

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**OCTOBER
1997**

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, October 8, 1997, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

September 29, 1997

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

North Tahoe Conference Center
8318 North Lake Boulevard
Kings Beach, California

October 8, 1997
9:30 a.m.

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

AGENDA

Page #

- 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 and Planning Matter 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 RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

- A. Proposed Amendment of the 1992 Transportation Plan-Air Quality Plan 1
- B. Proposed 1997 Regional Transportation Improvement Program 1
- C. 1996 Threshold Evaluation Cleanup Amendment to Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, Section 33.3.D(3) to Permit Special Projects in Community Plan Areas 7
- D. Resolution Amending Goals and Policies Attachment D (TRPA-Approved Subdivisions in Conformance With Bailey Coefficients) and Attachment E (Planned Unit Development) of the Goals and Policies 17
- E. Douglas County, Amendment of Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Man-Modified Determination, Douglas County APN 07-130-04 (Portion of Kahle Park Site) 23
- F. Prim, Amendment of Regional Plan Overlay Maps for Man-Modified Determination, Douglas County APN 07-120-08 (U.S. Highway 50 and Kingsbury Grade) 33

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Scoping for the 1998 Regional Transportation-Air Quality Plan Draft EIS 47

B. Status Report on the Environmental Improvement Program

55

C. Policy on Eligibility of Previously Approved Projects for Special
Project Commercial Floor Area Allocations

57

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

B. Legal Counsel

C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Horizon Casino Resort
U.S. Highway 50
Stateline, Nevada

September 10, 1997

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Chairperson Bob Jepsen called the regular September 10, 1997, meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to order at 9:36 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Mr. Thompson, Mr. Hust, Mr. Doughty (arrived at 9:45 a.m.),
Mr. Hansen, Ms. Baldrica, Mr. Barham, Mr. McDowell,
Mr. Singer, Ms. Rohr, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Morgan,
Ms. Kvas, Mr. Combs, Ms. Jamin, Mr. Jepsen

Members Absent: Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Joiner, Mr. Haen

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Deputy Director Jerry Wells stated that Agenda Item V.E. had been continued. Mr. Wells welcomed the new APC member, Candi Rohr.

MOTION by Ms. Baldrica, with a second by Mr Morgan, to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS - There were none.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Baldrica, with a second by Ms. Jamin, to approve the August 13, 1997, APC minutes as presented. The motion carried with Messrs. Hansen, Singer, Barham, and Ms. Rohr abstaining.

V. PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE GOVERNING BOARD

A. Draft Environmental Improvement Program for the Lake Tahoe Region

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

Deputy Director Jerry Wells gave an update of the draft environmental improvement program.

Mr. McDowell asked for an advanced copy of the EIP before being adopted.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Singer stated that it would be helpful if there were an explanation of where the expected dollars were coming from along with each EIP project.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 10, 1997

Mr. Wells responded that the EIP has broken the costs down by State, local, private and Federal funds. In addition, TRPA has more detail now than when the EIP draft was first circulated.

B. Amendment of Regional Plan In-Lake Fish Habitat Map

Associate Planner Coleen Shade presented the staff summary recommending adoption of the staff proposed amendments to the In-Lake Prime Fish Habitat.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Jeff Cutler, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that the League's concern was that the existing fish studies have never looked at or analyzed the biocumulation issues, toxic chemicals and things of that nature. Mr. Cutler stated that the League has not joined on any consensus because of these issues.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

Mr. Poppoff noted the correct spelling of Placer County.

MOTION by Mr. Poppoff, with a second by Mr. Hansen, to recommend to the Governing Board adoption of the proposed amendments to the In-Lake Prime Fish Habitat. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Repeal of Ordinance No. 87-8 Prescribing Standards for Amendments to the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances, Schedules for Further Implementation of the Regional Plan, and Procedures for Review of Projects and Activities Pending Adoption of Further Chapters of the Code of Ordinances

Special Projects Attorney Susan Scholley presented the staff summary repealing Ordinance 87-8 prescribing standards for amendments to the Goals and Policies and the Code of Ordinances, schedules for further implementation of the Regional Plan, and procedures for review of projects and activities pending adoption of further chapters of the Code of Ordinances.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Jeff Cutler, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that a side-by-side analysis of the findings that needed to be made and have to be made have not been provided. He commented that he did an analysis of his own and believed that there was a gradual weakening and deterioration of the findings.

A discussion ensued.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing

Mr. Hansen commented that the proposed amendment lacked an opinion paper or briefing stating why the ordinance was being amending. He would have liked to see an opinion to explain the ordinance in greater detail.

Mr. Singer commented that he believed that preponderance of evidence should be substantial evidence. He stated that in Chapter 6, 2.40 on page 14 of the the staff summary, the sentence states "the amendment provides for an equal or better means of attainment of maintenance of the thresholds", but it doesn't state anywhere in Chapter 6 that a finding had to be made that a project was consistent with attainment. He commented that we talk about not causing thresholds to be exceeded, but we know that with many of our thresholds, we are trying to attain them as opposed to exceed them; it is not that a project would cause exceedence because we haven't attained the thresholds yet. In addition, Mr. Singer remarked that on one side we are talking about trying to attain certain things, and on the other side, we talk about exceedence.

MOTION by Mr. Singer, with a second by Mr. Doughty, to recommend approval to the Governing Board to repeal TRPA Ordinance 87-8. The motion carried unanimously.

(Break taken at 10:45 a.m.)

(Reconvened at 10:53 a.m.)

- D. 1996 Threshold Evaluation Cleanup Amendment to Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, Section 33.3.D(3) to Permit Special Projects in Community Plan Areas

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett presented the staff summary amending the 1996 threshold evaluation cleanup amendment to Chapter 33, Allocation of Development, Section 33.3.D(3), to permit special projects in community plan areas.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Mr. Doughty, with a second by Mr. Poppoff, to recommend approval to the Governing Board of the 1996 threshold evaluation cleanup amendment to Chapter 33, allocation of development, Section 33.3.D(3) to permit special projects in community plan areas, along with the amendment to add the words "designated community plan areas". The motion carried unanimously.

VI. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Deputy Director Jerry Wells stated that Mr. Baetge was in Washington, D.C. following up on some of the Presidential Forum results and should be back on Thursday. He commented that there is legislation that is going through California relating to the MTVE additive in fuels. Through our influential friends in California, we were able to get that legislation amended to add in

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 10, 1997

a piece for Tahoe. The bill has not been finalized. They are setting aside a half a million dollars to do a study on MTVE in California, a portion of which would be targeted for the Lake Tahoe Basin. The study would be final by January of 1999, which would come about six months prior to TRPA's phase out of the 2-stroke engines.

Ms. Rohr stated that the water districts who take water out of Lake Tahoe do regular testing and TRPA might want to approach the water districts about doing some sampling.

Principal Planner Gordon Barrett stated that the application packet for special EIP projects allocations would be brought to the APC in October for review. He stated that the deadline for applications should be February 1, 1998.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Singer stated that he would like to reopen Agenda Item No. V.D. because he had a problem philosophically as to what the original intent was in the amendment. He questioned as to how one could have an unadopted community plan with an irrevocable commitment.

Special Projects Susan Scholley stated the rules provide that the actions of the APC are not final until the close of the meeting, so it was appropriate to make a motion to reconsider the item.

MOTION by Mr. Doughty for reconsideration of Agenda Item V.D.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Wells suggested adding a period after "TRPA master Plans" and starting a new sentence stating "Special projects in adopted community plan areas must demonstrate that all required irrevocable commitments have been made."

Mr. Singer questioned if you had a community plan that was adopted and you have a requirement in there for some irrevocable commitments but they had not yet been made, you are now going to penalize a special project that we all think is a good one in that area. He believed that this would be setting up an inconsistent standard.

Ms. Kvas believed that the item should be tabled until next month.

MOTION by Mr. Singer, with a second by Mr. Doughty, to reopen Agenda Item No. V.D. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Doughty, with a second by Mr. Morgan, to not move forward with Agenda Item No. V.D. and directed staff to return next month after consideration of the commercial group and performance review committee, and that we take a look at the entire ordinance with regards to special projects and some of the philosophies behind that issue. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Jamin asked about the ramifications of the motion timewise. Mr. Barrett

stated that the amendment would be effective 60 days after adoption and an application would not be accepted until December.

B. Legal Counsel

Special Projects Attorney Susan Scholley stated that we received an order from the Ninth Circuit regarding Suitum which had bounced the case back to the district court. In the Barbieri v. TRPA case, which was on hold pending the outcome of the Supreme Court decision, is now scheduled for Motions for Summary Judgment which will be heard at the end of October. In the TSPC v. TRPA case, the parties are in the process of filing pretrial motions. The briefing schedule for those motions is over on October 31, 1997. The pretrial or setting of a trial date probably won't be until 1998. In the Tonnemacher, et al. v. TRPA case, an enforcement action was filed against him for unauthorized grading in a stream environment zone.

C. APC Members

Mr. McDowell stated that the Forest Service has advertised the Timber Harvest associated with the North Shore and the Pioneer project and no bids have been received because of the value of material. They are being readvertising for bids. He stated that the Forest Service is having some heartache over variances that are being granted to single-family residences throughout the region where there is National Forest/Santini Burton lots adjacent to those.

Ms. Kvas stated that the County cannot tell someone that they cannot apply for a variance. She commented that if an applicant chooses to apply, the County has to have a public hearing.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Doughty suggested Mr. McDowell bring his comments before the Douglas County Planning Commission for discussion.

Mr. Poppoff stated that there is evidence that sediment bases around the Lake are not working the way they should. He suggested that TRPA and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, NRCs and the Forest Service get together and review the design criteria and see if that is the problem. He based his rationale on the fact that the measurements made by both TRPA and Lahontan staff showed that turbidity going in and out of the Basins are roughly the same.

Mr. Singer stated that some municipal projects are not designed to the 20-year, one hour storm. They lack the area for this. He suggested that the problem may be that we are undersizing some of the facilities.

Ms. Jamin stated that her title has been changed to Public Services Director and along with that are changes in her duties as well. Her role as the City's representative on the APC has been changed; Gary Marchio will now be the lead person and she will be the alternate starting in October.

Mr. Doughty welcomed Candi Rohr to the APC.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 10, 1997

Special Projects Attorney Susan Scholley stated that the Nevada American Planning Association is having a seminar in Sparks on October 5th, 6th and 7th.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT - Meeting adjourned at 12:00 Noon.


Sue Mikanovich
Clerk to the Commission

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call for an appointment at (702) 588-4547. In addition, any documents submitted at the meeting may be reviewed at the TRPA office, 308 Dorla Court, Elks Point, Nevada.

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
Email: trpa@sierra.net

MEMORANDUM

September 30, 1997

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: 1997 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and
Associated Amendment to the 1992 Regional Transportation Plan-
Air Quality Plan

Proposed Action: No action by the APC is required at this time. This item is presented for discussion purposes. It will require action at a later date.

Staff Recommendation: Staff is initially recommending the list of RTIP projects on Attachment A.

Background: The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is developed by TRPA to provide project programming information to the State of California. Projects listed in the RTIP may be eligible for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Prior to the 1996 STIP, STIP funds were allocated to El Dorado and Placer Counties for use throughout their entire county, including their portions in the Tahoe basin. Because of the highway improvement needs outside of the Basin were so great, and because of strong non-basin representation on the planning commissions responsible for STIP program development, relatively little funding was programmed for inside the Basin over the years. The Tahoe City Urban Improvements Project, approved in the 1994 STIP, has been the only state highway project funded in the STIP in either county in many years, with the exception of Transportation Enhancement Activity (TEA) projects.

A very important change to this funding situation occurred when the California Legislature amended Section 188.8(3)(b) of the California Streets and Highways Code. The amendment provided, for the first time, a "county minimum" for the Tahoe Region. The county minimum is derived from that portion of the county population and state highway road mileage in El Dorado and Placer Counties that is included within the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. The amendment provided that county minimums be counted separately toward the area under jurisdiction of TRPA. Unfortunately, when it came time for programming projects for the 1996 STIP, the State of California did not have enough revenues to provide funds for any Tahoe area projects. Instead, the Tahoe region was able to "bank" funds for future years.

RAW/rd

AGENDA ITEMS V.A & V.B.

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land

On September 12, 1997, both the California Senate and Assembly approved SB 45 (Kopp). SB 45 provides for profound changes in the way highway funds are appropriated and allocated to regional jurisdictions, and the role that TRPA will have in project programming. As of September 26, Governor Wilson had not signed SB 45 into law, but TRPA staff are proceeding with development of the RTIP with the assumption that the Governor will approve this legislation.

The following summarizes significant changes for TRPA for the 1998 STIP:

- STIP is shortened from seven years to four years, except for the 1998 STIP which will be 6 years;
- Eight existing programs are consolidated into two, interregional and regional. Caltrans is responsible for the interregional program;
- Regional improvement funds, for which TRPA would be responsible, would become a fixed entitlement, to be programmed through the RTIP;
- Regions can request to reserve funds for later STIPs;
- Regions can propose projects for the interregional program, and projects can be funded from both programs;
- Due date for the 1997 RTIPs is moved to March 1, 1998, with STIP adoption by June 1, 1998;
- Projects can be programmed by the following components: environmental studies, design engineering, right-of-way acquisition, construction, and construction engineering;
- For large projects, environmental studies would be programmed in one STIP, completed between STIPs, and decisions on alternatives made before programming construction funds in the next STIP;
- Any STIP project would be required to have a Project Study Report (PSR). A PSR includes project location, limits, description, scope, costs and schedules, and must be approved by Caltrans;
- No STIP project would have any local match requirement; and
- Regions could use up to two percent of regional improvement funds for planning.

A new fund estimate that identifies the regional improvement program funds for each region will be due by January 5, 1998. At that time, TRPA will know how much funding it has available to program. However, preliminary estimates put our program funds at approximately \$9.5 million.

Discussion: Regardless of SB 45, TRPA needs to develop the RTIP list to submit to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The projects listed below have been identified as potential projects for inclusion into the 1997 RTIP. Please keep in mind that this is a preliminary list, as there are still outstanding issues relative to whether these projects are eligible for inclusion in the RTIP. Many regions, including TRPA, do not have enough projects "on the shelf" that have approved PSRs to program all available regional improvement funds. It is important not to program projects that have not been fully examined or have not gained community support.

Attachment A is a project summary, indicating fund category, project component, PSR status, allocation year and allocation amounts for each of the projects below.

1. Echo Summit Guardrail Replacement

This is a safety project to replace the metal beam guardrail on U.S. 50, 0.3 miles east of Echo Summit to 0.2 miles east of Johnson Pass road. This project is programmed in the 1996 State Highways Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for \$2.488 million. Construction is planned for 1998.

2. Echo Summit Concrete Barrier

This project will provide for widening the roadway and constructing a concrete barrier on U.S. 50 at the same section as the project above. The barrier would be located on the outside edge of the outside lane, and not be for lane division. This project would provide for water quality and scenic improvements. The estimated cost is \$10 million. TRPA staff have requested Caltrans consider this project as part of their interregional improvement program.

3. U.S. 50/Tahoe Keys Intersection Improvements

A PSR for this project was completed in 1991. The PSR calls for ROW acquisition, construction of a right-turn lane from U.S. 50 to Tahoe Keys Boulevard, and lane restriping. The project cost in 1991 was approximately \$2.5 million. The project scope, however, does not include water quality treatment. Water quality treatment must be added to the project scope, and the cost estimates and schedules would need to be updated in order for this project to qualify for inclusion in the 1997 RTIP. TRPA staff have requested Caltrans to complete these changes to the PSR.

4. U.S. 50 Sidewalks - One of Three Phases

This project includes construction of sidewalks, curb and gutter and Class II bike facilities on both sides of U.S. 50. At this point in time, however, Caltrans has not approved the PSR submitted by the City of South Lake Tahoe. Staff are coordinating with Caltrans for approval of at least one of three phases designed for project and included in the PSR. As with the U.S. 50/Tahoe Keys Intersection Project, the scope needs to be expanded to include water quality treatment features. The estimated cost of the entire project is \$4.0 million, but water quality treatment may raise this cost. Staff have therefore estimated construction of one phase at \$2.0 million.

Staff is unaware of any other projects that have or may have a PSR approved in time for inclusion in the 1997 RTIP. The following projects use TRPA's project support funding for preparing PSRs to be eligible for inclusion in the 2000 STIP.

5. South Y Intersection

Improve the U.S. 50 and SR 89 intersection (South Y) based on the recommendations in the South Y intersection study completed in 1997. The estimated construction cost is \$1.0 million, including quality treatment.

6. SR 89 Realignment in Tahoe City

There is significant interest by the North Shore community to assess the impacts on congestion with a realignment of SR 89. The concept is to build a new bridge downstream from Fanny Bridge, routing traffic south of the 64 acre site. Funding for a PSR would allow for inclusion in the 2000 STIP for environmental analysis.

7. Kings Beach Sidewalks and Water Quality Treatment

This project would provide for completion of a PSR to scope and cost out the construction of sidewalks and water quality treatment in Kings Beach.

Projects are included in the RTIP for programming Regional Surface Transportation Program "Exchange" funds, as required by the RSTP agreements between TRPA and the recipient jurisdictions. Placer County, El Dorado County and the City of South Lake Tahoe each receive Exchange funds. El Dorado County has identified two erosion control projects to use their funds on, however project descriptions are unavailable at this time.

Transportation Enhancement Activity (TEA) projects are also included in the RTIP, although there are no projects currently programmed. A new cycle of applications will likely begin during the summer of 1998.

If there are any questions or comments regarding this agenda item, please contact Richard Wiggins at (702) 588-4547.

Attachment A - Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Project Summary
September 30, 1998

PROJECT NAME	PSR APPROVED	FUND CATEGORY	PSR	ENVR. STUDY	DESIGN ENGIN.	ROW	CONST	ALLOCATION YEAR	AMOUNT (\$MILL)	REGIONAL CUMULATIVE TOTAL
1 Echo Summit Guardrail	Yes	SHOPP					X	1998	2.48	0.00
2 Echo Summit Concrete Barr	Yes	InterReg					X	2000	10.00	0.00
3 Tahoe Keys Intersection	Yes (*)	Regional		X				1999	0.15	0.15
Tahoe Keys Intersection	Yes (*)	Regional			X			2000	0.15	0.30
Tahoe Keys Intersection	Yes (*)	Regional				X		2001	1.50	1.80
Tahoe Keys Intersection	Yes (*)	Regional					X	2002	1.50	3.30
4 US 50 Sidewalk Phase 1	No (**)	Regional		X				1999	0.15	3.45
US 50 Sidewalk Phase 1	No (**)	Regional			X			2000	0.15	3.60
US 50 Sidewalk Phase 1	No (**)	Regional					X	2001	2.00	5.60
5 South Y Intersection	No	Regional						1998	0.04	5.64
6 SR 89 Realignment	No	Regional						1998	0.08	5.72
7 Kings Beach Sidewalk	No	Regional						1998	0.08	5.79
North Upper Truckee EC	N/A	RSTP Exch								
Pioneer Trail EC	N/A	RSTP Exch								
CSLT	N/A	RSTP Exch								
Placer	N/A	RSTP Exch								
TEA	N/A	TEA								

Notes:

- PSR - Project Study Report
- ROW - Right-of-Way Acquisition
- CONST - Construction, Construction Management, and Engineering
- (*) - Update Required
- (**) - Draft Under Review by Caltrans



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
Email: trpa@sierra.net

MEMORANDUM

September 30, 1997

To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

From: TRPA Staff

Subject: 1996 Threshold Evaluation Cleanup Amendment to Chapter 33,
Allocation of Development, Section 33.3.D (3) to Permit Special
Projects in Community Plan Areas

Proposed Action: Staff is requesting an APC recommendation on the adoption of the following amendments to clean up a mistake made with the adoption of the special project amendments recommended by the 1996 Threshold Evaluation. The 1996 recommendation did not limit special projects to adopted community plans; however, "adopted" was inadvertently added during editing to match the master plan wording. The proposed amendments delete the word adopted as follows:

3. Special Projects: A maximum of 150,000 designated square feet of commercial floor area may be permitted in ~~adopted~~ community plan areas or adopted TRPA master plans/. In ~~which~~ adopted community plans all required irrevocable commitments shall have been made. TRPA shall administer the special project allocations. The distribution of this floor area shall be as follows:
 - b. Eligibility: All projects in ~~adopted~~ designated community plan areas or adopted master plan areas are eligible for special project allocations.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments. This language is also supported by the Commercial Workshop Group.

Background: The Commercial Workshop Group that assisted TRPA staff in the fall of 1996 did not recommend that special projects be limited to adopted community plan areas. The recommended wording that was reviewed by the APC and Governing Board in December of 1996 stated:

- A. Eligibility: It will be open to major projects (includes assessment districts) in all jurisdictions within community plan areas and adopted master plan areas.

It was the intent of the Chapter 33 code language to follow the proposed policy language. However, when drafting the code language, changes in the wording are sometimes needed for technical reasons. Thus, the wording does not always match the policy language. In this case, the legal editors assumed that the word adopted should be used consistently and made a technical change. Staff has attached the policy document (Attachment A), and the Code section (Attachment B), for reference.

The Commercial Workshop Group specifically did not use "adopted" with CPs for a reason. The group did not want to limit commercial EIP projects like the Meeks relocation or the cement plant relocation to adopted CPs.

The APC reviewed this item at the September meeting and continued it until October. Staff was directed to have the Commercial Workshop Group look at the proposed amendments. On September 29, the Group reviewed the draft language and agreed it was consistent with the original policy and the environmental documentation of the 1996 Threshold Evaluation. Because the irrevocable commitment language affected only the Stateline Community Plan and there are no projects currently proposed, the Group agreed to keep the limitation.

The Commercial Workshop Group and TRPA staff did not support expanding the Special Project Program beyond the community plan boundaries. This would be contrary to the community planning process and the environmental benefits of concentrating commercial development.

Required Findings: The following findings must be made prior to adopting the proposed amendments:

A. Chapter 6 Findings for the Goals and Policies Plan, Code, Community Plan, and Plan Area Amendments:

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: The 1996 Evaluation reviewed TRPA's progress toward threshold attainment and made recommendations to improve threshold attainment. These amendments are needed to be consistent with those recommendations and to permit the implementation the recommended EIP projects that will assist in the achievement of thresholds, which is the core goal of the Regional Plan.

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