

**TRPA  
APC  
PACKETS**

**JANUARY  
1982**

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

P.O. Box 8896  
South Lake Tahoe, California 95731

2155 South Avenue

(916) 541-0246

January 1982

MEMORANDUM

January 8, 1982

To: The Advisory Planning Commission  
From: The Staff  
Subject: Amendment to the Agenda

The attached APC agenda should be amended to include an additional planning matter as follows:

V PLANNING MATTERS

G. 1982 Air Quality Plan

The background material for this item has been included in the packet.

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on January 13, 1982 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: January 7, 1982

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

January 13, 1982  
10:00 a.m.

---

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS
  - A. Pfeifer House Restaurant/Ice House Area, Three Parcels, General Forest to General Commercial, Placer County
  - B. City of South Lake Tahoe Administration Building, Johnson and Al Tahoe Boulevards, 36 Acres, High Density Residential and Rural Estates to Public Service, City of South Lake Tahoe
  - C. Hyatt Lake Tahoe, 2.1 Acres Between Incline Creek and the West Property Line of Hyatt Tahoe, Recreation to Tourist Commercial, Washoe County
- V PLANNING MATTERS
  - A. Shorezone Ordinance Amendments
  - B. Remedial Erosion and Runoff Control Ordinance
  - C. Transfer of Development Rights
  - D. Status Report on 208 Plan
  - E. Clearinghouse Review, Master Plan for the Tahoe City Public Utility District Water System
  - F. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities
- VI REPORTS
  - A. Public Interest Comments
  - B. APC Members
- VII RESOLUTIONS
- VIII CORRESPONDENCE
- IX PENDING MATTERS
- X ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  
South Lake Tahoe, California

November 12, 1981  
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL OR ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman John Meder called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 10:05 a.m. Mr. Dennis Goodenow was introduced and a letter of authorization was submitted into the record from the Air Resources Board authorizing Mr. Goodenow as Mr. Randolph's designee.

APC Members Present: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith,  
Ms. Smith, Mr. McCurry, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen,  
Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Goodenow,  
Mr. Meder  
APC Members Absent: Mr. Combs, Mr. Martens, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Schlumpf,  
Mr. Pyle

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION BY Mr. Hansen with Second by Mr. Smith to approve the November Agenda.  
The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The disposition of the October minutes were deferred to the December meeting.

IV. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Role of the APC

Ms. Shellhammer stated that she would like to see the expertise of the APC used more to its potential but was unsure how this could be implemented. Mr. Smith commented that the APC's opportunity to express its expertise would come with participating in the steering committee of the Threshold Study.

Chairman Meder brought the subject of a resolution reaffirming the position of the APC as a technical body to advise on technical and professional matters and not get into the political matters. This resolution was passed out at the August meeting, however at that time the APC expressed concern about the wording of the resolution and it was subsequently tabled. In the interim Ms. Bogush reworked had the said resolution and explained the changes made. Chairman Meder then read the revised resolution into the record.

MOTION by Mr. Smith with Second by Mr. McCurry to adopt the the Resolution of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Setting Forth the Role of the Advisory Planning Commission in the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Planning Matters. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Environmental Impact Statement, Bureau of Reclamation,  
64 Acre Tract, Tahoe City, Placer County

Executive Director Philip Overeynder introduced Mr. Gary Shellhorn, a new member of the TRPA staff, and informed the APC that Mr. Shellhorn was assigned to review the EIS prepared for the above planning matter. Mr. Shellhorn summarized the EIS by giving a background on how the 64 acre parcel was acquired by the Bureau of Reclamation and who has and is utilizing this parcel at this time. Mr. Shellhorn stated that the Bureau of Reclamation no longer has a need for this parcel and therefore must dispose of it. One way to dispose of this property is to turn it over to other federal agencies, such as the Forest Service who has expressed interest in acquiring the property.

Mr. Shellhorn stated that the Bureau of Reclamation purchased the land in 1904 and then the land was given custody to the Truckee Carson Irrigation District as part of their New Lands project. The TCID leased portions of this land to other parties without knowledge or approval by the Bureau of Reclamation. These leases, which run year to year, provide revenue to the TCID, approximately \$600,000 over the life of the lease. It has been determined that the Bureau of Reclamation has the right to turn this property over to the Forest Service for recreational purposes. Mr. Shellhorn went on by stating how the land is being utilized at this time and the concerns the EIS pointed out, e.g., traffic congestion, carbon monoxide, access to the Lake in the Tahoe City area. The alternatives addressed in the EIS were to 1) transferring the entire 64 acres to the U. S. Forest Service, 2) disposal of the land to state and local governments, 3) dispose of 8 acres north of the highway to state and local governments and the rest to the U. S. Forest Service, and 4) a no action alternative would allow the existing uses on the property to continue.

Mr. Shellhorn went into detail of the impacts that would result from the Forest Service acquisition of the land. This would include removal of all commercial and residential uses and revegetating which would cause substantial hardship to the persons occupying this area, and he stated that the EIS adequately addresses the impacts involved. The final EIS will involve public hearings and would require comments from the APC as to their views on the alternatives for the disposal of the land.

Mr. Ray Nelson, projects manager at the Lahontan basin projects office, Bureau of Reclamation in Carson City, came forward to explain what the Bureau of Reclamation was trying to do with the Forest Service here in Tahoe and to answer any questions the APC had.

Ms. Bogush inquired whether the relocation of the businesses and residents was a condition of the sale, court required or Forest Service requirement. Mr. Nelson stated that it was the Forest Service's intention to make this land recreational and the uses on the property now did not conform to recreational use. He also stated that the land was not now zoned for commercial and residential use therefore these uses were nonconforming.

There was some discussion as to how much time the businesses in the area would have to vacate and the procedure that would be used. It was also mentioned that the final EIS would address the impact that would be created if these businesses and residents were relocated elsewhere in the basin or perhaps out the basin.

Mr. Hallam inquired if there was any consideration given to relocating these business and residents on other federally owned lands.

Mr. Bidart brought up the subject of the negative impact that this type of project would have outside the basin and suggested that the final EIS address this issue.

C. U. S. Forest Service, Review of Alternative Plans for Utilization of Camp Richardson, El Dorado County

John Hoefer, Planning Staff Officer for the Lake Tahoe Basin Management unit, gave the presentation to the APC. Mr. Hoefer started by giving a background and why this item is before the APC at this time stating that Camp Richardson started out as a multi-service resort and started in about 1920 as a private resort. In 1965 the Forest Service acquired this resort along with the land. During the past fifteen years the resort has been operated under a concessionaire permit. That permit terminates December, 1982 at which time the Forest Service normally would reissue a permit for the use of the property. However, before the Forest Service does reissue a permit it decided to reexamine this use and perhaps look at some alternative uses.

Mr. Hoefer then went over some of the concerns regarding the resort, e.g., the disrepair of some of the cabins, congestion along Highway 89, density of some camp sites and vehicle parking sites, camp sites in stream environment zones, recreation vehicle sites near an indian burial area, deviations from health and safety standards and environmental standards for some of the buildings and other facilities at that area, utilities that are not up to standard, and a pier that is in disrepair. Mr. Hoefer also mentioned that the Forest Service has some concerns over the economics of the operation.

Mr. Hoefer then pointed out some of the alternatives for the site, e.g., continue the resort as is correcting problems as they occur, having the resort used for day use only, using only recreational vehicle for camping, completely remodel the resort for same use, use most of the buildings for Forest Service headquarters and employee housing, to mix the public recreation use with Forest Service facilities, and public use with some Forest Service facilities. He mentioned that none of the alternative completely prohibit public recreation.

Mr. Hallam mentioned that Placer County held a meeting in this regard and that the overwhelming response was that the public wanted the resort to remain as is. Ann Bogush also pointed out that the residents of South Lake Tahoe felt that the character and low cost of this resort should remain the same.

Chairman Meder suggested that a motion be made that no significant changes be made until the threshold study and new general plan update was completed. There was some disagreement from other members of the APC; no motion was made. There was some question as to who would decide if there was going to be significant impacts.

No action was taken on this topic.

D. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

Mr. Randy Sheffield gave an update to the APC. Mr. Sheffield pointed out a couple of important points that come out of the October Governing Board meeting, first, that an EIS would need to be prepared for the development for the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, second, the steering committee would be expanded to include the federal representative making a body of seven in the steering committee. The steering committee meetings would be noticed as public meetings and the Chairman of the steering committee would seek public input at the individual meetings. There would be no public representatives included in the Core Group. There will be a technical resource team that would provide technical input. Mr. Sheffield mentioned that there will be two general public meetings, tentatively, December 9 & 10 to inform the people in the Basin and for the people outside the Basin, they will be informed through the media.

Mr. Sheffield mentioned that would be a meeting of the steering committee on the 20th of November at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Sheffield introduced Dave Ziegler and David Greer to the APC and described each of their positions and also mentioned that he was soon to hire a new person as a transportation planner.

E. Shorezone Ordinance Amendments

Kristina Elfving, Planning Assistant, updated the APC as to the anticipated completion date of the Shorezone Ordinance Amendments, stating that at this time the said ordinance was not ready for public hearing and asked if there were questions.

Mr. Smith had a question on the addendum regarding the prohibition against discharges on page 12. There was also a question on the prohibition on buoys. Ms. Smith suggested that the APC receive the comments submitted by Lahontan.

Chairman Meder commented that the public and any other interested parties' comments are welcome and asked what procedures were being used to get these comments, e.g. workshops.

Chairman Meder questioned #7 on page 3 regarding "special events" and what it entailed. It was suggested that this item be clarified.



F. Land Use Ordinance Amendments

Executive Director, Philip Overeynder gave a status report on this item. The draft was presented to the APC and Governing Board in October. The Governing Board accepted it as the basis for the land use ordinance and that when staff has a draft copy of the ordinance ready, staff will bring it before the APC for review and comments.

G. Status of 208 Water Quality Management Plan Implementation

Senior Planner Gary Shellhorn gave the presentation to the APC on the remedial erosion control and onsite runoff and he explained that Senior Planner Dave Ziegler would give the presentation on the transfer of development rights. Mr. Shellhorn explained that they needed some sort of direction on this regulatory ordinance before December, 1981 and asked the APC for direction in its development.

Mr. Shellhorn stated that funds were needed to deal with some of the remedial problems, namely, the mitigation fund and explained to the APC how these monies would be collected and used. Mr. Shellhorn also explained some of the alternatives with regard to enforcement mechanisms for onsite runoff and erosion and alternatives that may be used to resolve these problems. A primary question is whether it should be done on a voluntary basis or mandatory basis.

The APC had several suggested areas where they felt the funds should be used and where these funds should come from.

Mr. Shellhorn pointed out that the two major problems in the 208 Plan deal with road drainage and unvegetated cut and fill slopes. The next most major problem is the service yards and then service stations.

Mr. Shellhorn asked the APC if felt it was feasible to put some enforcement on the transfer of property, e.g., having erosion and runoff problems solved prior to title change. He also suggested that it might be a better choice to prioritize as to which problems are more significant and work to solve those before working on some of the less significant situations. Ms. Bogush suggested that the funds should perhaps come from a whole neighborhood or subdivision to correct problem areas instead of charging individuals. It was the consensus of the APC that prioritized method rather than a random method would be more acceptable and that after problem areas have been sited create a timetable for individuals to correct these problem areas. It was felt that the procedure used to have problems corrected is to first make it voluntary, then request the problem be resolved or corrected and the final step would be to demand and set a time limit on the project's completion.

After much discussion Mr. Shellhorn felt he had enough suggestions to put together more specific alternatives with in the next couple of months.

Senior Planner, Dave Ziegler came forward to present to the APC the topic of transfer of development rights (TDR). Mr. Ziegler went into four points for discussion 1) why the Agency was interested in transfer of development rights, 2) what does a transfer of development rights system involve, 3) what is our existing situation today with respect to TDR and 4) what are our options in proceeding. Mr. Ziegler stated that the interest stems from wanting to give relief to those people who had lots that were unbuildable, and the way to do this was through TDR. He then went on to describe what makes a good TDR and what were some of the options for implementation, namely, 1) have the Governing Board, through resolution, adopt the California system for the California side only, 2) that the TRPA take the existing California system and make a TRPA ordinance 3) through ordinance impose or create a moratorium and extend California system and 4) take no action at this time or until the general plan was updated.

H. Status Report on Water, Sewer and Traffic in Incline Village, Washoe County

Associate Planner, James Dana, gave the presentation on water to the APC and introduced Kermit McMillin, General Manager of the the Incline Village General Improvement District. Mr. Dana asked that Mr. McMillin speak on what IVGID's future plans were as far as building and water, sewer and traffic. Mr. McMillin stated that IVGID has been negotiating for new water rights; however, due to several difficulties those rights have not been acquired at this time. Mr. McMillin also talked about the anticipated building growth and that IVGID was still within their present water rights.

Mr. Dana then gave a presentation on the sewer situation in IVGID and again asked Mr. McMillin to comment. Mr. McMillin addressed the timetables and regulations that IVGID abide by in this regard. Mr. Overeynder asked about the EPA grant and what that was to be used for. Mr. McMillin stated that it was the both the step two in their process and the land acquisition.

Mr. Dana lastly gave a presentation on the traffic situation in IVGID in which Mr. Dana explained to the APC the annual traffic flows for both through traffic and Incline Traffic and what the impacts will appear to be by the year 2000. He also looked at some the alternatives that people would or will be using to get around Highway 28.

V Reports

A. Governing Body Action on APC Conflict of Interest Requirements

Chairman Meder informed the APC of the results Governing Board meeting with regard to APC's filing of Conflict of Interest Statements, that a resolution was made and passed that the APC would be required to file. It was requested that all APC members who had not filed please to do so.

B. Public Interest Comments - None

C. APC Members

John Renz mentioned that today there would be some decision as to the proposed alternative to the Kale casino.

VI Resolutions

VII Correspondence

VIII Pending Matters

IX Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,



Sharon A. Fick  
Secretary II

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  
South Lake Tahoe, California

December 9, 1981  
10:00 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman John Meder called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 10:08 a.m., Executive Director Philip Overeynder introduced Judith Unsicker to the APC as a representative for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Lahontan Region and placed into the record a letter of authorization.

APC Members Present: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Harper, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Smith, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. McCurry, Mr. Schlumpf, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Meder  
APC Members Absent: Ms. McMorris

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no additions or amendments to the Agenda and the following motion was made:

MOTION by Mr. Bidart with Second by Mr. Hallam to approve the December Agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Smith with Second by Mr. Harper to approve the October Minutes. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. 1982 Nonattainment Air Quality Plan Status Report

Associate Planner, Dale Neiman summarized a memo that was in the APC packet bringing the APC up to date on the air quality planning development. He gave some background stating that the Clean Air Act amendments of 1977 required states to identify areas exceeding air quality standards and required the states to prepare a plan to obtain those standards by December 31, 1982, however, an extension could be obtained until 1987. He explained which agencies had the responsibility of developing a bistate air quality plan, the steps involved in obtaining this plan and the major issues involved, e.g., Establishing an attainment date for the 6 ppm 8-hour high altitude carbon monoxide standard adopted for the Basin by both California and Nevada, resolving the conflicts in terms of what control measures should be adopted and which should be deferred, meeting the May, 1982 submittal deadline and obtaining the implementing agreements and implementation dates for the control measures. Mr. Neiman also presented the proposed adoption process.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 9, 1981

Stan Randolph suggested that a motion be made that either the staff or the APC write a letter in opposition to the Traxler-Hillis Bill that proposes to relax automobile emission standards for automobiles. There was concern regarding the policy of APC initiating such a letter and the motion was dropped. However, it was agreed that staff would transmit a letter regarding the proposed legislation expressing concern regarding the effects on the Tahoe Basin. An additional report will be presented in December.

There was much discussion on this planning matter but no action was taken.

B. Environmental Threshold Carry Capacity Study

Mr. Randy Sheffield, Chief, Long Range Planning, updated the APC as to the status of developing environmental thresholds. Mr. Sheffield explained what happened at the November 30 meeting of the Steering Committee, e.g., finalize the work plan, bring together for the first time the technical resource team, and to review draft value statements. Mr. Sheffield mentioned that the next Steering Committee meeting will be in conjunction with the January 13 APC meeting in the afternoon and explained what he would like to accomplish at that Steering Committee meeting. He also informed the APC and public that on December 16 and 17 there were going to be four public hearings held to inform the public about the environmental threshold carrying capacity process.

There was some discussion, however, since this was a status report, no action was taken on this planning matter.

C. Water Quality (208) Plan Implementation

Senior Planner, David Ziegler, brought up the subject of EPA's approval letter on the Lake Tahoe Water Quality Management Plan stating that as a condition of approval that by December 31, 1981 TRPA shall submit to EPA a letter of commitment from each major management agency which acknowledges that agencies' acceptance of the responsibilities and time schedules assigned by the plan. Mr. Ziegler said that TRPA was working with EPA to find out exactly what it was they wanted and which agencies the EPA considers major. Also to find out if there were alternative ways to demonstrate agency commitments. He noted that when this information is available, staff would contact the agencies individually.

1. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Senior Planner, David Ziegler gave a status report on where TRPA stood with regard to the TDR and summarized the outline that was a part of the APC packet. Mr. Ziegler mentioned that a meeting had been held in the beginning of December for those people who indicated interest in TDR. Mr. Ziegler then discussed some of the issues of concern regarding the TDR program; timing, whether TDR's should be considered before the update of the 208 Plan; the transition of responsibility and activity from CTRPA to TRPA. He explained that what came out of the meeting of December 2 was a recommended approach. What he proposed to do is to break the effort down into two phases, one directed to the short term and one directed to the long term. In the short term it was recommended that (1) the TRPA staff and the CTRPA staff work together to evaluate the existing system and the transition of responsibility from CTRPA to TRPA, (2) TRPA would monitor development and building activity in Nevada and consider adopting an interim TDR policy in that

state and (3) to study some specific limited transfer concepts such as land coverage transfers on contiguous lots with land coverage transfers with subdivisions. In the long term it was recommended that (1) start working on a new complete TDR system to accompany the 208 update.

There was some discussion on the how TDR's work, and it was requested that any comments or suggestions that the APC had be written down on the staff summary and turned into Mr. Ziegler and that these comments and suggestions would be incorporated in the development of the programs. No action was taken on this planning matter.

2. Remedial Erosion Controls

Senior Planner, Gary Shellhorn, summarized the preliminary draft outline on the proposed remedial erosion and runoff control ordinance that was a part of the APC packet. Mr. Shellhorn showed a flow chart which outlined the three phases of the implementation, (1) a notice phase, (2) a planning phase and (3) compliance or implementation phase. Mr. Shellhorn also went over the APC recommendation for a priority system and explained how it would work and pointed out the pros and cons connected with this method. Mr. Shellhorn also passed out to the APC a Watershed Priority Criteria sheet and summarized how it would work and asked for APC comments and suggestions. There was quite a bit of discussion on cost effectiveness and the pros and cons related to concentrating on cost effective projects. Mr. Shellhorn then went over each phase individually and explained how each would be implemented.

No action was taken on this planning matter.

D. Shorezone Ordinance Amendments

Planning Assistant, Kristina Elfving, presented this item to the APC and explained the stage of development so far and explained that more work was needed before these proposed ordinance amendments were ready for adoption and clarified and answered questions presented by the APC. The question was raised whether or not an EIS would be required for these proposed amendments. Mr. Larry Hoffman came forward in favor of an EIS, however, it was the staff's opinion that an EIS would not be necessary or required in that it is required in the Compact that this ordinance be reviewed and updated every two years and the ordinance amendments were directed only at matters of clarification of the existing ordinance that are necessary to be consistent with the bi-state compact amendments. No action was taken on this planning matter. However, staff agreed to conduct an additional meeting of the Shorezone Development Review Committee to solicit input from concerned property owners responding to concerns raised by Mr. Hoffman and others.

V REPORTS - None

A. Public Interest Comments - None

B. APC Members

Ms. Bogush mentioned that on Friday, December 11 the City Council and the Board of Supervisors were going to have a joint meeting and that one of the items on their agenda was the role the of local and regional governments and how they can cooperate.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 9, 1981

- VI RESOLUTIONS
- VII CORRESPONDENCE
- VIII PENDING MATTERS
- IX ADJOURNMENT - The APC adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon A. Fick  
Secretary II

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
STAFF SUMMARY

Obermuller/Fassbender/Koonce  
(Pfeifer House Restaurant/Ice House Area)  
General Plan Amendment  
Placer County

Proposed General Plan Amendment

The applicants are requesting an amendment to the TRPA General Plan map to reclassify three parcels from General Forest (GF) to General Commercial (GC). The purpose of this amendment is to make the existing commercial establishments on the site conforming uses and thus permit replacement and major repairs.

Property Location

The three parcels (APN 95-110-22, -08, and -09) are located on the north side of Highway 89 at the western edge of Tahoe City.

Property Description

Use - The subject property contains the Pfeifer House Restaurant, the Ice House Office Building, and two single family residences. The surrounding uses and classifications are shown on Attachment A.

Land Coverage - The land coverage on the site is approximately 24% which is in excess of the land coverage permitted by the land capability system. As shown on Attachment B, the property is classified as High Hazard, with most of the coverage and disturbance being located in the southern portion of the property which is classified as a stream environment zone (SEZ). A site inspection indicates the SEZ may not be properly classified, but such a finding would require more data.

Impacts

The proposed reclassification to GC would make the commercial uses conforming, thus permit expansion and replacement. The two single family dwellings would become nonconforming and thus would have to be phased out. The development potential of the property would be increased in terms of permitted uses but would be physically limited to nonconforming land coverage restraints.

Conformance to:

Local Zoning - Placer County has the property zoned Commercial C-1).

CTRPA Zoning - CTRPA has the property classified the same as TRPA (GF).

Tahoe City Urban Design Plan - As shown on Attachment C, the TRPA/Placer County adopted plan indicates the long range use for this area to be highway corridor and parking.

1/7/82  
GWB:jf



Obermuller/Fassbender/Koonce  
(Pfeifer House Restaurant/Ice House Area)  
page two

Issues for Discussion

1. Can this General Plan amendment qualify for a Finding of No Significant Impact?
2. Would this be a suitable urban boundary for Tahoe City?
3. Is the application premature in light of the conflict with the urban design plan and the unresolved transportation issues?

