

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
RPU COMMITTEE**

TRPA Offices  
Stateline, NV

November 15, 2011  
November 16, 2011

**MEETING MINUTES**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

RPU Chair Mr. Shute called the meeting to order on November 15, 2011 at 1:01 p.m. and November 16, 2011 at 1:27 p.m.

Members Present: November 15, 2011

Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute

Members Absent: November 16, 2011

Ms. Bresnick

Members Present: November 16, 2011

Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute

Members Absent: November 16, 2011

Ms. Bresnick

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Aldean moved approval  
Motion carried unanimously

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES & ACTION SHEETS FROM PRIOR MEETING (S)

Ms. Reedy moved approval of September 28 and November 2, 2011 minutes and action sheets

Motion carried unanimously

V. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Review and Action on Draft Regional Plan amendments Related to Land Use, Housing and Community Design

Mr. Stockham Starting at Goal LU-5 and related policies which staff is not recommending any changes to then we will go to Goal LU-4, Land Use Framework

Mr. Stockham Page II-30, Goal LU-5 is language speaking about coordination with Agencies outside the Region on issues of broader Regional importance. Language appeared appropriate for Regional Plan and nothing requires updates at this point which includes a Goal and two related policies

Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Aldean If you have a large subdivision proposed i.e., Washoe County it is inevitable if you are going to add to the population of any Community in the Valley that there will be the potential of increased impact on the Tahoe Region because there will be recreation in the Tahoe Region. Do not object to entering into joint agreements; but what are the alternatives? Will TRPA interfere with the ability of Washoe County to pursue/approve the development of potential impacts in the Tahoe Basin? Local Governments may be concerned with this

Mr. Stockham Intent is essentially no change to current TRPA practices for activities outside the Region. Policy 5.2 speaks to joint agreements and that would require agreement of both parties to enter into. 4.1 are mitigating impacts of activities within the Region. There is not intent to be involved outside the Region unless there is an agreement with an overarching consideration that would warrant that and the Local Government agreed. It would have to be mutual intent  
Mr. Sevison In the past, TRPA attempted to dramatically comment on the ability of projects in the Martis Valley of Placer County. It seemed to be the beginning of an era moving to adjacent cities and commenting on plans/projects. Have concern what the motive is and what we expect to accomplish by it

Ms. Marchetta This policy has been in our plan for a long time, but in its implementation there should be a check in with the Board before we do anything on a development outside the Basin. There could be an implementing policy that suggest before staff were to act on this that there be authorization by the Board. We can recommend alternative language

Mr. Robinson This is not optional, being permissive in the Compact, is this how you got to this?

Mr. Sevison Any opportunities TRPA takes to do that should get approval from the Board

Ms. Aldean LU-5.1, the Local Jurisdictions should not have a problem keeping the Agency informed, the implication here is the projects will be reviewed by the Agency; suggest a minor change to the language to be more permissive.

Mr. Stockham LU-5.2 change “shall” to “may”. Suggest adding language speaking about Board action before staff pursues any agreements

Public Interest Comments & Questions: Goal LU-5 and Policies LU-5.1 & 5.2  
None

Mr. Stockham If the Committee desires to direct us to research what the Compact says in relation to Policy LU-5.2 and bring back language consistent with the Compact and addressing Board comment about pursuing anything outside the Region. Policy as written says we will do these agreements and we have not independently verified that the Compact requires us to do them.

Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Aldean Even if the Compact makes it obligatory for the TRPA to do that you have to have cooperation with the Local Jurisdictions, you cannot do it unilaterally. If you have to make it mandatory of what the TRPA is obligated to do pursuant to the Compact, we should make any action require Board review and approval

**Ms. Aldean Motion to approve LU-5 and Policy LU-5.1 without modifications**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick, Ms. Fortier**

**Mr. Shute Defer action on Policy LU-5.2 and directed staff to modify language on the policy that will reflect the Compact and require Board direction**

Mr. Stockham Amended some sentences based on direction from the last Committee meeting regarding Federal Plans and that the areas are designated in Federal Plans and removing some qualifying language for the Town Centers and High District Tourist overlays

Ms. Aldean LU-2.2: For purposes of this plan regulated development is categorized as Residential Tourist Accommodation, Commercial Recreation, Public Service and Resource Management, it conflicts with the new use categories that are being

defined later in the document, why?

Mr. Stockham Those are use types and how the Regional Plan categorizes different types of uses as opposed to Land Use Districts which is what Goal 4 references. Possibly could make them uniform, but there are not Wilderness Land Uses in our Code of Ordinances. LU-2.2 has not been discussed yet and will be discussed later

Mr. Stockham A nuance, the Land Use District we are recommending to amend Commercial to Mixed Use to reflect the desired development pattern. Commercial floor area is well established in TRPA's system as part of Growth Management framework and converting CFA to Mixed Use matrix would raise new issues. Different topics although there is overlap in terms

Mr. Shute In LU-4.1 and throughout document redevelopment is used and sustained development is used. Redevelopment has a connotation of massive urban structures where you are talking about sustainable development, is there a better term than redevelopment?

Mr. Sevison Seems like redevelopment is an overlay on most of the zoned districts; you could have redevelopment in Recreation, Commercial, etc.

Mr. Shute We are also using the word redirection and sustainable development, redevelopment, need to be consistent

Ms. Marchetta We could note that we are not referring to large "R" Redevelopment, State statutory directives on large "R" or Redevelopment Districts

Ms. Aldean Similar to discussion about the term urban. Redevelopment is a familiar term. Like redevelopment vs. redirection and assure people we are not talking large "R" development projects

Mr. Shute Sustainable development is also used and not clear on what they mean. The Plan needs to be consistent, would rather use a term that is defined than a term of redirection or sustainable development

Mr. Stockham Redirection is an important defined term in the Regional Plan of areas where development rights are, the transfer of development rights system encourages rights to go away from redevelopment areas. Suggest we develop working definitions of these terms and bring back at the next meeting

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.1

None

Mr. Robinson Big “R” development; are you going to develop a definitive definition

Ms. Marchetta Sometimes State Law defines redevelopment in redevelopment districts, we would define it in the negative of that is not what we are speaking about, referring to relevant State Law

**Mr. Shute Defer voting on LU-4.1 until staff develops working definitions of terms**

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.2

None

Committee Comments & Questions: LU-4.2

Mr. Shute If there is anything in the existing Plan Area Statements that directly contradict newer provisions that could be hard to administer. Thought on how you would decide whether there is a conflict or not?

Mr. Stockham Looking at a transition process where existing plans are in place now until superseded, however, there are likely to be new Regional Plan Ordinances adopted at this point that may conflict with provisions of those plan area statements. The goal is if there are important new Ordinances adopted next year that those should be in place for all new development activities

Mr. Sevison Is there going to be another process at the end where we will go back and clean up, it may be hard to administer in the long term

Mr. Stockham Yes, defined in Policy LU-4.5. Recommending a transition process and then two years after adoption evaluate progress

Mr. Marshall Suggest deleting the word “directly” and say “contradict”. Staff agreed.

Ms. Aldean What was staff’s intent, is there a hierarchy of contradictions

Mr. Stockham Intent was straight forward, did not want a long strained train of logic that a sidewalk requirement contradicts a building height requirement. Needs to be a direct contradiction

Mr. Shute Recommend taking out “directly”

**Mr. Sevison moved to approve LU-4.2 with modifications (see Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick, Ms. Fortier**

Mr. Stockham LU-4.3 & LU-4.4 essentially are the same except for two additional levels of TRPA Plans, Community Plans are in LU-4.3, and the Special Area Plans are in LU-4.4.

Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Aldean LU-4.4, 4<sup>th</sup> line from the bottom, referring to multiple plans of any of these plans contain as opposed to contains provisions

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.3 & LU-4.4

Ann Nichols North Tahoe Preservation Alliance I hope the term goes to height because stories could be anything. Example; if the new map has four stories and a Community Plan has not been adopted yet and a project comes through it is automatically allowing four stories?

Mr. Stockham Recommendation later in the document is not to permit four stories, so there would not be a contradiction. It is to allow the option of Local Government Plans to include heights up to four stories; in implementation there would not be a conflict, it is not a Code change. These provisions are not endorsing any particular height

Carl Young League to Save Lake Tahoe LU-4.3-LU-4.4: Concerns with delegation and superseding things by local plan concept is not going to achieve the Thresholds and need to be strong safe guards in order to achieve Thresholds. Also, Community character is not interfered with which refers to massing, height, density, etc. that can change a neighborhoods

Laurel Ames Tahoe Area Sierra Club It does not matter what the height issues are if Local Governments wants something that conforms to the language in 3 or 4 then they are home free. Where does the local input come in?

Mr. Stockman Topic is addressed in LU-4.13

Mr. Shute There provisions for the local planning process that include input from local residence. Is this too narrow as it does not speak to stakeholders. My interpretation is nothing in these two provisions would allow a Local Plan to exceed a height limit that was set otherwise in the plan

Mr. Marshall What the provision does is if there is a Local Plan that is eventually adopted and possibly contradicts a previously adopted Plan Area Statement or

Community Plan in LU-4.2, 4.3 & 4.4 that the Local Plan would control.

**Mr. Robinson Motion to approve LU-4.3 & 4.4 with modifications. Remove “direct” (See Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick, Ms. Fortier**

Mr. Stockham LU-4.5 is the transition process; Recommendation is two years after scheduled adoption of this plan TRPA evaluates the progress in preparation and adoption of local plans. Potentially, the area could be covered by conforming Local Plans. Some Agencies could decide not to do Local Plans and in the event there were not Local Plans for significant areas, check in and evaluate how the transition is going

Committee Comments & Questions: LU-4.5

Mr. Sevison Concerned with putting in specified dates that you would have to perform by. Is this necessary to set goals or dates that cannot be missed.

Mr. Stockham Intent was to do an evaluation if there is a planning process under way or a reason why plans have not been adopted by then. The second date mentioned in policy maybe we would not need a deadline for what we do, we would like deadline to do an evaluation but not a deadline to what we do in response to that evaluation

Ms. Reedy If we are going toward a process by which the localities are making plans/decisions and we are going to defer to them to a degree with appropriate mechanisms to protect, a dead line is good so we continue to go forward. What is the repercussion when you miss a deadline? Do we have a joint agreement that we refer to earlier between the entity and TRPA to move forward

Mr. Sevison Possibly an evaluation of that deadline is palatable; if you have TRPA over Local Government and the deadline is missed, they may say that they cannot process any other permits in your jurisdiction until you meet the deadline. It should be evaluated, there could be some constraints. A Community Plan process could take a long time need to evaluate it

Mr. Stockham Staff is proposing deadlines on TRPA but are not recommending any sanctions on Local Governments. TRPA would retain the existing planning and permitting system we have now until superseded under Local Plan provisions. Local Governments are not mandated to do this

Ms. Aldean There is a process for extending deadlines. It is an overstatement to say these are hard and fast deadlines

Mr. Stockham Perhaps an extension language within this policy would be appropriate

Mr. Marshall Deadlines in statues and codes, they do not deprive, unless there is a specified consequence they do not preclude TRPA from acting; you do not lose the authority to take action if the deadline is missed. Set goals by which the Agency should take action

Ms. Aldean Language that reads updates and plan consolidation that are prepared in accordance with this policy shall be approved by December 31, 2015, by whom?

Mr. Stockham It is the TRPA, in the event Local Governments do not do these plans, what would TRPA do

Ms. Aldean Is there a deadline for transitioning from Community Plans and Plan Area Statements to Local Plans?

Mr. Stockham We did not recommend that, this policy addresses that topic, there are choices whether you give Local Governments a deadline, we feel there are enough incentives that this transition will happen. This is to see if TRPA needs to take any actions

Ms. Aldean The language that we will be adding specific extension language, will that be an administrative decision. Staff confirmed that is the recommendation

Mr. Shute It appears we would have two systems, one which Local Governments did one or more Local Plans and the other where TRPA did a continuation of Plan Area Statements or Community Plan or its own Local Plan and would all exist side by side. Since we are not telling Local Governments when they have to do their plan, but deadlines are set when TRPA would evaluate; this does not seem to mesh.

Mr. Stockham Effectively Local Plans or TPRA Community Plans, Plan Area Statements are all more detailed planning tools that implement the Regional Plan. In substance whether TRPA Board adopts a Plan or Local Government adopts a Plan and TRPA finds that plan conforms to the Regional Plan; all of those plans have to conform and implement the Regional Plan. Sensitive to the financial circumstances and various considerations among the seven Local Governments by not putting a hard mandate. If there is an area where Local Plans are not being developed, we have over 170 PAS documents which are cumbersome; if there is



not going to be a Local Plan done, we would work to consolidate and update those through the TRPA process

Mr. Shute Would each Local Jurisdiction have one Local Plan or one for a Town Center and another for Mixed Use?

Mr. Stockham The Local Governments should have discretion as to how many Local Plans they have

Mr. Shute Suggest to establish a date by which the Local Governments have to inform TRPA whether they are pursuing Local Plans

Mr. Robinson Would there be a deferral upfront specifying that the Local Jurisdiction is not going to participate

Mr. Shute If the Local Jurisdiction lets the deadline pass and does not notify TRPA, then TRPA knows they would have to plan for that jurisdiction

Mr. Stockham Staff can come up with some language

Mr. Sevison TRPA shall be notified as far in advance as possible of Local Jurisdiction participation

Mr. Hester Recommend having a deadline and also leaving it open

Ms. Aldean Compliance by December 31, 2015; Local plan that conforms or consolidation of existing plans. Will Local Government be allowed to come to after deadline and participate?

Mr. Stockham If it went out for a few years, TRPA should do some plan consolidation and make existing plans more user friendly

Ms. Reedy Should TRPA have a required date to be notified?

Mr. Stockham Probably does not need the 2014 date of to evaluate. Would be a notification deadline and then Action Plan would go to the Board in response to notifications. Suggest one year from adoption for Local Governments to decide whether they are pursuing the Local Plans

**Mr. Shute Defer action on LU-4.5 and directed Staff to revise policy to do extension language notification. Intent from Local Governments and development of action plan based on the statements of intent**

Public Comments & Questions: LU-4.5

None

Mr. Stockham LU-4.6: Encourages but does not require Local Governments to do these plans. LU-4.13 will address the plan preparation process

Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Aldean Include “and other Stakeholders and TRPA Staff”

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.6

Ann Nichols Are local residences including second homeowners?  
Staff response is that they are a residence and stakeholder

**Mr. Sevison moved to approve LU-4.6 with modifications (Recommended language: Local residence and other stakeholders and TRPA staff) (see Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham LU-4.7 Conformance Review process for Local Plans. List of criteria to make findings of Conformance. LU-4.8. Before taking effect Local Plans have to be found in Conformance with the Regional Plan, subject to same voting requirements of Regional Plan amendments. It would come back to the TRPA Governing Board after Local Plan is approved

Mr. Stockham Before it would supersede adopted TRPA Plans; Board would have to make a finding that the Local Plan conforms to Regional Plan. Later policies MOU could be assumed by Local Governments and not subject to TRPA permits this would tie it to Thresholds and compliance to Regional Plans

Mr. Robinson Will there be a Conformance Review by Board before final approval?

Mr. Shute Language should also include achieving and maintaining the Threshold

Mr. Marshall Applicable findings that are necessary specifically in LU-4.7, findings necessary to adopt plans in current 6.4 & 6.5 of the Code that are direct Threshold related finding that we can acknowledge

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.7

None

Mr. Stockham Suggested language LU-4.7, 5th line down add: achievement and maintenance of Thresholds and the Goals & Policies of the Regional Plan

Ms. Fortier If written this way, each Community Plan would need to meet the highest TRPA Thresholds

Ms. Reedy LU-4.8, item 4 references integrated plan to comply with Regional policies and provide Threshold gain

Ms. Fortier We have had a policy of creating EIP projects for specific problems, with TMDL requirements and the new look at the Regional Plan. Are we to meet EIP projects and Thresholds which have had a lot to with how we received residential allocations or look at the EIP and what is required on TMDL and try to consider what are we going to be held to in a Regional Plan. There would be different models to adhere to

Ms. Reedy Would this be specified in the Ordinances?

Ms. Marchetta EIP is a strategy to move toward Threshold attainment. Tying the allocation of residential development rights to Local Jurisdictions achievement of various EIP projects put in place in early 2000's to meter out allocations to Local Jurisdictions. This system in return for developing a plan that TRPA compares to Regional side boards to move us toward Threshold attainment

Mr. Marshall Threshold findings: Finding from the Compact is that the Regional Plan, not that the Local Plan achieves and maintains Thresholds. Overall finding relates to Regional Plan achieve and maintain Thresholds. Local Plans should move us towards Threshold attainment, the finding the Board must make overall is that the Regional Plan will attain and maintain Thresholds

Mr. Shute The Local Plans must have provisions to help achieve Thresholds you cannot say the Regional Plan is doing that when much is dependent on the Local Plans

Ms. Marchetta EIP single most important strategy in moving toward attainment of Thresholds

Ms. Reedy Would Municipalities have to distinguish it goes to the Thresholds and is it the intent in putting in this particular one?

Mr. Shute Include EIP projects in the Local Plan and show environmental gain

Mr. Sevison If consistent with this Regional Plan it will further the Threshold

improvement. Local Plans would only then need to be consistent with Regional Plan

Mr. Shute Need acknowledgement that the Local Plans are aware of Thresholds and moving toward achievement

Ms. Fortier Threshold findings are not just about Water Quality degradation, there are other issues in the Thresholds. Does each plan has to measure those particular policies

Ms. Marchetta TRPA can dictate a plan; or in consultation with us in the development of a Local Government General Plan will include policies and implementation practices, under Conformance Review we could make findings that it achieves and maintains Thresholds

Mr. Stockham Providing a more flexible system as to how Threshold gain is achieved will be more effective than our current frame work

Mr. Sevison We did not have an EIP program when the Thresholds & Regional Plan were adopted and we made the findings then

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.7

Dave McClure Is the language going to be in there?

Mr. Shute Only added reference to achieving and maintaining the Thresholds as part of the finding that would be fundamental policy.

**Ms. Reedy Motion to approve LU-4.7 with modifications. (See pages 21 & 22 where there was a unanimous vote of approval to eliminate original modification) (See Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham LU-4.8 Works in conjunction with LU-4.9 & 4.10. Conformance Review criteria for Local Plans. LU-4.8 works with all Local Plans universally. LU-4.9 are additive requirements if the Local Plans include Town Centers. LU-4.10 High Density Tourist Districts

Committee Comments & Questions: LU-4.8

Mr. Shute Environmental sideboards performance standards?

Mr. Stockham System provides non quantitative requirements and review point for Board to make determination of Conformance or Non. No quantitative standards for each Local Plan areas because they have different opportunities and constraints and levels of degradation for various plan areas.

Mr. Sevison We did this for CTC and Legislature; it was difficult because it takes years to see the benefit in an EIP project. Can you get there from here?

Ms. Marchetta TMDL regulating and administrating the approach to water quality. Staying away from superseding regulating entity and then overlay another set of standards the way the Agencies are administering the TMDL. Local Jurisdictions are putting together their own TMDL plans, due 2014. Need interim provisions that would then be superseded as Locals develop their own plans.

Ms. Reedy LU-4.8; Goes against what we have talked about, looking as a whole and not as one plan vs. another getting to a specific number, forcing Local Municipalities to make up for past deficiencies.

Mr. Shute Jurisdictional difference between who is doing TMDL and approving those plans and TRPA's work that the Local Governments are hard pressed to do a Local Plan and a TMDL Plan unless they do it at the same time. To prove water quality improvement is to know what the TMDL Plan is and how it fits into Local Plan, etc.

Ms. Fortier How do BMP's fit in science side, issues on the science side that needs to be resolved? Are the regulations imposed effective? We are essentially developing three different plans

Mr. Stockham Sub item 4 environment improvement projects and the opportunity of Local Plans to suggest modifications. Concurrently Local Governments are doing TMDL implementation plans. We do not have the local TMDL Implementation Plans, all going toward the same objective and how the Agency can contribute in the interim period before all TMDL Plans are done. In Goal 2 there are policies promoting and removing existing regulatory barriers to redevelopment. We are working on details of the water quality sections, what recommendations will probably be is strengthening of the existing private site development requirement relating to water quality

Mr. Shute TMDL and the Land Use Plans are integral and cannot be separated. Add criteria for after deadline for approval of TMDL Plans then also a required part of approving a Local Plan

Mr. Stockham Local Plans could be developed and found to conform with the Regional Plan in the interim but after that date added, maintaining approval of a

Local Plan would be an approved TMDL Plan

Ms. Fortier Want to build infrastructure to a 2014 TMDL Plan; two states/two methods of implementing plans, focus is water clarity, problem of implementing TMDL may not address a clarity issue. To hold any Local Jurisdiction hostage to a plan in 2014, we can do nothing until then

Mr. Shute Until plans are adopted the Local Plan could be approved with whatever criteria we come up with. After State/Federal Law requires the Local Government to have TMDL Plan there is a process the city will have to go through to have an approved plan

Ms. Aldean Overlapping efforts, is it TRPA's responsibility to withhold incentives that are available? Multiple Agencies know what they need to do in order to bring plan in compliance with the Regional Plan. Is the Agency put in the position of having to enforce State/Federal Law?

Mr. Stockham Do not want to be the enforcers of a State obligation. If the Local Government did not do the TMDL implementation plan by that time frame, this could take back any permitting authority that was previously granted under conforming Local Plans

Ms. Reedy Since the TMDL is not completely solidified yet, it is not right to refer to something that may/may not happen. If something happens outside of the scope, the Governing Board could come in and amend something

Mr. Stockham Preliminary drafting on water quality, interim standards would be evaluated and updated/replaced when there are TMDL Plans for each of the Locals. Effect of putting it here if a compliance issue with the TMDL and permitting authority granted under these policies would be removed

Mr. Sevison Suggest delay in taking action on this until I can confer with Board of Directors in Placer County

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.8-4.10

Ann Nichols North Tahoe Preservation Alliance No. 3, Local Plans may also recommend amendments to the Regional Plan Land Use Map. We need maximums that cannot be exceeded on i.e. height. It is encouraging planning through amendments. No. 6; preserving character of established residential areas, elsewhere in Plan it specifies; encouraging development on the edge of Town Centers, area boundaries. Would like clarification on 6. No. 7, SEZ; development may be allowed in SEZ within Town Centers, new development or existing development to remain. No. 9; adequate BMP's

Mr. Stockham Sub item 3; designed not to amend project by project, map is capturing what is adopted today. 6; Stability, not targeting any significant changes to Land Use patterns in residential neighborhoods. Encourage additional environmentally beneficial development activity in Town Centers and discouraging in sensitive areas. Item 7; Many SEZ in Town Centers are paved over. Very little has changed since 1987 Plan was adopted since you keep what you have. Development in SEZ within Town Centers, could be allowed if there are environmental enhancements involved

Committee Comments & Questions:

Mr. Shute As worded it could allow alteration of an existing undisturbed SEZ as long as some improvement was made somewhere else. Suggest clarifying language

Mr. Sevison Include linear projects such as Bike Trails, develop technology to crossing SEZ's with bike trails, would be a transportation benefit

Ms. Aldean Suggest: development may be allowed in disturbed SEZ's. Unlikely you would have a natural stream environment in a highly urbanized area

Mr. Stockham Bike trail transportation section that is being developed may be the best place to deal with that

Mr. Sevison We should encourage these types of facilities

Mr. Stockham Work on that in policies under Transportation

Public Interest Comment & Questions:

Gary Bohem Air & water quality and TMDL benefits of trails. On the reluctance on the TMDL direction; currently working with the EPA Watershed Academy, the issue of TMDL is unfunded mandate, Lake Tahoe that has taken it on as a program, sustainability is what TMDL is about and not as much sustainability in what has been presented here. This should have review by the Governing Board. Tahoe is a guinea pig for the TMDL process

Laurel Ames Suggest word change for SEZ language. Examples in the State of CA of restoring stream zones that are under pavement. A Threshold standards is a 25% reduction of disturbed SEZ and it was not intended to Forest Service SEZ's (they have their own program for restoration); this is for private disturbed SEZ's. Item 2 in LU-4.9; consider ridge line and view shed protection. Suggest "respect". TMDL; Modeling is good, but input not as much and results are not as predictable. Measures sediment and fine sediment, mid Lake Standard. Pathway process in

2005 it was stated did not have to look at the Nearshore. Nutrients are down played, sediment in the Compact as a reduction goal and quantified in the Threshold standards. The clarity that has been lost is quantitative, it is algae not sediment. It is not going to be measured in quantitatively in nutrients or sediment; it will be done loads that the model will reduce

Ann Nichols Item 5; ensure adequate capacity for redevelopment transfer development rights into Town Centers. Crystal Bay is being called a Town Center. Wouldn't you need to determine the carrying capacity first before you transfer development? Re-write: Determine carrying capacity and ensure that there is enough. LU-4.10; Item 4; High Density Tourist: Provide Threshold gain including but not limited to measureable improvements if necessary to achieve the Threshold gain offsite improvements may be required. Not so much focus on "offsite". Work offsite that is in a different area and existing area can be degraded

Carl Young League to Save Lake Tahoe LU-4.8, 4.9 & 4.10: Consistent with other Land Use concepts, suggest achievement and maintenance of Thresholds in the top headings because they do involve amendments to the Regional Plan. To maintain consistency with the Compact there should be achievement and maintenance of environmental Thresholds. Subheadings: Provide Threshold gain; is it at the expense of other Thresholds or one that is already in attainment?

Mr. Severson Do we forsake one Threshold for another?

Ms. Marchetta It is a false distinction, forsaking or competing Threshold interest. There can be tradeoffs; our role is to be a Regional Agency. At a Regional scale we can always reconcile Thresholds

Mr. Feldman Implications of the TMDL; The Local Jurisdictions have load reduction requirements, an individual property owner potentially would be held hostage to Local Jurisdictions and ability to adopt a compliance measure for their TMDL requirement. It is generally perceived as a Regional solution and throughout the TMDL development process the Water Board was clear that it was not their intention. Target date for Local Jurisdiction to have its Local Plan approved, the consequence could be a defacto moratorium for those jurisdictions to formulate a plan that meets their Regional obligation and dialed into the project level. Most of the jurisdictions are outside the Basin and do not receive the same amount of resources. As TRPA identifies an interim standard needs to have that standard so project applicants know what their obligations are during the interim period. If a Local Jurisdiction is unable meet obligations on a longer term bases. LU-4.8: paragraph 4, EIP projects recognize and support plan projects some plans may in fact promote new projects, may say, also recommend enhancements to planned environment projects or additional environmental projects



Mr. McClure Threshold gain is a slogan, experienced recently is between the benefit of local BMP's on the parcel for the sake of the project vs. the traffic generated by the project. Is a few tons of material that may not reach Lake Tahoe worth 3000 cars per day? There is weigh offs when it comes to many of the Thresholds, to say gain for one small parcel and have all the other consequences is over simplify it. Should be a way to measure or recognize there is a conflict with Environmental gain/Threshold gain. Is street sweeping material selection and treatment, is that a part of the EIP's? Mobile BMP?

Ms. Marchetta EIP at present takes the form of set of programs and its project list. Concept of street sweeping/mobile BMP's is a term for purchasing high tech street sweepers. Strategy that Local Jurisdiction can use to meet the TMDL standards. Not to confuse EIP project with a TMDL implementation strategy

Mr. McClure Army Corp recently completed a study for Placer County and how to help achieve there TMDL and street sweeping and material selection had a 38% reduction in fines at \$3 per pound and EIP's were \$65 per pound. BMP's and practices possibly requiring more stringent BMP's. How long are the grandfathered uses going to get a pass on doing BMP's?

#### Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Fortier Local Jurisdictions creating two or three plans, EIP are specific plans and we have mobile BMP street sweeper issue which may or may not be a Regional Plan mandate. There are limited resources, where do we get credits; this is what we face as Local Jurisdictions regularly in the TMDL/Regional Plan mix. Where are our limited resources going to gain the most for the entire Community? That points out why the Local Communities feel such conflict. We are in the process of putting in a \$15 million dollar in a sediment casement in Bijou, which will relieve private owners of property of their BMP's. The cost of maintaining those projects and looking at BMP's by neighborhood or Regional bases is critical as we move forward. Local Jurisdictions are fundamentally responsible for ensuring BMP's are implemented?

Summarize changes we have agreed or not agreed:

LU-4.8, 4: Suggested planned or additional environmental improvement projects

Mr. Marshall Once an EIP is identified as an EIP project it is "planned". Does it mean that there are other EIP projects that are not now within the EIP that could be in the future. Can be done within the meaning of the language. Take out "planned"

Mr. Stockham Perhaps instead of enhancements it is modifications. An outcome of

Local Planning processes would potentially to recommend different Environmental Improvement projects. Perhaps broader language would not automatically change list but it could look at those projects and potential changes.

Mr. Marshall Suggest enhanced or additional environmental improvement projects

Mr. Stockham Does not capture if there is a replacement, would only allow additional

Ms. Aldean Suggest to modify earlier in the paragraph: Recognize and support planned, new and enhanced environmental improvement projects. The TRPA is recognizing the supporting these planned, new or enhanced environmental improvement projects. Local Plans may also recommend enhancements. Take out planned, the last plan in the second line

Mr. Marshall add planned, new or enhanced and in second line also. Take out "planned" before environmental improvement projects

Mr. Shute Number 4: Support for "provide substantial Threshold gain for out of attainment Thresholds"

Ms. Aldean subjective

Ms. Reedy As we look at the projects we need to decide whether is meets the qualifications

Mr. Shute Number 7: Development may be allowed in disturbed SEZ's LU-4.9, 2: Second line of number 2 "and respect ridgeline and view shed rather than consider"

Mr. Marshall Respect contains a subsistent notion that consider is only procedural

Ms. Reedy In a project, we determine in the findings, whether it achieves goals/gains and we consider that. It takes away some choice we make in comparing gains/thresholds as a Board member. Stay with "consider"

Mr. Marshall This is a standard that the Local Government would have to meet not what the Governing Board would see when they have projects

Mr. Fortier "Respect" we have a situation that we are held to height standard prior to even being able to develop the plan. Agree with "consider"

Mr. Shute LU-4.8: Changes made to number 4 and "in disturbed SEZ"

Ms. Fortier LU-4.8, 9: All development complies with TRPA Best Management Practices. Clarification BMP standard in light of TMDL's would look like? Do not want two Conformance issues

Ms. Aldean Later part of sentence reads: "or require more stringent BMP practices if deemed necessary" Takes delegation of authority away from Local Jurisdictions. If the TRPA is mandating requiring that all development comply with TRPA BMP's or requires more stringent BMP's. Local Jurisdiction could impose a more stringent standard

Mr. Sevison Comply at a minimum and leave off the last part

Mr. Stockham Intent is compliance with TRPA Best Management Practices unless a Local Plan proposes a different set of Best Management Practices that are more stringent than what we have in place

Ms. Aldean Is it a mandate or election. Staff response: Election

Ms. Aldean By law Local Jurisdictions can implement requirements that are more stringent. Recommend to take out more stringent BMP practices

Ms. Reedy 4, planned, new or enhanced, 7 disturbed, 9 period where the comma is

Mr. Marshall Also combine 2 & 10 are basically the same consistency with Regional Plan policies, combine the two: "be consistent with applicable Regional Plan policies including but not limited to" and number 10: "growth management system (e.g. development allocations and coverage requirements)

Mr. Shute Leave 2 and drop 10

Mr. Marshall Be specific to Local Governments that these are the items that TPRA would be specifically looking at

Ms. Marchetta TRPA driven issues that a Local Jurisdiction under their own planning and zoning authority might not consider

Mr. Shute combine 2 & 10 per Mr. Marshall

**Ms. Aldean Motion to approve LU-4.8 with modifications (see Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**  
**Abstain: None**  
**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

**Ms. Reedy Motion to approve LU-4.9 without modifications**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison**  
**Nays: Mr. Shute**  
**Abstain: None**  
**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**  
**Mr. Shute LU-4.9 Proposed using: “respect” instead of “consider”**  
**(Committee approved language change proposed-see Attachment A)**

Mr. Shute No. 4: If necessary to achieve Threshold gain offsite improvements may be required. Encourages offsite rather than onsite improvements

Ms. Aldean If we want to get away from project by project mitigations and look at the Region as a whole; offsite improvement may advance the cause as well as an onsite improvement, especially in the well developed area

Mr. Stockham This was drafted as an additive requirement, additional item that would be done in that area. Part of a package in the High Density Tourist District. Permit buildings up to the height of the existing tallest building. Maybe limited opportunities for onsite improvements, most appropriate area for redevelopment and transfer of development rights

**Mr. Sevison Motion to approve LU-4.10 with modifications (If necessary to achieve Threshold gain offsite improvements maybe additionally required)**  
**(see Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**  
**Nays: None**  
**Abstain: None**  
**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Committee Comments & Questions: LU-4.11

Mr. Shute Overtime, TRPA effect Ordinances somewhere, Local Ordinances elsewhere and there is no uniformity

Mr. Stockham There is a review determination that is has to conform, intent to allow flexibility of how the Local Governments implement the Regional Plan, instead of mandating a Regional approach to every specific issue,

Mr. Shute What is the role of a TRPA Ordinance if there has been a Conformance determination and the review authority has been delegated to the Local Government?

Mr. Stockham TRPA Ordinances apply unless specifically superseded by Local Ordinances and a finding as part of the Conformance Review process that permits that replacement. Differences in Governmental structures and in Local circumstances on the ground

Mr. Sevison Placer has a portion of TRPA's authority that is outside the Basin. This may fall into category you have specified

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.11

Ann Nichols Suggest adding: Achieve and maintain Thresholds

Committee Comments & Questions:

Mr. Stockham The Regional Plan and aggregate needs to meet the achieve and maintain

Mr. Shute Do not agree

Ms. Marchetta If we add in one place and not in another, by implication it applies in one sense and not another; did not add to every statement of Goal & Policy. Can write an overarching policy that these Goals & Policies should be interpreted with the intent to achieve and maintain Thresholds

Mr. Shute Is language added earlier broad enough? Recommend staff have suggestions at next meeting

Mr. Marshall Suggest: These Conformance determinations shall be made consistent with consistent 6.4 & 6.5 of the Code

Mr. Stockham There is introductory for the Plan and for each element within the plan. Introductory language in will be out in December

Ms. Aldean Do we need to remove from LU-4.7. Originally voted to include it

Mr. Shute Since we have an overarching statement about one of the primary goals of the Plan is to achieve and maintain Thresholds we should not repeat in some places and not others. Remove the language in LU-4.7 about achieving and maintaining Thresholds

**Ms. Aldean Motion to remove language in LU-4.7: achieving and**

**maintaining Thresholds and approve as proposed by Staff (see Attachment A)**  
**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**  
**Nays: None**  
**Abstain: None**  
**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham In December, staff will have suggestion for introductory text for Plan in general and for Land Use Element; Local and Regional Planning framework

Mr. Marshall Is the direction of the Committee to specify that the Conformance determinations made by TRPA would be made consistent with the current Code of Ordinances, Section 6.4, making the Threshold findings for Regional Plan consistency with attaining and maintaining Thresholds

Public Comment & Questions: LU-4.11  
None

**Ms. Aldean Motion to approve LU-4.11 without modifications (see Attachment A)**  
**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**  
**Nays: None**  
**Abstain: None**  
**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham Policy LU-4.12 specifies after Conformance determination of a Local Plan additional permitting activities can be granted to Local Governments subject to limitations, regionally significant projects that would still by course go to TRPA Governing Board for final approval. Staff identified some wording amendments to this policy set; we should be replicating the specific language in the Compact this reflects how the Compact is set up but there are specific changes in how they are identified in the Compact that would be appropriate to reflect here and a refinement of sub item 2b related to Gaming. We are recommending introductory bold text; clarifying language as written first sentence is intended to say: Once a Local Plan, development Code and zoning (delete all until next comma) have been found in conformance with the Regional Plans... Adding: Development Code (after Local Plan) and deleting: and development codes within the Plan. Sub item 1: Typo on first line; at least every annually (delete every). Sub item 2: Specifying projects, the Compact uses the term activities which includes projects, should say; approval of activities within Local Plans shall TRPA finding of Conformance if the activity includes any of the following criteria. Sub item B; all development permitting Gaming; language as written does not capture some of the nuance of the Compact about interior improvements to Gaming establishments. Add at the end of that: subject to the limitations set forth in Article 6 of the Compact. Sub item E: instead of all projects replace with: all development

containing more than. "F" all development would that be all activities

Mr. Stockham "E" can say all activities. Need to define A-F would all use the term "development" which we would define what development is specifically because it differs from activities

Mr. Shute We have approval of projects, approval of activities when the Local Plan area shall require TRPA finding of Conformance if the project includes any of the following

Mr. Stockham Change both of those projects to activities and in A-F, all would read: all development. Two terms in this package "activities" & "development". Staff will bring back definitions that include redevelopment, redirection and look at all specifically. We should maintain and continue to build definition list if it is the same as what is currently in the Regional Plan or differs

Ms. Fortier What is an example of 50,000 square feet

Mr. Stockham Numeric break point that is used in many jurisdictions nearby Truckee area, limit how many Commercial establishments over that square footage can occur, captures a modern supermarket. Activities below these levels are not exempt from TPRA permitting/compliance it is implemented through the requirement for conformance with Local Plans and all activities have to comply with Local Plans. Direct tie for all level of activity. Developments that are sizeable on their own do warrant direct review

Mr. Robinson Annual review is there statutory Compact basis for the Annual Review, what is the workload, why annually if it has been approved and no changes?

Mr. Stockham A transitional process new way to implement the Regional Plan and staff believe another level of scrutiny is appropriate during this transition as a catch to ensure that are not unintended consequences. Would annually evaluating activities approved by Local Governments under their plans and verifying that they are not in conflict with Regional Plan. When plan is in place for a period of time it may be appropriate to relax the procedural safeguard

Ms. Aldean Sub paragraph D: An activity that would require a TRPA finding of conformance with respect to a particular activity is if the development includes a structure that is greater than two stories in height. Under design guidelines; outside of Town Centers you are limited to two stories. Is this a variance process?

Mr. Stockham Clauses for Tourist establishments to have the opportunity to go taller than two stories, recommended to remain. There is an allowance and

opportunity to go taller than two stories. Potential Regional implications, therefore, appropriate by the Board

Ms. Aldean Believe there is a built in conflict between limiting the height of buildings outside of Town Centers to two stories even if they don't project above the forest canopy.

Mr. Sevison Need for a variance procedure

Mr. Marshall No variance proceedings because findings that have to be made for those items

Mr. Stockham Height: In Community Design identifies provisions for additional heights may be provided for unique situations and gives examples

Ms. Aldean With affordable housing there is a critical mass to make it financially affordable to build

Ms. Reedy Is two stories defined?

Mr. Stockham More detailed definitions will be provided when we get to that point in the Plan

Mr. Shute Stories vs. height

Mr. Hitchcock We are planning to establish height as measured in feet. For the planning process we want to visualize height in terms of stories that can be related

Mr. Stockham High Density Tourist District is measured in feet; how many feet tall the building is today

Ms. Aldean Plan Area Statements that are out of the Town Centers that are receiving areas for bonus units for affordable housing. Recommend to review

Mr. Marshall Two stories is additive to Tourist TAU and CFA

Ms. Aldean If it is in a Town Center and a tourist accommodation facility may be eligible for more than two stories as opposed to the limitation imposed under building height for areas outside of Town Centers

Mr. Marshall All development outside Town Centers that are TAU and CFA and are two stories and are greater than two stories in height

Ms. Aldean TAU's that are greater than two stories?



Mr. Stockham It would be the unique situations that qualify to go above two stories. List under Community Design. Staff will review language

Mr. Shute How many projects have had 50,000 square foot in the last 5-10 years That number maybe too high

Mr. Stockham Approximately: less than one half dozen

Mr. Hitchcock 1987 Plan Commercial Square Foot allocation was 800,000

Mr. Stockham Does not have to be the same numeric standard for commercial as residential. Residential projects of 50,000 sq. ft. more common than commercial projects of that size and in general have lesser impacts. Could do a numeric trigger for residential and a different trigger for non-residential

Ms. Fortier All under number 2 goes back to the same problem we are having in the City. For each plan South Y, Ski Run, Casino Core has to have the approval of TRPA at every level, correct?

Mr. Stockham Projects meeting these criteria would have to go through both steps it is more defined on the order of that and the process it would go through. Permitting activities to Local Government would be for smaller projects

Ms. Fortier Is this a good thing if we cannot control our commerce centers?

Ms. Marchetta This identifies what is considered a project of Regional significance. What is the defining criteria was has Regional significance

Mr. Stockham Conformance review against the Regional Plan, same review standard that the Local Plans go against. Consistency with the Regional Plan as a whole

Mr. Sevison Will there be an appeal process?

Mr. Shute Should have an appeal process, should not give to the Local Government without the opportunity for greater oversight is too much

Ms. Reedy If the standard is too high a grocery store would not be approved. Should we be doing that? Threshold gains Government entities appeal process

Ms. Fortier If the overarching environmental plan is looking at the impacts and we are dovetailing our Local Plans to fit within that, then what we are entitled to do within our Commercial zones should not be sent back for further

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.12

Ann Nichols North & South Shores are different; rules are Basin wide. Maybe CSLT should have different rules than others. Cannot make determinations if we do not know what the height (feet) is. Want to see the overlay of Tourist Town Centers included in this. Finding of Conformance, does it include Governing Board?

Sarah Ellis Nevada Realtors Clarification: Discussion about assumed review authority by MOU. Item 1; Is there a difference between permitting authority and development review. If not, suggest TRPA may retract the MOU

Gary Bohem There is not enough green and sustainability in the considerations here, because we need buildings of a specific size. AIA sustainable design project we did not use term affordable housing we used housing affordability. Clarification between activities and development

Mr. Stockman All developments and activity, but not all activities are development, staff will bring forward more definition at future meetings

Mr. Feldman Quantify a project of less than Regional or more than Regional significance: Example is the Red Hut Center 40,000-50,000 square feet. Is that above the Threshold? If there is a one year window that Local Plans are subject to review, they will still take too long and be costly

Mr. Stockham Appeal issue (in our Staff Summary) with the substantive and procedural safe guards recommended, appeals are unnecessary and in conflict with the process improvements we are trying to make. Safeguards substantive and Conformance Review & procedural with the recertification process cover that issue 2) For items that we will not have a consensus on, we would recommend to have a few appointees to work with staff on different alternatives for LU-4.12

Mr. Severson Would be helpful to have Local Jurisdictions give feedback as to what conditions need appeals

Public Interest Comments & Questions:

Laurel Ames TRPA does have variances; they amend Code and the Regional Plan

**Mr. Shute Defer action on LU-4.12**

Mr. Shute Called a recess at 4:55 p.m.

Meeting re-convened at 11/16/11 at 1:27 p.m.

Public Interest Comments & Questions: Proposed Sub Committee  
None

**Ms. Aldean Motion to move the approval of Sub Committee to work on LU-4.12:  
Mara Bresnick & Clair Fortier**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham Discussion yesterday involved differences between the core areas of South Lake Tahoe and other Town Centers that have been designated. We have a proposal to create a third overlay district; middle category with an intensity between that of Town Centers and the High Density Tourist District. Would enable the application of different development standards, review criteria in Town Centers, i.e., Tahoe City/Kings Beach vs. Regional area around Heavenly/Gondola/CSLT. To create we need to review LU-4.1 (endorsed yesterday), proposed language in line with language of those existing descriptions of the different districts. Revised language on page II-24 in between the Town Center overlay and the High Density Tourist overlay. LU-4.8-4.10 provides additional review criteria for Local Plans containing Town Centers vs. High Density Tourist District. Propose that Regional Centers be treated the same as Town Centers for purposes of substantive review criteria. LU-4.9 would add: Second line down in introductory text, Local Plans that include Regional Centers or Town Centers shall include. Add: "Regional Centers after Town Centers"

Committee Comments & Questions:

Mr. Marshall This is an additional overlay vs. LU-4.12 was the criteria for the distinction between projects of Regional concern and projects that would go to Local Jurisdictions. Additional overlay in LU-4.1 to be incorporated in to LU-4.9. Sub Committee would not address whether or not to add this overlay to LU-4.1 and LU-4.9

Ms. Reedy Would they take LU-4.12 overlay into consideration

Mr. Hester They would have the option to designate a different type of review process for height in the Regional Centers

Mr. Stockham This is a tool to provide additional options in discussions, treat whatever it is within the area. Recommend height be treated differently in the Regional Center overlay vs. the Town Centers

Mr. Shute One size fits all for Town Centers is overly broad, this is a good idea

Ms. Aldean Is this more complex than it needs to be? Concerned over sub paragraph D, limitations being imposed on height. TRPA establishes the upper limits and then through the development of Local Plans, Residence, Stakeholders, etc., decide what they want to be applicable to the geographical area

Mr. Stockham Staff concurs on process; Regional Center would allow us to establish different maximums for this area vs. Town Centers

Ms. Aldean A maximum that is universally applicable and then through the Local planning process decide how high you want your areas to be, square footage into incorporated developed area of plan

Mr. Sevison Need to tailor to certain areas

Ms. Aldean It would be made through the Local planning process

Ms. Reedy Localities can have more stringent rules, are these changes to give localities more while keeping within environmental more choices? We have the mechanism already if we are having the Local Governments decide and the community can go to the Local Jurisdiction to make more stringent

Ms. Fortier By adding additional overlay in SLT, come to agreement to treat South & North differently. What is that Threshold? What does the new overlay entail does it require a TRPA review?

Mr. Shute Height would be a sideboard for the different categories

#### Public Interest Comment & Questions: Regional Center Overlay

Ann Nichols North Tahoe Preservation Alliance Agree: One size fits all, Counties and Developers are driven by revenue. Recommend to use feet vs. stories. What is a "story"?

Laurel Ames Tahoe Area Sierra Club Height issue is important and should be changed to respect ridgelines. Need to keep track of where height is appropriate or not and is the responsibility of the TRPA.

Nancy McDermid Douglas County Commissioner A portion of Douglas County outside of TRPA jurisdiction. 15,000 acres into conservation easements which tie the waters to the land and protect it for agriculture use, etc. Growth management was instituted in Douglas County. Do not want to destroy view sheds, productive lands paved over. Want smart development where appropriate, do not want

skyscrapers but less coverage and you go up you have greater open, etc. is reasonable. Giving the parameters to Local jurisdictions without harming view sheds

Dave McClure New increased development. If the concept is to take of what development there is and get rid of it and then construct something new that contains exact same development and no increases in traffic. If you are going to leave all development there now and add new development that goes up, scientific fact it will create more traffic

Carl Young League to Save Lake Tahoe Concerned with scenic quality, ridgelines, scenery should be protected at the Lake, height can interfere. Talking about stories here, TAU's, it is morphing to 3-4 bedroom units several thousand square feet. Need to have a connection between of how many feet and should be a limit

Lew Feldman Paradigm in Lake Tahoe is taking something down to build something new. Acquiring blighted strip development close to 100% coverage, consolidated parcels and development resources into a new project area where there is significant coverage reduction and put parking below grade and create iconic architecture and opposed to strip blight opportunity to achieve that. Expectations is that we will live within these caps

#### Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Reedy LU-4.1 Regional Center overlay and adding language to LU-4.1 is what we were originally taking public comment on

Mr. Shute and LU-4.9. Should there be height parameters for categories; original conversation was whether to amend LU-4.1 & LU-4.9 to add new Regional Center. Propose to stay with that and let our Committee review the height issues and come back to us with recommendations

Mr. Marshall Height limitation appropriate for each district is not set in LU-4.12 it will be set by you all when you get to those parameters for each district

Mr. Shute Two story parameter already in "D" and is an issue for many

Ms. Reedy Previous discussion was to define "story". Possible for Committee talks about the difference in height and how we look at something.

Ms. Fortier Best interest to check with staff to determine what a Regional Center looks like and other are more clearly defined or should it go to the Sub Committee

Mr. Stockham This language doesn't change what the height standard would be.

We have not got to those sections yet. This doesn't require the Regional Center be treated differently than Town Centers it only provides an option of treating it differently. Sub Committee is assigned to focus on LU-4.12. If Sub Committee is desired when we get to height standards that is an opportunity

Ms. Marchetta Regional Center overlay are areas of the South Shore

Ms. Fortier What the Regional Center overlay defines is that there is a different approach on South Shore vs. North Shore. Where does TRPA get back in and where is the Local Government in control

Mr. Shute Will work with staff and Sub Committee members to set a date to come back with a report

**Ms. Reedy Motion to approve changes in LU-4.1; add the Regional Center overlay language, and corresponding changes in LU-4.9 (see Attachment A) (Added to LU-4.8: "Regional Center" after "Town Center")**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham LU-4.13: Cooperatively developing the Local Plans with Regional TRPA staff involved

Mr. Sevison Comply with TRPA requirements, suggest "consistent"

Mr. Stockham Suggest "in Conformance with"

Mr. Shute Why is it limited that Local Governments shall consult with responsible public agencies and nothing about other stakeholders, etc.

Mr. Stockham LU-4.6; Intent of policy is to specify that TRPA staff would be involved in the plan development process, with the intent of working with the Local Governments so when Plan is brought forward it is in conformance

Ms. Aldean To differentiate between the two paragraphs; developing of the Local Plans to include Local residences/stakeholders; if you added the language TPRA would be conducting those same interviews, but it is actually the Local Jurisdictions. Your conversation is going to be limited to the Local Agencies who are drafting the Plan based on public input

Mr. Stockham As these Plans are developed we see the Local Governments staff's

being the lead in public workshops and we would be there as participants  
Ms. Aldean Some of the advocacy groups will not go before the APC, they will wait until it becomes before the Governing Board. TRPA define the process as well as we can to provide input as early as possible in the process.

Mr. Stockham LU-4.12 What are the criteria that would require a TRPA Conformance Review but also what is the substance of that Conformance Review. Staff recommends is the substance of the TRPA Conformance Review is compliance with the Regional Plan; it is not compliance with all of the Local Plan. If someone chooses not to comment during the Local planning process, maybe limiting their ability to affect change through the process because of the scope of the TRPA is somewhat narrower than Local Government

Mr. Robinson See it as the Local Plans are developed they do not go too far down the road before in the wrong direction and especially when they are first done with two entities involved in it

Mr. Sevison How much of a role do you see our existing plans playing in the re-adoption of the new Plan

Mr. Stockham Same as any other Plan update, existing plan would be the starting point for a new plan

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-4.13

None

**Mr. Sevison Motion to approve LU-4.13 with modifications (as proposed, except for “comply” it would be changed to are in conformance with) (see Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham LU-4, Page II-28 Code amendments and Implementation Items for the policy changes that we reviewed and table is about the Regional side boards. Intent procedurally is as policy changes advance they will be forwarded to the Clarion, the Code Update Consultants and will take implementation measures to develop Draft Ordinances

Ms. Aldean Expand to three overlay Districts to include Regional Centers

Mr. Stockham In the Implementation boxes there will be some recommendations that involve implementation items not directly tied to policy language changes in

the Regional Plan

Ms. Fortier Development Code: Requires Local Plans to establish based line information and conditions of all Thresholds and identify how attainment will be enhanced. Is there a process for Local Jurisdictions?

Ms. Reedy Yesterday, we spoke about how we are not going to make Local entities, scientifically prove attaining Thresholds; not reading this the as such

Mr. Stockham Recommendation throughout related to Local Plans is not that they in themselves make a Threshold finding that needs to be made for the Regional Plan, but they support and do not conflict and moves towards Threshold attainment. , Consultants are developing a tool that would help Local Governments capture status of Thresholds. Work on language for what Local Government would show on threshold attainment. Recommendation not making the Regional Plan finding but positively contributing

Ms. Reedy Want the Local Government Committee review how tool is going to make them do that

Mr. Sevison Wouldn't you make finding that is consistent with Regional Plan

Mr. Stockham Intent of this provision and the need for it, we do not believe these needs to be codified as part of TRPA's Ordinances. Intend to do is furnish Local Governments with information related to the status of Thresholds at the beginning of planning processes to help inform planning processes, should be a function of TRPA to inform rather that put obligation on the on Local Governments.

Mr. Hester Local Government Committee is working on the funding for the SGC HUD Grant applied for on the Nevada side as well as the money we had for Form Based and Transect Planning that some Jurisdictions have started on. Draft report will go to Local Government Committee

Mr. Shute Should be in the Code and taken on TRPA's obligation to provide this information

Ms. Marchetta Have a one-time grant, if it becomes an obligation for TRPA then we will need more funding

Ms. Fortier It requires a monitoring and reporting from the Local Jurisdictions in the next two lines. Are you suggesting all of those be removed? If you have one time grant to establish the base but putting back to the Jurisdictions?

Ms. Marchetta Proposing to delete this item and not make it an obligation



Mr. Stockham Bullets 1-3, bullet 4 references the table below. Covered under the Conformance Review criteria. Table the first three bullets and come back with a recommendation

Mr. Hester Bullet 3; anticipate if we provide the base line information than we track projects throughout the year so baseline information. Project information is given to us and at the end of the year we can take project information to see how baseline has that changed. Information would come from the Local Government

Mr. Robinson There would not be an obligation on the Locals to update the baseline information?

Mr. Hester TRPA would have to update the baseline information with what Local Government gives us. We do not have funding to re-establish a base line every year

Mr. Sevison Need a check list rather than having to produce a mini EIR

Mr. Hester We would get summary information from each application to update our baseline

Mr. Shute After speaking with the Local Government Committee, staff will bring back information on the three bullets

Ms. Reedy Ok to delete the three and Local Government may come back with more and possible revisit it, but in a straw vote deleting the three

Mr. Hester Suggest deleting the first 2

Mr. Shute Why are we deleting 2

Mr. Marshall Duplicative of the requirement of example LU-4.8

Mr. Shute This is Code not the plan and there is a lot of stuff duplicative of the plan where do you draw the line?

Mr. Stockham At topics requires additional detail that would be specified in Code when it comes to a Plan review criteria.

Mr. Hester Number 3, Draft Staff report is that each Local Government in the MOU would identify how we monitor audit and report. If you took out we would address in MOU. Option is to leave it in the Code

Mr. Shute Not in favor of shifting to MOU

Ms. Reedy We could require that it be in an MOU, part of reporting requirements for Local Plans

Mr. Stockham Ordinance could say, provide the additional detail and other details that need to be specified. Staff could come up with more detail Code language that would implement this

Mr. Shute Suggest to take out and see it again in Code?

Mr. Stockham Suggest deleting the first two bullets under the last solid bullet and keeping the last two bullets. Return for last two bullets remain with more detail Code language

Ms. Aldean The only item coming back to us is the third, unless the Local Government decide to bring it back to

Ms. Reedy Remove 1&2, all goes to Local Government Committee along with the last two and will bring back recommendation

Ms. Aldean Determined that TRPA will provide Local Government a status on Thresholds, so in part meets requirements of bullet 1. Incorporation of Environmental Improvement Projects is already a part of the Regional Plan Update. Why would Local Government need further review of these?

Ms. Fortier "Monitoring" what does that entail?

Mr. Shute Number 2, is there more to be developed in the Code, we have already mandated, including EIP Projects. Number 2 is not controversial, Number 1 question of TRPA doing this from the beginning but not in any formal way, 3-4 would stay in

Public Interest Comment & Questions: All of LU-4/Bullets

Hillary Roverrood Director of Development Services with CSLT With the transition of providing the Local Governments more discretion and jurisdiction in many areas. Recommend this section have discussion with Local Governments staff/committee. Concern with monitoring/reporting base line information is going to be the responsibility of the Local Governments, Where does the funding come from?

Dave McClure Regarding the condition of the Thresholds and how Threshold attainment would be achieved, measuring monitoring the indicators. TRPA only has money to set up system but not continue; therefore the Local Jurisdictions would have to do it. Would depend on the project information by developer.

Project information used for a report about what is going to happen on the Thresholds. Generating new data not depending on a written document by a consultant

Mr. Shute Should spend our time on the Policies and the Plan

Ms. Reedy Concern in writing the plan on some of these details. How it is implemented and how it effects the individual/Local Government. On some would want to see the Code, it is the regulations we get complaints about. Important that Code go along with it

Mr. Shute In Table: Height up to 197 feet, maximum coverage of 70% in some categories, all come up in the Regional Plan draft. Would rather discuss in the context of policy than Code Implementation

Ms. Alden There will be a reconciliation based on the alternative that is selected do not jive with what we may or may not recommend to the Governing Board

Ms. Marchetta This was not a good example in terms of associating Implementation Measures that need to be in the Code with Policies we just spoke about. It mixed grant requirements with Code requirements.

Mr. Hitchcock Washoe Tribe was deeded land to them by the Federal Government on the East Shore and during the Stakeholder process, Tribe asked when TRPA update the PAS, recognize in a planning policy that they own land and have access to the Lake

Mr. Shute On the fourth bullet: Amend the Code to state that the Code and PAS as amended by the Regional Plan, do we need to add Community Plans, Ski Area Plans?

Mr. Stockham Bullets 1, 2 & 4 are implementing policy changes that have been voted on and one category. In policy changes Staff/Consultants reference policy language that was endorsed and sync development code with policy language. Bullet 3 is separate, unrelated to the policies. Bullet 5 which has been most of the discussion, recommendation is to work with the Local Government staff's to work on all details of this. Category of monitoring and reporting is part of the transition process to Local Planning. Table large part of the Regional sideboards that Local Plans would need to operate within.

Ms. Reedy prioritize your work to go, if we had a motion to go with bullet 1,2,3 & 4 neither accept nor nullify the balance of this would that have impact so we can work on of height and issues we want to put into our agendas for the future

Mr. Shute would you include after the Local Government Committees made recommendations that this would come back to us?

Ms. Reedy Yes

Mr. Stockham Under fifth bullet, there is a reference to the Table, needs further discussion

Ms. Reedy motion made not approved anything

Mr. Hester Clarification: Bullet 5, No. 1 & 2 are off the table, No. 3 work out details with Local Government Committee, No. 4 continue discussion today

Ms. Reedy Bullet 5 has four bullets below it

Mr. Hester the four under it

Ms. Aldean Table will be discussed; table will also need to go to the Local Government Committee. Suggest including all four bullets under No.5; get input from the Local Government Committee

Ms. Reedy you are including these and the table, you are saying to go to the Local Government Committee, not that we have approved it

Ms. Aldean we have not had the discussion on the table yet, Local Government Committee can review our discussion/review

Ms. Reedy My motion is to instruct what can go gray, and the balance of this entire item would go to Local Government Committee

**Mr. Shute Motion to approve LU-4 (bullets 1-4) with modifications (See Attachment A) No. 5 would go to Local Government Committee and come back to RPU Committee with a recommendation  
Defer action on Implementation Measure Table**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham Regional Center area was recently added will be in a new column and staff's recommendation is to treat the same as the Town Center designation with one change under height to allow up to six stories, Regional Center overlay Gondola area in South Lake area.

Ms. Aldean Mixed use was previously residential and commercial

Mr. Stockham it was commercial designation that in place today was renamed to promote a range of use not just commercial, no residential areas were converted to Mixed Use

Ms. Alden Mixed use implies that you are going to have a mixture of uses (Commercial/Residential). Currently, you have separate categories, some ways combining those categories and how does that affect, height existing, is that residential or commercial?

Mr. Stockham There are two Mixed Use categories, outside of Town Center/Regional Center it would be the existing height requirement for Commercial. No height recommended changes outside the Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist District, what applies today under this package would stay in place. Only changes in height requirements would be in the Town Centers, Regional Center overlay, and the High Density Tourist District

Ms. Aldean Add clarifying language under existing Residential and Commercial will be situations where you will be marrying the two. Height restrictions different? New category, what is existing?

Ms. Fortier Need to check with my Local Planning Dept., Regional Center as currently mapped out, how does it dove tail with our Tahoe Valley Plan on proposed height

Mr. Hitchcock Delineated the Tahoe Valley Community Plan as a Town Center

Mr. Shute Height up to 4 stories in Mixed Use and Town Centers, 6 stories in Regional Centers and 197', should be feet to be consistent, since stories are not defined

Mr. Stockham 2 stories= 32', 4 stories= 56', 6 stories= 95'

Ms. Reedy Clarification on other issues in density, MFD, existing except Local Plans and why how it benefits. The residential and TAU, where did 70% come from?

Mr. Stockham Density single family remains as existing, Density, Multiple families as you go across the Non-Urban designations remains as is. Residential stays as is with one provision that will allow opportunity for Local Plans to identify transitional district next to Town Centers.

Mr. Hitchcock Existing Density currently for accommodations uses is capped at

fifteen dwelling units an acre for units that have kitchens, we recommend going from fifteen to twenty five dwelling units per acre, trend in TAU market is moving toward units with kitchens. Tourist Density up to forty units an acre for units w/o kitchens is not changing. Tourist High Density designation same standards as the Mixed Use Town Centers. Only change is to TAU's with kitchens. Multiple family residential and Tourist with kitchens are handled the same going from fifteen to twenty five to correspond with the increase building height. Rationale on the High Density Tourist District for not having higher density is consultation with the property

Mr. Stockham Land Coverage: Do something new and better pedestrian amenities no longer economically feasible with current design requirements redevelopment improvement environment

Mr. Stockham If a new fifth tower in that district came up, the environmental gain would offset any impact through the local planning process

Ms. Reedy Hotels in that area do not attract main stream America. End up having less density

Mr. Stockham South Lake Tahoe will have to adopt a more detailed plan, specifying what can/cannot occur. Outdated facilities that are not contributing to the Region economically and scenically, etc.

Ms. Aldean Compact restricted the expansion of Gaming; feasibility of someone building a fifth tower with no Gaming component is remote

Ms. Fortier Amount of development that would be required for a fifth tower, how would that work?

Mr. Stockham Recommended package that sets up incentives for transfers of development right to occur preferentially from environmentally sensitive lands, under Goal LU-2.

Mr. Stockham Studies done and public feedback regarding that we have barriers that we are trying to remove, the incentive package is removing barriers, system where we limit coverage, development opportunities and for Legal reasons we allow non-conformances to remain subject to BMP's, etc., there is a financial block that keep property owners from improving their properties they lose parking, etc. Results are due on Transfer ratios and coverage provisions around the New Year

Mr. Stockham Land Coverage: Outside of Community Plans, Town Centers nothing changes except transfer provisions. Within the Town Centers today is a situation where development on a vacant parcel is permitted 70% coverage and

redevelopment is at 50%. It did not have basis in Bailey or science. To promote removing barriers to redevelopment within Town Centers/Regional Centers/High Density Tourist Districts. Recommend blanket 70% coverage

Mr. Hitchcock Coverage overrides apply under the current Code of Ordinances to Community Plans. Community Plan areas were switched to Mixed Use centers which will get coverage overrides. We have industrial areas that are designated as Community Plans but are technically not Mixed Use areas, but coverage override will still apply in those areas.

Ms. Fortier Does TRPA have a complete streets plan? Are other areas the same as South Lake Tahoe?

Mr. Stockham Could be defined in great specificity for Local Governments, instead our proposal is to lay out basic outcomes of what a complete street is and allow each Local Government to determine what that would look like. Complete streets are continuous sidewalks and pedestrian amenities. Sidewalks count as coverage

Ms. Marchetta Currently updating the Transportation element of this plan. TTD working with Caltrans on a concept that could be applied in the Tahoe Basin and coordinating with the TRPA

Public Interest Comment & Questions: Table

Ann Nichols Was LU-4.12, Item 1 being changed to Governing Board approval? (Mr. Stockham) This policy was delegated to Committee. Ann Nichols we have been incentivizing large project owners not to do BMP's, if they say they will but do not and could get extra height, etc. Regional plan overlay, table not clear, where does the Tourist Town Center overlay go? (Mr. Stockham) It is the Town Center overlay. Ann Nichols Tourist: exiting including special height district? (Mr. Stockham) No long applicable, height overlay district is now in the Regional Center and reflected in the six story height. Ann Nichols Local Plans may have higher density transition areas adjacent to Mixed Use in Town Centers, in Residential.

Lew Feldman High Density Tourist/197' Resorts that we compete; (Whistler) 35,000 beds within walking distance of amenities and in South Lake Tahoe approximately 5,000. The most highly disturbed area is the High Density area, (Embassy @ Stateline) we eliminated approximately 15 acres of development and created open space by relocating these of use to that area. We are trying to encourage open space and park like settings. What will happen when the lease is up in 2014 at the Horizon? We need to transition from a gaming economy to a recreation base economy.

Laurel Ames It has been said that the Casino area is dime spot on map but are a big

blight in the Basin. 10% coverage is where degradation begins; we are over covered to having any restoration on the Lake. 70% coverage is an error in terms of protecting the Lake.

Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Fortier Baily looked at the Tahoe Basin and determined 30% could be developed without harming the watershed. To take by parcel, taken coverage and decided that there is a percentage of each parcel can be developed, can prove is no longer the case. 70% would probably destroy the Lake, this is not what is being proposed, and Baily coverage should not be considered the standard. Coverage itself is not enough to degrade water quality.

Public Interest Comments & Questions:

Laurel Ames presented document on above discussion

Committee Comments & Questions:

Mr. Hitchcock Restore 25% in disturbed subdivided lands in Urban, outside of Unban is to restore all disturbed SESZ's

Mr. Stockham What is in place today has not been as effective as we want for Town Centers. We have come up with our best proactive strategy for improvement and achieving the Thresholds.

Mr. Marshall Soil Conservation Threshold management standard for impervious cover: Impervious coverage shall comply with the Land Capability classification of the Lake Tahoe Basin, CA/NV guide for planning, Bailey 1974. Implemented through the Regional Planning Code that goes down to requirements outside of our IPES system for individual parcels to comply with percent coverage in Baily (depending on how sensitive land is).

Mr. Hitchcock You can transfer coverage above your base allowable and has to come from the same hydrologic ally related area. HRA's that exceed Baily coefficients, (impaired watersheds). There are urban areas where we exceed the Baily coefficients for certain Land Capabilities. Needs to be consistent with Threshold

Mr. Shute Do the coverage transfer provisions today to bring coverage into Community Plans, are those contingent on the hydrologic areas not being impaired out of compliance with Baily?

Mr. Stockham They do not



Ms. Reedy Baily study was of the percentage of the Basin that would have to be covered that would then impact the area, what percent is covered?

Mr. Hester Baily has a number of different soil classifications. Coverage can be above/below 30%. Part of the Threshold evaluation

Ms. Reedy If numbers were ran, including the TAU's and what was available to build to, standard set 20 years ago, do we hit a Baily limit if it is a Basin wide thing we are deriving down to parcel. At 70% maxed out, we would still be in compliance

Mr. Stockham Goal LU-2: Coverage transfers (page 15) it is a complicated system in place now that staff is not recommending at this time. We recommend adjustments to alleviate some parcel by parcel challenges in the application of Baily. You get base coverage based on the environmentally sensitivity and the additional coverage to get total coverage. Sliding scale to get to coverage reduction. Sub item C, exception that may allow 1:1 transfers.

Goal LU-2 relates to total growth management system; starts with a goal speaking to environmental Threshold carrying capacities and directing the amount and location of new land uses should be in conformance with carrying capacities.

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-2

None

**Ms. Reedy Motion to approve LU-2 without modifications (see Attachment A)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Shute LU-2.1 "permitted" has an overbearing connotation

Mr. Stockham Staff has not recommended any changes because we are not recommending changes to the overall growth management system

Ms. Reedy Suggest: total capacity in the Region, eliminate population permitted. Anywhere there is population put capacity

Public Interest Comments & Questions:

None

**Ms. Fortier Motion to delete all of LU-2.1**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**  
**Nays: None**  
**Abstain: None**  
**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

Mr. Stockham Policy LU-2.2: Development rights, allocations, new allocations, bonus units with the exceptions PAOT's, table (page 18) would be helpful in guiding our discussion on staff recommendation for overall allocations. Development rights are defined, development right for each residential parcel, metered out over time through allocations. Residential allocations there are none remaining from 1987 Plan.

Mr. Hitchcock Local Governments have allocations that are currently unused and holding them pursuant to the Code that allows them to do that

Mr. Stockham TPRA has no additional allocations, recommending Residential allocations continued to be metered out at the same rate in recent history. Residential bonus units are created in addition to development rights as an incentive for necessary activities. Currently, primarily used for affordable housing and can be used for existing transfer of development right policies. Approximately 500 have been used

Mr. Hitchcock 245 Residential bonus units of the 739 are reserved for Community Enhancement projects

Mr. Stockham Tourist Bonus Units: 174 remain and no proposal to create any additional. Commercial Floor Area: Proposing an addition 200,000 square feet available just for transfer rights out of the sensitive areas to the Town Centers. Existing currently held by Local Jurisdictions could continue to be used as they are currently being used (224,000 square feet less TRPA Pool of 24,000)

Mr. Sevison Is it up to the Local Jurisdictions to reallocate under plan?

Mr. Hitchcock Provisions in the current Code for Local Jurisdictions to reallocate to wherever they need

Mr. Stockham Permit Local Governments to continue with Residential allocation system comparable to how it has been done. Needed to create enough allocations and bonus units to utilize through transfer of development right programs restoration of sensitive areas and redevelopment of Town Centers

**Mr. Stockham LU-2 Implementation Measure: Discussion was informational. Requesting no action by the Committee**

Committee Comments & Questions: Chart

None

Public Interest Comments & Questions: Table 2-18

None

Mr. Stockham LU-2.2 Deleted numbers out of the policy and wanted to maintain a working table that captured accurate status. With the exception of PAOT'S which are not proposing to change, updating language only  
Staff will include in table, status of rights and allocations

Mr. Shute Total additional development which may be permitted within the Regional has to be specified in each plan, even though it may be Plan Area Statement that does not have to do with the whole Basin, is that worded correctly?  
Staff agrees that Plan Area Statements or other plans that are not Region wide

Ms. Aldean In LU-2.2: it was recommended to take out "all other plans" is it included because of the local plans that are going to be developed?

Mr. Stockham Noted that some are going to be replaced by Local Plans, a word to capture all of those

Mr. Stockham Regional Plan should state the total and we have already gone through policies that require that the Local Plans be consistent with the Regional Plans

Ms. Aldean "the Regional Plan adopted by the Agency"

Mr. Shute Tourist accommodation: Limited need for additional units, does that number come out of the chart?

Mr. Stockham There is a limited need for additional Tourist accommodation units has not changed, just moved

Mr. Shute Any restrictions on TAU's?

Mr. Stockham This is a summary of each category and will be in more detail later

Mr. Shute That goes with Residential bonus units, Tourist Units, Commercial on Table LU-2, 2-18 will be discussed when we get when a bonus can be used

Mr. Stockham Limitations on use of those additional units will be spelled out in later policies

Public Interest Comments & Questions: LU-2.2

None

Committee Comments & Questions:

Ms. Fortier Recreational Units: Has the standard changed?

Mr. Hitchcock Not proposing to change the PAOT standard. Board direction was to deal with PAOT's and the Recreation element after adoption of the Regional Plan

LU-2.2 (down to just above the note relocated and amended to LU-4 on page II-3 under Public Service)

Ms. Aldean Including the removal of first paragraph "of and all other plans" in the first line and commitment by staff to update the approximate number of undeveloped Legal parcels in the Basin. Add II-3 through II-4 is stricken green text deletion be added to motion

Mr. Stockham Should the 16,000 that were existing at that time to remain and then we add in what is remaining as of this point in time. Committee then can review specific text that we add on Action Sheet

Mr. Sevison Suggestion: Total number, number that have been acquired with public purchase projects, and there are many lots that are not buildable

Mr. Hitchcock Approximately 1000 lots that are IPES score 0 or SEZ

**Motion to approve with modifications (see Attachment A) Need to add current status of Residential development rights (from 1987)**

**Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute**

**Nays: None**

**Abstain: None**

**Absent: Ms. Bresnick**

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Shute adjourned at 4:51 p.m.