

## FactSheet FollowUp

### Public Lands, Milestone #2\*

#### What is a FactSheet FollowUp?

A FactSheet FollowUp is a set of Milestone meeting summary notes that serve as a companion to the FactSheet prepared for each Milestone. It documents each policy issue discussed in the FactSheet, the staff proposal, and direction given by the Governing Board. The FollowUp is not intended to serve as regular minutes of the meetings. These will be prepared for the Board and made available in the usual way.

#### What was the direction given by the Governing Board concerning Natural Hazards policy issues?

##### NH Issue #1: Why should TRPA propose to update the natural hazards maps in all action alternatives?

**Staff Proposal:** To reflect the nature of the different EIS alternatives and provide different approaches to achieving the policy purpose, staff proposed to revise the plan alternatives as follows:

<i>Alternative 1</i>	<i>Alt. 2</i>	<i>Alt. 3</i>	<i>Alt. 4</i>
<i>Policy #1 from the 1987 Plan's Goals and Policies: DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE REGULATED IN IDENTIFIED AVALANCHE OR MASS INSTABILITY HAZARD AREAS.</i>	<i><b>NH-1.1</b> <u>NATURAL HAZARD MAPPING: JOINTLY PREPARE, BASED ON AVAILABLE FUNDING AND IN COORDINATION WITH UNIVERSITIES AND LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES, MAPS TO IDENTIFY NATURAL HAZARDS AND PREPARE NATURAL HAZARD MAPS FOR USE DURING PROJECT PLANNING AND REVIEW.</u></i>	<i>Same as Alt. 2</i>	<i><b>NEW POLICY:</b> <u>TRPA SHALL PERFORM ALL THE NECESSARY ANALYSIS AND UPDATE ITS NATURAL HAZARD MAPS.</u></i>

**Governing Board Direction:** The Board concurred with the staff proposal.

---

\* Milestone Meeting #2 was held on February 24, 2010 at the TRPA Offices, Stateline, NV.

## What was the direction given by the Governing Board concerning Open Space policy issues?

### OS Issue #1: What is the definition of “open space?”

**Staff Proposal:** To alleviate confusion between the concept of “open space” in the Goals and Policies and the definition of “Open Space” in Code Chapter 18, staff proposed that Code Chapter 18 be revised so that “Open Space” appears as “Open Space – Dedicated.”

**Governing Board Direction:** The Governing Board directed staff to develop a clearer name for “Open Space” in Code Chapter 18 (other than “Open Space – Dedicated” as proposed by staff, or “Open Space – Deed Restricted” as proposed by the APC). The new name should be an improved descriptor of what can and cannot be developed on designated open space parcels.

## What was the direction given by the Governing Board concerning Recreation policy issues?

### REC Issue #1: Is TRPA’s current Master Plan requirement too narrowly drawn to protect the environment of Lake Tahoe?

**Staff Proposal:** Staff proposed to retain Policy 5.6 in the Developed Recreation Subelement, but make a change to the first Implementation Measure. Specifically, the proposal was to change RecDev.Imp-4 to read: “Amend Chapter 18 to add a ~~new~~ definition for a new category of recreation facility called ‘multi-season resort.’”~~This definition would include ski areas, marinas, developed day use areas, etc.”~~

**Governing Board Direction:** The Board supported the staff proposal, which was also supported in the APC’s technical advice. Specifically, the Board directed staff that the multi-season resort concept should be studied in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the new Regional Plan. This should include various “triggers” for when modifications to an existing TRPA Master Plan would be required. TRPA should also clarify the difference between commercial and recreational uses within multi-season resorts. For the EIS analysis to be effective, the Master Plan revision or requirement triggers should be developed sooner rather than later. Also, the Project Description should contain more specificity on the types of recreation projects that would be subject to master planning requirements.

### REC Issue #2, Part 1: Why is TRPA proposing to designate permissible uses for public lands (the snowmobiling issue)?

**Staff Proposal:** Staff proposed to amend Implementation Measure Rec.Disp.Imp-5 to read, “Establish appropriate use areas for snowmobiling ~~within the transect districts and match use areas established by the~~ using U.S. Forest Service and State

Parks' maps to inform the development of TRPA use maps," and add an additional measure that states, "Amend the definition of Dispersed Recreation in Code Chapter 18 to allow snowmobile use in designated recreation areas."

**Governing Board Direction:** The Board directed staff to adopt the recommendation by the APC for REC Issue #2, Part 1. The APC supported staff's proposal to collaborate with Agency partners in developing TRPA's snowmobile maps. The APC also recommended that the impact of the mapping and the allowance of snowmobiling as a permissible dispersed recreational use should be studied in the Regional Plan EIS.

### **REC Issue #2, Part 2: Why is TRPA proposing to designate permissible uses for public lands (the mapping issue)?**

**Staff Proposal:** Staff proposed not to make changes to the Implementation Measures in the Dispersed Recreation Subelement as a result of stakeholder concerns.

**Governing Board Direction:** The Board directed staff to continue to designate permissible uses for public lands in the new Regional Plan. The APC also concurred with the staff proposal.

### **REC Issue #3: Is TRPA proposing additional measures to protect public access to recreation areas and Lake Tahoe?**

**Staff Proposal:** Staff proposed that no changes be made to Implementation Measure Rec.Gen.Imp-3 (concerning right-of-way (ROW) and public easement abandonments) based on the fact that this measure would ensure that the public interest is preserved whenever ROW abandonments are considered. (Public access is a Recreational Threshold standard and staff acknowledged that TRPA must protect access as a mandate of the Compact.)

**Governing Board Direction:** Though some Board members questioned TRPA's authority to review and approve abandonments, the Board's straw vote indicated concurrence with the staff proposal. The Board further directed staff to collaborate with local partners to develop the process for approval of ROW and public easement abandonments to aid in the achievement of the Recreation Threshold as it relates to public access to recreation areas at Lake Tahoe.

### **REC Issue #4: Should TRPA require mitigation for loss of private and public recreation facilities?**

**Staff Proposal:** Staff proposed that no changes be made to REC Policy 4.4 in the Developed Recreation Subelement or its associated Implementation Measure (Rec.Dev.Imp-6) as a result of some stakeholder concerns.

**Governing Board Direction:** The Board concurred with the staff proposal, directing staff to work out details in the Implementation Measures that will be included in the

revised Code of Ordinances. The APC had discussed ideas regarding potential mitigation measures for loss of recreational facilities. The Board also directed staff to consider the quality of a recreational experience when developing mitigations for loss of recreational facilities.

#### **REC Issue #5: Why is TRPA proposing to continue to use PAOTS?**

**Staff Proposal:** Staff proposed that the Board not make any changes to the PAOT (Persons at One Time) policies in the Developed Recreation Subelement or its associated Implementation Measures as a result of stakeholder concerns.

**Governing Board Direction:** The Board supported the staff recommendation and concurred with the APC's technical advice to continue with the current PAOT system. The Board also gave direction to staff to consider the original purpose of the PAOT system and continue to look for better measurement tools in the future as an alternative to PAOTs.

The Board went on to direct staff to "strongly consider" establishing recreational carrying capacities for the region after adoption of the updated Regional Plan. (These carrying capacities would consider site settings, quality of experience, and ability of sites to handle recreational demand in addition to reserving basic service capacities for water and sewer service).

#### **REC Issue #6: Should TRPA consider reinventing the Recreation Element and Program?**

**Staff Proposal:** Staff posed a question to the Board that, if it believed that the proposals in Alternative 2 failed to address the major considerations mandated by the Compact, the Recreation Threshold, and the comments of stakeholders, staff would reconsider the overall structure and content of the Recreational Element and Program.

**Governing Board Direction:** With one abstention, the Board voted to consider the reinvention of the Recreation Program after adoption of the updated Regional Plan and not sooner.