

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**JUNE
1987**

6-87

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 10, 1987, in the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Zephyr Cove, Round Hill, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that the chief planning officers from local governments within the Tahoe Basin will meet from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. to discuss the community planning process.

June 1, 1987

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
Zephyr Cove, Round Hill, Nevada

June 10, 1987
10:00 a.m.

AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV PUBLIC HEARING
 - A. To Consider Amending the Regional Plan Maps
- V PLANNING MATTERS
 - A. Status Report on Ordinances and Plan Area Statements
 - B. Discussion on Final EIS for the Placer County Criminal Justice and Administrative Center
 - C. Discussion on Processing the Remaining Unadopted Chapters of the Code of Ordinances
 - D. Discussion on Regional Transportation Plan Update
 - E. Discussion on Waterborne Feasibility Study, Draft Report
 - F. Appointment of Committee Charged with Updating Criteria for Ski Area Master Plans
 - G. Discussion and Recommendation on Distribution of Commercial Allocations
- VI REPORTS
 - A. Staff
 - B. Legal Counsel
 - C. Public Interest Comments
 - D. APC Members
- VII CORRESPONDENCE
- VIII PENDING MATTERS
- IX ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

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

May 13, 1987

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Alice Becker called the May 13, 1987 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:40 a.m.

Members Present: Ms. Huber, Mr. Renz, Ms. Jamin, Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefler, Ms. Becker, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Glab (present at 9:50 a.m.), Mr. Hansen (present at 9:55 a.m.), Mr. Poppoff (present at 9:55 a.m.), Mr. Harper, Mr. Combs (present at 9:55 a.m.)

Members Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bedard, Mr. Van Wagenen

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. David Ziegler, Chief of Long Range Planning, advised that Executive Director Bill Morgan was in transit from Flathead Lake, Montana and would not be at the APC meeting. Mr. Ziegler would be in charge of the staff's presentations. Item V(g) (report on activities of the special task force on rehabilitation fees and land banking programs) should be postponed. Discussion on the Waterborne Feasibility Study (item V F.) is to be scheduled for after the lunch break so the consultants can be present.

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

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. DeMello asked that "cumulative" be stricken from the second to bottom line on page 13 of the April 8 minutes and "will" be changed to "would" on the bottom line of page 13.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve the April 8 regular meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PUBLIC HEARING

- A. To Consider Amendments to Plan Area Statements (PAS), Including Specifically, But Not Limited To, the Following: PAS 070A, 080, 089A

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett explained that the second trailing amendment of the PASSs had been acted on already by the APC with the exception of certain issues raised by the Park Cattle Company on PASSs 070A, 080, 089A. Using wall displays, Mr. Barrett described the configuration of these PASSs and explained that the proposed plan attempts to recognize existing land use patterns. In developing the PAS concept and priorities for development, staff's first priority was existing developed urban areas. The second was existing urban or

subdivided areas that are disturbed. The third was vacant, undisturbed land within subdivided areas; the last choice was raw, undeveloped areas. Mr. Barrett explained the physical characteristics of PAS 080 (item 1 in staff summary) which caused the area to be classified by staff as "Conservation" and Mr. Gordon DePaoli's request, on behalf of Park Cattle Company, that 246 acres be included in adjacent Plan Areas (Nevada South Stateline Resort Area, Kingsbury Commercial, and Middle Kingsbury Residential). Mr. Renz agreed with Mr. DePaoli's request, explaining that this was one of the few areas with development potential and good land capability in Douglas County. For this reason, alone, the area should not be considered in a Conservation category.

Mr. Gordon DePaoli, for the Park Cattle Company, distributed a copy of a map showing the subject Plan Area Statements and explained that the Park property was located between a tourist area, a commercial area and a residential area. When the potential uses for the property were planned in 1971, TRPA did take into account what uses surrounded the property; that concept has pretty well been lost in the PAS process. Consideration should be given to allowing high density residential housing somewhere in this area because of its proximity to the major employment center. By adjusting boundaries at this time, the Agency is not in any way approving a project. Unless portions of this property are placed in other Plan Areas, there is never going to be an opportunity to show whether land capability, access and utilities are adequate to support a project. With regard to the open space required for the Park Tahoe/Caesar's project, only 16 acres of the entire 246 acres must remain open. Insofar as the SEZ and land capability are concerned, there has been consistent disagreement with these classifications. Unless the meadow area is irrigated, it is not a naturally occurring wet area. Land capability should not be the controlling factor in placing lands in Plan Area Statements. The code provides tough, adequate regulations that preclude development on low capability lands; there is no need to zone an entire low capability area Conservation in order to prohibit development. Much of this property, as pointed out by staff, does have good capability and should be recognized. Just because property has not developed to date is no reason to put it at the bottom of the development list. It is important to look at the location of this property and to give consideration to what the plan hopes to accomplish, particularly in 089A. This is an area that should have employee housing, affordable housing, and employee parking, and the request is that consideration be given to modifying the boundaries of 089 to take in some of 080 and modifying 076 and 078 as well.

Mr. Harper suggested that, instead of dividing up PAS 080 and combining it with other Plan Areas, a new Plan Area be created (080A) to contain the better land capability areas within the existing 080; this area could be looked at for an expanded Community Plan. He totally disagreed with the argument that previously existing zoning should automatically be continued. Zoning is a privilege, not a right. He would like to see further study of what transitional types of uses could be proposed by Park Cattle Company for this area. The current Conservation designation places an extreme limitation on the property and is too broad.

Mr. Ziegler reminded the APC that all the Plan Area Statements are dominated by an infill philosophy; new development is to be directed to already existing developed areas. In reviewing the Community Plan process, the boundaries of the Plan Area Statements and Community Plan (CP) can be looked at again. Staff can integrate the study of this area with the study of the Lower Kingsbury Grade,

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 13, 1987

the Nevada Stateline, and Round Hill areas. The pros and cons of different development schemes can be studied as they relate to VMT, air quality, scenic resources, SEZs, water quality, traffic, circulation and housing. Targets can be set in terms of restoration goals, VMT reductions. If this area is recognized as a new PAS or as a special area within another PAS, the Community Planning process will still have to occur. It is not clear what would be solved by recognizing this area as a special area at this time. Mr. DePaoli suggested all these studies can be conducted whether this property is Conservation or something else. No project is being approved now; all that is being done is to open the door.

Mr. Hansen asked to see a plan or map delineating what Park Cattle Company would propose for PAS 080. This should ultimately be carried out in conjunction with Douglas County's Community Planning effort.

Mr. Ziegler advised the APC that watershed work done in 1983 showed the Edgewood Creek and Burke Creek watershed to be more covered than what the Bailey system would allow. This is largely a function of how much steep and 1A lands are in this area. Edgewood Creek does flow through the northern corner of this property and is a major drainage. In the Community Planning process, there will be a requirement to look for SEZ restoration opportunities, and Edgewood Creek is a likely target. Carrying capacity of the watershed is an issue.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, second by Mr. Hansen, with regard to PAS 080 (item 1) to bring back a plan that addresses uses and boundaries and their relationship to surrounding areas - either in the form of a draft Planning Area Statement, or an expansion of the Community Plan boundary to encompass this area.

Mr. Hansen suggested that his intent was for the Park Cattle Company to come back to the APC in June with a plan showing what specific boundary adjustments they favor in relation to the PASs and the CP. Mr. Harper urged that staff be involved with this planning process.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Glab, Mr. Hansen,
Mr. Harper, Mr. Combs, Ms. Becker
Nays: Ms. Huber, Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefler, Mr. Poppoff
Abstain: Ms. Unsicker
Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Van Wagenen, Mr. Pyle, Ms. Bedard

Mr. Barrett suggested that items 1., 2., 3., and 5., all relating to PAS 080, could be deferred under Mr. Harper's motion.

Using the wall maps to clarify his remarks, Mr. Barrett explained staff's position that portions of PAS 080 be designated as "scenic view corridor." Mr. DePaoli asked for clarification of the term. Requiring private property to be maintained for a public purpose is a burden that should not be imposed on private property. Mr. Renz suggested that this designation should not preclude development but would require that consideration be given to views in the design of any project. Mr. DePaoli asked that this be made clear. Mr. Ziegler explained that the intent is to maintain views from Highway 50.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 13, 1987

MOTION by Mr. Harper to maintain the staff's language that the scenic view corridor designation be kept in PAS 080. Second by Mr. Hansen. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Hansen, that the Edgewood Water Company facilities (PAS 080, item 6) be an allowed rather than a special use.

Mr. Barrett explained that staff agrees with Mr. DePaoli's request but would like some clarification so that the policy is clear that Edgewood Water Company, which is classified as a public utility center or local public health and safety facility, is an allowed use. The intent is not that such uses be allowed anywhere in the Plan Area. Within the whole watershed area, such uses will be special uses.

Mr. Harper amended his motion to approve the request that Edgewood Water Company be an allowed use but that other such uses will be considered special uses. Mr. Hansen concurred. The motion carried unanimously.

With regard to item 7 (PAS 080), Mr. Barrett explained Mr. DePaoli's concern that, although Special Policy #3 states that a developed campground should be considered, no additional capacity for such use has been assigned. Staff does not recommend allocating Persons At One Time (PAOTs) until the Community Plan for this area has been completed. The APC's Recreation Committee is also working on the whole recreation issue. No APC action is necessary at this time.

With regard to item 8 (PAS 080) and Mr. DePaoli's suggestion that the PASs should not mandate implementation of improvement programs not yet adopted by the Board, this is a concept that runs through all the PASs. Some of these programs include the water quality improvement plan, the highway improvement plans, stream zone restoration, and the scenic restoration program. These programs must go through a public hearing and adoption process. Deleting these references at this time will have repercussions in many other Plan Area Statements. Mr. DePaoli suggested it was a mistake for TRPA, or any agency, to mandate something that it has never seen. The fair way is to develop the plans and then to mandate them to the different Plan Areas.

MOTION by Harper, with a second by Mr. Hoefler, to approve the staff recommendation mandating implementation of certain as yet unadopted improvement programs in PAS 080. The motion carried with Ms. Unsicker abstaining.

MOTION by Mr. Hansen, with a second by Mr. Harper, to approve Mr. DePaoli's request that Planning Consideration #2 (PAS 070A) be expanded to recognize the fact that Edgewood Golf Course ponds have acted as siltation basins and have assisted in the reduction of pollutants entering Lake Tahoe from Edgewood Creek. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Barrett explained that item 10 (PAS 070A) refers to a special policy requiring that a fertilizer management program shall be initiated at the golf course and the golf course redesigned to provide for natural buffers of vegetation along the creek and pond area wherever possible. As part of the overall SEZ restoration program, the intent here is to increase the effectiveness of streams and ponds as buffers and treatment facilities. Mr. DePaoli explained he was not objecting to the fertilizer management program; he was objecting to mandating the golf course to redesign wherever possible. This

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 13, 1987

will create problems any time Edgewood wants to do anything at all. Mr. Ziegler explained that this was really a reaffirmation of the Goals and Policies which suggest that golf courses within SEZs should be looked at for redesign possibilities to, for instance, increase setbacks from streams and encourage riparian vegetation. Ms. Becker suggested that the policy be reworded to provide that when the applicant redesigns the golf course these criteria shall be taken into account. Mr. Ziegler explained that the policy is really more of a guideline.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefler to disapprove the request to modify the Special Policy #1 which suggests that Edgewood Golf Course be redesigned. (The motion is to approve staff's language.) Second by Mr. Hansen. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to recognize the facilities of the Edgewood Water Company (item 11, PAS 070A) as allowed uses (as requested by Mr. DePaoli). The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Barrett explained staff's position on Mr. DePaoli's request that eating and drinking places be an allowed use. This will make it clear that the bar and restaurant facilities at the golf course are allowed as a primary use. (PAS 070A, item 12). Mr. DePaoli explained that the bar and restaurant operate at times of the year which do not coincide with the golf course. If special findings cannot be made for these facilities as special uses, then they will be forced to operate only when the golf course is operating. There is no problem for the pro shop to remain a special use; it is seasonally used and its hours are very close to those of the golf course. Mr. Hansen suggested that the existing eating and drinking establishment be recognized as an allowed use; anything new would be a special use. Mr. Ziegler suggested that staff work on language for the APC's consideration after the lunch recess.

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve Mr. DePaoli's request (PAS 080A, item 13) that water intake lines be an allowed accessory structure. The motion carried unanimously.

With regard to item 14 (PAS 070A) and the request that additional outdoor recreation development should be allocated due to its location adjacent to a major tourist center, Mr. DePaoli explained that the Park Cattle Company has no plans to develop anything in this Plan Area other than a golf course. If there is a potential here for additional outdoor recreation, PAOTs should be allocated. It appears, however, that there are not enough to go around, so they can't be allocated to areas that may not use them. Mr. Barrett recommended that this item be deferred until after the Recreation Committee completes its work. Chairman Becker concurred. No action was taken.

MOTION by Mr. Glab, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to approve Mr. DePaoli's request (with staff concurrence) that PAS 089A (item 15) expressly state that structures housing gaming under a nonrestrictive license are permitted and conforming uses. The motion carried unanimously.

With regard to item 16 (PAS 089A), Mr. DePaoli explained he had no trouble giving recognition to the fact that this area is part of the Caesar's Tahoe/Park Tahoe project. He was objecting to the policy requiring this whole area to be maintained as a scenic view corridor and historic site. Action on PAS 080

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 13, 1987

should suffice on this point. Second, there is no need to call the entire 16 acres (Friday Station and surrounding land) an historic site. The policy recognizing open space should speak only to the property that is recorded as open space. The historic site is actually in PAS 080. Ms. Becker explained that the National Register recognizes just the building as historic. Mr. Barrett asked that this be continued until after lunch so that staff can work on compromise language.

With regard to item 17 (PAS 089A), Mr. DePaoli explained that there is a special designation here for employee housing. The definition of employee housing is that it be residential units owned and maintained by a public or private entity for housing employees of said public or private entity. Where would such housing go in this Plan Area? The major employers in this area probably don't have any land that would be available for such housing. By listing multiple residential as a permissible use in the area, the Agency is opening the door for someone who doesn't employ people to provide that kind of housing. The code now requires that employee housing must be provided by the employer. Without allowing for multiple family housing as a permissible use, it is not likely it will occur. This may be a code problem. Mr. Barrett suggested that Park Cattle Company owns the only vacant land; if Caesar's needs employee housing, he would imagine that something could be worked out between Caesar's and Park Cattle. Mr. Ziegler suggested that the appropriate way to handle this is through a technical cleanup of the code of ordinances. Chapter 18 indicates that employee housing is to be owned and operated by the employer. It is possible for employee housing to be owned and operated by a third party with some restrictions or CC&Rs to ensure its use by employees. This is a code problem. Staff does not envision this part of PAS 089 as a residential area in the typical sense.

MOTION by Mr. Hoefer, with a second by Mr. Dodgion, to retain the language in PAS 089A (item 17) and to make changes with regard to employee housing at the code level. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion, with a second by Mr. Hansen to approve Mr. DePaoli's request, with staff's concurrence, that vehicle storage and parking should be an allowed rather than a special use in PAS 089A (item 18). The motion carried unanimously.

After some discussion it was determined there was no need for APC action on item 19 since sport assembly is already listed as a special use.

MOTION by Mr. Harper, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to retain language in PAS 089A (item 20) mandating implementation of improvement programs that have not yet been adopted by the Governing Board. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ziegler advised that Agency Executive Director Bill Morgan would be making a determination on when these matters would be taken to the Governing Board for final action. Chairman Becker pointed out that APC action had been deferred on items 1, 2, 3, 5. Items 12 and 16 would be taken up after lunch.

Ms. Becker asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on these or any other Plan Area Statements. Since there was no one, Ms. Becker recessed the public hearing to later in the afternoon.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 13, 1987

The meeting recessed for a lunch break from 11:50 a.m. to 1:15 p.m. Members present after lunch: Glab, Combs, DeMello, Poppoff, Hoefler, Dodgion, Hansen, Becker, Huber, Renz, Jamin, Unsicker, Harper (present at 1:35 p.m. during discussion on item V F.).

Chairman Becker reopened the public hearing on Plan Area Statements.

Mr. Barrett distributed copies of a 5/13/87 document entitled, "APC Recommended Changes." With regard to item 12 (PAS 070A), it is proposed that the Edgewood golf course restaurant and bar be considered as allowed uses, although any other restaurants elsewhere in the PAS will be special uses. The pro shop will be left as an accessory use. A special policy shall be added to PAS 070A and 080 recognizing the Edgewood Water Company as an allowed use pursuant to Chapter 18 and the Permissible Uses section in the PASs. The third item on the handout applies to item 16 in the APC packet material and provides that Special Policy #1 in PAS 089A be amended to provide for continued maintenance of the open space as officially recorded in Douglas County. Any activities taking place on the Caesar's Tahoe property should be viewed in light of said open space.

Mr. Barrett suggested there was no need to act on the second item on the handout dealing with the Edgewood Water Company; this material is provided so the APC can see the language which reflects the APC's earlier action.

MOTION by Mr. Dodgion to approve the language proposed by staff and Mr. DePaoli on items 1 and 3 of the handout to address items 12 and 16 of the packet material. Second by Mr. Hoefler. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Jamin advised that there had been an oversight in PAS 114 (Bonanza area close to the Y in the City of South Lake Tahoe) regarding Special Area #1. It would be appropriate for the trailer park to be listed as a special use. Mr. Barrett concurred.

MOTION by Ms. Jamin to include the trailer park in PAS 114 as a special use. Second by Mr. Renz. The motion carried with Ms. Unsicker abstaining.

Since no one else wished to testify, Chairman Becker closed the public hearing on Plan Area Statements.

V PLANNING MATTERS

F. Discussion on Waterborne Feasibility Study

Transportation Planner Curtis Jordan presented a status report on the study prepared by JHK & Associates which identifies both opportunities and constraints to implementation of a waterborne system connecting the north and south shore transit systems. This report covers the first three of six tasks to be undertaken. These tasks include, in part, identification of existing services in the Basin, identification of the existing facilities, an inventory of available technology, a determination on the demand for waterborne transit services, and an evaluation of the waterborne transit services and alternatives. What is being presented today is a progress report on the inventory tasks. Mr. Jordan walked the APC members through the report material.

Ms. Huber questioned whether the appendix would identify marinas with pumpout facilities. Mr. Jordan suggested that there was not a lot of detail on this in the document on transportation services. This is not really a guide for the recreational boater. Mr. Ziegler suggested that a point-to-point waterborne facility would have to have restrooms. There should be some provision in the inventory for addressing pumpout facilities.

Additional information on the report was presented by JHK & Associates representatives Mike Connors and David Szplett. The final report will make a recommendation on whether or not it is feasible to have waterborne transit facilities on the Lake. At this point it looks like the recommendation will favor a demonstration project. The final draft report will be completed in the next two weeks.

Mr. Poppoff suggested that the report was stretching the definition in saying there are an adequate number of marinas and shoreside facilities around the Lake. Burnt Cedar Beach, Incline Village, and Coon Street are hardly what he would call marinas; they provide only a boat ramp. He would like to see a more realistic view of what a marina is. Mr. Connors responded that in this first draft every possibility was identified. The next phase will provide more detail. There is one marina identified in this report which is feasible to use as a waterborne transportation port; everything else would have to be improved to some extent.

Mr. Poppoff commented that the cover letter with the report suggests that the inventory indicates there are quite a few marinas on Lake Tahoe and that shoreside services appear adequate. This is an exaggeration. Second, there are mistakes here. For example, the Carnelian Bay Company does not exist; it is the Sierra Boat Company. Lake Forest, a Coast Guard Station, has a better developed facility than most that are listed, and it is not on the list. The report does not provide a very thorough cataloging of facilities. Mr. Connors responded that JHK would take a closer look at this.

Mr. Glab suggested that the M.S. Dixie is not the largest boat on the Lake as suggested by the report. Also, have weather conditions and the ability to approach some of these docks in all-weather conditions been evaluated? Mr. Jordan responded that this type of analysis had been done by a subcontractor. Mr. Glab asked if anything was being done to determine willingness to pay or what the breakeven point would be as far as financing these transit programs. Mr. Connors suggested that determining how much a person would be willing to pay for such a service was somewhat subjective at this point. This will ultimately have to be a judgment call of the Governing Board. His firm could present information on what would need to be subsidized versus what the ridership estimate would be. Mr. Glab suggested that the consultant look at number of operable days for the transit system plus alternatives for days that are not operable.

Discussion followed, with staff and the consultants responding to questions on boat types, laws regulating waterborne vessels, performance speed, wave action's effect on suspended sediments, funding for such facilities, incentives for use, and a future operations plan. Ms. Jamin suggested that the consultants contact an operator who, a year ago, did studies to determine the financial feasibility of operating a hover craft on the lake. Mr. Glab suggested that drafts be listed for all vehicles. This is a critical feature. Mr. Hansen

asked that the report address connecting bicycle paths from Camp Richardson to Meeks Bay by ferry.

Mr. Curtis finished the presentation by advising that the final draft report would be available in two weeks. It will be sent either in the June packet or in advance of the packet mailing.

D. Status Report by Recreation Committee on Review of Recreation Element

Mr. Jon Hoefer, member of the Recreation Committee, explained that the intent of his presentation was to set forth the Committee's findings to date and to ask for APC comments before the Committee proceeds further. The Committee first started discussing Persons At One Time (PAOTs), a measurement of recreation use set forth in the Goals and Policies. Early on it was found that there were not enough to go around. The Committee then turned its attention to establishing areas of agreement. These are as follows: 1) recreation is "big" at Lake Tahoe, and not enough attention is being given to plan for it; 2) public agencies have looked at opportunities but not demand or integration; 3) the states and Forest Service view PAOTs as a reservation; 4) urban recreation lacks a reservation (not much land has been set aside for it); 5) PAOTs in the Goals and Policies should apply to state and federal lands; 6) do not assign any targets or limits to urban recreation at this time; 7) urban recreation is defined as those facilities operated to serve local residents (softball, soccer, pools, baseball, etc.); 8) while the plan does have some capacity set aside for ski areas, ski areas are different and should be treated differently; this already recognized to some extent because of the requirement for a master plan; 9) marinas should be treated differently; no allocations or inventory for an allocation to marinas were made from the PAOT capacity, so no capacity is recognized for these uses; 10) RV parks, campgrounds and overnight facilities on state or federal lands also lack capacity; until some other system is devised, it should be recognized that no capacity has been assigned these uses; this should be done by either a master plan or case-by-case review process; 11) recognize that there is much overlap between outdoor and urban recreation, and an overlap between what federal, state and local governments provide; and 12) for the present, use the five-year recreation plan required by the Goals and Policies Plan as the clearinghouse for integrating all recreation activities until a better system is developed.

Discussion followed on the Recreation Committee's findings with regard to recreation and, in particular, the subject of PAOTs, cross country skiing, dispersed recreation, what to do with recreation projects in the interim, the charge of the committee to look not just at PAOTs but at a better way to develop a recreation plan for the Basin. Mr. Hoefer explained that there needed to be an in-depth study of recreation, after which a decision will be made on whether PAOTs will fit in. Mr. Renz asked if, under the Committee's recommendation, an RV park, for example, would be subject only to the normal project review process. TRPA Planner Jean Shaffer suggested that the normal project review process in compliance with the Plan Area Statement would be one avenue in the interim; the easier approach would be to address the RV park in the Community Planning process. The Committee, in the long term, would like to provide some means for additional flexibility in assigning capacities that are available or in defining the capacities themselves. It should be noted that, when the Forest Service and State Parks were consulted on the number of PAOTs they foresaw needing, their reservations were based on rather long-term projections - in some