

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**DECEMBER
1980**

NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on December 10, 1980 at
10:00 a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Dated: December 1, 1980

By: 
Philip A. Overeynder
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

December 10, 1980
10:00 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV PLANNING MATTERS
 - A. Hyatt Tahoe, Inc., Alternative Plans to Provide Necessary Vehicle Parking Consistent With TRPA Land Coverage Constraints, Washoe County
 - B. Consideration of Specific Amendments to the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management (208) Plan and Implementing Ordinances
 - C. Activities Exempt from the Definition of a "Project" and Projects Exempt from Environmental Impact Report Requirements (Article VII f of the Proposed Tahoe Regional Planning Compact)
- V REPORTS
 - A. Public Interest Comments
 - B. APC Members
- VI RESOLUTIONS
- VII CORRESPONDENCE
- VIII PENDING MATTERS
- IX ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

November 12, 1980
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Phil Overeynder at 10:10 a.m. It was noted that the meeting had been properly noticed as required by the Nevada Open Meeting Law. Phil introduced new APC members: Bob Young, Washoe County Regional Planning Commission; Ginger Huber, El Dorado County Environmental Health; and Ann Bogush, the City of South Lake Tahoe Planning Department (present at the afternoon session).

APC Members Present: Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Young,
Mr. Scribner, Ms. Huber, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hoefer,
Mr. Minedew, Mr. Maki, Mr. White, Mr. Hansen (present
at 10:55 a.m.), Mr. Curtis, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey
(present at 10:45 a.m.), Ms. Bogush (present afternoon),
Mr. Parson

APC Members Absent: Mr. Hadfield

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Due to prior commitments on the part of the representative for the Hyatt application (agenda item IV C.), staff requested that the public hearing on the Hyatt amendment be moved up on the agenda.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer with a second by Mr. Maki to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer with a second by Mr. Scribner to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PUBLIC HEARING - General Plan Amendments

- A. Herb Weinman, Lots 5-10, Block C, Tahoe Vista Subdivision No. 1,
Placer County - from General Commercial to Tourist Commercial

Planning Intern Kris Elfving presented the summary and recommendation for approval of the requested amendment so that an addition can be made to the Weinman residence. Residential uses (and additions) are not permitted in General Commercial. In order to avoid a spot zoning, the applicant has included adjacent properties in the request. Mr. Weinman has contacted these adjacent property owners and they have no objections to the reclassification.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

Mr. Weinman advised that CTRPA had reclassified the property to Recreation but that a different use district could be requested.

In October, the Governing Body directed the staff to continue to process General Plan amendments upon request in spite of the uncertainty with regard to their status under the pending bistate compact amendments. Mrs. Kelly, an adjacent property owner, indicated she had no objection to the land use change.

MOTION by Mr. Scribner to approve the staff recommendation to reclassify the Weinman lot and the adjacent properties from General Commercial to Tourist Commercial with coverage limited to 35% for residential uses and 50% for commercial uses. Second by Mr. Combs.

Discussion followed on restricting development coverage whether for commercial uses or residential to 35% or land capability. Mr. Hoefler suggested that the zoning for the property should be based on what is best for the underlying land and not necessarily on the desired use.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Young,
Mr. Scribner, Ms. Huber, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Minedew,
Mr. Maki, Mr. Curtis, Ms. McMorris
Nays: Mr. Hoefler, Mr. White
Abstain: Mr. Parson
Absent: Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Hadfield

- C. Hyatt Tahoe, Inc., 2.1 Acres Between Incline Creek and the West Property Line of Hyatt Tahoe, Between Incline Way on the North and Lakeshore Boulevard on the South, Washoe County - from Recreation to Tourist Commercial

Associate Planner Jim Dana presented the history of the Hyatt site modifications and summarized the staff's concerns. Hyatt requests that a 2.1 acre portion of its property be reclassified from Recreation to Tourist Commercial to allow the continued use of an existing unauthorized employee parking lot. Currently 17.9 acres of the Hyatt property is Tourist Commercial and the subject 2.1 acres is classified as Recreation. The subject employee parking lot was constructed without TRPA approval of a commercial parking lot, approval of construction within a stream environment zone or approval to construct a commercial improvement within a Recreation land use district. The available options are: 1) to approve the reclassification as requested with 50% allowed coverage over the total 20 acre site, thereby permitting the parking lot in the SEZ to remain but requiring removal of 16,561 square feet of coverage from the total site; 2) to approve the request to Tourist Commercial with 50% coverage but not to allow any land coverage within the SEZ and requiring that the parking lot be removed and coverage transferred to the 17.9 acres; 3a) to approve the reclassification with 30% coverage with no coverage to occur in the SEZ but, again, transferrable to the 17.9 acres; 3b) to approve the reclassification but permit only 1% land coverage in the SEZ; or 4) to deny the request and require removal of the parking lot and a reduction of coverage on the existing Tourist Commercial portion of the site to a maximum of 50% coverage (currently 53%). The staff recommends approval of the requested amendment to Tourist Commercial with coverage not to exceed 30% of the 2.1 acres, but coverage within the SEZ is to

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

be prohibited. This would allow the 30% coverage to be transferred over to the 17.9 acres and would bring the total 20 acre site coverage to less than 50%.

Chuck White objected that the Agency was "bending its back" to help the applicant when there is a clear violation of TRPA plans and ordinances. An analysis should be done to show the benefits of mass transit in the area rather than permitting an increase in vehicle parking. The Hyatt should be required to have facilities to accommodate guests and employees but not necessarily to increase vehicle parking. A mass transportation facility should be considered. Bill Curtis suggested that Hyatt would likely consider cutting down the trees currently interspersed through its larger public parking area should it be required to consolidate parking. Germaine McMorris agreed with Mr. White and suggested that the application be returned to Washoe County for a determination on required parking spaces; there should be no encroachment into the stream environment zone.

Attorney Paul Bible, on behalf of Hyatt, presented a brief history of Hyatt ownership dating from construction in 1969. The contractor who put in the unauthorized parking lot was responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and apparently did not come to TRPA. Hyatt accepts this responsibility. It appears that the swimming pool, tennis courts and parking constructed without permits were under construction at the time TRPA came into being. The applicant recommends that the staff's first option (to approve the reclassification of the 2.1 acres to Tourist Commercial, allowing the employee parking to remain but requiring removal of coverage on the total site to bring it to within 50%) be approved contingent upon a resolution of intent which would permit the employee parking to be retained and would require removal of the swimming pool and sufficient parking to bring the total site to within 50% coverage. The applicant would submit a subsequent application plan consistent with what is being proposed. Whatever is feasible to add to the project from an engineering standpoint to protect the integrity of the stream will be done. The only public transit system at this point is a mini-bus system from Truckee and Reno airports. There is no Hyatt-operated system for employees.

Mr. White asked for more information on the feasibility of a bus system which would serve both employees and visitors to the facility and on what areas of the Recreation zone are in fact in the SEZ. It is recognized that the SEZ has been substantially modified. APC member Ken Milam objected to being asked to approve such a request and having TRPA backed into a corner because of existing construction. It shouldn't be tolerated. It is folly to consider single level, surface paved parking; this just isn't done any more.

MOTION by Mr. Milam to approve staff option number 4 on the Hyatt Tahoe requested General Plan amendment. This would deny the request for Tourist Commercial on the 2.1 acres, require the removal of the parking lot in the Recreation area and a reduction in coverage on the Tourist Commercial portion of the Hyatt site to a maximum 50% coverage. Second by Mr. Hoole.

Several APC members and staff asked that a more workable solution be looked at so that the objectives of open space and preservation of the environment could be achieved while not aggravating the existing parking problems.

Mr. Milam asked that his motion be amended to include a recommendation that the staff work with the applicant to consider alternatives to solving the Hyatt's parking problems and to reevaluate the proposal

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

to remove land coverage in the existing Tourist Commercial zone. The land use request to Tourist Commercial on the 2.1 acres is to be denied. Mr. Hoole concurred with the amendment. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Burnham, Ms. Huber,
Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hoefler, Mr. Minedew, Mr. Maki,
Mr. White, Mr. Hansen, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Parson
Nays: Mr. Scribner, Mr. Bailey
Abstain: Mr. Young, Mr. Curtis
Absent: Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hadfield

- B. Steven Bourne/Nevada Banking Company, 2.61 Acres in Douglas County, Located 75 Feet North of Kingsbury Grade on the East Side of Highway 50 from Tourist Commercial to General Commercial

Senior Planner Gordon Barrett presented the staff summary on the requested amendment to reclassify 2.6 acres to General Commercial in order to construct a bank, currently not a permitted use in Tourist Commercial. Although staff would favor the on-site improvements associated with the amendment, it has concerns and questions about the air quality impacts of increased vehicle movements in this area and how they relate to the highway's capacity and service levels. With regard to air quality, TRPA's Nonattainment Air Quality Plan sent to Nevada for certification as a part of the State's Plan specifically prohibits drive-up windows; the bank proposes three such windows. Staff is awaiting comment from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) on air quality and traffic impacts of the project and therefore withholds its recommendation until more information is obtained. The alternatives are to retain the Tourist Commercial zoning; to prepare a master plan for the entire area and to withhold development until the use of the adjacent Kahle hotel/casino site is resolved; or to find that a bank would be a permitted use in the Tourist Commercial zone. This latter option is not recommended by staff since prior actions have limited banks to the General Commercial district. The applicant is requesting that his coverage be 50%. Land capability on the site would permit 30% coverage on the lower portion and 5% on the upper portion; however, the entire site has been disturbed and modified by extensive grading.

Chuck White suggested that, in order to comply with the land capability limitations, the applicant be required to acquire property from next door or to obtain an easement to bring enough property into the project area to stay within the coverage limitations set by land capability. The bank should delete drive-up windows and have walk-up windows instead. APC member Andy Burnham explained that Douglas County in approving a special use permit for the bank had required the applicant to obtain NDOT approval for the proposed road improvements.

Mr. Jere Williams, from Creegan & D'Angelo on behalf of the bank, suggested that the bank was a diverter of traffic rather than a generator. There will be no access to the project off of Kingsbury, only off U.S. Highway 50. APC member Dave Minedew cautioned against approving a bank in a CO hot spot because of the effects on the employees. John Glabb, from Creegan & D'Angelo, advised that the standard of 6 parts per million of CO would not be violated with the additional traffic.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

MOTION by Mr. White to approve the Bourne/Nevada Banking Company General Plan amendment to General Commercial but require the applicant to keep coverage within the land capability constraints and that the applicant be required to either obtain additional land or easements to achieve this.

The motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION by Ms. McMorris with a second by Mr. Curtis to approve the General Plan amendment for the Bourne/Nevada Banking Company to reclassify the subject property to General Commercial with coverage limited to 50%.

Mr. Maki advised that NDOT would not be making any comments on the project until more information was received from the applicant. Likewise NDEP will not sign off on the permit until more air quality information is received but would request TRPA staff's cooperation in obtaining a more detailed assessment of air quality problems which may occur because of the project. At this point, NDEP is making no comments. Staff reiterated that it was not taking the amendment to the Board in November but was only asking for APC confirmation that more information on traffic and air quality was needed to complete the application.

Ms. McMorris asked that her motion be amended to provide that the second reading of the ordinance and the adoption of the land use amendment not take place until development plans for the bank are submitted. Mr. Curtis agreed to the amendment.

Jere Williams on behalf of the applicant concurred with the motion.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes:	Mr. Combs, Mr. Milam, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Young, Mr. Scribner, Mr. Huber, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Minedew, Mr. Maki, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey
Nays:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Ms. Bogush, Mr. White, Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Parson

The APC meeting recessed for lunch and reconvened at 1:45 p.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Minedew, Mr. Milam, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Young, Mr. Hoefer, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Maki, Ms. Bogush, Ms. Huber, Mr. Scribner, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Parson, Mr. White

APC Members Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hadfield

V PLANNING MATTERS

- C. Report from the Tahoe Federal Coordinating Council on the President's Executive Order for the Lake Tahoe Basin and Status of Work Program Development for the Threshold Carrying Capacity Analysis

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

Glenn Smith, Project Coordinator for the Tahoe Federal Coordinating Council's threshold analysis, brought the APC members up to date on the status of the program. In the middle of September, all affected entities were invited to meet and develop a work plan for the study. A subsequent report was submitted for comment in late October and this report is now in the revision stages for submittal back to the Tahoe Working Group, the staff of the Tahoe Federal Coordinating Council. After a December 5 Coordinating Council meeting in San Francisco, the report will be submitted to funding agencies in Washington. The Forest Service will be providing \$300,000 over the next two year period to get the threshold study off and running. *each year*

There was a concerted effort during the work program stage to get as much local agency involvement as possible; 23 of 30 entities responded and worked together on the work program formation. It is recognized that there must be full cooperation on the program for it to succeed. On another matter, Marc Petty in San Francisco should be contacted for interpretation of the Executive Order. The specific procedures for expenditure of federal funds on projects in the Tahoe Basin, pursuant to the Executive Order, have not been outlined yet. Because of the variety of programs in the Basin, each agency is being asked to give a response on how it will fulfill federal requirements; these responses will be reviewed on December 5.

A. Status of the Water Quality Management (208) Plan for the Tahoe Basin

Executive Director Phil Overeynder brought the APC up to date on 208 planning and advised that TRPA had written the California Water Resources Control Board (CWRCB) urging that adoption of the California 208 Plan be held in abeyance until differences between the State's Plan and the TRPA Plan could be resolved. On October 29, however, California adopted its version of a plan along with a resolution which allows 90 days for TRPA certification. The resolution sets forth those areas of the TRPA Plan which must be modified to be acceptable to California. If TRPA does not act in this 90 days, CWRCB will transmit its plan to EPA and ask for certification, at which point EPA will have two plans before it. EPA cannot impose a plan on either California or Nevada which is not acceptable to both states, but it can refuse to certify or approve one or the other of the plans. There are certain elements with which the CWRCB is dissatisfied in the TRPA Plan, primarily in the area of development restrictions on high hazard lands and stream environment zones (SEZ's), and with provision of an implementation schedule for remedial measures.

APC member Chuck White, representing Lahontan, emphasized that California's Plan prohibits any development in the SEZ and strictly adheres to the land capability system. The philosophy of the CWRCB's Plan is that any development at all in the Tahoe Basin will lead to water quality problems and must be offset by remedial water quality control programs. The State Water Board is trying to set up a program whereby 75% cost share funds would be available to local governments to implement such programs. This money would go toward local offsetting controls. Phil Overeynder pointed out that in the past the TRPA Governing Body has taken the position that this is a jurisdictional matter with TRPA having been given jurisdiction over 208 planning for the Basin and that it was inappropriate to deal with one state agency in either state with regard to specific amendments outside of that jurisdictional question. TRPA has given what it feels is the best plan for the Basin, but it must be recognized that this plan was adopted

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

two years ago based on information available two years ago. A lot of factors are different in the equation than when TRPA came up with its plan, and it makes sense to compare the two plans to see if a new direction for TRPA is warranted. It does not appear that all work is to be completed through ordinance form within the 90 days but rather that there is a commitment on the part of TRPA to work towards bringing the two plans into line.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen to discuss the 208 Plan at a workshop session.

The motion was withdrawn.

The APC members discussed and acted on areas in the TRPA Plan which could be modified to be more in line with the CWRCB Plan. The items discussed and acted upon were taken from the attachment included with the October 27, 1980 TRPA letter to Carla M. Bard, Chairwoman of the CWRCB. This attachment presented the basic differences between the two plans along with proposed solutions.

(Because of the length of the APC's discussion, only the motions have been included in these minutes. The meeting was recorded in its entirety and anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at 916-541-0246.)

MOTION by Ms. McMorris that TRPA adopt for erosion and urban runoff control projects a 10 year "objective implementation program" and request a rider to the federal bistate compact for \$100 million in erosion control implementation funds. Second by Mr. Young. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Milam, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Young, Mr. Scribner,
Ms. Huber, Mr. Maki, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis,
Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey
Nays: Mr. Minedew
Abstain: Mr. Hoefler, Mr. White, Mr. Parson
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hadfield

MOTION by Mr. Milam that any development restrictions imposed on subdivisions relate as well to parcel maps. Second by Mr. Hansen. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Milam, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Young, Mr. Scribner,
Ms. Huber, Mr. Minedew, Mr. Maki, Mr. Hansen,
Mr. Curtis, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Parson
Nays: None
Abstain: Mr. Hoefler, Mr. White, Mr. Bailey
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hadfield

MOTION by Ms. McMorris that TRPA proceed to review SEZ's as previously done for single family dwellings and where a person can site his residence out of the SEZ he can proceed with the regular review process. If there is not sufficient land outside of an SEZ for construction of a single family dwelling on a particular lot, a

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

temporary prohibition to build would be imposed on that lot until adoption of the revised General Plan. Second by Mr. Milam. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Milam, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Young, Mr. Scribner,
Ms. Huber, Mr. Hoefler, Mr. Hansen, Ms. McMorris,
Mr. Bailey, Mr. Parson
Nays: Mr. Minedew, Mr. Curtis
Abstain: Mr. Maki, Mr. White
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hadfield

MOTION by Mr. Milam with a second by Ms. McMorris that language be added to the TRPA 208 Plan that restricts land coverage consistent with land capability until the new Regional Plan is adopted by TRPA. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Milam, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Young, Mr. Scribner,
Mr. Huber, Mr. Hoefler, Mr. Minedew, Mr. Maki,
Mr. Hansen, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Parson
Nays: None
Abstain: Mr. White, Mr. Curtis
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Hadfield

MOTION by Mr. Milam that with regard to offsetting remedial erosion and drainage measures there be a 1 to 1 ratio between the amount of development and the amount of offset required from new development and the expected erosion which would take place as a result of that development; and that the method of implementation (be it by expenditure of public funds or by a requirement of individual development approvals) be left to the local jurisdictions. The exact method for determining the offsetting remedial measures is to be determined at a later date by TRPA staff. Second by Mr. Young. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Milam, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Young, Mr. Scribner,
Mr. Huber, Mr. Maki, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis,
Ms. McMorris, Mr. Bailey
Nays: None
Abstain: Mr. Hoefler, Mr. White, Mr. Parson
Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Burnham, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Minedew,
Mr. Hadfield

This last motion was passed with the understanding that the matter would be brought back to the APC for more discussion on the mechanisms for implementation.

- B. Activities Exempt from the Definition of a "Project" and Projects Exempt from Environmental Impact Report Requirements (Article VII f of the Proposed Tahoe Regional Planning Compact)

MOTION by Mr. Milam to continue this discussion to the December meeting. Second by Mr. Hansen. The motion carried unanimously.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES NOVEMBER 12, 1980

VI REPORTS

- A. Public Interest Comments - none
- B. APC Members

Chuck White asked if the staff could supply photographs of the sites on General Plan amendment applications so that the APC members can get a better idea of what is being reviewed. Jon Hoefler offered copies of the National Forest Program for the next 5 years to APC members. Bob Young advised that the Washoe County Regional Planning Commission had 11 planning positions vacant.

VII RESOLUTIONS - none

VIII CORRESPONDENCE - none

IX PENDING MATTERS - none

X ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (916) 541-0246.

Respectfully submitted,


Julie D. Frame
Administrative Assistant

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 2, 1980

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: Hyatt Tahoe, Inc., Alternative Plans to Provide Necessary Vehicle Parking Consistent With TRPA Land Coverage Constraints

The TRPA staff has rescheduled the Hyatt Tahoe item to provide an opportunity to resolve the Advisory Planning Commission's concerns regarding the stream environment zone, necessary parking, and land coverage. The applicant will be responding to these concerns at a Development Review Committee meeting to be held on December 3, 1980. The results of that meeting will be presented to the APC at its December 10 meeting.

The applicant, with staff's concurrence, voluntarily withdrew the subject application from Governing Body consideration in November. Tentative scheduling on the December 17 Governing Body agenda has been requested.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 3, 1980

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: Specific Amendments to the TRPA 208 Plan and
Proposed Schedule for Review

On November 19, 1980, the Governing Body directed the staff to schedule a public hearing for the regular meeting on January 28, 1981, to consider specific changes to the adopted TRPA 208 Plan. Attached is a tentative schedule for 208 activities during the coming months.

Staff will be prepared to present an outline of the range of alternatives and details of specific modifications to the existing 208 Plan for discussion at the December 10 APC meeting.

Attachment

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

TENTATIVE 208 PLAN SCHEDULE

- 12/10/80 Advisory Planning Commission meeting to discuss
 specific elements to be the subject of the public hearing.
- 12/15/80 Circulate amendments and request receipt of
 comments by 1/14/81.
- 12/18/80 Newspaper publication date of public hearing
 notice.
- 1/14/81 Public comment deadline.
- 1/14/81 Advisory Planning Commission meeting.
- 1/28/81 Governing Body public hearing on specific
 elements being considered for possible
 modification; first reading of ordinance.
- 2/25/81 Second reading of ordinance.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 3, 1980

TO: Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: TRPA Staff

SUBJECT: Activities Exempt from the Definition of a Project and Project/Activities Exempt from EIS Requirements

Attached is a draft list of activities which the proposed TRPA Compact requires to be categorized by ordinance. Article IV requires an ordinance listing activities that are not projects, i.e. not having any substantial effect on the resources of the region, and Article VII requires an ordinance listing projects/activities that are exempt from the EIS requirements. Conceptually, Agency staff has created a matrix which relates activities occurring in the basin to the type of review required. Included with this matrix are some definitions for terms utilized in the matrix.

This concept will be discussed at a workshop with state and local planners on Thursday, December 4th and the results of this meeting will be reported to the APC. It should be noted that the Compact requires documentation and findings prior to adoption of the ordinances.

Attachment

FINDINGS FOR:

- ① EXEMPT FROM REVIEW
- ② EXEMPT FROM EIS

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

ACTIVITIES

Activities	EIS Article VII(f) → Projects Article VI(a) → Type of Review →		Categorically Exempt from EIS Projects Ministerial/Local Permit		Neg Dec/EIS Agency Review
	Activities Not Projects	No Review	Ministerial/Local Permit	Projects	
I. Residential					
1. Repair/interior remodel (no expansion)	x	-	-	-	-
2. Reconstruction of existing facility	-	-	x - If conforming in noncritical area	x - If nonconforming and/or in critical area	
3. Additions/accessory structures	-	-	x - If conforming in noncritical area	x - If nonconforming and/or in critical area	
4. New construction or change in use	-	-	x - If conforming in noncritical area	x - If nonconforming and/or in critical area	
a. SFD - 1-4 units	-	-	-	-	x
b. SFD - +5 units	-	-	-	-	x
c. Multiperson dwellings	-	-	-	-	x
d. Mobile home park + 2 units	-	-	-	-	x
5. Nonconforming uses and variances	-	-	-	-	X