

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

TRPA
Stateline, NV

March 27, 2013

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Shute called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

Members Present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Cole, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Shute

Members Absent: Mr. Sevison

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

None

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Shute proposed the approval of the membership as is and any future changes would be handled at that time.

Ms. Aldean moved approval.
Motion carried unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

Recommendations on process and schedule for adoption of the four year Regional Plan Performance Benchmarks

Mr. Shute said the committee's job is to establish benchmarks for determining the success or need to modify the Regional Plan in a four year period when we have the obligation to review.

Mr. Stockham said Ms. Marchetta provided a detailed overview today and at the Board retreat last month on what the situation is and the timeline of what needs to be accomplished.

Why are we doing performance measures: It is to determine if the Regional Plan amendments are working. As desired the performance measures would focus on the

amendments that were approved in 2012, less so than the long standing Regional Plan components. This is also called for in the California Budget language.

What is it that we would measure: The power point slide presented outlines the priorities for the Regional Plan Update on the programs that are deemed effective and are retained. The changing programs focusing on environmental improvement through development transfers and restoration, redevelopment, better transportation options and the streamlined permitting process. Those are the high level priorities for the 2012 Regional Plan Update.

What are those priorities expected to achieve: Accelerated environmental improvement, water quality, sensitive land restoration and scenic quality in developed areas, reduced auto reliance because of the environmental impacts, reduced impactful development and improved process. Again, at a high level this is what the updates approved in 2012 sought to achieve.

Following that is what would be measured to see if it is working. These were initial categories that staff developed. We would come up with performance measures that are easily measureable and meaningful. Are we accelerating environmental restoration? It could include measures such as the acres of sensitive land restored each year compared to what has happened historically. We probably want to focus on privately funded restoration because public funded restoration depends on the dollars coming not on the policies we have in place.

We may also want to measure the rate of scenic improvement. Scenic quality under our ordinances has been improving but very slowly. The goal of the Regional Plan Update was to accelerate that improvement to the scenic quality of our developed areas.

The second category is improving Regional Land Use Patterns. The basic idea of having a higher proportion of development located in centers or centrally located areas; that are less environmentally impactful and a lesser proportion in outlying areas that are highly automobile dependent.

The next category involves travel behavior and alternatives to the automobile, less auto reliance. Perhaps we could measure the modal split and hope for increases in pedestrian, bicycle and transit use compared to automobile use.

The last category is effectively implementing the Plan and that would focus on delegation and is it working.

These are all preliminary and will take us to a short process to work through these. Today we are talking about that process and getting direction from this committee. In approximately the next two weeks we plan to publish and distribute a recommendation for a list of performance measures. The next step would be for a stakeholder advisory group to have two meetings to provide a diverse range of input into these performance measures that will then be recommended to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee. The RPIC

would review and provide a recommendation to the Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board at their May meetings.

The purpose of this accelerated time line involves budgetary considerations. This is not an exceedingly complex policy debate like we did with the Regional Plan Update. He feels that there was wide spread agreement on the broad goals of the Regional Plan Update and the main points of debate were on the techniques to meet those goals.

The Advisory Working Group will be the interim group to work through this package. We are tentatively planning a five member group. These members need to have a detailed knowledge of the Regional Plan Update, the policies that were changed and the reasons for that change. This group is proposed to consist of a California and Nevada representative, local government representative and business and environmental representative. This group is advisory only and would make recommendations to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee. We also plan to invite a number of interested stakeholders to these meetings and are also open for the public to attend.

Committee Members Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said the original intent with respect to the efficacy of the Regional Plan Update in terms of enabling us to meet our environmental objectives was over a longer horizon. It is important that we are discussing the initial performance measure categories; we need to be mindful of the fact that you can also measure progress with respect to planning. It is a big component of this; implementation does not start immediately after the adoption of the Regional Plan. You prepare to implement but there are some planning steps that are integral to the implementation. When we establish these benchmarks with certain time lines, we need to incorporate what the realistic planning horizons are before we start implementing and realizing the efficacy of the Regional Plan. Her concern is it may take more than four years for us to catalyze things to the extent where there are measurable results. It is unfair not to include the progress we make in implementing the steps we intend to take to achieve these interim benchmarks.

Mr. Stockham said some outcomes are going to be much slower to see on the ground, others may be realized a little more quickly. Whatever those targets are for a four year time period we need to recognize the time that it takes to do the area plans and the pre-application timeframe to put together a project. He would not expect the rate of progress over the first four years to be anywhere close to the rate of progress ten or fifteen years out once all of the policies that have been decided by the Board trickle out into the real world. That will be an important component of especially what those targets are, but you are correct, maybe there should be a number of area plans adopted or items that will attract progress.

12:44

Mr. Cole said he believes we all agree the need for an RPU in anything is the built environment that is the problem. The status quo has not worked for a long time and we are hoping this RPU will do something. One of the first criteria we need as part of the benchmarks is an inventory of what the built environment is especially in these area

plans which may take a significant amount of time. Until we have that base line and that benchmark then itemizing and categorizing improvements is relative to what is here now.

Mr. Stockham said that staff is currently working on documenting what exists on the ground today. We did a lot of that analyze through the EIS for the Regional Plan Update and our intent is on the 10th to distribute a staff summary that recommends topics that would be indicative measures and provide some information on where we are today. For example SEZ restoration acres per year could be a measure. We have information on how many acres per year have been restored historically and that would then inform what would be a reasonable expectation moving forward. Presumably it would be a gradual increase in that rate of restoration. We plan to distribute the base line information and then have those discussions with the Advisory Group and develop targets through that process based on the categories.

Mr. Cole asked if one of the area plans criteria is to determine coverage, residential units and TAUs. Are all those items going to be inventoried when the area plans come forward?

Mr. Stockham said staff has already inventoried that at a regional level. We have in our GIS system how much existing development is located in various areas. We also have the information on transit ridership and the model split. The historic information we generally have available and staff needs to assemble and disseminate in a summary. The one key challenge is what those targets are for the future.

Mr. Shute said he is glad the SEZ example was used because he feels the emphasis should be on relating how the Regional Plan is implemented in relation to attaining the Thresholds. That is the bottom line and believes that is what the Legislature was looking for. These benchmarks should be linked wherever possible to a particular Threshold to see if we are moving in the right direction or if an adjustment needs to be made.

Mr. Stockham said staff is looking at that but it gets deeper because some of the Thresholds are very slow to respond. For example, mid lake clarity we would not expect any short term immediate response to the policy changes. We can use proxies that are well documented to result in water quality improvements, an SEZ restoration or a TMDL implementation, etc. that would respond over a shorter term.

Mr. Robinson said the calendar is very ambitious and that is good that we get as much done as fast as possible. He asked what the advisory group would produce to bring to this committee and eventually to the Governing Board.

Mr. Stockham said the thought is to have a review layer where staff recommendations are vetted through this group that has diverse interests and they would present a recommendation to this committee. It would be an additional perspective on these issues that you might not get if a staff recommendation came straight to this committee.

Mr. Robinson asked who is going to choose this working group.

Mr. Marchetta said the budget language directed us to consult through the California Resources Agency and the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources which have agreed to delegate this down to agency level. The rest of the complement to the advisory group is individuals who are most familiar with the recent amendments to the Plan. In consultation with the chair of this committee, he agreed that reconvening the range of stakeholders who had sat at the consultation table to develop the recommendations on the Plan was an efficient and logical way of constituting the representation on the advisory working group.

Mr. Shute said he spoke with staff and we have come up with a representative from NDEP, Lahontan; and in order to have a balanced representation from the business and environmental community and who were also part of the Bi State consultation process we would have Darcie Collins, the League to Save Lake Tahoe and Lew Feldman.

Ms. Marchetta said the only addition to that is a local government representative. The local jurisdiction may be the ones who have to track some of this data. Also today we have some additional members sitting at the dais with us. At times these kinds of policy recommendations may go back for consultation to the Tahoe Interagency Executive Steering Committee (TIE-SC) but because we are on a tight time frame we did not have time to have extra meetings for the TIE-SC. She felt those representatives could add value because the TIE-SC went through the working process of establishing the performance measures for the Environmental Improvement Program.

Public Comments & Questions

None

TIE-Steering Committee Member Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara said we may want to consider how we are doing on generating additional revenue for the Environmental Improvement Program. For example, Nevada has one hundred million dollars programmed but have not been able to sell the bonds because of states bonding capacity. But in the course of the next few years or four year period they might do that. California has not yet identified its share of the EIP for the next round; there are some discussions on how to do that. A measure of the Regional Plan Update based on the themes is that the private sector would be able to accelerate its contributions through the Plan mechanism and does that happen over the next couple of years. The local government has TMDL and other things that they will be spending money on. There is the potential to have the EIP contributions themselves be a measure by which we could look at our progress over the next couple of years. He said he appreciates the opportunity to contribute to the forum.

Patrick Wright said in speaking with Secretary Laird's office this morning that this is a great opportunity. He believes Secretary Laird would say as well that it is not about re-writing the Plan in any way; it is simply better documenting the expected results of the Plan and putting all of us in a better position to explain the improvements that are expected over time. He

feels the biggest challenge is how this is framed because as you have heard from staff that this is about how we get to Threshold attainment. That is not going to happen anytime soon. The focus should be more on what Mr. Stockham termed the surrogates because we are not going to see meaningful Threshold attainment for a long time and that is what the four year Threshold evaluation process is about. This should not be replacing that analysis. People should also be aware that the EIP has its own set of performance measures and the RTP also has its own set of performance measures that are in the Plan that talk about VMT reductions and other items. Perhaps the easiest way to bound this effort in a meaningful time frame is to focus on the land use elements of the Plan; and for those elements what we can expect to achieve in land use over the next five or ten years as opposed to trying to what Lahontan did over ten years with respect to water quality. The biggest challenge is how you inform the public that this is real, it is serious and we are making a difference; and to get people off of defining the Regional Plan in terms of how it was different than the old Plan. To the extent to which we can collectively come up with a set of better documented expected results of the Plan, we will all be in a better position to move forward together.

Mr. Shute said that is an excellent observation. There is a lot of concern about Threshold attainment and many do not understand that you can't make a direct link between a particular project and TMDL reduction. Anything that we identify as a benchmark that is a substitute or indirect measurement we identify how it is linked to a Threshold. That is important for the Legislature and the public to understand who may be skeptical about whether this Plan would achieve or work toward attaining Thresholds.

Maureen McCarthy, Tahoe Science Consortium said she agrees with Patrick Wright that we have to be realistic that the four year benchmarks are not necessarily the same time frame of which the environment will be responding. It is important for us collectively to agree on how to map what we are hoping to achieve in the decisions that will be made in these benchmarks and what categories of the environment are expected to be impacted. We can then use that information to inform the science review if that goes forward to refine and understand more about what the time scale that the environment would likely respond, and how can you determine causation from a management action and into an environment. Anything we can do to frame questions that may be pushed into that potential science review would be exceedingly helpful.

Mr. Shute asked for a motion to approve the Advisory Committee as proposed and the tentative meeting schedule.

Ms. Aldean asked if we have identified who the local representative will be.

Ms. Marchetta said she has extended the invitation to Douglas County because their area plan is furthest along and they would have the best sense in how to think about this.

Ms. Aldean asked if we are doing this in a generic motion as opposed to a specific appointee.

Mr. Shute asked staff if they know the names of the state representatives.

Ms. Marchetta said Dave Gaskin, NDEP, Patty Kouyoumdjian, Lahontan, Darcie Collins, the League to Save Lake Tahoe and Lew Feldman representing the developer, implementer and private sector interest. We also extended the invitation to Brandy McMahon at Douglas County.

Mr. Shute said the motion would incorporate those names and the local government representative whose name is not finalized yet.

**Ms. Aldean moved approval.
Motion carried unanimously.**

Committee Members Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked what the schedule was for the next two RPIC meetings.

Ms. Marchetta said we will have the RPIC meeting the same day as the Board meeting if time permits. If not, it would be held on Thursday after the scheduled Wednesday Board meeting.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident said hopefully we can get information provided on the TRPA website 24 hours before the meeting so we are prepared to comment adequately.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Shute adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.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.