

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
NOTICE OF MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the **Advisory Planning Commission** of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its annual retreat commencing at **8:00 a.m.** on **Wednesday, July 9, 2014** at the **Inn by the Lake**, located at **3300 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, CA**. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

July 2, 2014

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J Marchetta", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Joanne S. Marchetta
Executive Director

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Inn by the Lake
South Lake Tahoe, CA

July 9, 2014
8:00 a.m.

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

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item listed or not listed on the agenda may do so at this time. TRPA encourages public comment on items on the agenda to be presented at the time those agenda items are heard. Individuals or groups commenting on items listed on the agenda will be permitted to comment either at this time or when the matter is heard, but not both.

All public comments should be as brief and concise as possible so that all who wish to speak may do so; testimony should not be repeated. The Chair shall have the discretion to set appropriate time allotments for individual speakers (3 minutes for individuals and 5 minutes for group representatives as well as for the total time allotted to oral public comment for a specific agenda item). No extra time for speakers will be permitted by the ceding of time to others. Written comments of any length are always welcome. So that names may be accurately recorded in the minutes, persons who wish to comment are requested to sign in by Agenda Item on the sheets available at each meeting. In the interest of efficient meeting management, the Chair reserves the right to limit the duration of each public comment period to a total of 2 hours. In such an instance, names will be selected from the available sign-in sheet. Any individual or organization that is not selected or otherwise unable to present public comments during this period is encouraged to submit comments in writing to the Advisory Planning Commission. All such comments will be included as part of the public record.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. Advisory Planning Commission
Direction and Team Building Retreat

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

VII. ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA
Stateline, NV

June 11, 2014

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Teshara called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

Members present: Mr. Buelna, Ms. Curry, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Drew, Ms. Garcia, Ms. Krause, Mr. Larsen, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Loftis, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Novak, Mr. Riley, Mr. Hitchcock for Ms. Roverud, Ms. Moss, Mr. Teshara, Mr. Trout

Members absent: Mr. Gaskin, Mr. Jepsen, Mr. Plemel

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Teshara said agenda item VII.A, Tahoe Valley Area Plan Notice of Preparation will be heard after V.A, Motions and Seconds.

Mr. Riley moved approval as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Teshara said he provided his minor edits to Ms. Ambler.
Mr. Larsen moved approval of the May 14, 2014 as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Discussion of APC Procedure: Motions and Seconds

Ms. Satre said there has never been a policy in place that would require the Advisory Planning Commission to require second motions. In addition, the Rules of Procedure that govern the Governing Board and the Advisory Planning Commission

also do not require seconds. The options are to discontinue using seconds from today forward or if the APC prefers to continue using seconds on a motion, staff will prepare the documentation to support that change.

Commission Comments & Questions

Ms. Krause asked if this would include all items on the agenda.

Ms. Merchant suggested that the use of second motions be continued.

The Advisory Planning Commission agreed to direct staff to prepare the documentation to continue the use of second motions.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Proposed Amendments to Chapter 50 of the Code of Ordinances for an Update to the Residential Allocation Program

Staff member Mr. Dobbs said there have been discussions to update the allocation program for several years. It was not resolved with the Regional Plan Update but was added to the Attachment five of the Regional Plan "To Do" list of potential Governing Board work program priorities for the Agency.

There was a seven month stakeholder process last year that did not reach a set of recommendations. The Governing Board directed the Advisory Planning Commission to bring forward recommendations to update the environmental linkage component of the allocation program.

There is a growth management system in place to meter out additional development at a rate that the environment can support. There is long standing policy to include environmental improvement links to the distribution. It is not a mitigation program. The third objective is to maintain a pool of allocations that encourage sensitive lot retirement and provide value for property owners of these lots.

To link the distribution to environmental improvements there were two categories recommended to be associated to the annual performance review system; implementation of the TMDL and retain the Memorandum of Understanding permit monitoring and compliance audit from the existing performance review system. This will ensure that regulations are being applied consistently at the local level and the Regional plan is being implemented correctly.

Another objective is to maintain and strengthen a pool of allocations for sensitive lot retirement and other environmental improvement incentives. The recommendation was to front load TRPA's allocation pool. Those opportunities include the removal and

retirement of stream environmental zone coverage. Furthering the Regional plan's direction to add new development and encourage re-development in town centers through the construction of attached residential units. Continue implementation of the Environmental Improvement Program and to improve public transportation. These are allocations in addition to those earned through the annual performance review distribution. Local jurisdictions already receive allocations from this pool when property owners retire sensitive lots, approved for moderate income housing and transfer residential development rights to centers.

With additional input from the APC leadership, staff made some minor clarifications and one substantive change that would allow the opportunity for a single jurisdiction to earn more than 25 percent of the allocations in TRPA's pool if all of the other jurisdictions agree to it.

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Larsen said the previous program was not intuitive and not well linked to environmental gains that we wanted to achieve in the Basin. He feels that we have done that with this program while maintaining a lot of the strong environmental linkage that we have been directed to provide. Ensuring that the program is linked to the corner stones of local government participation, particularly TMDL and the Memorandum of Understanding compliance. By providing opportunity and incentivizing additional environmental improvements through creating a larger pool of allocations to access and linking that pool to environmental improvements; the stream environment zones, coverage removal, development in town centers and the other items that Mr. Dobbs covered are a strong direction to incentivize those types of improvements.

After reviewing the draft language there was some ambiguity in some of the language. He made some corrections to provide clarity in the direction. In addition, Placer County also provided feedback in what they felt were other areas of ambiguity. The substantive change was the limitation on the number of allocations or the percentage of allocations that an individual jurisdiction could get was set at 25 percent to ensure that there were enough allocations. The point was made that if there was a worthy project that may need a number of allocations in a given year, those allocations could be given to one single jurisdiction if all jurisdictions agreed.

Mr. Lefevre asked what the mechanism of approval is for this modification.

Mr. Larsen suggested that when a motion is made to approve the language the commission would need to approve the amended language.

Mr. Lefevre asked if one dissenting vote would keep something from moving forward.

Mr. Larsen said as drafted yes, it would need to be agreed upon by all of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Teshara asked if that would be the Performance Review Committee.

Mr. Larsen said yes he believes that is correct.

Mr. Marshall said the Performance Review Committee meets annually to do the base line distribution. The 25 percent is not associated with that annual allocation; it is associated with merit ad hoc earnings of those reserved units. It would have to be a special meeting of the Performance Review Committee.

Mr. Trout asked for clarification on the process.

Mr. Dobbs said the Performance Review Committee meets annually and if raised in advance it could be discussed at the PRC meeting or an additional PRC meeting could be held to discuss a project that exceeded 25 percent for any individual jurisdiction and then that recommendation forwarded to the Governing Board.

Mr. Marshall said the representative from the respective County would need to have the proper authority to make decisions. It would be whatever each individual jurisdiction needed to do in order to get the approval of another jurisdictions use of more than 25 percent of the pool.

Mr. Drew said the proposed language references the credits and allocations on an annual basis in terms of achieving compliance with the TMDL but TMDL is set up on five year milestones. He asked if we are taking 20 percent of those five year milestones to see if have met the 90 percent of the annual credit.

Mr. Larsen said the current permit is written based on the five year milestone along with the TMDL. In future years, they anticipate that there will be individual annual credit targets associated with them. This first five year term was an anomaly because they knew that they had some front loading work to do.

Mr. Drew said the linkage is good and the percentages are reasonable for this first milestone. As we move forward in the TMDL the milestones are going to be more difficult to achieve because the low hanging fruit will be gone. He asked if the Water Board is willing to entertain looking at those percentages as we move into future milestones.

Mr. Larsen said those points were raised when they adopted the TMDL. Local governments expressed their concern about the ability to achieve the load reductions as we advance over time and the load reduction opportunities become more scarce. Their Board was not ready to start backing away from targets immediately. They have

asked their local partners to provide information regarding load reduction opportunities as well as their fiscal analysis to meet those load reduction targets in the future. The Water Board is committed to considering that information and if necessary adjusting the targets.

Mr. Buelna said he feels some of Placer County concerns will be addressed through the process. One is the deferral of the distribution portion; it will be their opportunity to address some of the concerns with enhancement increments and a number of different items that are tied to that.

Mr. Teshara said yes this would be completed.

Mr. Buelna said the other critical component is the every four year monitoring of the Regional plan and the ability to revisit the allocation discussion. He asked if staff would review the monitoring and tracking of the distribution for TRPA's pool of allocations. One is how the allocations are being utilized and to determine equity and availability. Is there enough in the pool or is the pool too large and we don't need to set aside reserves. The every four year review is important.

Mr. Teshara said that is a reasonable request.

Mr. Larsen said there was a lot of discussion about the opportunities to access the residential allocation incentive pool. It would be useful for TRPA to track which of those four options that local governments do use so they can determine which of those are most effective.

Mr. Marshall said there are a number of interests in this program that would want that same information from different perspectives; it would be useful for staff to collect and distribute this information.

Ms. Merchant provided comments from Mr. Kraatz. On page 50-6, number four, list of incentives in the pool. Mr. Kraatz cautioned that because there are stream environment zone projects in the EIP project list that there would be potential for an individual to get two allocations by doing an SEZ restoration project. Ms. Merchant suggested considering in that EIP item to state "except for SEZ restoration projects." They are covered elsewhere but may be it is the intent to potentially double count. Mr. Kraatz feels that the 90 percent score on the TMDL is too high especially in the first few years because it is new and we do not know what it is going to take to achieve some of those targets. He felt that getting an increment of deduction for not getting an "A" was too strong. Perhaps it should be reduced to 80 percent during this initial period.

Mr. Donohue said that is not in alignment with Mr. Larsen's statement about permit conditions.

Mr. Larsen said anything less than 100 percent is considered non-compliance and subject to penalties from the Water Board. He was unsure if going from 90 to 80 percent is going to be a substantive difference. If a jurisdiction anticipates that they are going to fall short they should have that discussion with the Water Board to determine the cause.

Mr. Donohue asked if that would be a more appropriate conversation to have when we re-visit this in two years.

Mr. Larsen said the first permit term expires at the end of 2015. So far local governments are on track to achieve those so it is going to be looking at the 2016, 2017 and 2018 targets. It will be towards the end of the next five year term where it is going to be a challenge. The point is well made but we have an opportunity at a number of policy levels such as the TMDL and re-visiting this language to address this if necessary.

In regards to the stream environment zone, a lot of the EIP projects are SEZ restoration. He asked what number of those is removing existing coverage from the SEZ because that is what is linked here. If there is overlap between EIP projects that remove coverage from the SEZ then the suggested change is something they could consider.

Mr. Marshall said 4.C is essentially referring to double counting, already credited. We could make that not specific to subsection 55.2.E.1 but generally to this chapter. If you are getting EIP projects that could count under A. or under the TMDL provision then you would not be double counting.

Mr. Drew said this is where the fundamental difference of using the term stream environment zone in the Tahoe Basin and stream restoration as it is used everywhere else. There are many projects where you may get SEZ restoration here that never touched the stream and projects in the Basin where they are truly stream restoration projects and there is not coverage removal associated with them. Often times the coverage is within the 1B capability but it is not within the true traditional riparian area. It is important that we have projects and we incentivize individuals when they have coverage adjacent to stream restoration projects to remove that. It is a good idea when the project proponent has the opportunity to do a high quality project that may be a stream restoration project but they reach out to remove coverage that may be within 1B. He recommended that if there is an opportunity to incentivize individuals to do both of those things will be good.

Mr. Larsen said Mr. Drew's point is that double counting could be a good incentive.

Mr. Drew said yes there is value in being able to have double benefit.

Public Comments & Questions

None

Commission Comments & Questions

Ms. Merchant asked how the incentives stacked up against each other as incentives because an incentive is related to the economics of doing that and does it make sense to do that versus what you are getting in return. Is it a big enough carrot? She is unsure that all of those things are necessarily equal. What is the cost to take 10,000 square feet of existing land capability coverage and remove it versus taking a complete EIP project that is in item C.? It is probably cheaper than providing additional transit service in order to achieve the items in D. She suggested considering rather than having one allocation for some of those things that we might provide an increment. In item C, should we have a bench mark to try and level out the field?

Mr. Teshara said that is the value of the decisions we make today, knowing that this is going to be reviewed within two years and the data will be tracked.

Ms. Merchant said we should commit to monitoring the pool and what is used by the jurisdictions as part of our action today so we have the data for the next review.

In tables 50.5.1-1, 50.5.2-2 on pages five and ten there was a discussion at the last APC meeting that we do not know what those distributions are going to be yet because that is the next task. Since this is going to the Governing Board for ratification and approval to be placed on the books during the interim, she suggested that this group may want to add that this is for demonstration purposes only. She is concerned that this is going to be set in stone if we do not come up with another plan.

Mr. Teshara said during previous discussions that there was consensus with the group around caveat language so it was not misconstrued by others for that reason.

Ms. Merchant suggested as Code is amended that it go back to the consultant who did the technical writing during the Regional plan to ensure consistency and accuracy.

Mr. Teshara asked if staff planned to have an outside company review Code amendments for consistency during the next Regional plan.

Ms. Marchetta said it would be contingent on the budget.

Mr. Donohue said he is confident that TRPA staff is capable of doing this work.

Ms. Marchetta said if there is substantial Code amendments at the time of the next Regional plan update in 2016 staff will apply the best resources to that effort.

Public Comments & Questions

Darcie Collins, the League to Save Lake Tahoe said they support staff's recommendation. In section 50.5.1.4.C referring to allocations for the five year EIP projects; on the flip side of Ms. Merchant's comments that all things not being equal there are a handful of projects on that list under certain programs that do not have any environmental connection. She recommended reviewing what projects would qualify for the allocations.

Mr. Larsen said this issue was brought up in trying to ensure that there is environmental benefit. The language included is to link the EIP project to something that is tied to a measurable EIP performance measure. The goal is that the EIP performance measure is providing that linkage to environmental benefit that Ms. Collins spoke about. If we are not linking to adequate environmental benefit on the ground by linking to an EIP performance measure then he would consider revising the language. The intent was to ensure that there was some environmental benefit on the ground by ensuring that the project that is being awarded an allocation has a direct tie to a performance measure.

Mr. Teshara asked Ms. Collins if that addressed her concern.

Pat Davison, Contractor's Association of Truckee Tahoe said in the findings it is not mentioned that the allocations as a result of incentives could be used for moderate income housing and there could be an environmental linkage. If you are reducing commute times and able to provide housing to the workforce in the Basin there is a net environmental gain. She agreed with the statements made today about the necessity to have detailed monitoring of the program as it moves forward. She said the two charts in Chapter 50 on pages 50-5 and 50-10 have the jurisdictions listed in a different order.

Darcie Collins, the League to Save Lake Tahoe asked if Mr. Larsen's explanation would be a language change.

Mr. Larsen said that is the proposed language that is in the document and is already linked to an EIP performance measure. This language ensures that there is a link to environmental benefit on the ground.

Darcie Collins, the League to Save Lake Tahoe said that it addressed their concern.

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Teshara felt that it was the consensus of the group that the double counting is a positive benefit and we do not consider the revised language from the legal counsel.

June 11, 2014

Mr. Trout said under four, a, b, c, and d can be interpreted as mutually exclusive in that a jurisdiction can only apply for one or the other and not cumulative. He suggested that language be added to ensure that it is clear that this is in any combination and cumulative for jurisdictions.

Mr. Larsen suggested adding “and”, “or” to each of those.

Mr. Buelna suggested adding “any combination of the following” would satisfy the disparity of whether it is only one.

Mr. Trout moved to recommend Governing Board approval.

Ms. Merchant asked if the motion was to accept what was presented in the report or was it inclusive of some of the other conversations.

Mr. Teshara confirmed that the motion was to approve the findings as indicated in the staff report, Attachment B.

Mr. Trout said that is correct.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Marshall suggested adding “and”, “or” to a, b, and c. Staff will review the language before it is presented to the Governing Board.

Mr. Teshara asked if this recommendation is acceptable to memorialize the intent subject to more precise language prior to going to the Governing Board.

Mr. Marshall said if you want to have the language immediately, he suggested adding “and” to the first three “or” at the end of a, b, and c.

Ms. Merchant suggested making the order of the tables consistent. She was agreeable to have staff review and revise the language for a, b, and c as necessary. She also suggested that we track the incentives, the pool and allocations.

Ms. Merchant agreed to make this a motion.

Mr. Larsen asked if Ms. Merchant’s comment on the tracking and reporting was to add language specific to the commitment to track or stating that the Advisory Planning Commission would like to direct staff and the Governing Board to ensure that the tracking occurs.

Ms. Marchetta said staff tracks this annually.

Mr. Donohue said we do not need to add this to the Code.

Ms. Merchant said it should be direction to staff to bring it forward to the Governing Board that we will be monitoring this.

Mr. Larsen asked in regards to the tables if there is specific language that we are proposing to change or a caveat as we move it forward to the Governing Board that we are committed to addressing the distribution.

Mr. Marshall asked if they are requesting additions to the Code.

Ms. Merchant said it would be out of place in the Code of Ordinance. Is the APC recommending Code changes now so there will be something in those tables in the Code of Ordinance? She suggested that they specify that they are recommending these changes but they are not asking the Governing Board to codify them until they complete the second part of the project.

Ms. Marchetta said currently we are not addressing the distribution, we are not there yet.

Mr. Teshara suggested adding information to the staff report prepared for the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and Governing Board that these are not the final distribution numbers.

Mr. Marshall said we are not amending any current proportion allocation. There is no amendment on the table that touches the percentages between the jurisdictions.

Mr. Donohue asked if it was correct that the environmental linkage is not going to be addressed until the next cycle. He suggested that this Code language be a draft and said why separate it from the opportunity to deal with the distribution. If the Governing Board likes the concept, then we could present it as one package. It is not going to get used until the other portion is developed.

Mr. Marshall said we currently have a set of linkages and allocations in the Code of Ordinances that are effective until they are changed. If you want to change the linkages and the opportunities for incentives you need to do that regardless of what you do with the distribution percentages.

Ms. Marchetta said the reason staff brought environmental linkage forward ahead of distribution was so that local jurisdictions would know as early as possible what the standards were for next year. She felt that the Governing Board will not want to keep that open. If you keep it open, you do not know what will earn an allocation and it could still change.

Mr. Teshara said we will convey the concept to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee and Governing Board with the language in the staff report because we are amending the Code of Ordinance and do not want the caveat in the Code.

Ms. Marchetta said the staff report can contain the Advisory Planning Commission anticipates moving on to the distribution issue and is not sanctioning the numbers that are in the table.

Mr. Larsen said we are amending the Code, if we adopt this it will be as ordinance. The Advisory Planning Commission would recommend to the Governing Board that they adopt this and the tables will be adopted. When the APC has the opportunity to address the distribution then we can re-visit those tables at that time.

Mr. Teshara said we have the amended Code to consider with the additional stipulation that is still germane but the other items are direction to staff.

Ms. Merchant suggested the moderate income housing item be added in D.4.b to clarify that it would be eligible.

Mr. Dobbs said that is included as an option to distribute from this pool to moderate income housing in item number two.

Ms. Merchant said that is to distribute under the current system.

Mr. Marshall said this section is to the residential allocation incentive pool. What Ms. Davison was suggesting is that she would like to see in the findings that you approved a reference to the connection between moderate and affordable housing and environmental considerations.

Pat Davison, Contractor's Association of Truckee Tahoe said it was in regards to findings. Is this a hard and fast change to findings for example or is it suitable to have it in the record. She felt it belonged in the record; the way that the minutes are recorded it is clear and direct connection to comments that were made. If you look at the use of the allocations from an incentive perspective there could be a net environmental gain when those allocations are used for moderate income housing.

Mr. Larsen added to Ms. Merchant's motion that the clarifying language will be determined by staff and counsel to ensure that those incentive options are not exclusive of each other.

Motion carried unanimously.

VII. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Tahoe Valley Area Plan

TRPA staff member Ms. McMahon said the Tahoe Valley Area Plan along with the Notice of Preparation is available on the City of South Lake Tahoe's website. The area plan is approximately 335 acres, located at the South Y intersection of Highway 50 and State Route 89 in the City of South Lake Tahoe. The vision is to transform the South Y into a recreation gateway. This is the first area plan to take advantage of many incentives in the Regional plan including provisions to facilitate the development of area wide BMP's. It also includes new transfer guidelines to facilitate the restoration of stream environment zones in the Tahoe Valley greenbelt and Upper Truckee watershed. The greenbelt is proposed to be used for stormwater detention as well as community open space amenity within the area plan. It also specifies for development of additional bike, pedestrian and transit facilities to create greater connectivity within the area plan and adjacent residential neighborhoods and identifies water quality improvement projects that will help the City meet their TMDL targets. The City's goal with the area plan is to leverage resources to achieve multiple benefits and promote environmental redevelopment.

There are four alternatives; Alternative one is the no action alternative; Alternative two-Revitalized Town Center would include reduced height and density when compared to Alternative three; Alternative three is the proposed alternative-Tahoe Valley Area Plan; Alternative four-Revitalized Town Center, increased residential would expand the area plan to include adjacent residential areas.

There is a public workshop and scoping meeting on June 19 and the City will present the Notice of Preparation to the City Council on July 1 and the City Planning Commission on July 10. All meetings will be held at the City Council chambers at the Airport.

Commission Comments & Questions

None

Public Comments & Questions

Lyn Barnett, Wells Barnett Associates said the Lake Tahoe Airport's comprehensive land use plan is zoning that is placed on top of the local zoning and will have to be adhered to if the area plan is adopted. Zone three covering the entire South Y is the least restrictive zone but has land use noise and density limits that are applicable to the uses on the ground. There is a statement made that only privately owned assembly and entertainment collection stations and sports assembly uses are

prohibited. This is accurate but there are restrictions in the comprehensive land use plan on occupancies for schools, hospitals, residential care, nursing facilities and personal care facilities which limit the number of onsite individuals to six. On page 35, noise; CNEL for the health care district is 55 and matches the current Plan Area Statement CNEL. But because of the zone three airport zoning it has been raised to 65 which creates an inconsistency between the two plans. When the airport master plan is adopted and there are increased uses or to meet new federal safety regulations it is possible the comprehensive land use plan could be further ratcheted down dampening some of the development efforts at the Y. He suggested that the two plans be reviewed concurrently.

The circulation plan that is in the area plan is important to Barton hospital. The bike trails in that circulation plan are located on Conservancy land and some of those lands may not be available for bike trails. Those properties need to be identified and see if the funding sources can be changed so the bike plan can be implemented.

Peter Eicher, California Tahoe Conservancy said Mr. Barnett is correct in the fact that many of their properties are purchased with various types of funding sources.

Commission Comments & Questions

Mr. Drew asked how the City of South Lake Tahoe is addressing the limitations of the airport master plan with regards to other planning activities the City has taken on.

John Hitchcock, City of South Lake Tahoe said their proposal is to adopt a policy that references the comprehensive land use plan, those standards will still apply. The issue is that they cannot amend the comprehensive land use plan until they determine what kind of aviation uses can occur at the airport. Currently the comprehensive land use plan is based on commercial airlines coming into the airport. Commercial airlines are not a viable use. The City will work through the master plan process and then update the comprehensive land use plan. If that requires the update the area plan later to be consistent they will do so. In the comprehensive land use plan it states that strict application of the comprehensive land use plan may create undue hardship, the City does allow deviation from those standards if specific findings are made.

VIII. REPORTS

- A. Executive Director
 - 1) Spring 2014 Quarterly Report

Ms. Marchetta provided an overview of TRPA's first quarterly report.

The report can be viewed at:

<http://www.trpa.org/wp-content/uploads/2014-First-Quarterly-Report.pdf>

B. General Counsel

No report

C. APC Members

Mr. Teshara said the first annual Advisory Planning Commission strategic planning retreat will be held on July 9, 2014.

Ms. Curry asked if there are programs in the school districts to educate the students on what an invasive species is.

Ms. Marchetta said as part of the communications staff outreach is to go to various classrooms and educate them on environmental issues.

Mr. Donohue said UC California, Davis has a program where the scientists and other resource professionals visit classrooms. He suggested that a smaller group of the Advisory Planning Commission members start preliminary discussions on the distribution in order to meet the November deadline.

Mr. Teshara agreed with Mr. Donohue's suggestion.

Ms. Marchetta agreed that a subset of APC and particularly the local jurisdictions should start preliminary discussions.

Mr. Larsen asked if they could do a workshop at the August meeting.

Ms. Marchetta said that would be fine.

Mr. Hitchcock said the students at the Bijou school visited the Discovery Center where they were educated on the Asian clams, Secchi disk and some also went out on the Lake. He said he would provide the information about the Discovery Center to Ms. Curry.

Mr. Lefevre said one of the fifth grade classes visited the Forest Service and presented a skit on the web of life. He said the Washington, D.C. office of the Forest Service is currently in the objection resolution period for the Land Management Plan. The Associate Deputy Chief will be back on July 1 to continue discussions on some of the objections where there is potential for resolution. The resolutions will be put in the final plan and a record of decision should be completed towards the end of the year.

Ms. Marchetta asked Mr. Lefevre to characterize the two key issues.

June 11, 2014

Mr. Lefevre said some of the objections surround the retention of 30 inch trees in their forestry program. It gets more at the core of late seral habitat. The discussion is about the removal of 30 inch trees and those exceptions where we would want to remove a 30 inch tree the core issue is late seral habitat and the retention. Another issue is the management within the inventoried road less areas of the fuels program and how they manage when there is an unplanned natural ignition. The Fire Chiefs are meeting with the environmental community tomorrow to work through that protection of community versus the use of natural prescribed fire in the environment. There are also discussion around preservation of habitat and management for martin and spotted owl as well.

Mr. Riley asked for a revised Advisory Planning Commission membership listing

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Teshara adjourned the meeting at 11:09 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.

