

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**SEPTEMBER
1994**

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

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 Wednesday, September 14, 1994, at the Glenbrook Room of the Horizon Casino Resort, Stateline, Nevada. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

September 2, 1994

By. 
Jerry Wells
Deputy Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Tahoe Valley and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office, and the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Glenbrook Room, Horizon Casino Resort
Stateline, Nevada

September 14, 1994
9:30 a.m.

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS (No Action)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on an agenda item not listed as a Public Hearing or a Planning Matter item, or on any other issue, may do so at this time. However, public comment on Public Hearing items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

- A. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, MOU *1-8*
Between TRPA and Placer County to Implement Sign Ordinance
- B. Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary Between Plan Area 013, *9-21*
Watson Creek (Conservation) and Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat
(Residential), to Add APN 092-010-18 to Plan Area 014
- C. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 115, Golden Bear (Residential), *22-33*
to Add Multiple Family Dwellings as a Permissible Use, and to Add
El Dorado County APNs 080-010-15 and 080-030-01 to Plan Area 115
- D. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 168, Talmont, and Plan Area *34-37*
Statement 166, Upper Ward Valley, Boundaries to Include Remainder
of Talmont Estates Parcels (APNs 83-460-22 Through -27) Within
Plan Area Statement 168
- E. Application by Tahoe Redevelopment Agency, Park Avenue Development *38-*
Project, Amendment of the Regional Plan Land Capability Overlay
Map Pursuant to Man-Modified Determination, El Dorado County APNs
29-440-04, 29-400-14, 29-200-12, 29-200-22, 29-200-23

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Discussion on Recreation Threshold Program Management 39-42
- B. Review of Tentative Scope of Work for Preparation of an EIR/EIS for Park Avenue Redevelopment Project EIR/EIS 43-109

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Role of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC), Recommendations to the Rules Committee of the Governing Board Regarding Project Review, Testimony, and Role of Official APC Members 110-112

VIII. REPORTS

- A. Executive Director
- B. Legal Counsel
- C. APC Members

IX. ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

308 Dorla Court
Elks Point, Nevada

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

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities, MOU between TRPA and Placer County to Implement Sign Ordinance

Proposed Action: Placer County and TRPA staff propose to amend Chapter 4 to adopt a MOU delegating sign review in the Tahoe City Community Plan to Placer County. APC is requested to make a recommendation to the Governing Board on the proposal. Copies of the proposed adopting ordinance and MOU are attached (Attachment A).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the adopting ordinance and MOU (Attachment A).

Background: Pursuant to Section 4.4 and 26.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, TRPA and Placer County may adopt substitute sign standards for the Tahoe City Community Plan area. The recently adopted substitute sign standards are contained in Chapter 18, Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines, of the Tahoe City Community Plan (Appendix B).

The APC recommended approval of these standards in February of 1994 and the Governing Board adopted them in February of 1994. These standards are now in effect. The approval of the MOU will permit Placer County to take its first step in assuming delegated permitting authority under the new sign standards.

It is the intent of TRPA and Placer County staffs to adopt the Tahoe City CP sign regulations for the other Placer community plans and for the Lake Tahoe portion of Placer County in the future.

Findings: The following findings are required for the Governing Board to approve the MOU amendment.

Chapter 6 Findings

Section 6.5 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances requires the following four findings be made prior to Code amendments:

GWB:rd

AGENDA ITEM V.A.

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land

- A. The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs;

Section 26.5 of the Code allows for the development and implementation of MOUs to exempt signs not otherwise considered exempt or qualified exempt under Chapter 4. The activities permitted in the proposed MOU have been evaluated in the Tahoe City CP EIS/EIR and were found to be equal or superior to the provisions of Chapter 26. The proposed MOU is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan.

- B. The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded;

Activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU are subject to the provisions of the Regional Plan. The activities are subject to restrictions of the adopted TRPA sign standards, and any significant exemptions will also be subject to TRPA review. Therefore, the activities will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded. This finding is also based on the Article V(g) checklist completed for the proposed amendment.

- C. Wherever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards; and

Activities undertaken pursuant to this MOU are subject to the standards of the Regional Plan and Code. This finding is also based on the Article V(g) checklist completed for the proposed amendment.

- D. The Regional Plan and all of its elements as implemented through the Code, rules and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

As explained under findings A, B, and C, above, the Regional Plan will continue to attain and maintain the thresholds.

Article VI(a) Findings

Article VI(a) states,

The Agency shall prescribe by ordinance those activities which it has determined will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, space, or any other natural resources in the region and therefore will be exempt from its review and approval.

Sections 4.4 and 26.5 of the Code allows for the implementation of MOUs with Placer County to delegate sign permitting and enforcement activities. The proposed MOU effectively and efficiently provides these services. The MOU has no impact on the regulatory structure and does not result in an increase in development. The minor nature of the activities, and the limitations elsewhere in the Code, assure the MOU will not have a substantial effect on the land, water, air, space, or other natural resources in the Region.

Ordinance 87-8 Findings

Section 2.5 of Ordinance 87-8 provides that findings under Section 2.40 are not needed to add policies or ordinances designed to make existing policies and ordinances more effective. The proposed MOU with Placer County will implement Section 26.5 of the Code which allows amendments to exempt certain sign review activities of public entities.

Environmental Documentation: Based on the Tahoe City Community Plan EIS/EIR analysis, staff has completed the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) for the initial determination of no significant effect on the environment.

Please contact Gabby Barrett at (702) 588-4547 if you have any comments or questions on this agenda item.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ORDINANCE NO. 94-

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 87-9, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING CHAPTER 4 OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATING TO EXEMPT ACTIVITIES; ADOPTING A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH PLACER COUNTY TO EXEMPT CERTAIN SIGN ACTIVITIES FROM TRPA REVIEW; AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO.

The Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does ordain as follows:

Section 1.00 Findings

- 1.10 It is necessary and desirable to amend TRPA Ordinance No. 87-9, as amended, by amending Chapter 4 of the Code of Ordinances to adopt a memorandum of understanding with Placer County pursuant to Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 of the Code in order to further implement the Regional Plan and Article VI(a) and other applicable provisions of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.
- 1.20 The Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") conducted a public hearing and recommended adoption of the amendments. The Governing Board has also conducted a noticed public hearing on the amendments. Oral testimony and documentary evidence were received and considered.
- 1.30 The proposed amendments have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are exempt from the requirement of an environmental impact statement pursuant to Article VII of the Compact.
- 1.40 The Governing Board finds that, prior to the adoption of this ordinance, the Board made the findings required by Section 6.5 of the Code and Articles V(g) and VI(a) of the Compact.
- 1.50 The amendments adopted by this ordinance continue to implement the Regional Plan, as amended, in a manner that attains and maintains the environmental thresholds as required by Article V(c) of the Compact.
- 1.60 Each of the foregoing findings is supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Section 2.00 Amendment of Chapter 4 of the Code

Subsection 4.4.D of Chapter 4 is hereby added as follows:

- "4.4.D Sign Activities Within The Placer County Portion of the Region: As set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding regarding exemption of sign activities from TRPA review and approval between Placer County and TRPA dated September 1, 1994 and set forth in Appendix DD of this Chapter.

Section 3.00 Interpretation and Severability

The provisions of this ordinance and the amendments to the Code adopted hereby shall be liberally construed to effect their purposes. If any section, clause, provision or portion of this ordinance or the amendments adopted hereby is declared unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance, or the amendments to the Code, shall not be affected. For this purpose, the provisions of this ordinance and the amendments are hereby declared respectively severable.

Section 4.00 Effective Date

This ordinance shall become effective 60 days after the date of its adoption or the execution of the MOU by Placer County, whichever is later.

PASSED and ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency at a regular meeting held September __, 1994, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstentions:

Absent:

Wayne S. Chimarusti, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
AND THE COUNTY OF PLACER
_____ 1994

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into this _____ day of _____ by and between the TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (TRPA), through its Executive Director as authorized by the Governing Board, and the COUNTY OF PLACER (COUNTY), by and through its Board of Supervisors.

All activities described in this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) shall be in accordance with the Regional Plan package of TRPA as adopted by Ordinance No. _____, as amended from time to time. All activities undertaken by the COUNTY pursuant to the MOU shall comply with all provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code), as it may be amended from time to time, except for the procedural provisions replaced by this MOU, and such guidelines as may be adopted by TRPA.

This MOU sets forth the responsibilities of the parties with regard to the regulation of signage and related activities, in accordance with the desire of the parties to provide a regulatory structure which is consistent with the most efficient possible use of public resources.

RECITALS

- A. TRPA is required by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact (P.L. 96-551, 94 Stat. 3233, Cal. Govt. Code 66801; NRS 277.200) to regulate activities within the Tahoe Basin which may have a substantial effect on the natural resources of the Basin. The bistate Compact, Article VI(a) required TRPA to define which activities are exempt from TRPA review and approval.
- B. Given the existing comprehensive regulatory structure of the COUNTY as it pertains to the installation of signs within the area encompassed by the Tahoe City Community Plan (hereafter referred to as "Tahoe City"), and consistent with the mandate of the Compact to defer land use regulation to local government wherever feasible, the COUNTY and TRPA agree that the COUNTY shall review signage and related activities within the "Tahoe City" boundaries. Such review by the COUNTY shall include application of all applicable TRPA regulations to signage projects otherwise subjected to TRPA review. As long as the applicable TRPA regulations are being complied with and enforced, such activities shall be deemed an exempt activity under TRPA regulations.

IT IS NOW THEREFORE UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED BY THE PARTIES:

1. Effective _____, 1994, signage reviewed and approved by the County, consistent with Chapter 26 of the Code as amended by Chapter 18

of Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines, shall be exempt from TRPA review except as set forth in paragraphs 2 and 3 below. All applications for signage and related activities will be reviewed by the County through its normal and customary review process, including the review and recommendations of the Tahoe City Design Review Committee, and final action by County staff (Design/Site Review Committee [D/SRC]), except for signs or other activities exempt by statute from County review, in which case TRPA shall review said signs. In the event the County is not able to determine whether or not an application is to be reviewed by the County or TRPA, the County shall consult TRPA consistent with provisions established for that purpose by the County Manager or his designee and the Executive Director or his designee.

2. Amortization of signs pursuant to the Chapter 26 schedule will be the sole responsibility of TRPA to administer and enforce in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 26.
3. The COUNTY and TRPA shall jointly review all proposed sign projects involving exemptions or exceptions from any provision of the Sign Ordinance for "Tahoe City" or involving any additional or relocation of land coverage. These projects shall be subject to the procedures established for joint review of such applications by the Placer County Manager or his designee and the Executive Director or his designee.
4. The COUNTY and TRPA staff shall review semi-annually the implementation of this MOU and shall report to their respective governing boards following such reviews.
5. The COUNTY shall perform compliance inspections to ensure that the sign and projects activities permitted under this MOU are constructed in accordance with the plans previously submitted and approved.

The COUNTY shall have authority and responsibility to take any and all administrative steps to enforce the standards of the adopted ordinances as authorized by this MOU, including the processing of Code violations involving unpermitted sign activities.

In the event litigation is necessary to enforce provisions of the TRPA Code, the COUNTY shall contact TRPA Legal Counsel. If a show cause hearing is required, the COUNTY is authorized to institute legal action.

In the event an applicant desires to appeal any administrative action or decision on the part of the COUNTY, acting on behalf of TRPA, such appeal shall be to TRPA.

6. Any exempt activity set forth herein shall be considered a project requiring TRPA review if the Executive Director of TRPA determines that, because of unusual circumstances or failure to comply with this MOU, the activity may have a substantial effect on the land, air, water, space, or any other natural resource of the region.

7. This MOU shall continue until sixty (60) days' written notice of termination is given by either party. Both parties hereby agree to cooperate in good faith to carry out the provisions of this MOU to achieve the objectives set forth in the Recitals herein.
8. None of the duties set forth in this MOU shall be assigned, transferred, or subcontracted by the COUNTY without the prior written approval of TRPA.
9. None of this MOU shall be construed to limit the authority of the COUNTY to administer state or local regulations or to impose reasonable conditions of approval on any application. Further, nothing in this MOU shall be deemed to limit the regulatory powers of either the COUNTY or TRPA.
10. In carrying out the intent of this MOU, the COUNTY and TRPA shall adhere to all provisions contained within TRPA Code Chapter 38 relating to accounting and tracking of coverage and any other applicable procedures. All project accounting and tracking shall be completed by the COUNTY and transmitted to TRPA to be included in its permanent accounting and tracking records. In carrying out the provisions of this MOU, the COUNTY shall utilize tracking forms provided by TRPA to record all inspections, verifications, and other project review activities. The COUNTY shall submit completed tracking forms to TRPA on a monthly basis.

COUNTY OF PLACER

Dated: _____

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Dated: _____

James W. Baetge, Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

308 Doria Court
Elks Point, Nevada

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

(702) 588-4547
Fax (702) 588-4527

MEMORANDUM

August 31, 1994

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: Amendment of Plan Area Statement Boundary Between
Plan Area 013, Watson Creek (Conservation), and
Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat (Residential), to Add
Placer County APN 092-010-18 to Plan Area 014

Proposed Action: The owner of a 26.5 acre parcel in Placer County, presently located in Plan Area 013, Watson Creek (Conservation), proposes to relocate the parcel into Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat Residential, for the purposes of developing additional residential uses. The proposed action would expand the TRPA Urban Boundary. Refer to Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries, and Exhibit B, Applicant's Proposed Plan Area Boundary.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend denial of the proposed amendment to the Governing Board for the reasons set forth below in the Discussion section.

Background: The subject parcel is shown in Exhibit A, Existing Plan Area Boundaries. It is vacant. It is approximately twenty six and one-half acres in size and contains Dollar Creek, a perennial stream. The Dollar Creek riparian corridor is stable and well-vegetated, and not in need of restoration. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has mapped a 100-year flood plain along the creek which varies from 50 to 100 feet wide through the site.

The existing Plan Area designation for the subject parcel is Plan Area 013, Watson Creek Conservation. Refer to Exhibit C, Plan Area Statement 013, Watson Creek. Permissible uses include residential summer homes and several developed recreation uses. It is located outside the TRPA Urban Boundary which is coincident with the existing boundary of Plan Area 014, Cedar Flat Residential. Plan Area Statement 014 is shown in Exhibit D.

AS/rd

AGENDA ITEM V.B.C

The applicant also owns two vacant, residential parcels in the existing subdivision located adjacent to the subject parcel in Plan Area 014. The applicant has stated his desired intentions are to create three large lot parcels through a series of boundary line adjustments involving the subject parcel and the two parcels in Plan Area 014. It is uncertain at this time whether TRPA could approve the ultimate parcel configuration proposed by the applicant.

Land Capability: TRPA mapped land capability includes class 1b (SEZ), class 5 (Umpa very stony sandy loam, UmD), and class 6 (Tahoma stony sandy loam, TbD) found on site. The two soil types have slope ranges up to a maximum of fifteen (15) percent. A more refined slope analysis submitted by the applicant, however, estimates that approximately 15 acres have slopes in excess of fifteen (15) percent. Slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent in the Umpa soil series (UmE and UmF) are designated as land capability classes 3 and 1a, respectively. Tahoma series soils with slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent are Jorge/Tahoma soils (JwE and JwF) rather than Tahoma soils and are designated as land capability classes 4 and 2, respectively. The correct land capability will have to be ascertained prior to any project development.

Discussion: In evaluating proposed plan area amendments, staff uses a three-step procedure. The first step is to determine whether a mistake was made in mapping the original plan area boundaries in this area. Based on the existing land use pattern, including the Urban Boundary located at the edge of the platted, residential subdivision, and the presence of Dollar Creek and its related flood plain on the subject parcel, there is no evidence that a mistake was made in the original mapping on the subject parcel.

The second step is to determine whether some other factor has changed in terms of the land use pattern or character of the site. Based on staff's review, nothing appears to have changed which would warrant relocating the parcel into the residential plan area and, at the same time, expand the urban boundary. Further, the recent Douglas County Community Plan litigation settlement agreement prohibits TRPA from taking action on subdivision applications filed after July 1, 1994, on lands which are located outside the TRPA Urban Boundary existing on August 1, 1994. This prohibition applies to the subject parcel and may affect the owner's ultimate plans for the site. Refer to the TRPA Urban Boundary section below for additional discussion.

The third step is to determine whether amending the Plan Area would change the land use patterns such that attainment and maintenance of the environmental thresholds is improved or enhanced. The subject parcel contains Dollar Creek and its associated riparian corridor and flood plain, and appears to have large areas of slopes greater than fifteen (15) percent. As discussed earlier, the stretch of Dollar Creek and its associated SEZ on the subject parcel are in stable condition and not in need of restoration. Dollar Creek is not included in the SEZ restoration program of the adopted Water Quality Management Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin (208 Plan). It contains several intrinsic values in the areas of soil conservation, water quality, wildlife habitat and in-stream fish habitat. Similarly, the 208 Plan states that "This alternative will maintain the existing boundaries of the urban area within the

Region, and will generally result in the in-fill of property in land capability districts 4 through 7 with urban land uses, consistent with the TRPA Plan Area Statements (Volume I, p. 218). There are no regional benefits to be gained by approving the proposed amendment.

TRPA Urban Boundary: In 1986, as part of the Regional Plan package, TRPA established an Urban Boundary. All residential, commercial/public service and tourist accommodation plan areas are included within the Urban Boundary. The subject parcel is in a Conservation Plan Area which is not included within the Urban Boundary. Adding it to the Residential Plan Area (014) would expand the Urban Boundary.

TRPA established Urban Area Boundaries to clearly direct the location of all future residential, commercial/public service and tourist accommodation development. The Urban Boundary represents TRPA policy (shown below) that additional development occur within already developed areas. These areas contain the necessary public utilities, road system, and other supporting infrastructure to accommodate the additional development permitted under the Regional Plan.

The following sections of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, Land Use Element, Land Use Subelement contains the Urban Boundaries policies.

"GOAL #2 DIRECT THE AMOUNT AND LOCATION OF NEW LAND USES IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES AND THE OTHER GOALS OF THE TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING COMPACT.

Based on the findings of the Compact, evidence included in the environmental impact statement prepared for this Plan, and public testimony, the Tahoe Region is experiencing resource use problems and deficient environmental controls.

POLICIES

1. THE TOTAL POPULATION PERMITTED IN THE REGION AT ONE TIME SHALL BE A FUNCTION OF THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE REGIONAL PLAN AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD CARRYING CAPACITIES.

Population growth in the Region will be guided by the limitations on land use set forth in the Plan. This Plan identifies land use, densities, traffic volumes, urban boundaries, and other factors that indirectly determine the population at any given time. All of these factors have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds.

2. SPECIFIC LAND USE POLICIES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH THE USE OF PLANNING AREA STATEMENTS FOR EACH OF THE PLANNING AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE MAP INCLUDED IN THIS PLAN (LOCATED INSIDE BACK COVER). AREAS OF SIMILAR USE AND CHARACTER HAVE BEEN MAPPED AND CATEGORIZED WITHIN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS: CONSERVATION, RECREATION, RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE, AND TOURIST. THESE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS SHALL DICTATE ALLOWABLE LAND USES. MORE DETAILED PLANS, CALLED COMMUNITY PLANS, MAY BE DEVELOPED FOR DESIGNATED COMMERCIAL AREAS. OTHER DETAILED PLANS, SUCH AS THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN, SKI AREA MASTER

PLANS, AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANS, MAY ALSO BE DEVELOPED. THESE DETAILED PLANS MAY COMBINE TWO OR MORE OF THE FIVE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS.

Since the development permitted under this Plan is generally limited to the existing urban boundaries in which uses have already been established, the concept of this land use plan is directed toward regulating infill and redirection. The intent of this system is to provide flexibility when dealing with existing uses, continuation of acceptable land use patterns, and redirection of unacceptable land use patterns. Implementation ordinances set forth the detailed management criteria and allowed uses for each land use classification.

For example, as of March 1, 1993, there were approximately 1,244 vacant single-family parcels in Placer County which were above the IPES line and eligible for development. At the same time, there were 935 parcels in Placer County which are below the IPES line.

From a land use planning standard and in terms of attaining and maintaining the adopted environmental threshold carrying capacities, the existing lands within the Urban Boundary should first be built out prior to expanding into those areas outside of it. A fundamental concept of the Regional Plan is to infill additional development into existing developed areas. Cumulatively, the incremental expansions of the Urban Boundary would be inconsistent with the Goals and Policies stated above.

In summary, staff believes that the parcel in question is appropriately mapped in Plan Area 013 and should not be relocated.

Findings: Prior to amending the plan area boundary, TRPA must make the following findings.

Chapter 6 Findings

1. Finding: The project is consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and Maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs.

Rationale: This Finding cannot be made. Adding Conservation Plan Area lands to a residential plan area and consequently expanding the Urban Boundary is inconsistent with the Regional Plan Goals and Policies which direct new residential development into existing developed areas to infill rather than expanding into areas outside the Urban Boundary.

2. Finding: The project will not cause the environmental thresholds to be exceeded.

Rationale: This Finding cannot be made. As stated in page II-2 of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies, establishing the Urban Boundary infilling additional development in existing developed areas rather than expanding into undeveloped areas was one of the key factors which have been set to ensure compliance with the environmental thresholds.

Expanding the Urban Boundary at this time combined with the slower than anticipated progress toward threshold compliance will adversely effect the Region's ability to attain and maintain the environmental thresholds.

3. Finding: Wherever federal, state, and local air and water quality standards applicable to the Region, whichever are stricter, must be attained and maintained pursuant to Article V(d) of the Compact, the project meets or exceeds such standards.

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.

4. Finding: The Regional Plan and all its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules, and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Rationale: See findings 1 and 2 above.

Staff will begin this item with a brief presentation. Please contact Andrew Strain at (702) 588-4547 if you have any questions or comments regarding this item.