

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPU COMMITTEE**

TRPA Offices
Stateline, NV

December 15, 2011

MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Shute called the meeting to order on December 15, 2011 at 1:12 p.m.

Members Present: Ms. Fortier, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Mr. Shute

Absent: Ms. Aldean

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident asked that the Prosperity Plan be updated.

Steve Buelna, Placer County asked to get meeting materials as much in advance as possible.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Reedy moved approval.
Motion carried unanimously.

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

None

V. PLANNING MATTERS

Schedule and Process

Mr. Shute said that the schedule presented by staff is for the draft Regional Plan to be completed when the Environmental Impact Statement is ready for distribution.

Mr. Stockham said our schedule for completion of the policy language and the implementation measures about a month and half ahead of the Environmental Impact Statement and starting in late January through early March our focus would be the implementing ordinances. The draft Regional Plan, draft implementing ordinances and the Environmental Impact Statement released by the Governing Board in late March 2012.

Mr. Robinson asked what the product would look like that goes to the Governing Board.

Mr. Stockham said the draft Goal & Policy plan, the draft implementing ordinances (Code) and the draft Environmental Impact Statement will be released in March 2012.

Mr. Robinson said he is concerned that the Governing Board has to re do what this committee has already done.

Mr. Stockham said the draft plan is going to reflect the majority votes from this Committee. A separate document will be provided that will summarize the minority opinion for consideration.

Mr. Shute said he is concerned that the schedule of meetings is too aggressive.

Ms. Marchetta said it was management who created the schedule in order to meet the December 2012 deadline.

Mr. Shute said he would agree to discuss a modification to the meeting schedule.

Ms. Fortier suggested that we could have some all-day workshops.

Mr. Shute said he agrees with Ms. Fortier's suggestion.

Mr. Stockham said we will discuss with the Chair and Vice Chair.

Mr. Severson said as we move forward the process should get easier.

Discussion on Land Use Policy-2.15

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above policy.

Committee Comments & Questions

None

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizen Action Alliance (Item C) asked if there is a pool of bonus units that is limited where they have to come from it or are these above & beyond already specified bonus units.

Mr. Stockham said it is in within the pool of available bonus units.

Mr. Shute said there are two categories of bonus units.

Low Feldman said he encourages the approval of Land Use-2.15 as proposed.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident asked if the Best Management Practices are already installed, should we add a caveat for maintenance.

Mr. Stockham said this is covered in the Water Quality section.

Hilary Roverud said the language in Land Use-2.15, sub item B.2. is not consistent with the language that was discussed at the December 13 meeting.

Mr. Stockham said staff agrees that text "in a hydrographically related area" should be deleted in sub item B.2.

Mr. Shute asked what the rehabilitation fee and how does it relate to excess coverage fees, etc.

Mr. Hitchcock said it is the fee that is charged per square foot for excess coverage, it is then given to the two land banks to retire coverage.

Ms. Reedy moved to approve Land Use Policy-2.15 with modifications. Deleted "in a hydrologically related area."

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

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Aldean

Mr. Shute said for the record that he has already dissented Hydrologically related areas.

Discussion on Land Use-2 Implementation Measures for Coverage

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above Implementation Measure.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Reedy is concerned that we will give credit for pervious coverage that may not be doing the job in future years. She suggested that this could be reviewed at the time of a home sale. Also, are the trails considered hard or soft coverage and do we count the coverage Basin wide?

Mr. Stockham said staff recommends a 25% credit to install pervious coverage. The requirement of a trail is that it is open to public and non-motorized and the

coverage is counted Basin wide.

Mr. Sevison asked if the different types of pervious coverage are given the same type of credit.

Mr. Stockham said our initial recommendation is 25%, but we will have design requirements to outline what types of pervious coverage would qualify.

Mr. Sevison asked if the trails designated for non-motorized are allowed to have motorized vehicles for maintenance, etc.

Mr. Stockham said staff wants to prevent a driveway from not being considered coverage.

Mr. Robinson said that technology and maintenance has improved greatly for pervious coverage.

Mr. Shute asked how soft and hard coverage are treated for transferring purposes under the existing TRPA requirements.

Ms. Navarro said anything that is legally verified (hard or soft) is determined as coverage that can be transferred if it has been proven to exist prior to 1972.

Mr. Hitchcock said today we allow the transfer of soft coverage to residential only as hard coverage.

Mr. Shute asked the meaning of the language "allow soft coverage to be transferred from stream zones to Regional Centers," etc.

Mr. Stockham said it is recommended on sensitive lands to incentivize the removal of coverage in Stream Environmental Zones, allowing that to be transferred to hard coverage to support development in Town Centers.

Mr. Shute asked how land capability verification can be done without establishing criteria as to when you would not need a field survey.

Mr. Hitchcock said staff recommends criteria be established that gives the option to staff to make the determination at the desk if a field verification is necessary.

Mr. Shute said he does not have an issue with desk verification, but is not supportive of the establishment of the criteria deferred to an ordinance. He suggested a performance standard in the plan.

Mr. Stockham said the implementing ordinances would be more detailed as to

where it would apply. It would need approval by the TRPA Governing Board. Mr. Shute said a plan generally establishes the basic criteria and then the details are in the Code. As proposed, it defers it to the Code.

Ms. Reedy asked if there can be language added that there has been a field verification done in the past.

Mr. Stockham said staff could add a more general policy in the Plan and the details of where it is applied in the Code.

Mr. Shute said it needs something to give it guidance.

Ms. Fortier asked for an explanation for pervious coverage on decks.

Mr. Stockham said staff recommends for new decks up to 500 square feet outside sensitive lands, (subject to design restrictions) would be exempt from coverage.

Mr. Sevison said that all decks have to have gravel underneath them.

Ms. Fortier asked if green houses are coverage.

Mr. Stockham said it would be exempt if it is a small (approximately 10x12) and not on a permanent foundation.

Mr. Sevison asked if there is going to be a list of items that may be exempt.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident said maintenance is paramount on pervious concrete streets.

Mr. Stockham said streets would not qualify for this credit.

Nicole Gergans, League to Save Lake Tahoe said the first priority is to remove hard coverage from a stream environment zone. By allowing soft coverage to be transferred it may be a disincentive to remove hard coverage. Also, the credits for pervious coverage need to be mitigated.

Wally Auerbach, Auerbach Engineering is concerned with land capability credit for non-motorized trails at 100%. He suggested separating “pervious coverage” from “pervious surfaces.”

Lew Feldman asked why we wouldn't give incentives for Class 1A land.

Steve Teshara, Tahoe Transportation District Board said there would be cost savings and environmental benefit for our bike trails, if we did not have the coverage requirements that exist today.

Lisa O'Daly, California Tahoe Conservancy asked how the new policies pertaining to bike trails fit into the Tahoe Basin and if TRPA is going to lead the cooperative effort in the 208 Plan modifications.

Ms. Reedy asked why we would not give the same consideration to transferring hard coverage and add Class 1A land.

Mr. Stockham said hard coverage can already be transferred and staff is not opposed to adding Class 1A land.

Mr. Shute asked how we could compensate for soft coverage being less expensive and possibly making hard coverage less likely to be removed.

Mr. Stockham said staff's recommendation is that soft coverage is a higher priority to remove. Also, there is more development to be done on the bike trails and stream environment zone crossings before any exemption of coverage would be appropriate.

Wally Auerbach, Auerbach Engineering asked if the new Code would require boardwalks or elevated crossings in stream zones. This will increase the cost and will not provide the incentives needed to implement bike trails. He suggested there be a 100% credit for coverage.

Mr. Stockham said those designs are already being done with for new construction of trails. The intent is to reduce the cost related to coverage acquisitions for trails.

Lisa O'Daly, said the California Tahoe Conservancy will be vetting their construction cost study with other agencies to determine the best designs.

Nicole Gergans, League to Save Lake Tahoe asked where the findings came from that support soft coverage as being more detrimental than hard coverage in a stream environment zone.

Ms. Marchetta said that we will have to review different options for financing the removal of soft vs. hard coverage. There is a distinction between hard and soft coverage and each will have their own strategies.

Mr. Shute said he wanted to clarify, that it is not being stated that soft coverage is more environmentally harmful than hard coverage; they have different consequences and factors involved in their removal.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked if there is a motion for Land Use 2.15 with the modifications: Amend the Code of Ordinance second bullet will be deferred for staff to revise language on criteria for a desk evaluation. It was suggested to add “maintain” pervious coverage in the 25% credit and on decks, so it does not just mitigate the impacts, but maintaining them as pervious surfaces that would be required.

Mr. Stockham said we will defer the 2nd bullet on page 5, (which is the 3rd bullet in package.) The third open bullet on the 25% credit for pervious coverage, we would add: “subject to design and maintenance requirements.” On the 3rd item next to last bullet having to do with decks (pervious surface) also would be “subject to design and maintenance requirements.”

Mr. Sevison moved to approve Land Use-2 Implementation Measures, bullets 1, 2 & 4 with modifications. Defer bullet 3 and return with draft language addressing when field verification criteria is not required.

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

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Aldean

Discussion on Land Use Policy-4.12

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above policy.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Fortier said the local government committee reviewed the various items under number 2, which were Gaming and the Shorezone, 200' high water line.

Mr. Stockham said that development activities that do not trigger a Regional review will still be required to be conformance with the Regional Plan.

Ms. Fortier said if a local plan is being done through a Memorandum of Understanding, you can always become more limiting as a local plan.

Ms. Reedy asked for some clarification on square footage for residential and non-residential.

Ms. Fortier said this could refer to any type of residential units, which local government discussed if there should be two different measurements.

Ms. Reedy said since it could be a condo or multi family; does it mean a

development that has a few hundred residents could be built without going through the TRPA?

Mr. Stockham said an example is in the most intense areas of the Regional Center, a condo project could be built in the 199,000 square foot floor area in conformance with the local plan without requiring TRPA approval.

Ms. Marchetta said an example of a project that would be on the cusp for size, would be a multi-family project in Tahoe Vista, 20 units, 2000 square foot duplex.

Ms. Reedy asked if you could do a development of single family homes in the Regional Center.

Mr. Hester said 200 single family homes would be a subdivision.

Mr. Stockham said this is as process Threshold not a regulatory Threshold.

Mr. Shute said the actions that do not require TRPA approval, are considered not to be projects under the Compact because they have no substantial impact on the Region. He still feels this language needs be revised.

Mr. Marshall said the legal construct to allow local government to review and approve developments within these criteria is that they have to develop a local plan that has enough protections within it.

Mr. Shute said if this was adopted as is, this would be a determination that projects up to this size and meeting criteria are by legal definition of TRPA not a project.

Mr. Marshall said no, they become eligible for that finding to become non-projects.

Mr. Shute asked when that determination is made.

Mr. Marshall said when the local plan is presented for approval.

Ms. Reedy asked that in between the local plan four year review period is it possible to add or stop a plan.

Mr. Stockham said before local plans are adopted, the process would be the same as it is today. After local plans are found to conform and are in place, if an application was submitted that met one of the criteria's, it would still be processed the same as today.

Ms. Fortier gave an example of how a City could have redeveloped an existing site

under the parameters of this plan with all the safeguards in place under the local plan.

Mr. Stockham said today we are implementing the Regional Plan project by project. Staff is recommending implementing the Regional Plan through local plans.

Mr. Stockham said the concept review developments are to see if they conform to the Regional Plan.

Mr. Robinson asked what impact in the terms of numbers it will have on the Agency.

Ms. Marchetta said it moves the focus of threshold attainment up to the plan level and set strategies that apply that would allow local jurisdiction the flexibility to own Threshold attainment.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Nicole Gergans said the League to Save Lake Tahoe is concerned with taking the Regional planning approval process from TRPA to the local jurisdictions. It was also suggested adding Recreation Districts into 2.C.

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizens Action Alliance asked if the Tourist Accommodation Units apply to the residential category. Also, asked if a project like the Biomass plant in Tahoe City would not require a TRPA review.

Mr. Stockham said it depends what the local plans say, and if the local plan had allowances and protections for that.

Mr. Robinson said the Biomass was in preliminary stages, and it would have had to go through other state processes.

Mr. Shute asked what would have happened with Homewood under this language.

Mr. Stockham said Homewood is not in a Town Center.

Mr. Hester said TRPA would have seen the Placer County plan for approval requesting this change.

Lew Feldman said Homewood's residential element exceeds the 200,000 square feet; therefore, it would have gone to TRPA for review.

Mr. Marshall asked if the square footage figures as "building net" or "footprint."

Mr. Stockham said it is total floor area.

Ms. Reedy asked if there could be language added to the Ordinance to prevent the addition of new projects that are the same as the existing.

Mr. Stockham said it is a good suggestion to put in the Ordinances that if repeat applications were received within a specified time frame, they would be considered additional.

Mr. Hester said if you do serial divisions of land that create more than four parcels that is a subdivision.

Mr. Marshall said our Code has existing language that staff can use to modify language.

Mr. Shute asked if it was correct the local plan could have its own definition of the Shorezone.

Mr. Marshall said that was incorrect. The recommendation of the local government committee was to put the line for where everything must come to TRPA at the backshore and the lakeward. The activities in the Shoreland, (landward of the backshore) could be subject to exclusive local review if desired within local plans.

Mr. Shute said he is concerned that the numbers are too high; a project with 200,000 square feet has a category in the Town Center or Regional Center, if this were to have an initial study checklist, it would come up with no significant impacts.

Ms. Reedy said that redeveloping “r” areas in the Regional Center could have environmental benefit.

Ms. Fortier said it has always been in the parameters of the local plans that it would be coordinated with the Regional Plan. It gives the local jurisdictions to make decisions within the regulations without having to go back to the TRPA every step of the way.

Mr. Marshall said that project determination on individual projects but it is a way to have a tiered level of review, so when it comes to approve local plans look at projects of those sizes in the aggregate can be considered not to have a significant impact on the environment.

Mr. Severson said no matter what is proposed it needs to be consistent with the Regional Plan.

Mr. Robinson said he feels that there is an assumption that if it reaches this square

footage that there it is assumed that there is no significant environmental impact.

Mr. Marshall said as the projects get bigger, it is harder to show in the aggregate that they are not going to be significant.

Mr. Sevison asked if TRPA receives a project of significant size, would it have to go to the local government.

Mr. Stockham said everything has to go to the local government.

Mr. Shute said he feels the numbers are too high and will encourage planning to try and get up to that level and that is sends a message to the community of much greater levels of development that would be exempt from TRPA review.

Ms. Fortier said we are still looking at the 50,000 square feet as the determinant, but 200,000 square feet is alarming.

Mr. Shute said he agrees the 50,000 square feet, one size fits is inappropriate. He would agree to vote yes if a review of these numbers reducing them recognizing that they are different categories and entirely different treatment that would be fine.

Ms. Reedy said will agree with these numbers with the trust the local government committee their public works staffs are working together.

Mr. Robinson said he agrees and would defer to local government on this.

Steve Buelna, Placer County said that their preference would be that we maintain as a Regional Plan with certain square footages and then further refine the differences between North & South Shores.

Mr. Sevison moved to approve Land Use Policy-4.12 with modifications, "shall require TRPA review and approval" rather than "finding of conformance." Number 2 "approval of projects within local plans shall require TRPA review and approval if the projects include any of the following criteria." Number 3, "all of the local governments ongoing." Minority opinion will be drafted in coordination with Mr. Shute at a later date.

Ayes: Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison, Ms. Fortier

Nays: Mr. Shute

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Aldean

Discussion on Land Use-4 Implementation Measure

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above Implementation Measure.

Committee Comments & Questions

None

Public Interest Comments & Questions

None

Mr. Robinson moved approval for Land Use Implementation Measure-4, less the table.

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

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Aldean

Discussion on Land Use Goal-3 and Policies-3.1-3.5 related policies

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above Goal and Policies.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Marchetta said the Tahoe region won a strategic growth council grant to implement SB375. We are taking a contract under that grant to look at these transfer ratios.

Mr. Stockham said they are evaluating the specific proposals and will be coming back with the analysis of the environmental impact/benefit and economic analysis of the effectiveness.

Mr. Robinson asked if the ratios would change based on the study.

Mr. Stockham said staff is recommending that we continue to move forward with this draft and will adjust accordingly based on the report.

Mr. Shute suggested starting the review of Land Use Goal-3 and Policies 3.1-3.5.

Ms. Fortier asked where a project like Sierra Colina would be in the new Plan.

Mr. Stockham said staff is recommending that Sierra Colina will be handled through the local planning process.

Ms. Fortier asked if you believe there will be areas like Sierra Colina that could try to get into the realm of being considered a Town Center. What kind of effort will there be to drive into a Town Center.

Mr. Stockham said there will be a drive, which the policies in the plan speak to the criteria that Town Center's will have for transit systems.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara, Tahoe Transportation District Board suggested in the sustainable community's strategies chapter, a language revision to change "transit oriented development" to "mobility oriented development."

Mr. Stockham said the Greenway is not in a Town Center, and is a Transportation/Recreation improvement. This specifies the types of facilities that would be in a Town Center.

Mr. Shute suggested "encourages mobility without the use of personal vehicles."

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute suggested as part of SB375, there should be language that says "encouraging high densities for higher intensity of development."

Mr. Stockham said it is partially captured in bullet 5, capacity for receiving transfers and relocations. He said staff could strengthen the language.

Ms. Fortier said on the maps for the transfer sending areas, it appears the greatest capacity for transfer is eliminating the Tahoe Keys.

Mr. Stockham said the keys are not in the highest transfer ratio. Staff felt it was important to use objective criteria that tied back to walkability and travel distance.

Mr. Sevison asked if water borne transit was put into this. Suggested we have allowances for parking to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation.

Mr. Stockham said indirectly it was, because each station for the water borne transit corresponds to ground transit and Town Centers.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Crystal Jacobsen, Placer County in Land Use-3, item 4, asked for clarification on the highway access component and item 7, suggested adding the word "perhaps or" rather than "and" in the sentence "existing or plan street designs of contiguous paths and infrastructure."

Mr. Stockham said in item 4, all the Town Centers delineated now are along highways and item 7, we defined in the side board tables more detail the concept of sidewalks and paths.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Fortier suggested staff to revise the map.

Ms. Reedy said the map is not mandating anything. Tax issues could impact municipalities.

Mr. Stockham said the tax base would increase; one unit would turn into two or three units. A modification that would stay consistent is to show that everything on the lakeward side of the dark green corridors would not get a density bonus.

Ms. Reedy said it would not necessarily be in the same tax area. If the keys are included in this, it would probably be a substantial part of the tax structure for South Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Shute asked if the map will be used for anything else besides illustration.

Mr. Stockham said it is an illustration of the policy and implementation language.

Mr. Hester said not sure if the map would be used, but the concept is used in the modeling to quantify the greenhouse gas reductions.

Mr. Stockham said if we made the change, we would also make the change in the policy language as well.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said the concept is in line with SB375 to incentivize having more development in the areas that are accessible to transit. This may be distances for incentives that could be worked out in the local plans.

Ms. Reedy said it is the TRPA's jurisdiction on Regional bases to come up with these recommendations.

Mr. Shute Land Use Policies-3.4 & 3.5, Land Use-3.4, item 1 “a concentration of non-residential and mixed use development at a higher intensity than exists in other areas of the Region.” In item 7, at the end, “so as to encourage mobility without the use of private vehicles.”

Mr. Severson moved to approval for Land Use Policies-3.4 & 3.5

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

Ms. Fortier moved to approve Land Use-3.1 & 3.2, Land Use Goal-3. Change language in Goal 3 to “economic, and environmental...”.

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

Discussion on Land Use Policies-3.6-3.8

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked if sensitive lands are 1 through 3.

Mr. Stockham said that is correct.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Nicole Gergans, League to Save Lake Tahoe asked is concerned that development is being moved away from less impactful places and moving toward the lake that we are trying to protect.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Sevison said we are moving densities into Town Centers that are adjacent to the Lake. Suggested when we do the Community Plans we look at those areas.

Mr. Stockham said that is a good suggestion.

Ms. Reedy moved to approve Land Use Policies-3.6-3.8

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

Discussion on Land Use-3 Implementation Measures

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above Implementation Measures.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked about bullet 2 statements “to allow for subdivisions”, does that raise the subdivision two-step process.

Mr. Hitchcock said yes, the Goals & Policies currently prohibit subdivision of lands that creates new development potential.

Mr. Shute asked to defer bullet 2 in Land Use-3 and suggested staff provide to the Committee and public the August 22, 1995 memo to the Governing Board from the TRPA Legal division outlining the reasons for the two-step subdivision process.

Mr. Robinson moved to defer action on the second bullet under Land Use-3 Implementation Measures until more detailed information on subdivisions and the two-step process can be provided for review.

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

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Aldean

Discussion on Land Use-3 Implementation Measures, Bullet 1, and the Transfer Table

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above Implementation Measure.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute said it says “define mixed use facilities and permit resorts,” would that allow an office building or condos at the mid-mountain?

Mr. Hitchcock said the intent of this implementation measure is to allow a mixed use tourist commercial facilities at ski resort bases.

Mr. Shute asked if this should be reworded to include these kinds of uses in a ski master plan if approved.

Mr. Stockham said that would be a better reflection of what is intended. Suggested a language revision of, “amend Code to include mixed use facilities and multi season resorts in recreation areas as a component of ski area master plans.”

Ms. Fortier said then the only change would be for ski areas, what would be the impact for other recreation areas.

Mr. Stockham said staff can broaden the language.

Mr. Marshall said we included the ski areas items in the scope, specifically related to Heavenly.

Mr. Stockham said we should not have scope issues, because they are evaluating allowing these facilities in recreation areas subject to limitations.

Mr. Shute asked if this language does not allow bonus opportunities for these areas.

Mr. Stockham said they are not proposed to be receiving areas for the transfers.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Lew Feldman said we are trying to transition from the day use driven economy to more of a destination recreation driven economy.

Steve Buelna, Placer County asked for a copy of the letter for the two-step subdivision process.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe asked for clarification on the ratio tables. Top half refers to Existing Residential Units, Commercial Floor Area, Tourist Accommodation Units, and on the bottom half it references Residential Development Rights.

Mr. Stockham said that was the intent and the reason is the driver of trips. Suggested a language revision in the text on lower header on the right hand side, "only for transfers of residential development rights and existing residential units into Town Centers."

Lew Feldman said on bullet 3, the bonus units would propose that ski area master plans be eligible.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Hitchcock said at the last meeting the Committee took action to amend the Goals & Policies in the Land Use & Implementation chapter to allow bonus units to be transferred into approved ski area master plans.

Mr. Stockham said the action taken at the Homewood hearing allowed bonus units to be transferred in but it did not apply transfer ratios to ski area master plans.

Mr. Shute said the 3rd bullet currently does not include bonuses, the 4th bullet refers to the Town & Regional Centers but not ski area master plans.

Mr. Stockham said that Mr. Feldmans's point would be appropriate in the 4th bullet.

Mr. Shute is concerned about the language that would allow local governments and plans to have different ratios based on unique conditions.

Mr. Stockham said in South Lake Tahoe there are several long existing commercial establishments that are degrading the rivers which staff is recommending identifying stream restoration priority areas where local governments could apply more aggressive transfer ratios.

Ms. Reedy asked if the local governments could do this, would it come back to us.

Mr. Stockham said it would have to be done as part of a local plan and demonstrate and environmental improvement.

Ms. Fortier asked if the incentives ratios are high enough.

Mr. Stockham said this is another tool that could be used.

Mr. Shute suggested in the 3rd bullet adding ski resorts and or areas like Camp Richardson and in the 4th bullet add ski areas to be eligible density bonuses. Also, should local plans be allowed to have higher ratios? He suggested doing the Code draft and leave the ratio area blank.

Mr. Stockham said we could do that and start building the structure of the Code.

Mr. Shute said we are working with an absence of technical planning information.

Mr. Sevison said it would be helpful to have numbers, even if they are only for reference at this point.

Mr. Robinson asked if we are proposing to defer all of the Land Use-3 Implementation Measures or just the ratios.

Mr. Shute said he would prefer to take action, but clarify these ratios are place holders only.

Ms. Reedy asked if we are doing everything at the bottom of the table.

Mr. Robinson said he would like more time to review bullets but would propose move forward with the note the ratio numbers will probably change.

Mr. Robinson moved to approve the specific transfer ratios with the understanding they may be subject to refinement based on the findings of

ongoing analysis.

Mr. Robinson amends the motion to include the first bullet

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

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Aldean

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Shute adjourned the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

DRAFT