

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**DECEMBER
1985**

DEC 85 APC

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Wednesday, December 11, 1985, commencing at 9:30 a.m., the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Date: December 2, 1985

By:

W.A. Morgan

William A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada

December 11, 1985
9:30 a.m.

MEETING AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV PLANNING MATTERS
 - A. Status of Regional Plan Work Program
 - 1. Transfer of Development Rights
 - 2. Individual Parcel Evaluation System
 - 3. Monitoring Program
 - 4. CIP
 - 5. Transportation Plan
 - 6. Other
 - B. Review of Draft EIS, Relocation of the Lake Tahoe Community College
 - C. Status of Ski Shuttle Funding Under Transportation Development Act
 - D. Other
- V REPORTS
 - A. Staff
 - B. Legal Counsel
 - C. Public Interest Comments
 - D. APC Members
- VI RESOLUTIONS
- VII CORRESPONDENCE
- VIII PENDING MATTERS
- IX ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

195 U.S. Highway 50
Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, NV

P.O. Box 1038
Zephyr Cove, Nevada 89448-1038

(702) 588-4547

MEMORANDUM

December 3, 1985

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: Status of Regional Plan Work Program

In conjunction with the Agency's consensus-building process, the staff has been developing an amended work program to guide the refinement of the Regional Plan. Attached is the latest draft of those elements of the Work Program most closely related to the consensus-building process.

Part of the work program for the Regional Plan involves several small groups studying and making recommendations on key aspects of the Plan. On December 4, the staff made five presentations reflecting the work of small groups in the following subject areas:

1. transfer of development rights
2. individual parcel evaluation system
3. monitoring program
4. capital improvements program (CIP)
5. regional transportation plan

At the APC meeting on December 11, staff will summarize the presentations they made on December 4, both to inform the APC on recent developments in these five areas, and to obtain feedback from the APC on results to date.

Please contact Dave Ziegler at (702) 588-3296 if you have questions or comments on this agenda item.

12-3-85

Agenda Item IV.A.

DRAFT
12/4/85

Work Element: CBW-1

Objective: A-1

Title: Consensus-Building Process--Major Issues

Purpose: To resolve the major issues relating to litigation over the Regional Plan, including (1) framework of a complete plan, (2) content and format of Plan Area Statements, (3) rate of single-family development, (4) regulation of commercial development, (5) treatment of sensitive lands, (6) impervious coverage standards, (7) density standards, and (8) enforcement.

Method: With the assistance of a facilitator, the full consensus-building workshop (CBW) will address these issues, through the general process of issue identification, solution development, solution refinement, and agreement on issue resolution. To the extent that the deliberations of the CBW do not resolve a given issue totally, the workshop will meet to "clean up" unresolved issues after all the major issues have been addressed.

End Product: A set of written documents including all tentative agreements of the consensus-building group on the major issues, reviewed and approved by the full consensus-building workshop.

Staff Contact: Bill Morgan*, Gabby Barrett

Tasks/Schedule:

[See separate schedule of meeting dates and agenda topics.]

DRAFT
11/18/85

Work Element: CBW-2

Objective: A-1

Title: Consensus-Related Issue--Transfer of Development Rights

Purpose: To research needs and opportunities for transfers of development rights within the context of the TRPA Regional Plan; to make recommendations to the full consensus-building workshop for completion of agreements on treatment of sensitive lands; regulation of impervious coverage; and density.

Method: An ad hoc committee of the consensus workshop, with assistance from TRPA and Tahoe Conservancy staff, will address this task. The committee will evaluate other TDR programs (e.g., those of the California Coastal Conservancy, and Santa Monica) and evaluate specific TDR scenarios to determine their possible applicability to the Tahoe situation. The committee will also review the tentative agreements of the consensus workshops to date, to identify areas in which transfers of development rights are needed. Having conducted the necessary research, the ad hoc committee will make a set of recommendations to the full consensus workshop.

The full consensus workshop will then consider the recommendations of the ad hoc committee and ratify or amend those recommendations. The decision of the full workshop will then be incorporated into the package of tentative agreements.

Issues to be Resolved:

- what is the priority of TDR program
 - 1) single family dwellings
 - a) Nevada case-by-case
 - b) Stream environment zone lots
 - c) All other sensitive lots
- what purpose does each type of TDR have, such as transfer of allocation, transfer of density, and transfer of existing development?
- should there be TDR bonuses; what are the implications
- for each type of TDR, what are the desired characteristics of donating and receiving areas?
- can TDR be reconciled with a random-allocation process? how?
- what is the role of TDR in redevelopment and commercial development? (see also redevelopment work element, CBW-4)
- who will oversee the transfer?
- what is the role of lot consolidation in a TDR program?

End Product: A consensus agreement on transfer of development rights policies, reviewed by the full workshop, incorporated into the package of tentative agreements. This package should include a recommendation on: 1) Nevada case-by-case TDR; 2) single family dwelling TDR; and 3) multi-family dwelling TDR; and identification of further areas of exploration.

Staff Contact: Gabby Barrett*, Terry Armlin

Committee Membership: John Gussman, Tahoe Conservancy; Rick Sawyer; Gil Wright; Dennis Crabb, CSLT; Larry Livingston, consultant, California Attorney General; Bruce Martin, APC; Gregg Lein, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council.

Observers: Tom Martens, Larry Hoffman, Don Beck and Rick Skinner.

Tasks/Schedule:

	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Actual</u>
1. <u>ad hoc</u> committee completes problem definition		
2. <u>ad hoc</u> committee completes strategy development		
3. <u>ad hoc</u> committee completes development of alternatives		
4. <u>ad hoc</u> committee recommendations to full CBW	12-12-85	
5. <u>ad hoc</u> committee modifies recommendations as necessary		

DRAFT
12/4/85

Work Element: CBW-3

Objective: A-1

Title: Consensus-Related Issue--Individual Parcel Evaluation System

Purpose: To identify, in as much detail as possible, a system for evaluating the suitability of individual vacant, subdivided parcels in the Tahoe region for development, consistent with the tentative agreement (October, 1985) of the consensus-building workshop.

Method: The TRPA staff will convene a technical committee specifically to help develop a set of detailed recommendations on the content of the IPES. The staff will prepare initial proposals for the technical committee to review at periodic meetings during October and November, 1985, and provide the technical committee with meeting notes from discussions with the full CBW.

After the technical committee develops a set of recommendations, the full consensus workshop will review them to determine if they adequately describe the intended IPES for the purposes of reaching a consensus on all the major issues affecting the Regional Plan. The full workshop can affirm the recommendations of the technical group, refine them, or refer them back to the technical group for more discussion.

End Product: A detailed written document describing the IPES in as much technical detail as possible at this time, to be an attachment to the full tentative agreements of the consensus-building workshop.

Issues to be Resolved by the Technical Committee:

- what is the best set of evaluation factors to use in an Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)?
- what weight should each factor be assigned?
- what factors should be included in the definition of SEZ?
- how should the various factors be evaluated in the field? or in the office?
- what is the relationship of the IPES to the existing system for evaluating suitability of parcels for development?
- what is the recommended implementation process for an IPES?

Staff Contact: Greg George*, Wendy Melgin

Committee Membership: Robert Twiss, consultant, California AG; Ken Foster, Engineer; Clarence Skau, Ph.D, UN-R; Grant Kennedy and Larry Welch, consulting soil scientists

Work Element CBW-3
IPES
Page 2

CBW Observers: Tom Martens, LTSLT; Rick Skinner, Calif. AG

Tasks/Schedule:

	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Actual</u>
1. technical committee completes research into ranking methodology		
2. technical committee decision on selection of, and weighting of, ranking factors		
3. technical committee recommendations to full CBW	12-4-85	
4. technical committee revisions to recommendations, as necessary		

DRAFT
12/4/85

Work Element: CBW-4

Objective: A-1

Title: Consensus-Related Issue--Development of Community Plans (Commercial)

Purpose:

Method:

After reviewing the recommendations of the ad hoc committee, the full consensus-building workshop will affirm their recommendations, refine them, or refer them back to the ad hoc committee for further analysis.

Issues to be Resolved:

End Product:

Staff Contact:

Committee Membership:

Tasks/Schedule:

Target Date Actual

[To be completed.]

DRAFT
12/4/85

Work Element: CBW-5

Objective: A-1

Title: Consensus-Related Issue--Framework of a Complete Regional Plan

Purpose: To reach agreement on what elements of the TRPA Regional Plan are needed to constitute a complete, implementable package; to agree on strategies for those framework elements which can't be completed in the near term.

Method: The full consensus-building workshop has already agreed on the elements of a complete Regional Plan package. A small technical group will meet to discuss strategies related to those elements which cannot be completed in time to place a proposed litigation settlement before the federal District Court. Such strategies might include deferring certain types of project applications until pertinent elements are complete; using previous Agency rules in certain situations while key Plan elements re completed; or allowing pilot projects for future evaluation.

The technical group will make a set of detailed recommendations to the full consensus-building workshop, which will either affirm them, refine them, or refer them back to the technical group for additional analysis.

Issues to be Resolved:

- where portions of the framework are incomplete, what is needed at this time? a product? a process to complete that product? both?
- where portions of the framework are incomplete, what contingency plans are needed to ensure that the Regional Plan is legal and workable?
- in the portions of the framework dealing with research, what are realistic research schedules?

End Product: Agreement by the full consensus-building workshop on a written statement regarding strategies for completing elements of the Regional Plan framework which can't be completed in the next six months.

Staff Lead: Dave Ziegler*, Gabby Barrett

Committee Membership: Rick Skinner, California AG; Bill Morgan, TRPA; Clem Shute, LTSLT; Larry Hoffman, TSPC; Don Beck, Bd. of Realtors

Tasks/Schedule:

	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Actual</u>
1. technical group meets to review status of framework in detail		
2. technical group decision on strategies for incomplete elements of framework		
3. technical group recommendations to full CBW		
4. technical group modifies recommendations as necessary		

DRAFT
12/4/85

Work Element: F-2

Objective: A-10

Title: Capital Improvements Program--TRPA Regional Plan

Purpose: To identify required public capital improvements for the next 20 years in the areas of erosion and runoff control; SEZ restoration; and transportation improvements; to identify in substantial detail all necessary public capital improvements in these areas for the next five years; to identify a system for setting project priorities; to identify institutional responsibilities and sources of financing for all projects.

Method: TRPA staff will meet with units of local government, Caltrans, NDOT and others involved with the erosion/runoff CIP to identify mutually-agreeable short-term project priorities. Staff will determine whether funding is earmarked for each project and, if not, will identify possible sources of funding and assist with project applications. Staff will describe each short-term priority project in detail regarding design, financing, legal aspects, and schedule. For longer-term priorities, the staff will generally use the Capital Improvements Program contained in the existing 208 water quality plan. When describing each project, the staff will provide information that will be useful to project proponents in setting priorities. All project lists will be compiled jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction.

TRPA staff has already developed a draft SEZ restoration program, relying largely on field investigations. Staff will refine the existing draft program, will describe each project in detail, identify technical, legal, institutional, and financial components of each project; and provide information to be used in setting project priorities. During revision of the draft program, the staff will attempt to identify the impacts of each proposed project on Tahoe fisheries.

TRPA staff will also evaluate the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan and the TTD's Short Range Transit Program (now under review by the TTD) to determine if they represent the most cost-effective means of reaching air quality and transportation goals. As part of the pending 1986 update of the Regional Transportation Plan, the staff will recommend changes in the Transportation Element and identify necessary capital improvements in the areas of transit, streets/highways, intersections, and bike/pedestrian facilities. Staff will describe a short-term program in sufficient detail to identify basic design criteria, financing sources, institutional arrangements. The staff will also describe a long-term program in less detail.

During December, 1985, TRPA staff will make a report to the full consensus-building workshop on progress to date in development of a comprehensive CIP for the Regional Plan. The purpose of this report is to assist the workshop in its consideration of phasing within the Regional Plan, specifically, in identifying performance standards or benchmarks for progress on the CIP. The report will also discuss the baseline situation (i.e., status of capital improvements in 1985) and reasonable goals for the next five years.

Issues to be Resolved:

- how should the CIP deal with present and anticipated funding shortfalls? what additional sources of funding are available? (e.g., off-shore oil revenues, environmental license plate funds)
- what are the appropriate roles of the various agencies involved in the CIP? (e.g., Resource Conservation Districts)
- what level of specificity is required in the CIP? (short-term and long-term)

End Product: Complete Capital Improvements Program, reviewed in concept by the consensus-building workshop, ready for approval by the TRPA Governing Board; creation of ongoing involvement of the local community in the CIP

Staff Contact: Jim Haen*, Leif Anderson

Committee Membership: community-based group familiar with public service projects; politically active

Tasks/Schedule:

	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Actual</u>
1. staff meets with affected agencies to determine status of erosion/runoff controls		
2. staff re-draft of SEZ restoration program completed		
3. staff participation in review/revision of SRTP		
4. staff makes tentative identification of CIP benchmarks; reports to full CBW	12-4-85	
5. staff integrates CIP into overall Public Services and Facilities Element		

Work Element: F-1

Objective: A-9

Title: Monitoring and Tracking Program

Purpose: To develop an integrated document describing the Agency's monitoring program to evaluate compliance with the thresholds and the effectiveness of the Regional Plan; to coordinate the monitoring program with the phasing provisions of the Regional Plan, especially regarding the implementation of the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES); to gain approval of the monitoring program from the consensus-building workshop, the Advisory Planning Commission, and the Governing Board; over time, to allow the TRPA to evaluate the environmental thresholds, according to the criteria in Resolution 82-11; to enhance the public credibility of the TRPA.

Method: A small technical group will work with the TRPA staff to develop and maintain a monitoring and tracking program. The technical group will report its progress to the consensus-building workshop in December, and will prepare a complete monitoring program by February. The technical group will use a systematic approach to the development of the monitoring program, including preparation of a problem assessment, a strategy, a detailed work program, and an evaluation plan based on five-year monitoring cycles.

The monitoring program will identify the existing situation, including trends, and identify the exact methods for evaluating threshold attainment, and will identify monitoring tasks, responsible parties, and funding sources at two levels:

- 1) a baseline monitoring program, consisting of the existing program with only those additions required to assess threshold attainment, and
- 2) an expanded monitoring program, reflecting more-intensive ambient monitoring, especially of tributary water quality and nutrient and sediment loads to Lake Tahoe.

For both levels, the program will include a schedule for implementation and an indication of when the monitoring efforts will produce useable data for analysis.

Before asking for APC and Governing Board approval of the monitoring program, the technical group will arrange for a neutral and qualified Scientific Review Panel to review the program. The technical group will also arrange for technical conferences to be held from time to time on subjects pertinent to the monitoring program, a prepare a research agenda for the Agency. Before adopting the monitoring program, the APC and Governing Board will hold public hearings as appropriate.

The program to be designed will provide for publication of annual reports and presentations to the TRPA Board. These reports and presentations will be coordinated with the budget process in California and Nevada.

Issues to be Addressed:

- how should the Agency evaluate attainment and maintenance of the thresholds? how can the Agency avoid controversy over its conclusions? how can the Agency ensure that its methodologies are technically valid?
- what is the estimated cost of the monitoring program? are funds available for an expanded program? where would they come from? what happens if funds aren't available? is foundation funding available?
- how efficient is the current monitoring program? where can efficiency be improved?
- what are the roles of other agencies and entities in the monitoring program? what parts of the program can be delegated to others?
- what are the proper priorities for the various cause-effect studies?
- what should be the periodic products of the monitoring program? should there be an annual report?

End Product: comprehensive monitoring program, approved by CBW, APC, and Governing Board

Staff Contact: Wendy Melgin*, Leif Anderson, Jean Shaffer

Committee Membership: Earl Byron, Tahoe Research Group; Ken Smarkle, SWRCB; Wendell McCurry, NDEP; Andrea Holland, USFS; Dave Antonucci, TCPUD; Ranjit Gil, LRWQCB; Dick Serdoz, NDEP; Jim Ryerson, CARB; Earl Withycombe, Lake Tahoe Air Basin; Tom Cahill, UC-Davis; noise monitoring expert; fish-wildlife monitoring expert; management information system expert

CBW Observers: Leo Poppoff; Robert Twiss, consultant, California AG; Polly Smith, LWV/Tiburon; Fred McClaren, consultant

Tasks/Schedule:

	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Actual</u>
1. technical groups completes monitoring problem assessment		
2. technical group selects preferred strategy/approach		
3. technical group prepares detailed outline of monitoring program and reports to full CBW		
4. staff and technical group prepare draft monitoring program		
5. technical group identifies peer review panel, makes necessary contacts		
6. peer review panel provides feedback on draft program		
7. technical group revises draft monitoring program, as necessary		
8. APC review, public hearing, and approval		
9. GB review, public hearing, and approval		
10. conferences on AQ and WQ technical assumptions		

Work Element: H-3-c

Objective: A-10, A-13, D-7

Title: Regional Transportation Plan

Purpose: to add specificity to the Transportation Element of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies; to demonstrate feasibility of attaining transportation and air quality standards; to set additional standards called for in the Goals and Policies for noise and level-of-service; to identify the optimal phasing of transportation programs and improvements; and to gain consensus-building workshop, APC, and Governing Board approval of a refined transportation plan.

Method: The TRPA staff, through the use of its in-house modeling capabilities, will analyze various transportation scenarios to demonstrate the attainability of transportation and air quality standards. The staff analysis will examine the impacts of mass transit (ground, airborne, and waterborne) on the transportation network, as well as the impacts of changes in the land use pattern through transfers of development rights or redevelopment policies. The analysis will also examine costs and benefits of carpools and vanpools, ski and beach shuttles, bike and pedestrian facilities, and the Post Office Action Plan. (See also Work Element F-2.) This work will be coordinated with Caltrans, NDOT, the TTD, and other interested entities.

The staff will report to the Consensus-Building Workshop in November regarding progress on development of a refined Regional Transportation Plan and identification of transportation-related benchmarks. Prior to submitting the RTP update to Caltrans in November, 1986, the staff will seek APC and Governing Board approval, after conducting duly-noticed public hearings.

Issues to be Addressed:

- what mix of transportation control measures will meet the environmental thresholds?
- what will be the costs of the measures, and the sources of funding?
- what are appropriate targets, or benchmarks, for the transportation plan to shoot for?
- what is the role of parking management and other TSM measures in meeting transportation goals? can free transit fares be successful at Tahoe, as they have in other cities?
- what transportation strategies are available to address the feeder links into the Basin (e.g., U.S. 50, California 89)

- is it feasible to perform transportation planning at the sub-regional or local level? how can community needs be factored into the transportation plan?
- what are the impacts of changes in the transportation system on air quality?

End Product: Report to the consensus-building workshop; transportation-related benchmarks; updated Regional Transportation Plan.

Staff Contact: Leif Andershon

Tasks/Schedule:

	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Actual</u>
1. staff analysis of alternative transportation scenarios		
2. staff participation in review/revision of SRTP		
3. tentative identification of transportation-related benchmarks; report to full CBW	12-4-85	
4. ongoing revisions/refinements to RTP thru 11-86	-----	

Task: H-3-d

Objective: D-7, D-8

Title: Airport Master Plan

Purpose: To define the role of the South Lake Tahoe airport in the TRPA's overall Regional Transportation Plan; to determine the extent of expansion that would be consistent with the thresholds and the Regional Plan; to ensure that the airport's layout and operations are consistent with the thresholds; and to gain approvals for the Airport Master Plan from the City of South Lake Tahoe, the FAA, El Dorado County, the APC, and the Governing Board.

Method: The City has already developed a draft Master Plan and environmental document. In discussions of these documents with TRPA staff and others, many issues have been raised. The TRPA will convene a special consensus-building group specifically to discuss airport issues. This group will include representatives from the existing consensus-building group and key stakeholders in airport issues such as the City, the airlines, and the FAA. The special consensus-building effort will attempt to resolve numerous issues relating to the process and timing of developing the Master Plan, the content of the Master Plan, and attainment of environmental thresholds. In addition to addressing commercial airline operations at the airport, the master plan will also address general aviation and fixed-base operations.

When the special consensus-building group has reached a tentative agreement, the Agency will report to the full Consensus-Building Workshop, and seek approvals from the APC and the Governing Board. The staff will then proceed to prepare a detailed Master Plan and, when appropriate, circulate a TRPA EIS on the Master Plan.

Issues to be Resolved:

Process

- what is the process for developing an Airport Master Plan?
- what criteria should the TRPA use in reviewing a draft Master Plan?
- how should the TRPA's review be coordinated with City, County, Caltrans, and FAA reviews?

Content

- what should a complete Airport Master Plan contain?
- what is the relationship of the Tahoe airport to other airports, e.g., Douglas County, Tahoe-Truckee?
- should Tahoe adopt special policies regarding military aircraft?
- what level of service is desired, and desirable?

Thresholds

- what mitigation measures are needed to ensure that the Airport and its

-- is the implementation schedule for the single-event noise threshold at the airport achievable? are the monitoring points valid?

Work Element H-3-d
Airport Master Plan
Page 2

End Product: Report to the full Consensus-Building Workshop on airport agreements, and their relationship to Work Element H-3-c; Airport Master Plan and appropriate TRPA EIS.

Staff Lead: Leif Anderson*, Jim Brennan

Committee Membership: Dennis Crabb, CSLT; Ken Williams, California AG; Federal Aviation Agency; airlines; Mike VanWagenon, STGA; Stan Hansen, Heavenly Valley; Tom Martens, LTSLT; El Dorado County; Caltrans Division of Aeronautics; Dick French, airport manager; impacted property owners

Tasks/Schedule:

	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Actual</u>
1. issue identification and problem definition (timing, process, content, thresholds)		
2. alternative solutions, decision criteria		
3. report to full CBW	1-15-86	
4. APC review, public hearing, approval		
5. GB review, public hearing, approval		