

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**SEPTEMBER
1985**

Sept 85

APC

Packet

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

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

Date: September 3, 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, Nevada

September 11, 1985
9:30 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV APPEAL

Weider/Kaufman, Appeal of Staff Determination to Approve a
Single Family Dwelling Garage Addition, 3983 Beach Lane, Lot 4,
El Dorado County APN 29-093-12, TRPA File #85305

V PLANNING MATTERS

A. Status of Regional Plan Work Program

B. Review of Reasonable Further Progress Report, 1982 Air Quality Plan

C. Review of Draft SEZ Restoration Program

VI REPORTS

A. Staff

B. Legal Counsel

C. Public Interest Comments

D. APC Members

VII RESOLUTIONS

For Former APC Member Bill Murphy

VIII CORRESPONDENCE

IX PENDING MATTERS

X ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

2155 South Avenue

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

(916) 541-0246

MEMORANDUM

September 4, 1985

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Weider/Kaufman, Appeal of Staff Determination
Agenda Item IV

This item is being taken off the APC agenda because staff has learned, upon reviewing the original single family dwelling file, that the subject site does not have sufficient land coverage to meet the new application requirements for additions. Staff is therefore rescinding its intent to grant a conditional approval for a garage addition.

GC:jf
9/4/85

AGENDA ITEM IV

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

2155 South Avenue

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

(916) 541-0246

MEMORANDUM

September 4, 1985

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

At its August meeting, the APC reviewed the Long Range Planning Division work program for FY 85-86. The staff agreed to review the status of the work program with the APC each month, especially with respect to the refinement of the TRPA Regional Plan.

The following information summarizes the status of key Division objectives related to refinement of the Regional Plan which come due during the first quarter of the fiscal year:

<u>Objective Number</u>	<u>Description/Due Date</u>	<u>Status</u>
A-1	Obtain consensus on key Regional Plan issues (10/85)	On schedule; see attached calendar and minutes
A-2	Complete non-controversial portions of Code of Ordinances (10/85)	Behind schedule; "two-track" process proving difficult
A-7	Complete BMP Handbook (8/85)	Slightly behind schedule; draft Handbook complete
A-8	Revise Rules and Regulations of Practice and Procedure (10/85)	Just underway; Scholley/Barrett/Houghteling
A-13	Document V(c) and V(d) schedules (9/85)	Behind schedule; traffic modelling underway
D-5	Complete 83-84 "RFP" Air Quality Report (10/85)	In draft; on schedule
D-9	Select contractor to carry out environmental education/public relations program (8/85)	Proposals received and under review

AGENDA ITEM V A.

Status of Regional Plan Work Program
September 5, 1985
Page 2

The staff has also solicited proposals from potential contractors under objective A-5, "Arrange for and carry out editorial review of Code and Regional Plan framework (3/86)." The staff received three proposals, which are currently under review.

In addition, the SEZ portion of objective A-10, "Complete CIP for water quality, SEZ's, and transportation (2/86)" is on the APC Agenda for discussion at the September meeting.

At the September APC meeting, the staff will make a brief presentation on the Regional Plan Work Program and answer questions from the Commissioners. In addition, the staff anticipates that the APC will break up into committees to discuss objectives A-1 (consensus-building) and A-10 (SEZ restoration program) in more detail. The staff would like the Land Use Committee to review the recommendations of the consensus-building workshop regarding the level of detail in Plan Area Statements. The recommendations of the workshop were, in part:

- Mapping principle - amount of land shown in PAS's should reflect a reasonable projection of the amount of land available for the specific uses allowed in that area for the life of the Plan.
- The 400 scale Plan Area maps should be coordinated with other Agency maps to permit ready determination of the location of other relevant information, such as: Land Use, Land Capability, Historical Sites, etc.
- The Plan Area Statements should be drafted with more specificity. There should be fewer special uses and the standards that apply to special uses should be specified.

The staff would also like the Natural Resources Committee to review the project descriptions accompanying the draft SEZ Restoration Program in some detail. Please contact Dave Ziegler or Gordon Barrett if you have any questions on this agenda item.

CONSENSUS WORKSHOP MEETING SCHEDULE

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Subject</u>
#1	Fri.	9/9	Valhalla	Process
#2	Thurs.	8/15	Valhalla	Plan Framework
	Fri.	8/16	Valhalla	Plan Areas, Land Coverage
#3	Mon.	8/26	Valhalla	Land Coverage
	Tues.	8/27	Valhalla	Land Coverage
#4	Mon.	9/9	Harrah's	Land Coverage
	Tues.	9/10	Harrah's	Land Coverage
#5	Wed.	9/18	Granlibakken	Redevelopment
	Thurs.	9/19	Granlibakken	Treatment of Sensitive Lands
#6	Thurs.	9/26	Chateau	Governing Board Workshop
	Fri.	9/27	?	Land Coverage Wrapup
#7	Wed.	10/2		Rate of Development (including pipeline projects)
	Thurs.	10/3		Rate of Development and Allocation by PAS
#8	Wed.	10/16		Phasing/Monitoring/CIP
	Thurs.	10/17		TDR
#9	Thurs.	10/24		GB Workshop
#10	Tues.	10/29		Complete Package
	Wed.	10/30		Complete Package

Later Issues:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| - VMT reduction/transportation | - Funding CIP |
| - Shorezone | - Economic matters |
| - 208 Plan Consistency | |

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Consensus Workshop
August 26, 1985 Minutes

Valhalla
Tallac Estates
South Lake Tahoe, CA

PRESENT:

Don Beck, North Tahoe Advisory Council
Mike Van Wagenen, South Tahoe Gaming Alliance
Rick Skinner, State of California Attorney Gen. Office
Lois Shellhammer, League of Women Voters
Bill Morgan, TRPA
Marta Adams, State of Nevada Attorney General Office
Leo Poppoff, Lahontan Water Quality Control Board
David Ziegler, TRPA
Jim Coffey, South Tahoe Public Utility Office
Lew Dodgion, Nevada Div. of Environmental Protection
Bev Bedard, Tahoe City Advisory Council & No. Tahoe Chambers of Commerce
Mike Lee, Tahoe Basin Assoc. of Governments
Larry Hoffman, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council
Keith Klein, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council
Shirley Allen, American Assoc. of Univ. Women
E. Clement Shute, League to Save Lake Tahoe
Jim Broadway, Environmental Protection Agency
Bill Chidlaw, Tahoe Shorezone Rep.
Heidi Hopkins, Sierra Club
John Hoefer, U. S. Forest Service
Geoff Ball, facilitator, Forum on Community and the Environment
Gordon Barrett, TRPA
Tom Martens, League to Save Lake Tahoe
Susan Scholley, TRPA
Steve Tshira, KTHO
John Hassenplug, No. Tahoe PUD
Neil Eskind, No. Tahoe PUD

It was noted by Lois Shellhammer that Cathy Gordon would be her alternate.

Geoff Ball reviewed the duties of the Facilitator. After the introduction of those present Geoff Ball went over the agenda items for the day and the ground rules for the work group and for the observers. He also presented a Problem Solving Chart to the group and the proposed process for addressing issues and sequencing sub issues. Lois Shellhammer asked if the August 1982 Regional Plan Outline were the components of the Regional Plan. Bill Morgan replied that they were the working papers for the plan and that they have gone beyond that. Barrett said that that draft has been revised to reflect the chart. This brought up the subject of getting a written format prepared and distributed to the group. After some discussion, Bill Morgan said they were going to turn 3 or 4 more staff into this process of preparing written agreements for the next meeting. Shute and some others did not receive packets in the mail. They were distributed. Skinner requested that the charts be dated. There was also

discussion on whether the charts should be culled. Since the agreements have not been written up in a timely fashion, it was agreed that there was a problem with culling. Priorities were set for preparing and distributing written agreements in a timely fashion and providing copies of the wall charts. Geoff Ball asked if there were any disagreements to the press release. There were no disagreements. Geoff Ball reviewed the framework of the agreements made. Shute felt that since the committee is formulating policies for the Regional Plan, that there needs to be more detail to the agreements. Skinner, Hoffman, and Poppoff agreed. Hoffman suggested that a document be prepared that begins "it was tentatively agreed as follows:" followed by a sentence. Then put the word rationale or justification for that agreement. This format was agreed upon. This would be the first thing reviewed in the following meeting. Mailing of the packets was discussed. The goal of preparing the materials from the previous meeting in time for the next meeting was set. They are to be distributed if feasible, otherwise ready for next meeting. It was agreed the the first half hour of each meeting would be for review of the notes.

The first issue to be addressed was defined as: What is the best way to apply the Bailey Land Coverage Limits? Under that issue, sub issues under new and existing construction were identified as residential, commercial, tourist/commercial, public service, and outdoor recreation. At Skinner's suggestion, discussion followed as to the length of time the policies would apply. There was disagreement regarding the five year monitoring system; whether too long or too short a period.

At Geoff Ball's suggestion, interests and needs for new residential were listed in a "brainstorming" session. He suggested capsulating the twenty two interests and needs into several questions.

Morning break from 11:45 to 12:00 p.m.

Geoff Ball proposed that four or five questions be generated that would lead to addressing the interests represented by those questions. The five questions generated that capsulated the twenty two interests and needs were as follows: (A) Small Lots: How can we apply the Bailey System so as to provide fairness to owners of small lots (i.e. less than 3000 sq. ft. approx.) (B) Thresholds: How can we meet existing environmental and other thresholds, such as water quality, visual, vegetation, soils, scenic and transportation standards? (including recreation thresholds) (C) Architecture, etc.: How can we achieve good architectural design and siting practices (under the Bailey System)? (D) Broad Acceptance (Fair & Reasonable): How can we achieve effective, fair, stable, predictable, sensible and well understood administration of the Bailey System that gains public support through responsiveness to the best available data? How to manage a recreational area such as Lake Tahoe fairly, sensibly, etc. (E) Effective Administration: How can we develop a system that can be effectively administered?

Lunch break from 12:45 to 1:30 p.m.

Gordon Barrett said that at the last meeting he was given the task of generating the number of improved and vacant lots by land capability and jurisdiction. He attempted to run these on the computer. What he has handed out is the number of sensitive lots and how they fall out by jurisdiction and in that also the buyout program numbers. In the EISS there are the basic number of high hazard or sensitive lots vs. high priority lots. Didn't get to computer readout yet, but will get to it. Committee discussed the numbers on the handout re: lots.

Geoff Ball suggested that each committee member choose two out of the five questions as a starting point. (A) Small Lots was chosen as the first question to address by highest vote. Interests linked to this question were identified as (1) provide way not to penalize small lots or place in economic bind, (2) provide equity for owners of small lots, (3) system of incentives for small lot owners, (4) relate to need for new residential, and (5) a reasonable amount of coverage for any lot deemed buildable. It was agreed that the committee needed the number of small lots. For analysis purposes it was agreed that 400 to 600 small lots are still out there owned by people in high capability lands. This figure would be used for the day, then Gordon Barrett would try to research it further through information in the computer. Bill Morgan suggested that as long as we're doing that that we look at the State Water Resources Control Board Plan and see how they arrived at 1800 small lots (1980).

Geoff Ball said we are looking for ways out of these spots, things that could be done to address the problem as stated, how can we provide fairness to owners of small lots. Ideas for ways to do this were discussed and listed. Larry Hoffman said there was a need to identify the problem. He felt the problem was where a person is trying to build on a marginal area or where do small lots make sense in the basin and where not? After discussion, it was felt that not all small lots are the same. Bill Morgan suggested a strategy to deal with this: the individual lot evaluation system, taking all these things into account. It takes into account the subdivision, the rate of buildout, the present or absence of roads, streets, sewers, as well as size and land capability. Skinner reserved judgement on this. Hoffman defined two themes: the lot evaluation system and subdivision evaluation in an area where you have substandard lots to determine whether it seems sensible to build out the remainder of that size.

Afternoon break from 2:55 to 3:05 p.m.

Forming strategies for (A) Small Lots was discussed and listed as (1) create a system of overrides and allow building to go ahead (or); (2) stay with Bailey standards and use other approaches; (3) where mergers are possible, then require this (contiguous properties); (4) where mergers are possible, then allow this; and (5) no special consideration for situations where merger is available. Bill Morgan felt that suggestions for Strategy A2 would be to make small lots eligible for purchase, transfer of development right, transfer of coverage, merger program, redevelopment program, or resubdivision of some areas. It was suggested that if in fact you were able to change the Tahoe Conservancy Policy to allow for acquisition, then presumably there needs to be some sort of priority for those paper subdivision lots that don't have adequate coverage. Skinner noted the assumption is that a small lot owner should be able to build or else should be given equity in another way.

Hoffman's criticism would be to start off by windowing out of the system those buildable sites first and look to see what constraint prevents them from building. His guess is that it's the 1200 sq. ft. minimum. Secondly, without prohibiting, let owner check out the options. Skinner said we should look at some design review criteria for small building for health and safety concerns. Goal from his standpoint is to get people off lots, give them a fair price and get their building rights somewhere where we can handle them.

After some discussion, agreements consistent with Bailey were listed as:

1. Delete 1200 sq. ft. minimum coverage requirement.
2. Develop design review guidelines for small lots.
3. See adjustments in the two buyout option programs.
4. Provide menu of options for those who want to avail themselves of it.
 - a. transfer development right
 - b. transfer of coverage
 - c. merger
 - d. redevelopment
 - e. resubdivision

Skinner commented that he felt transfer development right (TDR) is a key option because merger/consolidation is limited. The result of a transfer is open space forever for adjacent property owners. Creates a situation where you have three potential buyers working together and maybe that creates a better situation for the lot owner who doesn't get to build than he otherwise would have. If a correct system could be set up there's a sharing of the purchase price by those who benefit from the retirement of the lot. Small lots will be the first one's sold in a TDR program. Discussion followed where benefits and problems/concerns were brought out. It was felt that the subject was analyzed, but that it should be written up by Gordon Barrett for future discussion/comment. Bill Morgan felt that the group had done the best possible job to develop a system which would allow us to operate within the Bailey standards. Overrides as a possible strategy should be looked at too.

Afternoon break from 4:40 to 4:55 p.m.

The following strategy was looked at and discussed: A system of overrides for small lots that would allow up to 1000 sq. ft. or Bailey, whichever is greatest. (2400 sq. ft. min.) Two options were discussed: Use grandfathering scenario in the April 1984 Regional Plan, 2400 sq. ft. min. lot, 1700 sq. ft. min. coverage; 5000 sq. ft. min. lot, 1700 sq. ft. min. coverage. Skinner said that with the Bailey System in effect, and TDR an option, then we need to consider limiting TDR to certain lots so as not to glut the market. Small lot definition was defined as "a legally subdivided lot which, under Bailey, can't generate 1200 sq. ft. of coverage: LC 4, less than 6000 sq. ft.; LC 5, less than 4800 sq. ft.; LC 6,7, less than 4000 sq. ft."

At Skinner's suggestion, it was agreed that Gordon Barrett would prepare a draft of agreements/discussions that took place in the afternoon, to be ready by noon tomorrow. It was felt that the group needed something in writing to look at and refine.

Hoffman suggested that this draft be titled "Small Lots".

Geoff Ball led the discussion on the group's evaluation of the day. The main concern was that most of the day was spent on process before getting to solutions and focusing more on issues. It was agreed that for tomorrow the following issue would be discussed: How can we achieve good architectural design and siting practices (under the Bailey System)?

The meeting was adjourned at 6:07 p.m. and will reconvene at 8:30 a.m. tomorrow.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
CONSENSUS WORKSHOP
AUGUST 27, 1985 MINUTES

VALHALLA
TALLAC ESTATES
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA

PRESENT:

Don Beck, North Tahoe Advisory Council
Bev Bedard, North Tahoe Chamber of Commerce
Heidi Hopkins, Sierra Club
Bob Twiss, Consultant to the Calif. Atty. Gen. Office
Rick Skinner, State of California Atty. Gen. Office
Lois Shellhammer, League of Women Voters
Mike Van Wagenen, South Tahoe Gaming Alliance
Larry Hoffman, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council
Leo Popoff, Lahontan Water Quality Control Board
Clem Shute, League to Save Lake Tahoe
Bill Chidlaw, Tahoe Shorezone Representation
Bill Morgan, TRPA
John Hoefer, U. S. Forest Service
Jim Broadway, EPA
Tom Martens, League to Save Lake Tahoe
Marta Adams, State of Nevada Atty. Gen. Office
Geoff Ball, Facilitator, Forum on Community and the Environment
Gordon Barrett, TRPA
David Ziegler, TRPA
Del Laine, TTD
Susan Scholley, TRPA
Neil Eskind, No. Tahoe PUD
Shirley Allen, Amer. Assoc. of Univ. Women
Keith Klein, Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

Geoff Ball reviewed the agenda for the day. Bill Chidlaw requested that the calendar be discussed after the morning break since he would be leaving at noon. This was agreed to. Discussion followed about the time the meeting should last for the day. It was voted on and decided to end at 3:00 p.m. Geoff Ball reviewed possible actions for moving faster for today and his role as facilitator. He felt that today we need to develop packages for strategies.

The first item to be addressed by the committee was issue (C): How can we achieve good architectural design and siting practices (under the Bailey system). The interests and needs to be addressed under this issue are: (1) a way to achieve good architecture, (2) allow for good siting location on the lot, (3) flexibility leading to good architecture and siting, (4) address the length of the driveway, (5) enhance the quality of the neighborhood, and (6) a reasonable amount of coverage for any lot deemed to be buildable. Hoffman requested that we get to presentation of the facts, Shute requested we get right to the proposals. Geoff Ball proposed that ten minutes be spent on getting the facts out. He called on Gordon Barrett to present facts regarding land coverage. The committee discussed land coverage and reviewed the map "Hard Land Coverage by Watershed and Watershed Association."

Specific sub problems were discussed in relation to driveways; coverage and siting and good architecture, also existing homes with a dirt driveway; should they be encouraged to pave? After discussing the map and the data collected, Gordon Barrett suggested that we have to figure out what's best for the lake and what is the intent of the threshold and bring in all those factors and make a choice. Bill Morgan pointed out that the court's conclusion is that the Watershed Association approach is too gross and doesn't satisfy the Bailey threshold. Shute pointed out that the Regional goals and policies establishes Bailey on a parcel by parcel basis subject to the overrides that were build into that plan, the court said that the Bailey percentages apply and the Watershed Assoc. is too gross, that leaves you with parcel by parcel as being the only system that the agency has ever administered or sanctioned by its policies. He was disturbed with the discussion starting out by wanting to change the lot by lot approach rather than trying to find a way to work within it. We know that the water quality standards are not close to being met and probably becoming more gross. Discussion continued about agreement and disagreement of the lot by lot approach. Geoff Ball ended the discussion and asked to go back to the specific sub problems. Hoffman expressed desire to get to a rule dealing with coverage of driveways. Skinner suggested that a guy with a dirt driveway ought to be able to pave without penalty. Agreement was made for the following: existing home can pave old dirt driveway (at no penalty).

The next issue was new homes, siting and the amount of coverage on the property. Hoffman feels that we should encourage paved driveways to be put in and encourage the house to be sited on the lot in the best possible spot. Skinner feels that coverage is so important that it overrules the right site. He's not closed to the idea of the right site but feels a need for more data that says that's a better environmental result. Ideas for architectural review/coverage allowance were made as follows: narrowing driveway, paving block, house overlap over driveway, transfer of coverage from other lots, and flexibility re: each lot.

Hoffman drew a diagram dealing with the problem with siting and coverage, and building on the best site. Hoffman said he is trying to move the committee to a direction that says that siting will be equally important to us as other constraints. Skinner felt that he would be more receptive to that idea if he had the notion that siting and coverage are equal factors in the environmental impact. Klein expressed concern with the environmental impact, i.e. cutting trees, grading, excavation, visual/setbacks with siting. Neal suggested that if someone couldn't transfer probable coverage by TDR technique they could contribute money which would be put into a pool to be used to buy transfer of coverage. It would make an environmental offset. Hoffman suggested that the "pool" be contributed to remedial programs in that particular watershed; something that they can see happening. Bill Morgan felt that this remedial work could be done in lieu of these extra benefits or it could be done by contributions of funds into further mitigation work or into a fund that would be used to buy up land to be donated to another public agency in order to accomplish the coverage retirement program. Jim Broadway suggested that where you have a siting problem, locate garage next to street in order to avoid over-covering the lot, and place house on better site.

Morning break from 10:25 to 10:40 a.m.

Skinner feels there are two problems: (1) house siting building a driveway to site takes an amount of coverage that reduces the size of the house and the site that would allow the minimum driveway as an o.k. environmental site but the owner wants to place the house somewhere else for view, etc. He drew a diagram and offered a proposal: where the minimum driveway causes environmental problems, give the homeowner the option of obtaining additional coverage for the longer driveway to the better site environmentally (from the same watershed). Klein was concerned about where the incentive was in this and there has to be environmental gain. Comments that arose from this proposal were as follows: would require, case by case evaluation of designs/best site and best access criteria, would require careful implementation by agencies, purchase price for retirement could be set from equivalent sales, localizing environment gain, an alternative: use mitigation rather than retirement, or require an improvement of equal value, cost of coverage could be set by market value. Poppoff doesn't agree with the concept if it requires additional money for the homeowner for the additional coverage to place home on environmentally better site. Bill Morgan addressed the concept and philosophy of it by saying that Leo's assumption is that the improvement in siting is enough to offset the additional coverage, and the other point of view is that they can not envision an improvement in siting to being sufficient to offset the additional coverage because they consider the additional coverage to be a detriment, but at least if that detriment is limited by the elimination of coverage elsewhere then they can see there is a gain by allowing this procedure to be carried through. He would argue on that side more than Leo's because as long as additional coverage is allowed in every case where there is an improvement in siting we have inevitably an increase in coverage and that is a big problem in the basin. We have a definite need to reduce or at least hold the line on coverage. Larry defined the problem of siting as a problem throughout the nation that one of the constraints of the Bailey System is that it's causing people to squeeze in their houses close on poor sites so you end up with bad siting and bad architecture. Klein feels that if there are some incentives to not follow the minimum standards then we need to figure out a way to do it. The question is: is there a tradeoff that balances against strict Bailey? Hoffman said that if the agency requires an improved site, then require no payment for the coverage (the agency's problem to remove coverage), but if it's the owner's idea, then he must pay for the coverage. After some discussion, the following benefits and concerns regarding the proposal were noted. Benefits: (1) trade-off achieves environmental improvement, (2) may be o.k. with court, (3) help achieve thresholds for water quality, coverage, (4) reduces future potential for coverage, (5) provides an option. Concerns noted were: (1) cost of obtaining coverage, (2) retirement of coverage, espec

ially from LC 1-3; owner perceive retirement as an intangible. (3) owner may chose not to exercise the option, thus add to damage, (4) mitigation approach could add to coverage problems, (5) tends to penalize the best site if greater than \$1000, (6) behavior tends toward minimum standard, (7) processing time, cost of processing. After the discussion, it was agreed to decide the next course of action after lunch.

Regarding calendaring, Bill Chidlaw, expressed a desire to talk about the following two issues: present injunction prohibits repairs tp piers and what can happen in the future. It was decided that Skinner, Shute, Chidlaw and Sue

would adjourn to set a date where they could all meet in Sacramento regarding these Shorezone issues.

Lunch break from 12:35 to 1:05 p.m.

Committee was requested to write dates not available on the calendar, so that future meetings could be set. Geoff Ball reviewed the afternoon agenda.

Bill Morgan talked about the variances the committee had on the siting issue. Skinner asked if there was any agreement at all? Morgan said that on this issue we agreed that there was a need for flexibility in application of the coverage limitations regarding single family dwelling siting (driveway) in application of Bailey concept. Hoffman said he would like to add: "positive approach to allow/encourage paving existing dirt driveways" to the agreement. Skinner felt that at the concept level the proposal should allow the option to the homeowner to relocate the site to a better environmental site without the penalty on house size for the extra driveway coverage (driveway also environmentally sound access road), with appropriate mitigation (unresolved: should there be mitigation and what type?). It was agreed by the committee that the above agreement is agreed to in concept (conditional). On the options list of the agreements, it was noted by Lois Shellhammer that the owner has the option not to build.

The next item to be addressed was the calendar. It was agreed that the next meeting would be September 9th and 10th. Following meetings were scheduled for September 18th and 19th, September 26th and 27th, October 2nd and 3rd, October 16th and 17th, and October 29th and 30th.

The next item to be addressed was the write-up of the draft of agreements by Gordon Barrett. Hoffman suggested that the draft be titled, Land Coverage and under that New Single Family Home Construction, and under issues: Proposed Solution for Small Lots. Discussion followed as to comments/changes regarding the draft. Certain concerns were made regarding the absence of the proposal addressing overrides for small lots and that all lots less than 2400 sq. ft. will be treated separately. Shute said that they assume application of Bailey on a lot to lot basis. Changes to the draft were noted by Gordon Barrett. He will make the changes and prepare a revised draft for the committee. Issues requiring further discussion to be discussed at a later date were listed as: redevelopment, extent of TDR, TDR go to multiple family sites for additional density, 2400 sq. ft., buyout programs (small lots).

It was agreed that the documenting of agreements should be an ongoing process with an overhead projector the same day of the meeting. TRPA will re-draft the agreements before the next meeting. Referring to the "Proposed Meeting Schedule" Gordon Barrett asked the subject for the next meeting--if we are to follow the schedule. It was agreed that the first part of the next meeting should be devoted to clearing up some of the concerns regarding Land Coverage, and then proceed with the schedule. Shute recommended that redevelopment should follow land coverage, before nonconformity-SEZ's. It was agreed. Bedard suggested that economic impact also be addressed under redevelopment. It was felt that it would come up in the discussion. Bill Morgan asked Del