

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**OCTOBER
1982**

Phil

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on October 13, 1982 at
9:00 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: October 4, 1982

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

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

October 13, 1982
9:00 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV APPEALS - Pursuant to Ordinance 81-5 Case by Case Review
 - A. Buchbinder/Elegant, Lot 17, Block H, Geraldine Drive, Incline Village Unit #1, TRPA File #81-1392
- V PLANNING MATTERS
 - A. Regional Plan - Issues and Strategies
- VI REPORTS
 - A. Public Participation Program for Regional Plan
 - B. 208 Status Report - Highway 50 Erosion Control Program, Nevada
- VII RESOLUTIONS
 - A. Draft Resolution for Lynne Smith
- VIII CORRESPONDENCE
- IX PENDING MATTERS
- X ADJOURNMENT



GREGS -
TARBE STATION - EIS - NOVEMBER APC?
LOCATION MAP / SITE PLAN
- APPEALS:

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue
South Lake Tahoe, California

September 8, 1982
9:00 a.m.

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Mike Harper called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Mr. Harper welcomed Mr. Andrew Sawyer of the California Water Resources Control Board as Mr. Hampson's designee to the APC, and introduced Mr. Vern Rosse of the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources serving as Mr. Dodgion's alternate for the September meeting.

APC Members Present: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush (arrived at 9:15), Mr. Smith, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Rosse, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart (arrived at 9:50), Ms. Shellhammer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Harper

APC Members Absent: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Mr. Randolph, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES - July 14 and 15, 1982

The following corrections were noted:

Page 2, paragraph 9 "It shall be a goal to reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient thresholds for primary productivity and transparency" should read: Reduce the loading of dissolved phosphorus, iron, and other algal nutrients from all sources as required to achieve ambient thresholds for primary productivity and transparency.

Page 3, paragraph 8 "The last motion to amend returned discussion to the original motion by Ms. Bogush with second by Ms. McMorris" should read: The last motion to amend returned discussion to the original motion by Ms. Bogush with second by Ms. McMorris, as amended by Mr. Goodenow and seconded by Ms. Shellhammer.

Page 4, paragraph 11 "MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Hallam to amend the second paragraph of the standard to make it a policy direction to amend the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality guidelines" should read: MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Hallam to amend the second paragraph of the standard to make it a policy direction to amend the Uniform Regional Runoff Quality guidelines where there is a direct hydraulic link between surface water and ground water.

Page 5, paragraph 7, "Regional Visibility. There was no discussion on this category" should read: Regional Visibility. There was discussion on this category. (Delete the word no).

Page 5, paragraph 1, "MOTION by Mr. Renz with second by Mr. Combs to delete the second paragraph of the Carbon Monoxide threshold and made part of one of the implementation measures of the General Plan" should read: MOTION by Mr. Renz with second by Mr. Combs to delete the second paragraph of the Carbon Monoxide threshold and make it part of one of the implementation measures of the General Plan.

Page 5, paragraph 4, "MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz that the reduction in wood smoke emission by 15% be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to be dealt with in the Region Plan as an implementing measure for the threshold of the 171 kilometers" should read: MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to adopt regional visibility thresholds as follows:

Achieve 171 kilometers (103 miles) at least 50% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Achieve 97 kilometers (58 miles) 90% of the year as measured by particulate concentrations.

Further, that the wood smoke emission to be reduced by 15% is to be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board to be dealt with in the Regional Plan as an implementing measure.

Page 6, paragraph 5, "It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to encourage a reduction of wood smoke emissions by 15 percent and suspended soil particles by 30 as measured by particulate concentrations" should read: It shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to encourage a reduction of wood smoke emission by 15 percent and suspended soil particles by 30 percent as measured by particulate concentrations.

Page 7, paragraph 6, "Natural pervious surface shall meet the limits as defined in the Capability Classification, Bailey, 1974 to be applied on a geomorphic, watershed or areas wide basis" should read: Natural pervious surface shall meet the limits as defined in the Capability Classification, Bailey, 1974 to be applied on a geomorphic, watershed or areawide basis.

Page 7, paragraph 9, MOTION by Mr. Goodenow with second by Mr. Smith to accept the threshold as recommend by staff. Mr. Renz stated that he voted Nay.

Page 8, paragargh 3, "MOTION by Mr. Hansen with second by Mr. Bidart that the APC certify the technical adequacy of the Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment project" should read: MOTION by Mr. Hallam with second by Mr. Bidart that the APC certify the technical adequacy of the Fallen Leaf Lake Lodge Redevelopment project.

Page 9, paragraph 4, "To add a number 4 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the yellow pine forest, seral other than mature" should read: To add a number 4 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the yellow pine forest in seral stages other than mature.

Page 9, paragraph 5, "To add a number 5 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the red fir forest seral other than mature" should read: To add a number 5 to read Maintain 15 to 25% of the red fir forest in seral stages other than mature.

Page 9, paragraph 7, "A nondegradation standard to preserve the plant communities shall apply to stands of native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increas the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold. This does not preclude management practices" should read: A nondegradation standard to preserve the plant communities shall apply to stands of native deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows while providing for opportunities to increase the acreage of such riparian associations to be consistent with the SEZ threshold. This does not preclude management practices"

Page 10, paragraph 5, "MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Hansen to accept as recommended by staff the threshold standard with the exception of deleting the Major transportation corridors standard and the following paragraph add: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan that the definition of location and decibel levels of a transportation corridor be addressed" should read: MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Hansen to accept as recommended by staff the threshold standard with the exception of deleting the Major transportation corridors standard and the following paragraph add: It shall be the policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan that the definition, location, and decibel levels of a transportation corridor be addressed.

Page 10, paragraph 6, Ms. Smith was not present at this meeting, and the record should reflect that Dr. Unsicker voted aye.

Page 11, paragraph 6, "MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Renz that the APC accept the threshold as originally written in the EIS the Soil Conservation Service "T" factors for acceptable soil loss by soil type in the Lake Tahoe Basin sets the allowable amount of soil loss from an area or watershed area without impacting the productivity of the soil and that the "T" values be adopted for that purpose" should read: MOTION by Mr. Smith with second by Mr. Renz that the APC accept the threshold as originally written in the EIS. The Soil Conservation Service "T" factors for acceptable soil loss by soil type in the Lake Tahoe Basin sets the allowable amount of soil loss from an area or watershed area without impacting the productivity of the soil and that the "T" values be adopted for that purpose.

Page 13, paragraph 4, "MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to amend the first motion to add that it shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to support in response in addressed filed evidence state and federal efforts to reintroduce the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout" should read: MOTION by Ms. Bogush with second by Mr. Renz to amend the first motion to add that it shall be a policy of the TRPA Governing Board in development of the Regional Plan to support, in response to justifiable evidence, state and federal efforts to reintroduce the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout

Page 14, paragraph 10, "Establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation available to the public lands" should read: Establish and insure a fair share of the total Basin capacity for outdoor recreation use on the public lands.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 8, 1982

Page 15, paragraph 3, "Mr. Overeynder gave a brief outline as to what, in staff's opinion, the roll of the APC was" should read: Mr. Overeynder gave a brief outline as to what, in staff's opinion, the role of the APC was

MOTION by Ms. Shellhammer, with a second by Ms. Sparbel, to adopt the minutes of July 14 and 15, 1982 as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

DISPOSITION OF MINUTES - Corrections to Minutes of August 11, 1982

Page 3, paragraph 1, the last sentence "Mr. Randolph suggested that Nevada and Alpine Counties be invited to join the Technical Team" should read: Mr. Randolph suggested that Nevada County be invited to join the Technical Team. Mr. Hansen also suggested that Alpine County be invited to join the Technical Team.

Page 2, paragraph 6, discussion was noted that Ms. Shellhammer raised the issue of the presence of the federal agencies in the planning process.

Page 4, paragraph 2 last sentence should read: The APC members discussed the issues and suggested that a sixth category entitled Implementation Strategies, be included to address socio-economic issues and indicated that they will review them further at the September meeting.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph, with a second by Mr. Smith, to approve the minutes of August 11, 1982, as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Regional Plan Development

Randy Sheffield, Chief of Long Range Planning, introduced Ms. Lasta Tomasevich who has joined the Agency as the Public Involvement Coordinator. She will coordinate the program effort of public involvement during the next few months with the local agencies for the in-Basin public hearings and conduct out-of-Basin public hearings.

Mr. Sheffield announced that the Steering Committee will meet on September 15, 1982 at 10:00 a.m. in the Board Room at the TRPA office to review the Scoping Report for the Regional Plan. He noted some Technical Resource Team members were present to participate in the APC meeting and/or provide written comment if they could not attend.

Gordon Barrett, Senior Planner, presented the Regional Plan Scoping Report and asked the APC members for direction on streamlining the review process, emphasizing the key dates for accomplishing the tasks within the 1982-83 timeframe. The latter part of October will be the target date for scheduling the public hearings for input to suggested alternatives. Discussion then focused on issues and goals.

Mr. Smith suggested a change in wording to the Non-threshold Issue, Goal number 1 to read: "Develop a land use plan that will provide orderly growth and development consistent with the environmental thresholds", and amended by Mr. Sawyer who added "provide opportunities for orderly growth...". Mr. Sawyer questioned why the goals are being defined at this stage since goals were defined for the thresholds, which the Governing Body did not approve. Mr. Sawyer stated he did not feel it is appropriate to try to define goals again, and recommended focus should be directed toward achieving the thresholds, specific policy direction of the Compact, and that the issues are appropriate to present, but premature at this time to try to resolve. Mr. Sheffield responded that the primary reason goals had been established was to insure that the issues, thoughts and desires of the Governing Board, the Advisory Planning Commission and the public are dealt with as the plan effort proceeds.

Mr. Randolph commented the goals are just a rephrasing of the issues, the concerns have been covered, and he suggested the APC address the issues at the present time. Ms. Bogush agreed, stating that when the Board originally considered the work program for the thresholds, citizen participation was deferred to the regional planning process, as there may be additional suggestions during the citizen participation and public forums which can be translated into draft goals at that time. Mr. Barrett clarified it is staff's intent to present to the Governing Board in September the major issues and the goals that have been raised which need to be addressed and receive feedback at that time.

Ms. Shellhammer asked what the legal requirements are for setting up a Regional Plan in the Tahoe Basin; if it will be similar to or different from the other government agencies and various utility districts, and how it will be synchronized to be accomplished. Mr. Sheffield stated that the legal requirement is the Agency adopt a Regional Plan that shows attainment and maintenance of the environmental threshold carrying capacities, and provides opportunities for orderly growth and development. The inter-relationship with other planning entities is identified in the Compact and planning efforts will be coordinated with the entities involved. } *Review*

Mr. Sawyer suggested that staff prepare a matrix which shows the legal requirements which need to be addressed to comply with the Compact in conjunction with the elements that are required to be included in the Regional Plan. Mr. Combs commented that the required elements for the California side for implementation of a Regional Plan would be met if all the proposed elements are incorporated. Discussion followed pertaining to the local entities which may have a stronger or more restrictive plan than the Regional Plan.

Ms. Mary Shallenberger, California Office of Planning and Research, stated that during the development of thresholds, the public did not feel their views were being solicited. Ms. Shallenberger felt that the Regional Plan Scoping Report should have gone to the Steering Committee prior to the APC review. Ms. Shallenberger further stated that the Agency should make sure the public has an opportunity to provide input.

Ms. Sparbel commented she did not think it necessary to take an issue and repeat it as a goal, but if there is a goal which addresses a problem/concern it should be discussed as it could be valuable in defining parameters of direction in the Regional Plan. Mr. Smith suggested that a list of issues, generated to date, should be presented to the public giving them the opportunity for input and comment, then the list could be expanded at that time.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 8, 1982

Mr. Barrett outlined the non-threshold format in evaluating the issues which go beyond the thresholds. Mr. Dennis Winslow, CTRPA Executive Director, stated that the priority facing the APC is to consider the implications of carrying through with the thresholds, how it will be achieved to maintain the numerical values set by the Governing Board, if options are available, and emphasized that the thresholds do define a clear direction of the issues, and staff should not become bogged down with the goal statements. Mr. Harper responded that the APC is aware of the concerns, but there are certain items, issues, and subjects that may have been bypassed in the threshold process but will have to be addressed in the Regional Plan.

Mr. Sawyer suggested that the title "Non-threshold Issues and Goals" be changed to "Additional Issues and Goals" in case of an overlap between thresholds and issues. In addition, the specific elements of the Regional Plan, as set forth in the Compact, as well as the requirements of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act will need to be addressed. Ms. Bogush added that during the last year, time was spent focusing on the statutory requirements, but now it is time to focus direction on the additional categories. Ms. Sparbel recommended that the sequence of events should be decided.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to address just the issues, and not the goals, at this meeting. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Smith, Mr. Sawyer,
Mr. Rosse, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Bidart, Ms. Shellhammer,
Mr. Randolph, Mr. Harper
Nays: Ms. Sparbel
Abstain: None
Absent: Mr. Hallam, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Schlumpf

Mr. Harper clarified the intent of reviewing the issues/goals effort is to make sure when the alternatives are constructed, and provided to the general public, that nothing may have been missed or perceived to have been missed in the threshold project, and to make sure there is a complete package for the staff to develop, with the assistance of the APC and the Steering Committee, for the alternatives that need to be preliminarily reviewed and adopted in November.

Ms. Shellhammer suggested the non-threshold issues and goals be referred to as "Issues and Goals Relating to the Regional Plan".

The APC members discussed and generally agreed to the following amendments and or changes in the wording of the issues. Those not listed were generally accepted as written.

- Issue 1. Changed to: What are the Proper Amounts, Types, Locations, and Timing of Activity/Development Within the Region?
- Goal 1.a. Changed to an Issue: How Can the Conflicts Between the Land Capability System and the Existing Land Use Pattern be Resolved?
- Issue 1.b. Changed to: What Opportunities for Economic Growth Should be Provided for Within the Regional Plan?

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 8, 1982

- Issue 2.a. Changed to: Can the Regional Plan be Developed to Provide a More Healthy Economy?
- Issue 2.c. Changed to: What Incentives or Disincentives Should be Used to Achieve the Goals and Thresholds of the Regional Plan?
- Issue 3.c. Changed to: What are the Proper Geographical Allocations of Scarce Resources?
- Issue 5.a. Changed to: Can the Transportation System be Designed to Attain the Environmental Thresholds and Still Accommodate Transportation Needs Generated by the Selected Land Use?
- Issue 6.c. Move to a separate category: How can Public Health and Safety, and Social Well Being be Provided for in a Way that is Consistent With the Environmental Thresholds and the Directives of the Compact?

Mr. Randolph expressed concern that the chart pertaining to the environmental thresholds and goals needed to be amended. Mr. Combs suggested that another goal be added to the chart entitled "Public Health, Safety & Welfare".

Mr. Barrett presented the staff recommendation for the Plan Content and Governmental Coordination which included topics required of local plans that will help insure coordination between local and Agency plans. Also included were sub-elements with recommendations referring to adopted thresholds and the Implementation Element to insure coordination of implementation strategies.

Mr. Barrett clarified for Ms. Sparbel that commercial activity, although not listed, came under the heading of the Land Use Element (population) and possibly under Development Management. Mr. Combs suggested that under the Land Use Element, sub-element number 4 should be changed to Natural Hazards/Public Safety.

Ms. Bogush questioned why some of the sub-elements under Land Use could not be included under an additional element. Mr. Sheffield quoted Article V of the Compact which identifies the five elements in the Regional Plan. Legal counsel has advised that the Agency adhere to those five only. However, a sixth element, the Implementation Element is proposed to be added. The Agency has drafted broad general standards pertaining to planning implementation and governmental coordination asking for commitments from the local entities to fill in the details of implementation.

Mr. Harper expressed that he is concerned about the area of private lands as the TRPA is designated as both the planning and implementation Agency. It should not be the intent of the Agency to supplant any local entity to regulate and enforce its rules and regulations. Mr. Harper, speaking for Washoe County, felt that each local entity is in a position, both financially and legally, to do the job under the direction of the Regional Plan. Mr. Sawyer stated there are elements of the land use plan where TRPA will have to be the primary agency for planning and implementation. In other areas it will be a more relaxed approach in drafting criteria for local agencies. There is legal authority to apply the same controls to public agencies as to private parties and in some instances it is appropriate.

Feds - Air/Water Quality

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 8, 1982

The APC members recommended that "private and public lands" be eliminated from the wording except for Air and Water Quality. "Implementation" will be eliminated, and the wording will read "The TRPA will set broad regional criteria with local governments".

Staff also drafted a list of planning techniques to be utilized in the range of alternatives and alternative scenarios to be considered in the framework of the Regional Plan. Mr. Sheffield clarified that staff has just begun to develop the whole aspect of alternatives and ranges/options to meet the thresholds. The APC suggested some variations, i.e., consider conservative alternatives, no growth and no action alternatives.

V REPORTS

A. Delegation of Responsibility to APC

Resolution 82-12 delegating certain project review authority to Agency staff, subject to appeal to the Governing Body, and delegating authority to the APC to consider appeals of certain staff decisions, was passed by the Governing Board at the August 26 meeting. This Resolution will become effective 30 days from that date and the APC will review the staff summary of such appeals with recommendations/appropriate action commencing with the October 13 meeting.

B. Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities

Mr. Sheffield reported that the Governing Board adopted the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region on August 26, 1982 after an intensive one year effort to prepare.

D. Public Interest Comments

None

E. APC Members

Ms. Bogush stated that, as discussed previously with staff, concerning the tight deadlines for mailing the agendas and the possibility of changing the meeting dates for either the Governing Board or APC, asked if there were any other options the APC members could consider. Mr. Sheffield responded that in the past there were supplemental mailings to the Governing Board, particularly for the threshold reports, and the APC could consider this as a feasible option. This option would give staff time to prepare/rewrite the APC's recommendation to the Governing Board for their review.

Mr. Renz reported that the sub-committee meeting to set the EIS guidelines had been postponed until after the adoption of the thresholds.

Ms. Bogush stated that Rick Heitkemper will not be available to serve on the sub-committee, due to a change in his work schedule.

Mr. Harper requested that staff prepare a resolution for Lynne Smith thanking her for serving on the Advisory Planning Commission. Mr. Harper announced that Vice Chairman Randolph will chair the October APC meeting.

C. 208 Status and Case-by-Case Review

Dave Ziegler, Senior Planner, reported that the third quarter progress report which was due in July to the Environmental Protection Agency had been mailed on September 8, 1982.

On August 24, 1982 an evaluation meeting of the 208 program was held with EPA, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, the Lahontan Board, the California State Water Resources Control Board, and Agency staff. The main issue that needs to be resolved in the near future is the relationship of 208 planning to the Regional Plan update. The work plan calls for site specific management plans for stream zones and high hazard lands. EPA and the states feel very strongly that the 208 update and the Regional Plan update are one in the same and should be meshed together. Another key part of the issue is the role of local government and the work load. It was suggested at the evaluation meeting to wait and not try to resolve this issue until the scoping of the Regional Plan update is complete and staff has had time to review the budget and the schedule of the 208 work plan. Another issue discussed was the status of the work element for erosion and runoff control strategies. TRPA is contributing approximately \$59,000 to this effort and the Lahontan Board is contributing approximately \$67,000. Staff has concerns about this work element, such as the direction needed, timing of this element, scheduling, and the monitoring approach. Part of the effort is to evaluate Best Management Practices (BMP's), and yet do before and after monitoring. Mr. Ziegler stated these problems can be worked out by having an indepth evaluation session which is scheduled for September 16 with the Lahontan Board to try to resolve these problems in a direction that is acceptable to everyone. The third issue was how the 106 funds provided by Nevada is being expended.

Staff has been concentrating on assisting local governments with development of remedial projects. The work program focuses on evaluation and enforcement of conditions for project approval of new development. Review at staff level of this issue has been scheduled to try and get it resolved. Direction is towards taking the water quality planning staff and re-orient the activities to get into the area of evaluation and enforcement in keeping with the work plan.

Mr. Ziegler also stated that the Agency is using the data base to do analysis and reports. Staff is looking at the feasibility of taking the data base off of the Brown and Caldwell computer facilities and move it to another computer facility where staff will have direct access, possibly by December. Staff has mapped every part of the Basin. Computerized in the data base is information on zoning, traffic zones, soil type, land capability, geomorphic units, precipitation, watersheds, and land use for different types of analyses among the variables.

Mr. Ziegler briefly outlined the evaluation efforts pertaining to case-by-case review. Evaluation tasks completed to date included: a five-person team visited 32 lots in Nevada to evaluate their buildability looking at the installation of temporary and permanent BMP's, the status of vegetation, the amount of coverage, soils and construction on both high hazard (1-3) and better capability (class 4-7) lots. Staff prepared case studies and data summaries for all 32 lots. A three-person team visited seven subdivisions in Nevada to become familiar with the work of the Subdivision Review Team, looking at vegetation,

coverage, soils, and construction in the subdivision. Staff will assess the cumulative impacts of the case-by-case review policy which will be done through the use of the geographic data base and modeling techniques being developed at present, in addition to evaluating outside mitigation measures, administrative impacts, social economic impacts, consistency of the case-by-case review policy with the thresholds, and look at and evaluate alternatives to case-by-case. A draft report will be available for the APC in October.

Mr. Ziegler clarified for the APC that cumulative impacts, through the use of modeling of the geographic data base, measures loads coming off of a watershed. Then it is backed up into the watershed and responsibility assigned for that load to the various land uses in the watershed. Theoretically, the impact of building on a single lot in a certain land capability has an impact. To analyze a determined number of houses on land capability would be the cumulative impact on the Lake. Gary Shellhorn, Senior Planner, stated that focus of this report is water quality which is the primary concern of evaluating, analysis, and addressing the impacts.

Mr. Ziegler presented background information of the criteria used by the Subdivision Review Team for evaluating case-by-case lot review and impacts in California. Ms. Nora Shepard, Assistant Planner in Project Review, described the case-by-case procedure, which is a two step process which involves rating of the sub-divisions with regard to the criteria as adopted in Ordinance 81-5. The Subdivision Review Team was formed in 1981 and rated all of the subdivisions in Nevada. They looked at road placement, drainage, maintenance of vegetation, downstream impacts, stable cuts and fills, internal drainage, access to lots, and overall land coverage, with regard to this criteria.

The rating classification of the subdivisions with regard to this criteria is "Needs Further Evaluation", "Potentially Adequate", or "Adequate". If a subdivision is rated as Potentially Adequate or Adequate, the Agency will accept applications for individual lots within the subdivision. If an area is rated Needs Further Evaluation, the Agency cannot accept applications in those areas, unless the property owners or groups of individuals within the subdivision wish to upgrade the area. They can submit a plan of the area to appeal the subdivision rating which will then be re-reviewed.

The next step is the actual review of the application. A basic plot plan must be submitted with a topographic map and a rough drawing of the proposed building with coverage calculations. If the application meets the lot review criteria, staff will work with the applicant to mitigate the potential impacts of the project. The applicant will then submit more detailed plans for review and approval. If the application initially does not fit within the criteria set forth in the lot review criteria, staff rejects the application indicating the reasons in writing and the applicant has the right of appeal to the Executive Director. If the applicant wishes to appeal the staff decision, a field inspection is scheduled with the Executive Director, and then a meeting with the applicant to discuss why staff felt the project application was considered a high risk with regard to the criteria. If the Executive Director concurs with the initial staff determination, the applicant can appeal to the Governing Board. If the project can be mitigated with staff being satisfied that it is not