

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**NOVEMBER
1987**

NOV 1987
APC

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 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 12, 1987, at 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.

November 2, 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

NOTE: Thursday, November 12, 1987
9:30 a.m.

AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV PUBLIC HEARING
 - A. Chapter 7 (Temporary Uses, Structures and Activities) of the Code of Ordinances
 - B. Chapter 10 (Structures Housing Gaming) of the Code of Ordinances
 - C. Chapter 24 (Driveway and Parking Standards) of the Code of Ordinances
 - D. Chapter 91 (Air Quality Control) of the Code of Ordinances to Clarify the Prohibition on the Use of Coal in the Tahoe Region
- V PLANNING MATTERS
 - A. Report on and Approval of Membership of Standing Committees
 - B. Status Report on Development of Code Chapters and Related Programs
 - 1. Chapter 15 (Redevelopment Plans)
 - 2. Scenic Package
 - Chapter 26 (Outdoor Advertising Standards)
 - Chapter 94 (Scenic Highway Corridors)
 - Scenic Restoration Program
 - Design Review Guidelines
 - C. Report on Status of Identification of Indicators and Time Schedules Pursuant to Chapter 32 (Regional Plan and Threshold Review), Code of Ordinances
 - D. Discussion on the Regional Transportation Plan Update and Regional Transportation Plan EIR/EIS
 - E. Status Report on Land Coverage Banking Program

VI REPORTS

A. Legal Counsel

B. APC Members

C. Public Interest Comments

VII CORRESPONDENCE

VIII PENDING MATTERS

IX ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

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

October 14, 1987

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Alice Becker called the regular October 14, 1987 meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:35 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

Members Present: Ms. Huber, Mr. Renz, Ms. Jamin, Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefler
(present after vote on September minutes), Ms. Becker,
Mr. Rosse, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Glab (present after vote on September
minutes), Mr. Hansen (present at 1:35 p.m.), Mr. Brooks,
Mr. Van Wagenen (present at 10:05 a.m.), Mr. Thräms, Mr. Combs
Mr. Harper

Members Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Bedard

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Morgan asked that discussion on the Incline Village postal committee recommendation (item IV C.) be taken up prior to action on the Recreation Committee findings (item IV B.)

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

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Pyle, with a second by Mr. DeMello, to approve the September 9, 1987 regular meeting minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Finding of Technical Adequacy, Final EIS for the Round Hill to Stateline Substation 120 KV Transmission Line, Sierra Pacific Power Company

Senior Planner Rick Angelocci explained that the 60 day comment period on the EIS began on April 20 and closed on June 19. Copies of the draft EIS were sent to the APC on April 28; the final EIS was sent prior to this meeting. The EIS evaluated four alternative routes for construction of a transmission line between the Round Hill and Stateline Substations. The final EIS notes that, provided the mitigation measures identified in the draft EIS are incorporated as part of the project, the preferred route (Alternative C) will not result in any significant environmental impacts. The two major issues in the EIS are visual impacts and impacts on resources such as wildlife, fishery and historic sites. Staff has reviewed the draft and final EIS and recommends that the APC find the document to be technically adequate and that it be forwarded to the Governing

Board with a recommendation for certification. Thirteen comments have been received on the draft EIS; the final contains the responses to those comments.

Mr. John Petrovsky, with EDAW, Inc., the consultant who prepared the EIS, explained the purpose of and need for the project. The additional line will increase reliability without increasing power supply to the Basin. In-basin generation or conservation cannot meet this need. While the project is the first step in completion of the 1978 power supply master plan, it is not dependent on any future phases. Mr. Petrovsky presented additional information on the design and location of the project and on alternative considerations.

Mr. Steve Siegel, of Sierra Pacific Power, explained that, while technically feasible, undergrounding the whole project would increase the project costs by 7.2 times. (This figure was later revised to 5.2.)

Using displays, Mr. Tom Packard, a technical specialist with EDAW, addressed the environmental impacts of the four alternatives that were evaluated and described land uses in the project area. The two most critical environmental concerns in the project area are meadow environments and deciduous/riparian habitats which occur along stream courses (shown on the display). Mr. Packard described the individual routes and their attendant impacts. Alternative C, the preferred alternative, avoids any serious scenic quality impacts and crosses Kingsbury Grade at a location that is already highly developed with commercial uses and overhead utilities. Alternative C is also 100 to 200 feet inside the forest boundary near a residential area and thus has sufficient vegetative buffer. It avoids the sensitive Kingsbury Meadow area and takes advantage of an existing utility line right-of-way through other portions of the project. The most significant comments received were raised by the Forest Service, one being that a complete archaeological, on-the-ground survey be conducted in the corridor of the preferred alternative. This has been done and is presented in the final EIS. One cultural resource site was identified, and effective mitigation measures have been agreed to by Sierra Pacific. Second, the Forest Service expressed concern about goshawk nesting in the area. A detailed field study was done to determine the relationship of the nest to the public transmission line. The results of the studies are Appendix C in the final EIS. Mitigation measures designed to protect the nesting site call for scheduling construction at appropriate times. The Forest Service has indicated this issue has been effectively address. A third comment, received from the Park Cattle Company, opposed Alternative B because it bisected Park property. It was also recommended that transmission lines be consolidated wherever possible. Sierra Pacific has agreed to double-circuit where possible. In summary, it is felt that Alternative C, considering all mitigation measures outlined in the document incorporated as part of the proposed project, is free of significant environmental impacts.

Mr. Thrans questioned the visual impacts of the transmission line in the area of the Douglas County park. Mr. Siegel explained that the line would run along the edge of the park, taking advantage of coniferous trees which will form a backdrop for the line in the area. Visual impacts will be minimized. Mr. Renz questioned the Douglas County Parks Department response on the proposal. There is a letter in the EIS from the Douglas County Public Works Director stating that Douglas County is not in favor of this particular route because of the visual impacts on the park; Alternative D is favored. Mr. Siegel explained that

the lines would be below the tree line. The trees are 60 feet in height, and the support structures for the line will be no higher than 47.5 feet.

Mr Siegel explained the changes made to Alternative C as a result of public comment. These pertain to consolidation of existing utility lines wherever possible and feasible. Mr. Hoefer spoke in favor of Alternative C but suggested there may be other opportunities for doubling up the lines. There is a distribution line along the north/south line through Section 23 running along the edge of a subdivision. Can doubling up occur here? Mr. Packard responded that there was discussion about consolidating the line with the 14 KV distribution line which runs literally in the backyards of residences located on the west side of Chimney Rock Road. There were residents who did not want to see the consolidation but preferred to see the new line placed 200 feet beyond and within the forest boundary. Mr. Siegel explained that consolidating the 120 KV line with the 14 KV line would require a wider right-of-way which would infringe onto backyards and could, in some instances, require homes to be moved. Moving the existing 14 KV line to the new transmission line route would mean that laterals would have to extend and connect to each residence.

Mr. Glab asked if the Community Plan for the area could be coordinated with the project. Mr. Renz responded that the Sierra Pacific Power project was way ahead of the Community Plan. Mr. Glab suggested it would be beneficial to combine the two. The power line might put restrictions on the Community Plan. Mr. Renz explained that the alignment would have no impact on the Community Plan area.

Mr. Frank Luchetti, with Sierra Pacific Power, explained that if approved the line will be constructed in 1988.

Mr. Hoefer asked that there be a commitment by Sierra Pacific Power to double up on the line in the area of the Chimney Rock residences. If not done as a part of this project, he would like this transition made in the future. He would like to see if the 200 foot right-of-way buffer could be narrowed down a bit through consolidation of the lines. The drop lines to individual residences are not much of an impact. Mr. Renz agreed that he would like to have the existing line moved to the proposed new alignment. Mr. Siegel explained there also is a telephone line in the alignment of the 14 KV line. He did not think the phone company would like to have its lines on the same structure as the transmission line because of the possibility of interference with the higher voltage. Relocating the 14 KV line will not eliminate the need to have poles behind the residences in this subdivision.

It was clarified that the cost for undergrounding the lines was actually five times more expensive, not seven, as earlier stated.

Mr. DeMello expressed concern with the visual impacts of additional overhead lines in future phases of the power master plan. Mr. Thrans asked if it would be possible to identify sensitive areas where undergrounding of lines could occasionally occur where there is a question of visual sensitivity, e.g., the park area. Mr. Siegel explained that there would still be a need for above-ground equipment; trees cannot grow above the underground lines. Mr. Renz asked that this be done along the park. He would like to see the line undergrounded along the road right-of-way to avoid removal of trees.

On the subject of the goshawk nesting sites, Mr. Hoefer concurred that Alternative C would likely have a minimum impact if the construction period is outside the nesting period. He did not see this recorded in the EIS as a mitigation proposal and would like to ensure its inclusion. The Forest Service's wildlife biologist has concerns about the cumulative effects. While the power line would have less impact than bicycle riders, joggers, and walkers, it would be an unfortunate loss if nesting birds chose not to return to these sites every year. Although he did not have any proposals for a contingency plan, there should be an awareness of what could be done should this occur.

Mr. John Berdrow, Sierra Pacific Power civil engineer, explained that undergrounding the wires from an overhead position requires a dip structure, a three-poled steel structure within a 50' x 50' fenced area. The fence is 10' in height to prevent people from getting near the wires. All areas above the buried 4" cable must be entirely cleared of vegetation. What would result would be two fenced areas (small substations) with a cleared swath between them. The maximum distance this wire can be pulled is 1,000'. Undergrounding for greater distances would require 10' x 10' buried concrete pole boxes with access. This would require more ground disturbance.

Addressing Mr. Hoefer's comments on the goshawk, Mr. Morgan explained that the EIS did cover the Forest Service's reservations. The EIS actually states it is questionable whether the Forest Service could issue a permit. Mr. Hoefer has added further concerns today about the possibility of adverse impacts on the goshawk. The Agency must make the V(g) finding relative to environmental thresholds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, there will be no violation of the thresholds. It is beginning to look like the evidence is weak in that respect. He was beginning to have reservations about recommending certification of the document unless this evidence could be strengthened relative to the goshawk issue.

Mr. Siegel explained that the threshold shows maintenance of 12 goshawk sites; this a 13th site, not originally identified in the threshold study. There is adjacent habitat for the goshawk; the goshawk moves its nest sometimes up to 1/2 mile from year to year. If the proposed route were to move even a quarter mile or less, it would be outside the area of protection afforded by the Forest Service. There are already quite a few disturbances (bicycle trails, etc.) in this area, and the birds have been seen in the residential areas. Activities associated with residential living do not appear to be much of a hindrance to the bird. They appear to be very tolerant, and there is area available for the bird to move into. If the threshold were to be affected, he would think that it would be affecting on one of the 12 identified sites. This is a 13th site. The measures that are to be taken are not to construct or do maintenance during nesting or brooding times. Work is going to be about as far away as possible from the nesting site without going into the residential areas. This 100 foot buffer can be reduced so that work is conducted even further away, but in doing so, there will be a visual impact on the home sites in the area. The Forest Service was asked to present additional measures that could be taken, and the only response was to put the line somewhere else.

Mr. Morgan asked what the likelihood would be of the Forest Service approving the project based on available information. Mr. Hoefer responded that he was not familiar with all the conversations on this one topic. He had discussed the topic briefly with his wildlife biologist. It has been confirmed that, while

the proposal would be issued a permit, it still doesn't lessen the concern for the potential impact. The mitigation during construction may take care of this concern. The birds are tolerant of people. They are not tolerant of people encroaching on their nests. When that happens on a regular basis, the birds' attention is focused on the intruder, and this means they have less time to forage and provide other protection for their offspring in the nest. If there is enough of that, the goshawks may leave the area entirely. He would think that the major impacts will result particularly from the bike trail; this is the area that needs to be focused on.

Mr. Petrovsky suggested that what was apparent in this discussion was a difference in professional judgment. EDAA's biologist believes that the people impacts have been severe and yet the bird remains and nests in this location each year. This project increment, as long as the nesting season is avoided, should not cause the bird to move.

MOTION by Mr. Harper to recommend that the EIS for Sierra Pacific Power's KV from the Round Hill to Stateline Substation be certified with the finding that the environment has been adequately disclosed and mitigation measures that are possible have been adequately disclosed. There is recognition that a particular project is not being approved at this time. Staff is requested to bring to the attention of the Governing Board at the time of the review of the project the possibility of combining both the distribution line and the major transmission line in Section 23 running behind the subdivision and, secondly, that the Board be requested to pay attention to mitigation measures for protection of the goshawk. Second by Mr. Renz.

Mr. Thrans asked if the concerns to be considered at the time of project review by the Board could include a consideration of the visual impacts by the park and the possibility of undergrounding the line in that area.

Mr. Harper and Mr. Renz agreed to include a request that the Board consider at the time of project review the visual impacts of the line at the park and the possibility of undergrounding the line in this area.

Mr. Morgan asked that it be noted that part of the evidence to support the motion is the testimony given by the representatives from Sierra Pacific and other comments made.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Ms. Huber, Mr. Renz, Ms. Jamin, Mr. DeMello, Mr. Hoefer,
Mr. Van Wagenen, Mr. Rosse, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Glab, Mr. Brooks,
Mr. Harper, Mr. Thrans, Mr. Combs, Ms. Becker

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Unsicker, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Bedard

Mr. Glab asked what the cost was to prepare the EIS for Sierra Pacific Power. Mr. Siegel responded that the consultant fees were \$58,000.

C. Discussion on Recommendation of Incline Village Postal Committee

Referencing the October 6 packet memo, Transportation Planner Leif Anderson

described actions in Incline Village which led to the recommendation by the Incline Village Postal Review Committee that a new, enlarged main post office be constructed to meet the needs for improved postal delivery service at Incline. TRPA staff has reviewed the recommendation in conjunction with documents which address this issue. The 1982 Air Quality Plan identified a system of substations to be built in the City of South Lake Tahoe or, as an alternative, to institute home delivery as a means of reducing vehicle trips. The Air Quality Plan, however, is geared toward the nonattainment area - primarily the South Shore. The Postal Service has prepared a 1983 Action Plan which includes a preferred alternative calling for construction of Neighborhood Delivery Centers (NDCs). Although this focuses primarily on the South Shore area, it does identify Incline Village as an area for NDCs without specifying the number of facilities or their location. The Goals and Policies call for a change in mail delivery modes and also set as a goal the initiation of neighborhood mail delivery. The draft Regional Transportation Plan also includes NDCs as a goal and sets as a policy the implementation of the Postal Service's Action Plan. If NDCs are shown not to be successful, the Postal Service is to report to TRPA and is encouraged to implement home delivery within defined areas of the Basin. The staff analysis at this point would indicate that construction of a new postal facility at Incline Village is not consistent with adopted Goals and Policies. Staff has not yet had an opportunity to do an indepth analysis to determine what changes in Vehicle Miles Traveled or traffic congestion would occur through construction of a new postal facility in Incline. Staff feels that APC input should be given before this type of analysis commences.

Mr. Keith Skytta, on behalf of the Incline Village Postal Committee, questioned why NDCs were being recommended for the Incline area and whether they would actually cause a reduction in VMTs. Eighty percent of Incline's residents drive to one central location for basic needs two to three times a week. Unlike the South Shore area, there is only one major center for shopping in the Incline area. The problem with the existing facility is inadequate parking and the fact that there are about 2,000 trips going past an elementary school to get to the post office. The Incline area needs a new postal service facility. In a recent survey, 75% of those responding indicated they would continue to use the post office for their mail. These people do not want rural delivery, NDCs or cluster boxes.

Mr. Morgan suggested that if the Postal Service wished to pursue the new postal facility a project application would have to be submitted. This would be evaluated and a determination made on what environmental documents would be necessary. Using the Agency's standards, the alternatives would have to be evaluated. It would be preferable if this matter did not come before the Agency until the Community Planning process was well underway; a postal facility of the kind being recommended is a key feature of a Community Plan; it causes development to occur or not to occur, and it tends to establish unique traffic patterns. The Community Plan is the ideal context in which to consider a main postal facility. The choice of how to deal with this is going to depend in large part on how the Postal Service wishes to proceed.

Mr. Fred Blauth, a member of the Postal Review Committee, explained that the post office defines home delivery as anything other than going to the post office and picking up mail. Home delivery could be an NDC, a rural box or cluster boxes. The concern with having cluster boxes is that in 20 years there will have to be over 1,000 to 2,000 locations spread throughout Incline. Each

cluster must have a 20' x 30' pullout because the County will not allow cars to be parked on the road in the winter time. The post office will not plow these areas.

Mr. Hoefler suggested that getting people to modify their patterns for picking up mail is difficult to accomplish. People who have been seriously inconvenienced at the main post offices have taken boxes at NDCs. Others are content to continue with the way they have been picking up mail all along. There needs to be traffic reduction with whatever method is chosen. If an alternative other than NDCs is chosen for Incline, he would like to know what will be done to take care of the traffic and the required reductions. This is something the Postal Committee should address.

Mr. Morgan explained that in his discussions with Postmaster Jack Wilkins he had learned that the Postal Service has money nationwide for these sorts of projects. A budget proposal and a two-year wait is not necessary. If the Postal Service were to receive the green light to move ahead with a new facility, it could move ahead with project development.

Mr. Harper suggested that one of the Committee's concerns appeared to be that the NDCs were the only alternative being evaluated. In his opinion, these NDCs were always oriented to South Lake Tahoe because of its nonattainment status. Second, South Lake Tahoe's topography is different from Incline Village's. Third, there is a desire to have NDCs evaluated before they are automatically installed in Incline. It should be determined whether a new, larger postal center located in a more convenient area would, in fact, alleviate the problems. The traffic patterns south of Highway 28 are not nearly as well laid out as those above Highway 28. Incline is changing from a second home area to a permanent home area; it has a central core. He would like the APC to urge the Postal Service not start selecting and building NDCs without examining all other alternatives. A site(s) needs to be identified.

Mr. Brooks, a member of the advisory board for Incline Village/Crystal Bay, explained that when this subject was discussed in Incline the feeling was that the post office was presenting this; it was not a part of the plan. The post office got all the heat initially. The feeling on the advisory board was that the community definitely did not want NDCs.

Mr. Newhall, a member of the Postal Review Committee, explained that historically the Postal Service runs a considerable period of time behind the demand for services. Even the post office recognizes that there is a problem that needed to be addressed. When the NDCs were proposed, the community objected strongly and formed the Postal Review Committee to give input to the Postal Service.

Mr. Morgan advised that staff would contact the Postal Service to determine how to proceed from this point. Staff will discuss the Postal Service's future intentions and will work with the Service in laying out the issues that need to be addressed. From this, a good issue paper will be put together for discussion with the Postal Service.

B. Discussion and Action on the Recreation Committee Findings

Senior Planner Jean Shaffer summarized the issues and recommendations of the APC's Recreation Subcommittee as set forth in the 9/24/87 packet material. In January the APC asked the committee to study the issue of recreation and how the capacity for recreation was being allocated around the Basin. The committee has been meeting regularly since January and in June presented an update with a request from input to the APC. APC action on the unanimously approved recommendations is requested today.

Discussion followed on the concept of PAOTs and their use as a planning tool, reserving sewer plant capacity for expanded recreational facilities in the future, visitor information centers, and how the PAOTs were allocated to the various recreation uses.

Mr. Pyle asked that visitor information centers, which require PAOTs, be better defined. There should not be double counting of PAOTs when several uses (day use and visitor information center, as an example) exist on one recreational site. Mr. Thrans suggested that the terms "visitor information center" might be reevaluated. A key point is whether the use is growth inducing or is actually mitigating impacts.

Ms. Marjorie Springmeyer, from the audience, asked what the Forest Service's plans were for the Rabe Meadow adjacent to Nevada Beach. Is this area available for public use and enjoyment? Also she was interested in what provision had been made for a cemetery in the Nevada portion of the Basin. Mr. Hoefler responded that the Forest Service had no plans for development of the Rabe Meadow; it is available to the public for dispersed types of recreation. The Forest Service does anticipate the eventual expansion of the Nevada Beach campground adjacent to the existing campground. Becker suggested that Ms. Springmeyer contact TRPA and Forest Service staffs for additional information on these topics.

The meeting recessed for a lunch break from 12:10 to 1:15 p.m. Members present after lunch: Huber, Harper, Renz, Becker, DeMello, Rosse, Thrans, Glab, Hoefler, Pyle, Hansen (present at 1:35 p.m.), Mr. Combs (present at 1:40 p.m.), Jamin (present at 1:45 p.m.), Mr. Van Wagenen (present at 2:12 p.m.)

Discussion resumed on the findings and recommendations of the Recreation Committee. Ms. Shaffer pointed out that visitor information centers were defined in Chapter 18 of the Code. There is not a shortage of PAOTs for day use areas so there would not be a problem with assigning PAOTs to visitor information centers. In the master planning process, sites with numerous uses will have those uses defined so that there will not be double assignment of PAOTs to single sites. Mr. Harper asked that it be clear that the total number of PAOTs would be assigned on a master plan basis and not assessed to individual uses within the master plan.

Mr. Pyle suggested that PAOTs should be assigned if a use is growth inducing. He liked staff's idea of having background information available so that reconstructing the process of assigning PAOTs and the whole recreation issue will be possible in the future. Mr. Morgan agreed and suggested it would be important for the Project Review staff to know how many PAOTs are involved in a

given facility. The interpretation to be applied is that the total complex be looked at as a whole unit. Recreation planners and designers will be expected to know how the PAOTs have been distributed and computed. He would like, as an addendum, to have staff make it clear how PAOTs are computed when there is a question of a combination of uses. The entire complex is to be viewed.

Discussion followed on PAOTs in connection with privately owned and publicly owned recreation uses, whether they serve the tourist or the local residents. Mr. Hoefer explained that if the land in question is federal or state park land and a use was being proposed for the broad, general public, PAOTs would be required. If the proposed use was to be urban recreation, it would not be subject to PAOTs. Ms. Scholley suggested that item 5 under PAOT Limitations (Developed Outdoor Recreation Uses) be amended to read, "Beach recreation, outdoor recreation concessions, golf courses, and rural sports not operated as by urban recreation providers require summer day use PAOTs."

Mr. Glab suggested that the PAOTs should be looked at as a planning tool. In the hands of bureaucrats, they could too easily become a restriction and be misused.

Mr. Morgan asked that the APC take action on the committee's recommendation. Should the APC vote to approve the recommendation, staff would commence looking into modifying or adding to the Plan in such a manner as to make the recommendations a part of the plan and Plan Area Statements. These amendments would come back to the APC.

Mr. Tom Martens, Executive Director with the League to Save Lake Tahoe, questioned the shift in item III. (Overall Recreation Recommendations) from a recommendation that 11% of the recreational capacity may be developed in the five to ten years of the plan to a recommendation that 25% of the reserved capacity be developed within five years. What is the impact of this on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? How will this be implemented and tracked? There needs to be an implementation section somewhere. In this same item, there is a suggestion that "locally operated recreational facilities acquired via the California Tahoe Conservancy should also be classified urban recreation." What does locally operated mean? Why are the California Tahoe Conservancy's projects all classified as urban? What happens to new public agencies that come along, particularly those that are quasi-private? How would they be treated? What resource is being allocated for new quasi-public agencies that come along? On the subject of dispersed recreation, why are certain classes of projects not subject to PAOT allocations? The function of PAOTs is to put a ceiling on growth-inducing projects and to be able to analyze when that level is reached. In dispersed recreation, where certain classes of projects are growth inducing, there is no analysis. As an example, the Forest Service is proposing an offroad vehicle trail that runs along Pioneer Trail to High Meadows. The impact of this will be that the trail will go on a publicly circulated and advertised map. It will be growth inducing. There is no PAOT review of this proposal and yet the impacts of environmental damage are great enough to warrant an analysis. Also eliminating staging areas (parking lots and places to access the trail) is also missing. Why are dispersed trails, particularly for offroad vehicle use, lumped together without a separation of uses? Finally, in doling out the PAOTs, why isn't there incentive to encourage people to meet other threshold goals?