

**TRPA
GOVERNING BOARD
PACKETS**

**JUNE
2000**

June 2000

Governing Board Packet

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (TRPA)
TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TMPO)**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Tuesday, June 27, 2000, at 5:00 p.m., in the conference room of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 308 Dorla Court, Zephyr Cove, Nevada, the Governing Board's Executive Director Selection Committee will meet. The agenda will be as follows: **1)** public interest comments (no action); **2)** interviews of and recommendation on a consultant recruitment firm to fill the Executive Director position; **3)** consideration and recommendation on administrative matters relating to the Executive Director job description, salary range, and the interview process; and **4)** member comments. (Solaro, Bennett, Sandoval, Neft)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Wednesday, June 28, 2000, commencing at 9:30 a.m., the Governing Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting. The meeting will take place at the Tahoe Seasons Resort, Saddle Road at Keller, South Lake Tahoe, California. The agenda is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

Governing Board Committee items are action items unless otherwise noted

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on Wednesday, June 28, 2000, commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the same location, the TRPA Finance Committee will meet. The agenda will be as follows: **1)** public interest comments (no action); **2)** May month-end trial balance; **3)** TRPA FY 1999-2000 operating budget revisions; **4)** TRPA FY 2000-01 operating budget; **5)** authorization for Executive Director to execute standard agreements pertaining to FTA Section 5311 with Caltrans; **6)** release of SEZ mitigation funds (\$250,000) to Washoe County for IVGID Rosewood Court SEZ restoration project; and **7)** member comments. (Committee: Neft, Heller, Galloway, Solaro, Bennett)

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that on Wednesday, June 28, 2000, during the lunch recess, at the same location, the TRPA Legal Committee, will meet. The agenda will be as follows: **1)** public interest comments (no action); **2)** James Colo, resolution of enforcement and settlement agreement, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APN 22-381-11; **3)** discussion of compliance issues at Tahoe Keys Marina; **4)** approval of settlement in TRPA v. Tonnemacher; **5)** discussion of recent developments in takings litigation; and **6)** member comments. (Committee: Sandoval, Miner, DeLanoy, Giles, Medina, Waldie)

June 19, 2000


John L. Marshall
Acting Executive 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
GOVERNING BOARD

Tahoe Seasons Resort
Saddle Road at Keller
South Lake Tahoe, California

June 28, 2000
9:30 a.m.

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted. Items on the agenda, unless designated for a specific time, may not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear. For agenda management purposes, approximate time limits have been assigned to each agenda item. All public comments should be as brief and concise as possible so that all who wish to speak may do so; testimony should not be repeated.

AGENDA

- I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (5 minutes)
- II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (5 minutes)
- III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS - **All comments are to be limited to no more than five minutes per person.**

Any member of the public wishing to address the Governing Board on any agenda item not listed as a Project Review, Public Hearing, TMPO, Appeal, or Planning Matter item may do so at this time. However, public comment on Project Review, Public Hearing, Appeal, and Planning Matter items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard. The Governing Board is prohibited by law from taking immediate action on or discussing issues raised by the public that are not listed on this agenda.

- IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (5 minutes)
- V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (5 minutes)
- VI. CONSENT CALENDAR (see agenda pg. 3 for specific items) (5 minutes)

(Adjourn the TRPA, convene the TMPO)

- VII. MEETING OF THE TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TMPO)
 - A. Public Interest Comments - **All comments are to be limited to no more than five minutes per person.**
 - B. Consent Calendar – 1) Report on the TTD June 9 Meeting (5 minutes) **Pg 79**
 - C. Public Hearing on Adoption of 2000 TMPO Federal Transportation Plan (20 minutes) **Pg 83**
 - D. Acceptance of NDOT FY 2001-2010 Proposed Transportation Projects List (15 minutes) **Pg 85**

(Adjourn the TMPO, reconvene the TRPA)

VIII. PLANNING MATTERS

- A. Discussion on Status of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) Update and Implementation (30 minutes) **Pg 91**
- B. Status Report on Coordinated Transit System (CTS) (20 minutes) **Pg 93**
- C. Discussion on Affordable Housing (1:00 p.m.) (90 minutes)
1. Request of Board Members Solaro and Sandoval for Reconsideration of and Action on Finding That the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and Douglas County Have Demonstrated a Commitment to Assume Their Fair Share Responsibility to Provide Low and Very Low Income Housing (60 minutes) **Pg 101**
2. Request of Board Member Galloway for Reconsideration of Three Projects Approved by the Board on May 24, 2000: U.S. Postal Service (New Post Office Building in Meyers); Staples (New Commercial Building in South Lake Tahoe); and Safeway (Commercial Rebuild and Addition, South Lake Tahoe) (**This item must be acted on before action on agenda items IX. A., B., and C.**) **Pg 129**
3. Comments by Nevada Senator Bill O'Donnell, Member of Legislative Committee to Continue the Review of TRPA **Pg 131**
4. Consideration of Governing Board Assignment of Affordable Housing Findings and Related Issues to the Local Government Committee **Pg 133**

IX. PROJECT REVIEW - (**Action on agenda items IX. A., B., and C. will occur if the request for reconsideration (agenda item VIII C.2.) is approved.**)

- A. Richard Truesdell/U.S. Postal Service, New Post Office Building, Corner of U.S. Highway 50 and Apache, Meyers, El Dorado County APN 034-342-09 (15 minutes) **Pg 135**
- B. Staples New Commercial Building, 2061 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APN 023-201-11, TRPA File #990780 (15 minutes)
- C. Safeway, Inc., Commercial Rebuild and Addition, 1020 Johnson Boulevard, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APNs 27-180-19, -22, and -23, and 27-090-23, File No. 990890 (15 minutes)
- D. Lowe, New Single Use Pier/Conversion of an Existing Accessory Shorezone Structure, 77 Shoreline Circle, Incline Village, Washoe County APN 122-169-09, TRPA File No. 990882 (30 minutes) **Pg 137**

X. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. 64-Acre Tract Intermodal Center Environmental Document (TRPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement, NEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement, CEQA Draft Environmental Impact Report) (3:00 p.m.) (60 minutes) Pg 149
- B. Amendment of Chapter 4, Project Review and Exempt Activities to Provide for an MOU Between TRPA and Nevada State Lands Relative to a Land Bank (15 minutes) Pg 151

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Approval of TRPA Overall Work Program and Budget FY 2000-01 (30 minutes) Pg 169

XII. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND BOARD ACTION

- A. Finance Committee (5 minutes)
- B. Executive Director Selection Committee (15 minutes)
 - 1. Selection of Recruitment Firm to Conduct Executive Director Search and Administrative Matters Related to Salary, Job Description, and Starting Date
- B. Legal Committee (5 minutes)
 - 1. Approval of Settlement in TRPA v. Tonnemacher

XIII. REPORTS

- A. Executive Director Monthly Status Report (5 minutes)
 - 1. Report on the June 9 Nevada Oversight Meeting
 - 2. Status Report on Project Applications Pg 171
- B. Legal Division Monthly Status Report (5 minutes)
- C. Governing Board Members (5 minutes)

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

CONSENT CALENDAR

<u>Item</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>	
1. May Month-End Trial Balance	Receipt	<u>Pg 1</u>
2. TRPA FY 1999-00 Operating Budget Revisions	Approval	

- | | | | |
|----|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| 3. | Appointment of Member Neft to Replace Member Waldie on the Executive Director Search Committee | Approval | <u>Pg 3</u> |
| 4. | James Colo, Resolution of Enforcement, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APN 22-381-11
(This item will be acted on after the noon Legal Committee meeting.) | Approval | <u>Pg 5</u> |
| 5. | Release of SEZ Mitigation Funds (\$250,000) to Washoe County for IVGID Rosewood Court SEZ Restoration Project | Approval | <u>Pg 7</u> |
| 6. | Incline Village GID, New Pump Station, Washoe County APN 131-280-04 | Approval of Findings and Conditions | <u>Pg 11</u> |
| 7. | Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute the Standard Agreements Pertaining to FTA Section 5311 With Caltrans | Approval | <u>Pg 25</u> |
| 8. | Serrett, New Commercial Building, Major Plan Revision, 925 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County APN 132-231-06, File #990876 | Approval of Findings and Conditions | <u>Pg 27</u> |
| 9. | Round Hill General Improvement District, New Water Storage Tank, Special use Determination, 525 U.S. Highway 50, Douglas County APN 05-220-04 File #200280 | Approval of Findings and Conditions | <u>Pg 45</u> |

Land Capability Challenges:

- | | | | |
|-----|---|----------|--------------|
| 10. | McKenna, Washoe County APN 123-161-01 | Approval | <u>Pg 59</u> |
| 11. | Nichols/Shields, Placer County APN 092-090-13 | Approval | <u>Pg 63</u> |
| 12. | Riordan, Placer County APN 084-025-12 | Approval | <u>Pg 67</u> |
| 13. | Lackey, Placer County APN 092-100-22 | Approval | <u>Pg 71</u> |
| 14. | Kouretas, Placer County APN 115-030-35 | Approval | <u>Pg 75</u> |

The consent calendar items are expected to be routine and non-controversial. They will be acted upon by the Board at one time without discussion. The special use determinations will be removed from the calendar at the request of any member of the public and taken up separately. If any Board member or noticed affected property owner requests that an item be removed from the calendar, it will be taken up separately in 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 Members:

Chairman Larry Severson, Placer County	Wayne Perock, Nev. Dept. of Conservation Appointee
Vice Chairman Don Miner, Douglas County	Drake DeLaney, Nevada Gov. Appointee
Kay Bennett, Carson City	Jerry Waldie, Calif. Senate Rules Com. Appointee
Jim Galloway, Washoe County	Leslie Medina, Calif. Assembly Spkr. Appointee
Hal Cole, South Lake Tahoe	Joanne Neft, Calif. Gov. Appointee
Dave Solaro, El Dorado County	Terry Giles, Calif. Gov. Appointee
Brian Sandoval, Nevada At-Large Member	Peter Chase Neumann, Presidential Appointee
Dean Heller, Nevada Secretary of State	

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
GOVERNING BOARD

North Tahoe Conference Center
Kings Beach, California

May 24, 2000

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

I. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Larry Sevison called the May 24, 2000, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Governing Board meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Vice Chairman Don Miner led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members Present: Dr. Miner, Mr. Waldie, Mr. DeLanoy, Mr. Solaro, Ms. Crowell (for Nevada Secretary of State Heller), Mr. Cole, Ms. Bennett, Mr. Giles (present at 10:35 a.m. during the consultant presentation on agenda item XI.A.), Mr. Perock, Ms. Neft, Mr. Galloway, Ms. Medina, Mr. Sandoval, Mr. Sevison
Member Absent: Mr. Neumann

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Mr. Steve Teshara, chairman of the Lake Tahoe Federal Advisory Committee, noted he would provide Board members with copies of his letter to Carl Hasty, EIP Program Manager, in support of the June 2 Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) work shop. He encouraged all Board members to attend this very important workshop which was designed to provide education and receive public input from the many stakeholders around the Basin on doing a better job delivering EIP projects.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Acting Executive Director Jerry Wells advised the Board that the Rules Committee would be meeting prior to the Legal Committee during the noon break. With regard to the main agenda, item XI.A. (Level of Service), staff wished to have that taken up prior to action on the two project review matters.

MOTION by Dr. Miner to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Bennett to approve the April 26, 2000, regular meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Waldie asked that item 2 (Safeway, Inc., Commercial Rebuild and Addition in South Lake Tahoe) be taken off the consent calendar and taken up separately.

TRPA REGULAR MEETING MINUTES MAY 24, 2000

Finance Committee Chairman Kay Bennett advised that her committee had recommended receipt of item 1 and approval of item 4 on the calendar.

MOTION by Mr. Galloway to approve the consent calendar with the exception of item 2. The motion carried unanimously.

(The following items were approved/received:

1. April Month-End Trial Balance
3. Wm. Mosher, Forest Health Restoration Project, El Dorado County APNs 032-090-051 and 032-100-061, File No. 200029
4. Placer County, Request for \$100,000 Additional Water Quality Mitigation Funds for Snow Creek Stream and Watershed Restoration Project)

Mr. Waldie explained he had asked for removal of consent calendar item 2 because of concerns expressed to him by the League to Save Lake Tahoe.

Safeway, Inc., Commercial Rebuild and Addition, 1020 Johnson Boulevard, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APNs 27-180-19, -22, and 023, and 27-090-23, File No. 990890 – consent calendar item 2

Ms. Rochelle Nason, for the League to Save Lake Tahoe, asked that this item be given more scrutiny than a consent calendar item would normally receive, because of apparent inadequacies in the staff summary regarding the traffic and circulation analysis. The project would be a large traffic generator, and she would like it considered along with the other two projects on the agenda (Staples Store and Meyers Post Office) and following the discussion on Level of Service (LOS) (item XI.A.)

Mr. Wells suggested it be taken up as the third item under Project Review.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- A. Discussion and Decision on Filling the Executive Director Position and Related Administrative Matters, Resolution Appointing Interim Executive Director

Chairman Sevison reminded the Board members of the fax he had sent them outlining a suggestion which he hoped would abbreviate the process and get the Board on a track all could live with. Staff was comfortable with the proposal, as it would give the Board latitude and time to make a top-notch decision. He recommended that the Board approve appointment of Agency Counsel John Marshall as Acting Executive Director on an interim basis to allow some time to fill the position permanently. Mr. Gordon Barrett was currently the Acting Deputy Executive Director, and there would be no change in that assignment.

MOTION by Mr. Waldie to approve Resolution No. 2000-7 appointing Agency Counsel John Marshall as Acting Executive Director effective May 27, 2000.

Mr. Marshall suggested there was not likely any inherent conflict between one person holding both positions, although it would deprive the Board potentially during this interim of having two separate people occupying those roles. Advice to the Board would come from one person during this interim period. Heretofore since he had been with the Agency there had not been a significant instance when Agency Counsel and the Director had not been able to resolve any potential differences before coming to the Board.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman of the Executive Director Committee Dave Solaro asked that the Board approve hiring a professional management consultant to recruit for the Executive Director position and also send letters to the remaining 18 top candidates from the prior application screening advising them they could reapply. The process would be opened up so that new people could apply.

Discussion followed on the process, having Board members submit potential candidates who they knew had expressed an interest in the job, supplementing the search with candidates from the previous list who were screened out, the timing of the process and the hope to have someone on board within four to five months, the Committee's desire for specifics up front regarding salary and job description, getting input from the management consultant on an appropriate salary level, having the Board members select a consultant firm, the timing on results of the recently conducted staff salary comparability study, and the potential \$20,000 cost for a recruitment firm.

Human Resources Director Michele Chouinard explained the various options and costs involved in the hiring of a consultant firm and responded to questions about potential recruitment approaches.

Ms. Bennett urged the Board to allow the Executive Director Committee to work with Mr. Marshall and Ms. Chouinard to make a recommendation on a recruiting firm and come back to the Board in a month for final action.

There was additional discussion among Board members about the process and various options available to the Board.

MOTION by Mr. Solaro that the Executive Director Committee, in conjunction with staff, interview a range of consultants (3 to 5) and make a determination who should be selected to run the recruitment and to include the caveat that the remaining 17 or 18 of the original top contenders are also notified and given the information and letters, to be brought back to the Board with the actual process and timetable next month.

Mr. Marshall asked for clarification on whether the Committee would select the consultant.

Mr. Solaro explained that the combination of the Committee and staff would make a recommendation to the Board.

Dr. Miner asked if within the recommendation there would be a revised salary structure and interview schedule and start date.

Mr. Solaro concurred that the whole timeframe would be presented, along with a complete package for the Board's consideration in June.

Chairman Sevison asked that some of the key community participants also be brought into the process again.

Ms. Bennett suggested that these participants be brought back after the consultant selection. The Committee and the Board had a pretty good picture of the values that were essential to the broader community and what was desired in the job description and position. The consultant would have a really good solid package to work with and good input from the community.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Sevison advised the Board that he attended a staff Management Team meeting earlier in the week. He had a high level of confidence that the Agency was in good shape and things were running smoothly. It would be business as usual during the interim, and the Board needed to keep a positive attitude about the process.

Ms. Bennett encouraged the Chairman, Board members, and the staff to stay actively involved with each other and to participate together in the months ahead.

Chairman Sevison adjourned the TRPA and convened the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Agency (TMPO).

VIII. MEETING OF THE TAHOE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TMPO)

Forest Service Representative Ed Gee, the former LTBMU Interim Forest Supervisor, introduced new Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Supervisor Maribeth Gustafson. She would now be sitting on the TMPO as the Forest Service representative.

- B. Consent Calendar – 1) Report on the TTD April 21 and May 12 Meetings; 2) Adoption of FY 2000-2001 OWP; 3) Recreation Trails Project Funding (Recommended Action on All Items: Receipt and/or Approval)

Transportation Team Leader Richard Wiggins asked that the TMPO Board accept the consent calendar. (There was no discussion.)

MOTION by Dr. Miner to approve the consent calendar. The motion carried unanimously.

A. Public Interest Comments

Mr. Galloway suggested that indemnification and legal defense of TMPO Board members be included in any action the TRPA Board took later in the agenda on legal defense and indemnification of its members.

Chairman Sevison responded that this could be addressed during the Rules Committee noon discussion.

There were no additional public comments.

(Adjourn the TMPO, reconvene the TRPA)

XI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Level of Service (LOS) Policy Discussion

Transportation Team Leader Richard Wiggins introduced members of the consulting firms (Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade and Douglas and Fehr and Peers, Inc.) hired to assist staff with regional and federal transportation plans. The purpose of the presentation was to educate the Board members on LOS; it was not tied to any specific development proposal.

Mr. Ron Milam, with Fehr and Peers Associates, distributed a handout to the Board members and provided a PowerPoint presentation. His remarks addressed intersection operations analysis, the highway capacity manual, the LOS concept, analysis of peak hour conditions, primary uses of LOS in traffic engineering, intersection LOS criteria and illustrations, policies and guidelines, and next steps. He responded to Board member questions.

This was not an action item.

Chairman Sevison suggested that the Safeway project be taken up as the first project review item since it was taken off the consent calendar earlier in the meeting.

IX. PROJECT REVIEW

- C. Safeway, Inc., Commercial Rebuild and Addition, 1020 Johnson Boulevard, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County APNs 27-180-19, -22, and -23, and 27-090-23, File No. 990890 (consent calendar item 3)

Mr. Waldie noted that the League to Save Lake Tahoe had requested this project come off the consent calendar in order to address the Level of Service (LOS) issues.

Ms. Rochelle Nason, for the League to Save Lake Tahoe, urged the Board to consider her comments on LOS as policy issues and not just as project issues. The LOS issue was evident today because of the three large-scale projects on the agenda. Several years ago several projects were being proposed which cumulatively and significantly impacted LOS in the South Shore area. At that time the Board approved an environmental document that allowed projects, rather than improving their traffic flow, to contribute to the Coordinated Transit System (CTS) as mitigation. The CTS was to be up and running in 1997. The start date for that now was 2001. The League strongly supported that earlier policy action and continued to believe that it was better for the environment to direct available funds to transit, rather than towards a futile attempt to control LOS. Nevertheless, the League believed that as the Board reviewed these projects it should do everything in its power to relieve the unnecessary congestion impacts they created. She questioned why, in view of the contemplated increase in traffic, left-hand turns off the adjacent Johnson Avenue on to Highway 50 would still be permitted. Even if it was a Caltrans requirement that these left-turns be allowed to continue, TRPA needed to address the fact that left-turns at this particular intersection were hazardous and should be prohibited. On another matter, the conditions of approval relating to water quality required basins and berms without there being sufficient analysis of water quality issues and impacts. The League wanted to assure that the water quality impacts were being mitigated, since parking was increasing from 200 to 325 spaces. The proposed condition of approval J(5) spoke only of staff's concern, noting lack of clarity on the plans on the height or depth of the basins/berms and revegetation potential. This was not an adequate condition, because it did not address what mitigation was required and how effective it would be. The condition was only stated as a staff concern. While there was much about this project that the League liked, the issues of unnecessary traffic impacts and water quality had not been addressed. She responded to Board member questions.

Mr. Waldie questioned the LOS at adjacent intersections, as noted in the traffic and circulation portions of the staff summary.

Project Review Planner Kathy Canfield responded that the signalized intersections at Highway 50 were Fairway Boulevard and Takela Drive; they were not at LOS F. With regard to the adequacy of condition J(5), staff was requiring a better grading plan than what was submitted,

and staff had a preliminary drainage study for the project. If items were shown as satisfactory on a set of plans, the staff did not repeat them in the conditions of approval. If infiltration trenches, as an example, were required for a project and those trenches were set forth on the plans, staff did not reiterate the requirement in the conditions of approval. The preliminary drainage plan did set forth what Safeway would be doing for the site relative to water quality.

Chairman Sevison suggested that condition J(5) should be restated to note that the specific details would be brought out on the grading plan.

There was more discussion between Ms. Nason, the Board, Mr. Marshall, and staff on the adequacy of the condition and the level of detail the Board was being asked to get into on the project.

Mr. Gordon Shaw, with LSA Associates, transportation consultant for the Safeway project, described the site's access and egress points and the results of the evaluation on numbers of people coming and going from the site. Even with the agreement by the applicant to do a signage program directing customers to the signalized intersections a block away, the project was expected to generate 8 new cars per hour turning left from Johnson onto Highway 50. LOS here now was F. Caltrans District 3, which owned the roadway, did not want to prohibit left turns from Johnson because there was not an inherent sight-distance safety problem. If drivers were prohibited from turning left, they would turn right on to 50 and then attempt to make a U turn back in the other direction. U-turns were a safety hazard.

Mr. Gordon Barrett, Acting Deputy Executive Director, noted that this project would treat all impervious surfaces in the area. Discharge would also occur across the street. The water on the project site was not a problem. The applicant was providing additional wetland treatment by the incorporation of an adjacent parcel; this added step was not necessary for the project itself to meet its water quality goals.

Ms. Nason suggested that this information should be available to the public. There was nothing in the staff report that indicated any of this work was going to be done. There was no basis for the water quality finding, and future staff summaries should address it.

Mr. Wells explained that staff did not typically put its entire analysis of every threshold in the packet materials. All that information was available in project files, which the League and anyone else could review. There were findings under conservation that the Board had to make that required that all BMPs were being applied to the entire project area. The issue was covered.

MOTION by Mr. Cole to make the findings for the Safeway project contained in the staff summary and a finding of no significant impact with the caveat that Condition J(5) be reworded that the permit would not be approved until staff had received revised plans to its satisfaction addressing height, berms and vegetation. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mr. Cole to approve the Safeway project based on the conditions and with the amended Condition J(5). The motion carried unanimously.

- A. Richard Truesdell/U.S. Postal Service, New Post Office Building,
Corner of U.S. Highway 50 and Apache, Meyers, El Dorado
County APN 034-342-09

Associate Planner Jeanne McNamara presented a brief summary of the proposal to relocate the existing Meyers post office to a new location. The building would contain post office boxes and a full-service counter, parking, BMPs, and on-site landscaping. Staff recommended a new condition be added to the project that the permittee comply with Section 33.5c of the Code to ensure that the project not be converted to commercial floor area while the post office occupied the building. The property was privately owned. The applicant had agreed to this condition.

Mr. Waldie questioned the wisdom of increasing the number of post office boxes from 768 to 1,180, when TRPA and the Postal Service's desire was to increase home mail delivery.

Postal consultant Sue Rae Irelan explained that the number of post office boxes for this facility was based on the current Postal Service action plan, which was currently being updated basinwide. The existing action plan identified the desirability of having a functioning post office in the Meyers area. Because of the limited boxes in Meyers now, numbers of families were sharing boxes; others drove into town where they did have postal boxes. The intent was to provide mail services as close to residents' homes as possible. The current action plan approved by TRPA did identify this facility as expanding in number of boxes.

Mr. Waldie suggested that if it was the Board's policy and goal to have home mail delivery it should not approve alternative methods of getting mail. He also questioned the clarification in the staff summary between significance and insignificance of vehicle trip generation and vehicle miles traveled. It appeared the project massively increased LOS in the area, yet there appeared to be no mitigation.

Transportation Planner Bridget Cornell explained that Code Chapter 93 required that a traffic analysis be done if a project proposed a significant increase in vehicle trips. The applicant did do a full traffic analysis. Regarding the reference to an insignificant increase for VMT, there were no set criteria in writing for determining when something was a significant or insignificant increase in VMT. A .08 percent increase in VMT basin-wide was, in general, considered insignificant. If the impact were found to be significant, mitigation would be required to offset the increase. The payment of an air quality mitigation fee attempted to mitigate the increase in VMT. VMT was a more regional than local issue; LOS was a local issue. Fees would be used to reduce VMT region-wide.

Ms. Margo Osti, South Shore resident, expressed concern about the post office closures at times during the day when people wished to check their mail. The Post Mistress closed the postal stations between 8 and 9 a.m. and 1 to 3 p.m. This, in her opinion, was in violation of the VMT mitigation placed on TRPA's approval of the main post office.

South Lake Tahoe Post Master Alice Ynchausti explained that the Meyers Post Office had always closed for an hour and a half every day. The Tahoe Valley branch and the main post office were open all day. The Bijou postal store and the Stateline post office were closed for an hour and a half. The hours for the Bijou and Stateline facilities were the only changes that had occurred, and this was done because of a decrease in the amount of business. Both were open until 1:30 and closed until 3:00. There were two employees at Bijou and three at Stateline. These branches were closed when customer traffic was minimal, as shown in a study. The Meyers branch was a one-clerk office and always closed from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. There were five post offices in South Lake Tahoe in a stretch of 12 miles; this was more Postal Service