Baetge reminded the Board that invitations to the December 20 TRPA holiday party at Embassy had been distributed. Please RSVP to staff.

The South Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce and the City recently signed an agreement on the concept of the around-the-Lake bikeway. Douglas County had advised that it could get the trail all the way from Kingsbury Grade to Cave Rock. Tahoe City FUD could get the trail from where it now ended in Meeks Bay clear to Vikingholm. Mr. Baetge was working on getting Caltrans to stripe from Dollar Hill all the way to the Nevada Stateline in the spring. Through Stateline, there was a grant on line now in the Community Plan area to take the trail through North Shore Stateline. This would leave a two mile gap before getting to Incline Village. Things were starting to happen fast and the project may be on line earlier than his initial estimate of the year 2000. Ms. Hagedorn noted it would be helpful to have a Xerox map as a visual aid to show the successes and progress with the bike trail as it moved around the Lake.
Mr. Baetge complimented the local government representatives who participated in the affordable housing committee discussions. The issues were really coming together, and there was another meeting on December 6 to formulate a recommendation for the full Board on what to do with the January moratorium date. Most of the local governments were doing very well on this.

B. Agency Counsel Monthly Status Report

Ms. R. J. Nicolle updated the Board on the status of TRPA v. Barbieri, Stack v. TRPA and Fallen Leaf Lake, and Hellman v. TRPA. Ms. Scholley updated the Board on Suitum v. TRPA and TSPC v. TRPA.

Ms. Scholley advised the Board that she was scheduling movement of the IDBS line for the December agenda.

C. Governing Board Members

Mr. Cronk thanked and complimented Dennis Crabb, the League and others for the outstanding work in getting 5,000 people to sign up for the Lake Tahoe California license plate. Dennis really did a fabulous job pulling everyone together to get it going.

Ms. Bennett asked that TRPA send a letter of thanks on behalf of the Board.

Mr. Severson noted the Resources Agency played a major role and did hundreds of press releases all over the state.

Mr. Cole suggested contacting Dennis to get a list of those to whom a thank you letter could be sent. There were a lot of people involved.

Mr. Severson noted that over the years the question of home mail delivery had come up and he would like to have a report on this, particularly as the issue related to the North Shore and Incline areas. This was a major source of traffic congestion, and getting the Postal Service's cooperation on home mail delivery could mean some major improvements.

Mr. Upton noted this was the week --- "Go Bears!"

XII. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Julie D. Frame
Clerk to the Governing Board

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (702) 568-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA office, 308 Dorla Court, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.

These minutes were approved

as presented on 12/20/95.