

**TRPA  
APC  
PACKETS**

**MAY  
1983**

Phil

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on May 11, 1983 at  
9:30 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: May 3, 1983

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

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  
South Lake Tahoe, California

May 11, 1983  
9:30 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV APPEALS
- A. Bambridge/Fleming Appeal of Staff Determination of a High Risk Rating With Regard to the Case-by-Case Lot Review Criteria, Lot 60, Tyrolia #7, Washoe County, APN 126-082-04, TRPA File #82912 (Estimated Time 9:40 a.m.)
- B. Lowry/Pillsbury Appeal of Subdivision Rating of In Need of Further Evaluation, Logan Creek Estates #2, Douglas County (Estimated Time 10:00 a.m.)
- V PLANNING MATTERS
- A. Recommendation on Extension of Allocation System Until the Adoption of the Regional Plan (Estimated Time 10:20 a.m.)
- B. Recommendation on Extension of Case-by-Case Process Beyond Ordinance Deadline (Estimated Time 10:40 a.m.)
- VI ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS, DETERMINATION OF TECHNICAL ADEQUACY
- A. Lake Parkway (Loop Road) Completion, City of South Lake Tahoe (Estimated Time 11:00 a.m.)
- B. Third Street and South Avenue Extensions and Improvements, City of South Lake Tahoe (Estimated Time 11:20 a.m.)
- C. Environmental Impact Statement for Adoption of Regional Plan Amendments (Estimated Time 11:40 a.m.)
- VII ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
- Distribution of Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Rubicon Water System Reconstruction, Tahoe City Public Utility District, El Dorado County
- VIII REPORTS
- A. Report on TRPA Public Hearings on Regional Plan Environmental Impact Statement

WITHDRAWN

CONT'D

B. Public Interest Comments

C. APC Members

IX RESOLUTIONS

A. Randy Sheffield

B. Glenn Smith

X CORRESPONDENCE

XI PENDING MATTERS

XII ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

The Chateau, 995 Fairway Boulevard  
Incline Village, Nevada

April 13, 1983 9:30 a.m.  
April 14, 1983 10:00 a.m.

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Mike Harper call the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 9:40 a.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Kortick (arrived at 10:00), Mr. Renz (arrived at 9:45), Mr. Combs, Mr. Sullivan (arrived at 9:45), Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen (arrived at 9:50), Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Michael, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper

APC Members Absent: None

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Harper noted that he had mailed a memorandum to the APC members suggesting a timeframe and topic list for the agenda, and discussion for the evaluation of technical adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement for amendments to the Regional Plan. It was agreed to review each topical area under the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences listed in the EIS with focus on related items after the public hearing inviting the public to participate and provide flexibility to conduct the public hearing portion of the meeting. It was also suggested that Item VI.B Round Hill Village, Douglas County would be moved and discussed first on Thursday morning. Mr. Overeynder clarified he had discussed the issue with legal counsel of moving this agenda item. He was advised the agenda did not indicate a time certain for the agenda items, but rather an estimated time, and the only certainty that is required is to have it on that specific day.

MOTION by Mr. Sawyer, with a second by Mr. Combs, to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

For the February 9, 1983 minutes, Mr. Sawyer noted that on page 6, fourth paragraph, fourth line to replace the word "reemphasizing" with the words based on the damage. On line 10 of the same paragraph change the words "this finding" with a finding of consistency with the plan.

On page 7, second line, Mr. Sawyer stated since the reference could be either federal or state courts eliminate the word "federal".

On page 19, fifth line, third sentence should read The Tahoe Area Land Acquisitions Committee (TALAC) will make recommendations to the Governor and to the legislature concerning how the funds will be used.

MOTION by Mr. Pyle, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to approve the minutes as amended of February 9, 1983. The motion carried unanimously.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES APRIL 13 and APRIL 14, 1983

For the minutes of March 9, 1983, Mr. Sawyer noted that on page 3, last paragraph, second line, change the words "which supports" to based on.

On page 8, Mr. Sawyer stated the third line should read: "What he meant was that none of the nonattainment strategies would require implementation in Placer County in order to correct nonattainment in the South Shore,".

On page 15, second paragraph, Mr. Sawyer also stated the fourth sentence should read: "This issue was never specifically raised, but his interpretation of the parcel by parcel basis is that it would not necessarily require existing parcels without 30% coverage to get within allowable coverage;"

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Ms. Michael, to approve the minutes of March 9, 1983 as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PUBLIC HEARING

Continued Public Hearing on the Regional Plan Environmental Impact Statement

At 9:55 Mr. Harper opened the public hearing on the Regional Plan EIS which was continued from the March APC meeting.

Katie Reading, teacher and resident, commented that beauty is the number one reason to keep in mind for planning the future of the Lake and urged the Agency to adopt regulations minimizing development. Marguerite Maxfield, Incline Village resident, commented that there are serious inequities such as proposed ferry's which would emit more fumes, filth, debris and litter if allowed to occur. Meri L. McEneny, resident of Crystal Bay, opposed alternatives 2 and 3, stating that alternative 1 was ludicrous, and urged the Nevada delegation to avoid degradation by adopting a strong and meaningful plan.

Dr. Fred Stugard, geologist and resident, stated the TRPA has documented the decline in water quality of Lake Tahoe and set reasonable thresholds. The voters of California allocated \$85,000,000 to purchase environmentally fragile lands which assures California lot owners of compensation if they cannot build on their property. The voters of Nevada were not consulted and owners of environmentally fragile lots in Nevada must wait for federal funds for compensation. Alternatives 2 or 3 would betray the California voters who have put up the funds for immediate purchase. Alternative 1 should be supported as it is the most realistic and least costly. In addition to commenting, Dr. Stugard also presented his written comments for the public record.

Susan Davidson, Tahoe City resident, stated that politics has played an important role of the TRPA since inception and she would like to see the role of the Agency make a difference. Jo Anne Payne, Nevada North Tahoe Property Owners Association, stating implementation of this plan presents some aspects which are impractical, inequitable, impossible to enforce, completely at odds with protecting the environment listing twelve problems found with the EIS for the Regional Plan. Ms. Payne's written comments were submitted for the public record.

Mike Van Wagenen, representing the South Tahoe Gaming Alliance, commented focus should continue on the quality issue, not the quantity issue, and he stated the Gaming Alliance retained a consultant to analyze transportation on the Highway 50 Corridor and he introduced John Gaudette, Consultant for the South Tahoe Gaming Alliance. Mr. Gaudette stated his background is in transportation and there are important first steps that need to be taken which cannot wait 10 or 15 years. Mr. Gaudette urged to consider the issues, i.e., magnitude and costs for improvement is staggering; look at reducing the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by reducing person trips per day; achieve goal of thresholds by reducing the 10% of the VMT; and he asked how much can the Basin afford - 500 or 5000 buses? Mr. Gaudette suggested adding 50 buses over the next 5 years. The Agency will have to take risks, one step at a time. Mr. Gaudette also presented a mode split analysis summary for person-trips/day and impact/cost to the APC members.

Following a brief break, Phil Overeynder, Executive Director explained that as part of the agreement with the U.S. Forest Service, Randy Sheffield, Chief of Long Range Planning, had been temporarily assigned to the Agency on a two year contract to help develop the Environmental Thresholds, Environmental Impact Statement, and the Regional Plan. Due to Mr. Sheffield's recent reassignment and departure, and to compensate for the vacancy, Mr. Overeynder further explained some restructuring of staff was necessary, and until the Regional Plan is completed he will devote more time to the direct supervision of Long Range Planning. During the interim the functions of Acting Chief of Long Range Planning have been split between Gordon Barrett, who will be responsible for putting together the staff recommendations for the Regional Plan, and Dave Ziegler responsible for conducting the public hearings. Mr. Overeynder introduced Gary Midkiff, Assistant to the Executive Director, from the Department of Conservation and Resources Agency in Sacramento, and previously from the State of Georgia, familiar with Lake Tahoe, the permit process, and making permit processes work smoothly.

The public hearing resumed at 11:30 a.m.

Shirley Allen, Carnelian Bay resident, commented it appears there is going to be degradation no matter what happens. She referred to the 295 units at Round Hill Village and asked how can "grandfathered" projects be allowed? Ms. Allen also asked that additional growth outside of "grandfathered" project be reserve until funding has been determined and decided, in addition to educating the public, and increasing their awareness and attitudes toward the transportation problems. Ms. Allen also recommended restoring the land to its natural state by developing/ planting vegetation that takes root quickly. Pete Perry, Incline Village resident, commented that the EIS does not indicate if further subdivisions can be built, he could not make sense of the EIS, that Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) should be addressed while the EIS indicates nothing will be done until funding is addressed, and argued that reducing the valuation of land should be considered condemnation.

Larry Hoffman, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council, requested additional time to present his comments along with copies of the "Tahoe Outlook", Vacant Lot Data by Jurisdictions, Littoral Zone Delineations and map. Mr. Hoffman commented that a great deal of data analysis has not been addressed in the EIS; single

family dwelling restrictions with development on high hazard lands is prohibited, and there will be massive litigation due to the word "prohibition". Mr. Hoffman's comments included there is a need to know the exact impact by jurisdiction; case-by-case needs to be discussed in the EIS; TRPA should establish a system that gives value to the lots; recreation alternatives needs more detail; there is a shortfall problem with the financial aspects and the transportation district dollar figures are staggering - dollars that are not available. Mr. Hoffman stated more work needs to be done on the EIS, questions need to be answered, slow down the process, do it right and know what you are doing.

Walter Auerbach, Raymond Vail Associates, commented there are deficiencies in the shorezone analysis portion of the EIS and questions need to be addressed such as, impact of sediment, impact of streams on the Lake, stream habitat destruction versus Lake habitat, loading disturbance, speed laws on the Lake versus pier removal, more analysis of fish spawning and feeding versus boating activity, and look into the historic impacts such as lumber mills and logging during the early days of Tahoe. Mr. Auerbach presented to the APC copies of an excerpt from "The Cumulative Impacts of Shorezone Development At Lake Tahoe" summary of the effects of increasing density of piers and buoys. Mr. Auerbach's comments also included questions pertaining to enhancement of fisheries when nutrients and water quality are to be balanced, setbacks, transportation and driving to marinas, costs for maintenance and acquisition of parks, compensation to the property/land owners, and the EIS presents very hazy numbers.

Tom Hill, resident of Incline Village, commented there has not been enough emphasis on the Burton-Santini program and he is concerned that the U.S. Forest Service may have misled property owners, promising fair market value. Mr. Hill further commented the program is a failure; that Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 has no use whatsoever. He suggested that the U.S. Forest Service offer him nothing at all which will force the issue into court and he will put up a battle. Mr. Hill asked where is the money going to come from? Will taxes be raised? Will user fees say how many will or will not be allowed to come into the Basin? Joe Drury commented that the timing is off - need more time to determine balance of figures and building; the alternatives need to be delayed; planners ignored present dangers; and that Tahoe is an L.A. basin in miniature. Alice Carpenter commented her appeal for case by case review had been denied. She would like to build on her lot, which would decrease erosion and reduce vandalism that has occurred due to the lot being vacant, and that mitigation would be shared generally and not just for her lot.

The meeting resumed at 2:30 after a lunch break.

MOTION by Mr. McMullen, with a second by Mr. Pyle, to recess the public hearing until Thursday, April 14. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Overeynder stated that copies of the draft Regional Plan would be available for the APC by May 11 and he outlined the schedule to review it and the response to comments. On May 13 the Governing Board will consider the technical adequacy of the document and take final action at their May 25-26 meeting.



APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES APRIL 13 and APRIL 14, 1983

The APC members discussed in general the Environmental Impact Statement and had the following comments:

That adequate substantiation be available and cited for planning and control measures contained in the plan. That complex issues including transportation, land capability and land coverage be adequately discussed and explained. That costs of implementation, sources of funding, and socio-economic impacts be adequately dealt with. That adequate time be permitted for full consideration and discussion of the EIS, the Regional Plan and related matters. That additional alternatives should perhaps be considered.

Following the general discussion there was a more detailed discussion which follows:

Ms. Bogush commented there seemed to be a consensus among the APC members that they should not be acting on the determination of technical adequacy of the EIS at this meeting and she suggested to continue consideration of the EIS to the May meeting and act on both the EIS and Regional Plan at that time.

Mr. Hansen asked if the APC adopts the technical adequacy of the draft EIS and if the staff preferred alternative comes out as the Regional Plan, shouldn't an EIS be done on the Regional Plan to incorporate concerns relative to the thresholds? Mr. Overeynder responded that this document is an environmental impact statement covering the range of alternatives being evaluated. A Regional Plan can be selected that picks various components as long as you stay within the range of alternatives being evaluated. The staff preferred alternative is within the range of alternatives evaluated which discloses the environmental impacts of all those alternatives. Therefore a new EIS does not have to be done on the staff preferred or APC recommendation, unless drastic or substantial modification is made to one of these alternatives. Depending on how significant that modification is then a choice of either recirculating the EIS or preparing an addendum to the EIS will have to be made. Mr. Hansen stated he could not comment on the EIS without having seen the Regional Plan and how all the alternatives will be incorporated in the Regional Plan.

Mr. Overeynder explained the process started with the definition of standards, then an environmental impact statement to define what the standards are. The second step was the policy plan, and the third step deals with very specific information on ordinances. There is still the flexibility of going back to take a look at approaching it differently. But the way it has been proposed at this point is looking at the broad regional concepts, making a basic determination as to which way the APC may want to proceed, and in turn that gives staff the direction needed to respond to the concerns of the APC; first on the addendum to the EIS, and secondly in the Regional Plan EIS. It is important that staff has a complete list of what the APC's concerns are in order for staff to indicate how we intend to respond to the concerns and what the timetable would be.

Mr. Harper agreed that the APC was not in a position to determine the technical adequacy of the draft EIS, and suggested to the members to seriously consider not taking any action at this meeting. Secondly, provide staff with a proposed timetable for the EIS, and the Regional Plan which needs to be discussed. In

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES APRIL 13 and APRIL 14, 1983

addition, the involvement and opportunity local and state government will have in responding to the Regional Plan and other alternatives. Time should be spent discussing with staff the shortfalls in the EIS such as the financial (sales tax) assessment, impact on bonds, costs to the utility districts, and possible alternative of using Burton-Santini funds for erosion control. Mr. Overeynder stated staff needs to have focus on defining the issues and what the priorities are. Mr. Harper added the APC needs to find out if the EIS does address that particular issue in a manner that is appropriate, and if not, provide the staff with direction on how to handle it.

Mr. McMullen commented that the timing for the review period for the Regional Plan needed to be extended. Mr. Combs added that the APC possibly recommend to the Governing Board that they consider an extension of time on both the entire process and adoption of the Regional Plan, because the degree of detailed review necessary, the amount of time needed is not enough. In the very near future we will be getting down to specific instances, the public will need to know what is being proposed on their lot and that is a very lengthy process which cannot be squeezed into 30 or 60 days.

Mr. Overeynder explained we are dealing with a statutory requirement to complete the Regional Plan by June 19, 1983. Staff put together a time schedule which fits very closely within that timeframe. Mr. Overeynder pointed out that since there is a statutory requirement for completion of the Plan, legal counsel has advised the Governing Board that delaying the adoption of the Plan leaves the Agency vulnerable in terms of challenging the actions of the Agency during this interim period and the APC should be aware of the implications.

Mr. Combs responded he does see future dilemma, and suggested that the Board consider some sort of action seeking concurrence from the local governments who are the permit issuing agencies that they would be agreeable and abide by some sort of continued allocation program during this interim time period. Speaking for his jurisdiction <sup>State</sup> El Dorado County would be agreeable to keep in effect some sort of growth management program as has been going on for the past several years while in this state of transition.

Jim Kyle, resident of Incline Village, commented that if Lockheed and Detroit can have their dates pushed for their reasons, he did not see why June 19 is sacred; if more time is needed something should be done to see that more time is acquired. The "forest is being lost for the trees" and some of the money should be put in the direction for cleaning up the Lake.

Earl Withycombe, Lake Tahoe Air Basin, commented he had worked with Agency staff in developing some of the air quality figures; that emissions and wood smoke should be reduced, are readily achievable, and that the studies should continue.

The APC members returned their discussion to specific comments on air quality and transportation, focusing on issues, analyzing whether the EIS appropriately, addressed the issues, and to provide staff with suggestions on how to resolve some of the problems. The public in attendance were invited to comment on the EIS if they wished.

Mr. Poppoff commented he thought the air quality data was well done, but he was concerned with the connection between the air quality and transportation

sections. He did not believe the large transportation plan that is being proposed is necessary, unless the federal guidelines or standards of air quality in the Basin were being exceeded. Mr. Poppoff further commented only two things have been definitely identified with automobiles in the EIS, the carbon monoxide problem on the South Shore, and the kicking up of road dust which creates the haze. Both of these can be taken care of with a smaller transportation plan, and have Caltrans clean up the highway. The idea that nitrates from automobile exhaust are a leading factor in algal productivity in the Lake may or may not be true. But based on this premise, a large transportation plan was created. It is not clear that the nitrates from the air are really impacting the Lake and there are too many doubts at this moment to use that particular aspect of air pollution to justify such a large transportation plan. There are no public safety or health aspects involved that means we have to rush into this particular aspect. The carbon monoxide problem is different but it can be taken care of in a more modest plan. As far as the nitrates go it is not an emergency situation and sees no reason why we can't wait and get some of the data that is just now being funded and this should be the proper approach. To the extent that the EIS uses air pollution to drive the transportation plan, it is deficient.

Mr. Overeynder responded that the EIS clearly states there is not a situation where we have all the information on nitrogen deposition. We do have some analyses that seems to support the environmental threshold standards adopted last year. Staff attempted to address this in the plan by saying we do need to continue the monitoring and data collection. Also, we need to know more about what the sources of the nitrogens are, what the pathways are, and what is the ultimate disposition of the nitrogen. At the same time staff has tried to address the timing element in the plan by indicating that we are starting with a smaller program in transportation and that the more massive expenditures will come later on in the 20 year capital improvements program. If after two years of developing data on nitrogen deposition it is concluded that the analysis was wrong there is the option to revise the transportation element and go with a less intensive program than was initially thought to be needed. At this point staff felt it was necessary to try and project for a long term. Mr. Overeynder also pointed out that phasing the timing and flexibility is one of the key elements often overlooked for the longer range solutions.

Mr. Randolph commented that a factor being overlooked is that the Compact requires emphasis on transportation. The Air Quality Plan adopted states that in 1987 the Basin will achieve a 9 ppm CO standard. That plan did not call for the number of buses, or the transportation system that is outlined in the baseline, because the growth was not there, programmed for that period of time. We cannot ignore the fact, when discussing an area growing, we are going to have to compensate for it. Mr. Randolph explained the document says that whatever the growth element is, here is the compensating transportation system that it takes to maintain the 9 ppm and we should not subscribe completely to the fact that the nitrogen deposition is driving that magnitude of the transportation system.

Mr. Kortick asked if the full service airport had been defined and if staff looked at the master plan noise and land use study that has been done? Mr. Overeynder responded that staff has looked extensively at the master plan and the Airport Noise Control Land Use Compatibility (ANCLUC) study was the basis for defining the levels of service. Based on the environmental constraints, how many types of planes arriving and departing which meet the noise standards, and some target levels of how many passengers the planes are expected to carry, staff has a general idea on the measurement of the scale of the airport facility of traffic generation. Mr. Kortick suggested staff might want to look at the ANCLUC study where it mentions increasing the impervious surfaces in the airport area. Mr. Kortick commented there was no discussion in the transportation section of the EIS concerning basic transport, particularly Highway 50 between California and Nevada, and he suggested addressing the feasibility of arterial highways that feed into the Basin. Pertaining to the guideway system discussed in the EIS, Mr. Kortick stated the staff preferred alternatives should include approximate dollar amounts. He also commented he thought that the ferry system might be a good way to transport people around the Basin, especially during the winter when Highway 89 is closed most of the time. He suggested the docking systems and other arrangements needed to handle ferries be looked at to meet the thresholds.

Mr. Dodgion asked if the assumption on nitrate deposition proven to be erroneous on the high side and come back to impact water quality with respect to the nitrogen loading from erosion and runoff? If the study that is being undertaken on nitrate deposition shows several years from now that the nitrogen loading to the Lake from atmospheric deposition estimate is high, wouldn't it severely impact some of the land use alternatives in order to achieve the thresholds on water quality? Mr. Overeynder responded the EIS describes the initial estimate for the range of nitrogen deposition are at least verifiable with the best current technology available, and we know that we are still within the range that was estimated. The constraining factors on land use are water quality, land coverage, and transportation. Mr. Overeynder thought it would have to be a significant departure off the range on the estimate to make a major modification of land use at this point, and he explained that a sensitivity analysis of how much range of estimate has not been done in terms of whether or not it will affect the land use. Mr. Dodgion stated he was concerned that the nitrate deposition estimate may be off by a significant factor and the impact it has on the transportation element. Mr. Overeynder replied that perhaps a sensitivity analysis should be conducted.

Mr. Pyle commented that one of the statements made at a recent meeting concerning the full service airport facility was that no more land coverage would be allowed in the watershed association because it is already overcovered. Mr. Pyle asked with what is being proposed in the Regional Plan if more land coverage is not allowed how can a full service airport facility be met, and if there are going to be restraints they need to be brought out in the EIS and trade off coverage to get a full service airport. Mr. Overeynder replied that the full service airport described did not need any additional net coverage; it may need coverage to be redeveloped in that area or rearranged. There may be specific things that the county feels may need to be done to maintain that level of service, which may be in conflict with other provisions. Staff has looked at the level of service, but will have to review further.

Mr. Sawyer commented on the issue of atmospheric inputs contributing to the water quality problems in the Basin. He stated that the State Water Quality Control Board believes their estimates based on total nitrogen loadings may have been overestimated, we still need to reduce atmospheric inputs. The TRPA cannot afford to adopt a plan that assumes atmospheric inputs are of minor importance or are a small percentage by allowing more development to occur and after five years of study discover that a mistake was made after it is too late. Mr. Sawyer urged that a conservative approach should be taken to insure whichever nutrient budget between the estimates presented by the State Water Quality Control Board and the estimates presented by the threshold study report meet the thresholds.

Mr. Sawyer also stated that it was not clear to him that the transportation mitigation measures proposed actually will achieve the reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and consequent reduction in oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>). Mr. Sawyer questioned whether a more conservative approach may be desirable to assure that we will actually get a mitigation that the assumptions are based on in compliance with the thresholds. The VMT projections under Alternative 3 showed lower VMT than Alternative 2 and he asked for an explanation. Mr. Overeynder responded there is additional development and recreational development as a result of redirected or redeveloped areas. One of the significant differences of lower VMT reductions in Alternative 3 was an assumption that with redevelopment there would be more density to use transit system/pedestrian/bikeways so that those facilities would become more effective than they would be with a dispersed land use. An area where there is a possible deficiency is that the recreation VMT is not fully counted in the display and the numbers will be revised, and Mr. Overeynder clarified that we are talking about are vehicle miles traveled, not trips generated.

Ms. Michael commented on a number of issues relating to the transportation element of the EIS, suggesting there should be a separation of strategies which are designed to reduce VMT versus those that are to improve traffic flow and reduce emissions. Ms. Michael expressed an opinion that there are areas where the TRPA is taking over some operational functions that should be implemented by the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD). Referring to the policy that requires free transit, she suggested rather than specify what kind of service TTD ought to provide, the EIS should discuss various overall goals, such as, how many trips do you want the TTD to carry; how many people diversions do you want to get out of their automobiles; and rather than saying these are the routes you ought to run and these are the fares or no fares, that you should charge. Another area that is lacking is there are no transportation strategies identified that will increase the efficiency of travel to the Basin. The EIS should identify ways that will make it more convenient to bring people in alternative modes to the Basin. The recreation element should be linked to transportation; how is increased vehicle use going to offset the proposed expanded ski areas. More detail is required in the five year plan, particularly sources of funds/financing, transit ridership and route mile goals, and how various measures meet the threshold goals. It is important to get a realistic plan in the short term and spelling it out particularly as it relates to the land use options. Ms. Michael expressed concern with VMT between Alternatives 3 and 2 as discussed earlier; the 9 ppm versus 6 ppm standard should be addressed