

**TRPA
GOVERNING BOARD
PACKETS**

**MARCH
1989**

March 1989
GB

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
NOTICE OF MEETINGS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on March 22, 1989, commencing at 9:30 a.m., and on March 23, 1989 commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada, the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting. The official agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on March 22, 1989, at 8:30 a.m., in the same location, the Finance Committee of said agency will meet to discuss receipt of the February financial statement, acceptance of the FY 88/89 audit report, the status of FY 89-91 budget requests to California and Nevada, Placer County's request for CTRPA Indirect Source Review funds (\$4,500) for support of Regional/Urban Design Assessment Team (R/UDAT), and amendment of the TRPA/Caltrans overall work program for FY 1988-89.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on March 22, 1989, at 9:00 a.m. in the same location, the Legal Committee will meet to discuss the redevelopment agreement (Agreement in Lieu of Litigation) regarding South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan for Project Area No. 1.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on March 22, 1989, during the lunch recess, the Rules Committee will meet to discuss the revision of the Agency's Rules of Procedure relating to environmental documentation (Article VI) and related amendments to Article V (Project Review) of the Rules.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on March 22, 1989, during the lunch recess, the Retirement Committee will meet to discuss return of retirement funds to former employees (James Brennan and Linda Hunn).

Date: March 15, 1989

By: W.A. Morgan

William A. Morgan
Executive Director

NOTE: Items on the agenda without a time designation may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BODY

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

March 22, 1989 9:30 a.m.
March 23, 1989 8:30 a.m.

OFFICIAL AGENDA

- I PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- II ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- III APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- IV APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- V CONSENT CALENDAR (see page 4)
- VI PROJECT REVIEW
 - A. Douglas County Library Addition, Special Use Determination, APN 05-060-08
 - B. Kingsbury General Improvement District, Lake Pump Station Relocation and New Lake Intake, Douglas County APN 07-090-05
 - C. May, New Residential Pier, 8209 Meeks Bay Avenue, El Dorado County APN 16-051-35
- VII PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS
 - A. Redevelopment Plan for the City of South Lake Tahoe -
March 22, 10:00 a.m.
 - 1. Approval of an Amendment of the Regional Plan Capability Overlay Map for Plan Area 091 (Ski Run) of the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan
 - 2. Certification of Final EIS on the Redevelopment Plan
 - 3. Adoption of the Redevelopment Plan and Related Amendments of the Regional Plan Overlay Maps (PASS 085, 089B, 091, 092 and 093)
 - 4. Approval of Redevelopment Agreement for Project Area No. 1
 - B. Amendments to Exempt Minor Utility Projects From Excess Land Coverage Mitigation Requirements and From Best Management Practices Retrofit Requirements
 - 1. Amendment of Policy 3 of Goal #1, Water Quality Subelement, Land Use Element of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies

- 2. Amendment of Chapters 20 (Land Coverage Standards) and 25 (Best Management Practices Requirements)
- C. Amendment of Chapter 36 (Interim Single Family Review System) to Provide Further Extension of Interim Single Family Review Procedures Pending Approval of Amended 208 Plan and Related Amendment to Chapter 33
- D. Amendment of Articles VI and V (Environmental Impact Statements and Project Review) of the Rules of Procedure
- E. Amendment of Chapters 20 (Land Coverage Standards), 56 (Mitigation Fee Requirements), 82 (Water Quality Mitigation), and 93 (Traffic and Air Quality Mitigation Program) Relative to Refund of Mitigation Fees - to be continued to the April meeting
- F. Unmet Transit Needs in the Unincorporated Portion of El Dorado County - to be continued to the April meeting

VIII PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Partial Issuance of 1989 Allocations in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County Within South Tahoe Public Utility District
- B. Discussion on Draft EIS/EIR for the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project No. 1 - this will follow agenda item VII A.
- C. Status Report on Highway 50 Corridor Study and Freeway Route Rescission Analysis

IX APPEAL

- A. Margo Murray-Hicks, Appeal of Staff Denial of Return of Mitigation Fees, Lot #75, Tyrolia Unit 7, Washoe County APN 126-082-26 - to be continued to the May meeting

X SHOW CAUSE HEARING

- A. Stephen Wassner, Violations of TRPA Code of Ordinances, Logan Creek Drive, Douglas County, TRPA File #560-100-89/1

XI ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Assignment of Board Members to Finance, Retirement and Legislation Committees

XII REPORTS

- A. Finance Committee Report and Board Action on Recommendations
 - 1. Receipt of the February Financial Statement
 - 2. Acceptance of the FY 88-89 Audit Report

3. Status Report on FY 89-91 Budget Requests to California and Nevada
- B. Retirement Committee Report
 - C. Legal Committee Report Regarding the Redevelopment Agreement (Agreement in Lieu of Litigation) Regarding South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan for Project Area No. 1
 - D. Rules Committee Report Regarding Amendment of Articles V and VI (Project Review and Environmental Impact Statements) of the Rules of Procedure
 - E. Executive Director
 1. Status Report on Projects Reviewed at Staff Level and on Emergency Permits Issued by Executive Director
 2. Status Report and Board Action, If Necessary, on Code Interpretations Made by Executive Director
 3. Discussion With Governing Board on Results of 1988 Public Opinion Survey
 4. Notice of Circulation, Draft EIS, South Tahoe Public Utility District, .2 MGD Plant Expansion
 5. Other
 - F. Agency Counsel
 - G. Governing Board Members

XIII RESOLUTIONS

- A. For Former Board Member Bob Pruett
- B. Other

XIV PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

XV ADJOURNMENT

CONSENT CALENDAR

<u>Item</u>	<u>Recommended Action</u>
1. Town and Country Market, Change in Operation, El Dorado County APN 31-290-28	Approval with findings and conditions
2. Resolution Supporting TRPA's Application to the California State Historic Preservation Office for Funding of Historic Study (\$9,760)	Adoption
3. Placer County, Request for CTRPA Indirect Source Review Funds (\$4,500) for Support of Regional/Urban Design Assessment Team (R/UDAT)	Approval
4. Amendment of TRPA/Caltrans Overall Work Program for FY 88-89	Approval
Successful Land Capability Challenges:	Approval
5. Kaufman, 8599 North Lane, El Dorado County APN 16-142-07	
6. Shelton, Highlands No. 2, Placer County APN 93-180-01	

These consent calendar items are expected to be routine and noncontroversial. They will be acted upon by the Governing Board at one time without discussion. If any Governing Board member or noticed affected property owner requests that an item be removed from the consent calendar, it will be taken up separately under the appropriate agenda category.

Four of the members of the governing body from each State constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the agency. The voting procedure shall be as follows:

(1) For adopting, amending or repealing environmental threshold carrying capacities, the regional plan, and ordinances, rules and regulations, and for granting variances from the ordinances, rules and regulations, the vote of at least four of the members of each State agreeing with the vote of at least four members of the other State shall be required to take action. If there is no vote of at least four of the members from one State agreeing with the vote of at least four of the members of the other State on the actions specified in this paragraph, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

(2) For approving a project, the affirmative vote of at least five members from the State in which the project is located and the affirmative vote of at least nine members of the governing body are required. If at least five members of the governing body from the State in which the project is located and at least nine members of the entire governing body do not vote in favor of the project, upon a motion for approval, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken. A decision by the agency to approve a project shall be supported by a statement of findings, adopted by the agency, which indicates that the project complies with the regional plan and with applicable ordinances, rules and regulations of the agency.

(3) For routine business and for directing the agency's staff on litigation and enforcement actions, at least eight members of the governing body must agree to take action. If at least eight votes in favor of such action are not cast, an action of rejection shall be deemed to have been taken.

- Article III(g) Public Law 96-551

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

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

February 22, 1989

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Roland Westergard called the regular February 22, 1989 meeting of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) to order at 9:30 a.m. and asked Board member John Cefalu to lead in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

It was noted that Alice Becker was sitting in for Nevada Secretary of State Frankie Sue Del Papa that Tom Perkins was sitting in as the Governor of Nevada appointee in Charles Deaner's absence; that Bruce Kanoff was the new Douglas County representative, replacing Bob Pruet; that Cindy Gustafson was sitting in as Placer County's representative in Mr. Fluty's absence; and that Ms. Cornwall, Ms. Bennett, and Mr. Gibbs were absent due to illnesses.

II ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Mr. Cefalu, Mr. Kanoff, Ms. Becker, Ms. Gustafson,
Mr. Chimarusti, Mr. Klein, Mr. Cronk, Mr. Houghteling,
Mr. Reed (present after approval of the minutes),
Mr. Perkins, Mr. Westergard, Mr. Hime (present at 1:45
p.m.),
Members Absent: Ms. Bennett, Ms. Cornwall, Mr. Gibbs

III APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Mr. Cefalu to approve the regular January 25, 1989 minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

(It was noted later in the meeting that Executive Director Bill Morgan was on vacation and not at the meeting.)

IV APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was noted that, as set forth on the agenda, both the Metas appeal (item VII A.) and the partial issuance of 1989 allocations in South Lake Tahoe and El Dorado County (item IX A.) were to be continued. The Metas matter was to be brought back at such time as the appellants requested a Board determination. The certification of the EIS for the Sierra Pacific Power 120 kV transmission line (item IX B.) was to be acted on by the Board ahead of the project itself (item VI B.). The unmet transit needs hearing for the unincorporated portion of El Dorado County (item VII A.) and the County's request for Local Transportation Funds for a summer beach bus, a TART connection, and road maintenance projects (item XI A. 3.) were to be continued at the request of the County.

MOTION by Mr. Klein to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

V CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Houghteling questioned whether the violations in the Marelich Construction Company and Mein Trust enforcement matters would enhance the value of the properties to a greater degree than the penalty being imposed. Should this be the case, he felt it was an invitation to violate the Code.

Assistant Executive Director Gary Midkiff explained that there was a potential for this in the Mein Trust matter, where cutting of the trees did enhance the view.

Mr. Houghteling asked that at a future time the staff and Board review the penalty grid to eliminate this possibility.

With regard to the Khashoggi pier relocation and expansion, Mr. Houghteling commented on his previous disagreement with the Executive Director's interpretation (No. 88-4) of the Code on which this particular staff recommendation was based. A new pier was not permitted in a fish habitat area; although, according to the interpretation, a modification or extension of an existing pier could be approved in these areas. He felt there was an inconsistency between the Code and the interpretation. The interpretation did not state that in the approval there be a finding that the extension or modification of the pier would not impact the fish habitat. This was a finding made by staff in its report, however. He would feel more comfortable if this were added to the interpretation as a required finding for approving extensions.

Mr. Midkiff explained that in cases where there was an existing single family pier, even if it was in an area of fish habitat, a modification which would not substantially modify the existing situation in terms of disturbance could be approved. In each case, staff conducted a field review of the request to determine the impacts that could occur. In this case, it was determined that, because most of the cobbles that would have been on the lake's bottom were no longer present and because the bottom was sandy, the extension of the pier would not have a negative impact.

Agency Legal Counsel Susan Scholley explained that the finding that the existing structure would not degrade the fish habitat was found on the Compact Article V(g) checklist. Staff had in the past turned down pier extensions in situations where it was felt that the extension would impact fish habitat. Every situation was looked at individually.

Mr. Houghteling explained he would vote against this consent calendar item and wished it voted on separately from the remainder of the consent calendar. He would like to return to this subject again in the future because of continuing disagreements between the TRPA staff, the California State Lands Commission, and the California Attorney General.

Mr. Westergard pointed out that the Nevada Division of State Lands had not received an application for the pier extension from the Khashoggis. The State would not be bound by TRPA's action.

No one in the audience wished to comment on any of the consent calendar items.

TRPA REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FEBRUARY 22, 1989

Mr. Midkiff explained that pier applications were required to have all necessary approvals before TRPA's permits became operative.

MOTION by Mr. Klein to approve consent calendar items 1, 2, and 3. The motion carried unanimously. (Marellich Construction Company, resolution of enforcement matter at APN 125-141-27; Mein Trust, resolution of enforcement matter at APN 83-162-31; and Dale new residential pier at 731 Lakeview Avenue, APN 26-021-09)

MOTION by Mr. Reed to approve consent calendar item 4 (Khashoggi pier relocation and expansion at APN 03-050-01). The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Cefalu, Mr. Kanoff, Mr. Klein, Ms. Becker, Ms. Gustafson,
Mr. Cronk, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Reed, Mr. Chimarusti, Mr. Westergard
Nays: Mr. Houghteling
Abstain: None
Absent: Ms. Cornwall, Ms. Bennett, Mr. Gibbs

VI PROJECT REVIEW

- A. Regan Beach West, Rehabilitation and Erosion Control, Special Use Determination, Shoreline Protective Structure, City of South Lake Tahoe, APN 26-022-16 and -17, El Dorado County

Senior Planner Jerry Budy presented the staff summary of the City's request to stabilize 100 feet of shoreline with a new rock revetment and a wood retaining wall. The City would be required in implementation of the project to protect the Rorippa subumbellata habitat.

No one in the audience wished to comment on the project.

MOTION by Mr. Reed, based on the staff summary, for a finding of no significant environmental effect for the Regan Beach West rehabilitation and erosion control project. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Klein, based on the staff summary, to approve the Regan Beach project with conditions as set forth. The motion carried unanimously.

(See page 7 of these minutes for additional action on this item.)

IX PLANNING MATTERS

- B. Certification of the Final EIS - Sierra Pacific Power Company Roundhill Substation to Stateline Substation 120 kV Transmission Line

Senior Planner Rick Angelocci presented the staff summary, explaining that, when the EIS previously came to the Board in January, 1988, the Board directed that an additional alternative (Alternative E) be evaluated in response to concerns expressed by residents in the area regarding the proximity of the power line to their homes. The new Alternative E was proposed to start at Kingsbury Meadow and, rather than circumventing the forest and the meadow, would cross the lower portion of Kingsbury Meadow, would parallel Echo Drive and end at the Roundhill substation. A new draft and final Supplemental EIS for Alternative E were prepared and circulated, and the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) at its February meeting voted unanimously in favor of the document's technical

TRPA REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FEBRUARY 22, 1989

adequacy (the draft and final EIS and the draft and final supplemental EIS). The APC also endorsed the routing of Alternative C from the Stateline substation to Kingsbury Meadow and the new Alternative E from Kingsbury Meadow to the Roundhill substation. Staff was recommending certification of the document because it complied procedurally and substantively with Article VII of the Compact, Chapter 5 of the Code, and the Agency's Rules of Procedures.

Mr. Tom Packard, a landscape architect with the consulting firm of ED&A, Inc., hired by Sierra Pacific Power to prepare the environmental documents, provided the Board with a review of the South Tahoe electric supply system, described the project and its purpose and need, reviewed the alternatives studied a year ago, provided a summary of the study of Alternative E, compared Alternative E with the northern portion of Alternative C, and reviewed the comments received on the draft supplemental EIS. Using a diagram, Mr. Packard explained that two primary 120 kV lines brought power in from Nevada to the South Shore area ending at Meyers and at Roundhill. A smaller voltage line brought power into the Stateline substation and connected to the Meyers station. There was no existing connection between Roundhill and Stateline. In February of 1985, an avalanche knocked out several towers, disrupting service and causing a 13-day power outage in the South Tahoe area. At the same time, there was sufficient power at the Roundhill station but no means of transmitting it from Roundhill to Stateline. The project under consideration would provide that connection. Additional information was presented, and Mr. Packard responded to Board member questions. It was pointed out that the EIS was to be amended to state that the centerline location of Alternative C from residences in one area was 50 to 75 feet, not 200 feet from all residential areas, as stated in the draft EIS.

Mr. Steve Siegal, environmental specialist for Sierra Pacific Power, explained that Alternative E was less expensive to construct than C because of the overall length. This advantage had decreased, however, because of the expense to analyze an additional alternative and because of rising building costs. Overall there would be a cost savings, however.

Mr. Frank Luchetti, the supervisor of the Sierra Pacific Power's Environmental Affairs Department, distributed and explained a handout showing the electric and magnetic field modeling profile for the proposed line. Since 1970 there had been 18 epidemiological studies conducted on the effects of power lines on adults and children; 11 of those had found no health effect association. Seven claimed to have an association; two of the seven claimed to have consistent data to support that position. Research in this area was continuing. The projected model for the worst case scenario showed the electric field within the line's right-of-way to be 13 times less than the most restrictive current standard.

Mr. Tim Reynolds, a resident in the area, questioned the results of studies which had not yet determined what the health impacts were from power lines. It had not been proven scientifically that there were or were not effects.

Mrs. Patricia Close, a resident of Cypress Way, explained she now overlooked four power poles from her home. Because of her health, she could in the future be required to have a pace maker. Would the power lines cause a problem?

Mr. Luchetti responded that the values which had been modeled were, in fact, very low. Interference with a pace maker would not be expected.

MOTION by Mr. Cefalu to certify the final EIR/EIS for the proposed Roundhill to Stateline transmission line proposed by Sierra Pacific Power, finding that it was in compliance procedurally and substantively with Article VII of the Compact, Chapter 5 of the Code, and the Agency Rules of Procedure. The motion carried unanimously.

(Mr. Hime came into the meeting during discussion on the following item.)

VI PROJECT REVIEW

B. Sierra Pacific Power Company, Roundhill Substation to Stateline
Substation 120 kV Transmission Line

Chairman Westergard suggested that, because of the previous presentation by the consultant, the Board was familiar with the project description.

Mr. Angelocci again explained that the line was proposed to include Alternative C from Stateline substation to Kingsbury Meadow and Alternative E from Kingsbury Meadow to the Roundhill substation. The staff's report included a review of the project relative to the Code and other Agency documents and included all of the mitigation measures and conditions of approval. Photo simulations were displayed showing the crossing of the line at Kingsbury Grade. Mitigation would be required to offset any degradation of the scenic views in the Kingsbury area. Mr. Angelocci recommended the following changes to the conditions: 1) condition #7 be modified to read, in part, "The project shall be ~~designated~~ designed to avoid...; 2) condition #26 regarding right-of-way easements be deleted because it related to purchase of easements at fair market value; 3) condition #29 be amended to provide for insulators to be an appropriate brown neutral color..." Mr. Angelocci noted that copies of the two letters in opposition to the project had been distributed to the Board members. These were a joint letter from Mr. and Mrs. Fisher and Mr. and Mrs. Walton and a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Close.

Mr. Chimarusti asked whether, in the event the line was approved, there would be a need to upgrade the existing line from Stateline to Meyers.

Mr. Gene Henneberg, supervisor of General System Planning for Sierra Pacific Power, explained that a master plan was done for the Basin ten years ago. The potential upgrade between Stateline and Meyers was discussed, but it was an entirely separate project and had no bearing on the project before the Board today. A break in the line between Stateline and Meyers could be handled with equipment now in existence at the Stateline office.

Mr. Packard, from EDAW, responded to portions of the Fisher/Walton letter. With regard to the concern that the line would be visible from the Lake Village townhouse, the intent was that there be a tree screen between the roadway and the line. The poles would not exceed the height of the existing tree stand. When detailed pole locations were determined, attempts would be made to utilize screening to the extent possible. It would be fair to say that Alternative E from Lake Village would not be evident to the casual observer. Should a person in the area specifically try to look for the project and to identify it in and amongst the trees, some evidence of the project could probably be detected.

Mr. Henneberg, from Sierra Pacific Power, responded to concerns 2 and 4 in the Close letter regarding power line noise level and the potential for reception

TRPA REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FEBRUARY 22, 1989

interference for radio, television and other home electronic receiver equipment. Initial construction would insure proper installation practices; there also was instrumentation readily available to detect and narrow any problems for maintenance purposes.

Mr. Siegal addressed items 6 and 7 of the Close letter and agreed that the preferred route for the power line would not be the least disruptive alternative for residential impacts. Alternative D was the least disruptive. Residential impacts were not the only criteria used in selection of the routes. With regard to the concern that construction would have a significant disruptive impact on bordering residents, the disruption would be for a very short term. Construction of the power line would take two to three months, and work would take place during normal working hours. All equipment would be in proper operating order to keep noise down. Mr. Siegal also addressed the reasons why Alternate B was not selected for the line north and south of Kingsbury Grade.

Mr. Packard addressed items 1, 5, and 8 of the Close letter relating to visual impacts, the length of the route, and the concern that Alternative C was not the least environmentally sensitive route.

Mr. Tom Martens, Executive Director for the League to Save Lake Tahoe, advised the League was not opposed to the project because its necessity was understood. There was a concern, however, why mitigation for the scenic resources section was left unaddressed and put over to a plan to be developed in six months but not implemented for five years.

Referencing the displayed photo simulations of the line crossing Kingsbury Grade, Mr. Angelocci explained that, while the line would not lower the scenic rating of the area, staff felt there would be some degradation. The condition was phrased to provide for an additional visual analysis to identify what mitigating projects could occur to offset the impacts of the line.

Mr. Robert Plimpton, from the audience, spoke in favor of Alternative E.

Mr. Gordon DePaoli, representing Park Cattle Company, explained that the Park Cattle Company would be affected wherever the line went. The need for the project was understood, and the initial suggestion was that it go underground. Because of the costs involved, the project would not likely proceed if this were a requirement. Sierra Pacific Power in its presentation had answered his questions concerning why Alternative B was not selected. Park Cattle Company was opposed to B because it would bifurcate their property in an area where no power line existed at this time. Alternative C allowed for the consolidation of existing power lines. Impacts along the boundary of the Park property had been adequately addressed. It appeared that the power line would expose people to no more risk than they now received from common, ordinary household appliances. In terms of the upcoming Douglas County Preliminary Community Plan process, Alternative C left the maximum flexibility for that process. The Park Cattle Company supported the new alternative and opposed Alternative B.

Mr. Chuck Neff, president of the Lake Village Association (327 units), explained that his Association had mixed feelings about the line and felt enough consideration had not been given to undergrounding the project. All of the utilities in Lake Village now were underground. Should the project be a necessary one, the issue of cost was diminished. He would prefer to see the

TRPA REGULAR MEETING MINUTES FEBRUARY 22, 1989

project placed underground or an alternative considered that would get the line away from the subdivision and the nearby school.

Mr. John Berdrow, civil engineer for Sierra Pacific Power, explained that the cost of undergrounding was 5.2 times the cost of overhead construction. The Company had not used much undergrounding for its lines because of cost. Undergrounding would require trenching for the entire length of the line, causing considerable environmental impacts. All trees and brush would have to be removed in the path of the line. A 50'x50' fenced area would be required at each end of the line. The cost per mile above ground was \$320,000. Undergrounding would cost \$1.625 million per mile. He did not feel there were sufficient funds to complete the project should it be required to go underground.

Ms. Scholley advised the Board that the project was located in both California and Nevada; five votes from each state would be needed for approval.

MOTION by Mr. Klein, with regard to the Sierra Pacific Power 120 kV transmission line from Roundhill to the Stateline substations, to make the findings outlined in the staff material. The motion carried unanimously. (Members present: Kanoff, Klein, Becker, Gustafson, Cronk, Houghteling, Perkins, Reed, Chimarusti, Cefalu, Westergard)

MOTION by Mr. Cefalu to approve the Sierra Pacific Power project based on the staff summary and subject to the conditions in the packet material, as amended by staff. The motion carried unanimously.

VI PROJECT REVIEW (continued)

- A. Regan Beach West, Rehabilitation and Erosion Control, Special Use Determination, Shoreline Protective Structure City of South Lake Tahoe APN 26-022-16 and -17, El Dorado County

(See page 3 of these minutes for earlier discussion and action on this item.)

Ms. Scholley advised that staff had inadvertently omitted from the staff summary the Chapter 51, Section 51.1.B special use findings. (Copies of the findings and the rationale upon which they were based were distributed.) Because of the procedural irregularity, Ms. Scholley asked that the Board make the two motions over again.

MOTION by Mr. Klein to make the findings, as amended, for the Regan Beach West project. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Klein, based on the amended findings, to approve the Regan Beach project with conditions. The motion carried unanimously.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

- C. Status Report on Redevelopment Plan for the City of South Lake Tahoe, Related Amendments of the Regional Plan Overlay Maps (PASS 089B, 091, and 092 and 093), the Redevelopment Agreement (Agreement in Lieu of Litigation) and the EIR/EIS

Assistant Executive Director Gary Midkiff explained that the plan was continuing