

**TRPA  
APC  
PACKETS**

**JUNE  
1982**

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on June 9, 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: June 1, 1982

By: Randall C. Sheffield  
Randall C. Sheffield, Chief  
Long Range Planning Division  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  
South Lake Tahoe, California

APPEAR @ 9:00 ←  
- START  
- LATE SET - CERTAIN AM  
- BACKGROUND STAFF BRIEF  
- ORDINANCES FOR APC  
- LIST  
June 9, 1982  
10:00 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV PUBLIC HEARING

R.S. Environmental Impact Statement for Establishment  
of Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

- Policy statements / stls  
- Socio-Economic Impacts

V CLEARINGHOUSE

R.S. Redfield Trust, 3,000 Acre Donation to the U.S. Forest  
Service - Washoe, Douglas, and Placer Counties

VI PLANNING MATTERS

A. Consideration of Certification of the EIS for Fallen  
Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment, El Dorado County

CONT'D

D.N. B. 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin  
and Environmental Impact Statement

GWB C. Work Program for Regional Plan Development

G.S. D. Mitigation Fee Policy for Remedial Erosion Control Work

D.Z. E. Management Agency Letters of Commitment for the 208 Plan

D.Z. F. Case-by-Case EIS

VII REPORTS

M.K. A. Subcommittee Report on APC Role

G.S. B. Remedial Erosion Control Ordinance

D.Z. C. 208 Status Report (General)

D. Public Interest Comments

E. APC Members

{ PROJECT REVIEW - APPEALS } VOTING  
LONG RANGE STRUCTURE  
EIS CERT.

VIII RESOLUTIONS

IX CORRESPONDENCE

X PENDING MATTERS

XI ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  
South Lake Tahoe, California

May 12, 1982  
10:00 a.m.

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chairman Stan Randolph called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 10:10 a.m. and welcomed Ms. Connie Sparbel, Supervisor of Acquisition Planning Grants, Nevada State Parks, who has been designated by Roland Westergard to replace John Meder, as a member on the APC.

APC Members Present: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Harper, Ms. Bogush (present at 10:15 a.m.), Mr. Hoeffler, Ms. Smith, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart (present at 10:20), Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Randolph

APC Members Absent: Mr. Pyle, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Schlumpf, Ms. McMorris

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mr. Hallam with a second by Mr. Dodgion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion to approve the April 14, 1982 APC minutes as presented. Second by Mr. Hoeffler. The motion carried unanimously.

IV ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER

Selection of APC Chairman and Vice Chairman

Vice Chairman Randolph asked for nominations for the selection of the APC Chairman and Vice Chairman, and recommended that the new Chairman take over the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Dodgion nominated Mr. Randolph (with no second). Ms. Bogush called for a discussion, asking Mr. Overeynder to comment on the last TRPA Governing Board meeting and the feeling of the members of being overwhelmed with the amount of projects they were reviewing, and staff request for delegation of some of the authority. Ms. Bogush suggested that the APC members be sensitive to the selection of a chairman and vice chairman. Ms. Bogush pointed out that if there is a good balance between the APC and the Governing Board, some of that authority might be delegated to the APC.

Mr. Overeynder commented that under the terms of the Compact, if a vacancy does occur in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the person that is elected by the APC will fill that vacancy for the remaining term. In this case, since it is a two year term, the term that is remaining will be until January, 1983, or approximately an eight month period. With regard to the delegation of responsibility to the staff, a proposed resolution for certain classes of

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 12, 1982

project review will be placed on the May Governing Board agenda. Prior to adopting the resolution all of the available options will be considered.

Both Mr. Randolph and Mr. Hoefler recommended that the APC be given more responsibility. After no further discussion, Mr. Hansen nominated Mike Harper, with a second by Mr. Hoefler. Ms. Shellhammer nominated Glenn Smith (with no second). Mr. Hoefler nominated Ann Bogush, with a second by Ms. Smith. Discussion followed pertaining to the nominations. Ms. Bogush stated that she would be more interested in being chairman when a Californian is chairing the TRPA Governing Board, and therefore withdrew from the nomination in support of Mike Harper.

MOTION by Mr. Bidart that all nominations be closed with a second by Ms. Smith. The motion carried unanimously, with Mr. Harper being elected as the APC chairman.

For the record, Mr. Overeynder pointed out that the reason this meeting was noticed as selection for both chairman and vice chairman was if in the event the vice chairman was elected as chairman. Mr. Randolph will continue as vice chairman until the end of his term.

Mr. Harper thanked Mr. Randolph for chairing the meetings in behalf of John Meder when he could not be present.

V PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 1982 Air Quality Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin  
and Environmental Impact Statement

Mr. Overeynder stated that last month the APC conducted a public hearing which was continued to this month and staff has received the preliminary comments based on review of this document. To date, staff has attempted to respond to the comments received from the APC and will meet with some of the principal parties involved in certifying the plan; the Air Resources Board, the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, and the Environmental Protection Agency during the coming week. It is proposed to take the comments of the APC as one element of the comment on the public record to the Governing Board for final action at the July meeting. These comments will be assimilated into an addendum to the draft plan and the Environmental Impact Statement, and ask the Governing Board to take final action on that plan.

Senior Planner Dale Neiman briefly answered the concerns that the APC members had expressed last month pertaining to the Agency's legal authority to implement an Inspection and Maintenance (I & M) program. He stated it was legal counsel's opinion that TRPA does have legal authority to adopt this program as an ordinance for the Basin if the Governing Board desires.

The second concern was the commitments from implementing agencies. Mr. Neiman stated that staff has been working with the agencies for the last month. It is felt by these agencies that no commitment can be given until after the plan is approved. Staff is presently working with Caltrans, the City of South Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe Transportation District on the details for the commitment statements.

The third concern regarding the cost benefit analysis was addressed by Mr. Neiman. He pointed out that these are rough estimates based on discussions with Nevada and the Air Resources Board and more information will be included in terms of costs for the measures. Mr. Overeynder stated that a more detailed analysis, i.e. traffic flow improvements, will increase the efficiency of the transportation system, decrease travel time and fuel consumption, and will be identified more specifically with the cost estimates.

Mr. Neiman also stated that staff has met with Nevada and EPA. The present changes that are being looked at are expanding the schedule identified in Chapter 7 and also expanding certain areas in Chapter 4 which deals with the control measures of solutions to the air quality problems in the Basin. Mr. Renz asked why the plan did not address attainment and Mr. Neiman replied that it was one of the areas that would be expanded in Chapter 4. Mr. Neiman further explained that a number of alternatives for the I & M program such as gas stations, or a centralizing program doing the inspections are available and will be addressed in the development of an ordinance. Essentially, the cost of an I & M program would be typically what it costs to have an automobile inspected, approximately \$10-\$15. If it fails, the cost is \$10-\$50 to get it corrected. According to legal counsel we have authority in the regional plan to do this, but we do not have the authority before the regional plan is adopted. Mr. Randolph expressed concern that in adopting such an ordinance, more detailed information for the implementation of the plan and how it will be administered will have to be provided for the Governing Board to make a decision. Mr. Overeynder pointed out we should attempt to follow the leadership in California and not set a program that is contrary to the direction of the majority of cars that are coming into the Basin; not make the rest of California fit Lake Tahoe. Mr. Overeynder suggested we wait and see what action the State Legislature does take and then follow suit. That would be an easier program to implement on a local level. The question was raised if Nevada had a similar program and Mr. Neiman replied that currently any area in the State has the ability to adopt and implement an I & M program, the State government or legislature does not require it. Mr. Dodgion clarified that it will become mandatory July, 1983 for Reno and Las Vegas.

Pertaining to the commitment statement by the City, Ms. Bogush stated that the Planning Commission approved conceptually the plan with their recommendations to the City Council. She expressed concern that the City's responsibilities will have to be better defined since at the present time they are very general, and the Council may be reluctant to make a commitment until these issues have been resolved. Mr. Neiman said that he has discussed these issues and measures with Rick Heitkemper. Some have been defined as to the exact dollar amount and some can not be. Further work still has to be done in order to identify the City's responsibilities.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 12, 1982

Ms. Bogush asked why El Dorado County and Placer County have not been requested for a statement of commitment. Mr. Neiman replied that the carbon monoxide problem in the Basin is limited to the area between the South Lake Tahoe "Y" and Stateline. In terms of impact of implementing measures, the areas affected would be the City, Caltrans, and the Tahoe Transportation District. El Dorado County does not have jurisdiction in that area and there is no air quality problem projected in Placer County. Ms. Bogush disagreed stating that the City, as a part of El Dorado County, will need their support in implementing this plan. Mr. Combs stated that he thought it would be appropriate to ask for support from all the jurisdictions including the Placer County Board of Supervisors for conceptual approval of the I & M program. Mr. Overeynder stated that all of these concerns will be addressed in the regional plan. This plan addresses a site specific problem existing along the Highway 50 corridor within the City of South Lake Tahoe along with the measures that have been identified to meet and attain the federal standards. There will be other measures that will become part of the Basin-wide solution that will go much further than this. At the present, this is an interim strategy. Mr. Overeynder agreed with Ms. Bogush, particularly on the transportation measures which will require cooperation since a great deal of the traffic through the corridor area is generated by people living outside of the City's boundaries. They will have to be tied into a commitment of the concept for improving the bus service within that area. If the program would enhance the air quality in the basin, then additional measures will be proposed which will address the regional problem.

Mr. Renz commented that this has not been discussed with Douglas County and Mr. Neiman replied that there are two measures, I & M potentially in the future and installation of pedestrian separation between the two casinos, which will be defined in the regional plan when the transportation element will be adopted. There are two types of commitments, the first are the improvements that will be made this year as part of the STPUD mitigation program, and the second commitment will be what is developed in the regional plan. This is an interim plan that will be updated and expanded with development of the regional plan.

Ms. Shellhammer asked why the regional plan was being discussed instead of the thresholds, which should be the next step. Mr. Overeynder replied that staff has prepared a draft environmental impact statement for public review. It has recommended values in terms of what the threshold standards would be and that the general plan would be required to implement those standards. There is another step to be taken which has to be formulated and approved by the APC and the Governing Body.

Ms. Bogush further stated that since this is a Basin-wide air quality plan, statements of commitment should be requested from all jurisdictions in the Basin. Mr. Neiman replied that this is a Basin-wide air quality plan which deals with specific problems in a specific area and certain people are responsible for the problem. Mr. Hallam stated the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors did not have any conceptual problems with Plan, but specifically asked staff if they were an implementing agency or required to do anything at this time and the answer was no. They indicated they would rather take a low profile, but would back the City of South Lake Tahoe, but not make any formal commitment at this time.

Mr. Overeynder also added that the Compact indicates the Regional Plan will assess a regional transit system and come up with a transit plan. We have indicated there will be an increased effort in transportation planning to meet the air quality goals. One possibility is to go to all local entities and ask them to set aside funds in a capital improvement program that would be identified strictly for transit improvements. The specifics would later be identified as part of the regional transportation plan that is adopted as part of the general plan a year from now. At this point, the most logical thing to ask for, as opposed to a conceptual type of approval, would be a specific dollar amount.

Mr. Randolph commented that in El Dorado County, outside of the City limits, approximately one third of the permanent population of that area reside. He pointed out that there was bus operation for a short time on an experimental basis. The County does have money for public transportation, and could possibly use that money inside the City of South Lake Tahoe for the betterment of public transportation for all people in El Dorado County. Mr. Randolph urged that everyone has the responsibility in the Basin to make a commitment.

Discussion followed pertaining to the options before the APC members: 1) to send the plan to the Governing Board with no recommendations; 2) to reconvene on May 25 prior to the Governing Board meeting; 3) to reschedule it for the June 9 APC meeting, and 4) to form a sub-committee to review and address the concerns that the APC members have.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen to form a sub-committee to reconvene on May 25 to review the plan on behalf of the APC for recommendation to the Governing Board on May 27. Second by Mr. Bidart. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Harper suggested that the sub-committee be represented by the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Air Resources Board, Lahontan, and Douglas County. Members appointed were Ms. Bogush, Mr. Hallam, Mr. Randolph, Ms. Smith and Mr. Renz.

MOTION by Mr. Bidart to close the public hearing. Second by Mr. Renz. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Environmental Impact Statement for  
Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

Mr. Harper pointed out that although this item had been noticed for public hearing, it is for the purpose of taking comment.

Randy Sheffield, Chief of Long Range Planning stated that this item would continue as a public hearing on the EIS for the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity study since it had been properly noticed back in March. Mr. Sheffield noted that the EIS is complete and will be available May 19. Copies will be mailed to the APC and Governing Board Members. Mr. Sheffield thanked the numerous staff and others for their technical skills, long hours above and beyond, and hard work in preparing the EIS.

Mr. Sheffield stated that the April 21 working copy of the EIS provided to the APC was initially discussed with the Governing Board on April 28 and continued to May 7 for final review before sending it to the printer. A technical review of the working copy was conducted on May 3 with the Technical Resource Team, which included the APC members. Between May 3 and May 7 the working copy of the EIS was rewritten and the presented to the Board. The comments received from



the Governing Board on May 7 created another rewrite of the EIS which was finished and sent to the printers on May 12. The 60 day review period will begin on May 19 and run through July 17. During that period of time there will be a continuation of this public hearing before the APC at the June and July meetings. The Board will also conduct public hearings at their May and June meetings, before taking action in July, to first certify the EIS and then adopt the Environmental Thresholds. A summary of the EIS will be mailed to each of the people on the mailing list, approximately 700 individuals. The summary will identify the opportunity to obtain more information. The EIS is available for review and/or purchase at the TRPA office. The EIS will be provided to the Governing Board, the APC, the Technical Team, and the federal, state and local agencies that have involvement or jurisdiction within the Tahoe Basin. In addition, copies will be placed in all the libraries. The remainder of the copies of the EIS will be sold at a cost of \$6.00.

Mr. Sheffield pointed out that the EIS contains information on the thresholds for 10 different environmental component areas, plus the sub-components under each one of the particular environmental resource areas. Each component and sub-component has been discussed along with the recommended threshold, some alternatives to the recommendation, and where the recommendation falls in terms of the existing standards. It also describes the affected environment and the environmental consequences of adopting the recommended threshold or the alternatives to the threshold. Mr. Sheffield explained that the section on consequences is primarily focused on physical and biological impacts that can be defined, identified and evaluated. The discussion on the social and economic aspects or consequences of implementing and adopting the thresholds is more broad, because at this time we do not have alternative land use plans developed that meet the thresholds. The consequences been addressed in a broad way, but until the Regional Plan is developed there is no opportunity to present finite figures. Response to the public comment received through the 60 day review period will be scheduled for the Governing Board on July 27-28 for certification of the EIS and then their action to adopt the thresholds.

The only public comment from the audience came from Mr. John Reilly who stated that he was interested in recreation and there is a company that doesn't even know anything about recreation which has made this report. This is something that has to be addressed, and being interested in skiing, the capacity for that sport leaves few remaining areas in or near the Basin where skiing can be developed. Mr. Reilly felt that the APC and TRPA is going to have to address that subject.

Mr. Combs commented that there has been a great deal of discussion of how to deal with the problem of having to prepare an environmental document, but yet not having any thresholds that this document can identify. He asked, from a procedural standpoint, would there be a draft EIS prepared, then the adoption of the thresholds, and then a change to the environmental document to reflect the actions of the Governing Board? Mr. Sheffield replied that the action or the requirement of the Compact is to adopt thresholds. Subsequent to the adoption of the thresholds, development and adoption of the revised Regional Plan will maintain those adopted thresholds. Mr. Sheffield pointed out that one of the aspects discussed with the Board on May 7 was a need to make clear in this

process that the Board will now adopt environmental thresholds, but there may be a need to review the thresholds and take a look at the actions that are being contemplated to achieve those thresholds. The second phase of planning, updating the regional plan, will be the point to begin to look at what is or is not provided in terms of meeting the thresholds that have been adopted. The opportunity to review and revise was made very explicit from the Board.

Mr. Overeynder clarified that in July the Governing Board would be asked to certify the EIS which would disclose what alternatives were evaluated and the impacts. If the Board were to take action within the scope of that EIS there would be no need to revise it. If the Board took action outside the scope of the EIS a revision or addendum would be required.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen to continue the public hearing until June 9, 1982. Second by Mr. Hallam. The motion carried unanimously.

#### VI PLANNING MATTERS

##### A. Consideration of Certification of the EIS for Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment, El Dorado County

Associate Planner Jim Dana presented a summary of the proposed rehabilitation plan for Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge. The plan calls for the removal of many of the old buildings and campsites, construction of 30 new cabins, and renovation of existing lodge and recreation hall. In addition, Fallen Leaf Road, which runs along the beachfront would be relocated upslope and away from the lakefront. Once relocation is complete, a portion of the old lakefront road would be removed and the shoreline rehabilitated. The construction period would be approximately five year. During the first year, the old buildings would be removed, the sewer and water system to the remaining buildings would be installed; and the road relocated. The 30 new cabins would be constructed over a four year period. The rehabilitation plan would reduce the number of cabins from 82 to 37 and no campsites. At present there is an existing lodge, cabins, campsites, tent sites, and motel units. As part of the proposal, 7 of the existing cabins would be retained, 23 cabins would be removed, all 32 of the existing campsites would be removed, 9 tent sites would be removed and 5 of the 6 motel units. There would be a total of 41 accommodations on the property. Mr. Dana showed pictures of the existing facilities and stated that he had met with Mr. Gary Oates, consultant with Madrone Associates who prepared the EIR/EIS, and Mr. Ernie Jones of Jones and Turner representing the applicant.

Mr. Dana pointed out that the environmental document analyzes the proposed project and three alternatives. The no project alternative, would involve maintaining the facilities in their present condition until another buyer was found. The second alternative would involve purchase by the Forest Service with continued recreational use. The third option analyzed was using this site in much the same manner as the Stanford Camp located adjacent to this property, which provides public use for educational/recreational programs, guest speakers and evening entertainment.

Mr. Dana stated there are major concerns which need to be addressed including three stream environment zones delineated as part of this report and possibly

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 12, 1982

several more water influence areas. Agency staff has indicated to the applicant as well as the consultant that the placement of any dwellings within a SEZ would be prohibited. The other question that arises is whether Agency Ordinance 81-5 would allow construction of a road within these three affected stream environment zones.

Another concern is that currently classification of the property would not allow the proposed use and would require rezoning in order to facilitate the proposed use. In each of the proposed alternatives, less traffic would result in the area on a daily traffic level than is currently experienced. Staff is concerned that the peak hour estimates of vehicle trips were not provided. There is a great deal of vegetation next to the road shoulder that would severely restrict the ability to widen the road in the future. Questions concerning the traffic estimates will have to be addressed. Another concern was the overview of tables does not rank the alternatives in terms of relative benefits or adverse impacts. Staff has asked for clarification of what public services will remain.

Mr. Dana stated that the site contains land capability districts 1 and 5; most of the improvements are shown within an area delineated on the Agency maps as being land capability level 5. The position of staff has been no construction within sensitive areas and asked for some relocation of the proposed configurations. The area is also subject to slide that occurred in 1955 mentioned in the document. The applicant has shown the slide hazard area as capability level 1; staff has asked the consultant for clarification and some rating of the slide hazard.

The proposed operators of this resort have stated that it would be operated as a private resort for their use. There would be approximately 30 memberships within the Fallen Leaf Lake Associates, which is comparable to the number of cabins that are proposed. The units would not be owned individually within that corporation. The corporation would own the property and the units would then be available for use by the members on a non-assigned basis. When not in use by the member, the cabins would be available for other people. The proposed units would be one story high and approximately 800 square feet.

Mr. Dana pointed out review by the Agency, CTRPA and El Dorado County would be required for approval. Another question that arises is would this project be considered a subdivision? Do these units need to be accounted for within the Bi-state allocations of building permits? Should this activity be able to initiate construction prior to May, 1983? These questions need to be resolved by staff in conjunction with legal counsel.

Mr. Hansen opened the discussion by asking about the present sewer hookups and Mr. Dana replied that the lines have been extended to each facility, but no hookups have been provided and Mr. Craven, the present owner, will be required to provide hookups to any of the cabins that will have a continued use, but not connected at present. Mr. Hansen also asked if the 30 hookups would constitute a subdivision. Mr. Dana stated that, unless legal counsel has a different opinion, he thought it would; it is a question that would need to be resolved in conjunction with legal counsel. Mr. Combs commented that under the Map Act on the California side, if it is a stock cooperative, it would have to be considered a subdivision.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 12, 1982

Mr. Hansen then asked in restricting public access since would it reduce public use of the area to zero? Mr. Dana replied in that particular portion of the area, if the boat ramp is not retained, public use would be precluded. Mr. Dana also pointed out that one of the major problems within the area of the boat ramp is not enough room in the existing configuration for adequately separating parked vehicles, especially with boat trailers, from other vehicles going to either Stanford Camp or to the Forest Service trailhead to Desolation Wilderness.

Mr. Oates of Madrone Associates clarified, with regard to public access, that the project as proposed would restrict vehicular access along the southern lake shore, but would not restrict pedestrian access. Public access would continue. With respect to the boat ramp, the intention is to maintain the public access that currently occurs which is informal control on behalf of Mr. Craven. At the present time, the residents in the area drive their boats to the ramp, launch the boat, and since there is no place to leave their trailers, drive the trailers back to their houses. The project proposes to provide a small parking lot with 10-12 spaces for boat trailers.

Ms. Sparbel asked why the Forest Service had not provided boat launching and trail head facilities. Mr. Hoefer responded that there had not been a need to provide access to the lake in the past, until the acquisition of the land at the north end, and since then have not really dealt with that problem. The U.S. Forest Service must consider funding and priorities. Mr. Hoefer added there is a proposal for a small type of access point for boats on the lake, but one of the problems is a general feeling that there should not be access for large boats or fast boats because of the environment at the lake. No decision has been made for what type of facility will be provided.

Mr. Hallam asked about recreational use for the general public, if it would restrict public access, and commented that there is no guarantee that it won't. His other concern is with the Forest Service considering some change of operation at Camp Richardson, which may or may not decrease the resort recreation opportunities on the southwest side of the Lake and he would not like to see this impact that further. Mr. Hallam asked that if this does become a private ownership operation versus a seasonal resort type use, will this actually allow the property owner to then reserve the cabin for a period of time during the winter? Because the roads are not plowed, what would this mean as far as fire protection?

Mr. Combs stated he understood the purpose was to certify the environmental document, but wanted to know if it would be scheduled as a project with recommendations for approval. Mr. Overeynder responded that the purpose in presenting the EIS was the Governing Board had asked the APC to certify the technical adequacy of the document in order to be assured that all of the impacts are mitigated to a less than significant level. APC is part of the review process.

Mr. Combs re-emphasized the earlier discussion pertaining to the overwhelming consensus from the APC that their role is not fully appropriate, or fully involved in project review and advising the Governing Board as to what actions should be taken on projects, mitigation measures proposed, and to certify or not certify this environmental document. Mr. Combs feels that only half a job