

**TRPA  
APC  
PACKETS**

**JANUARY  
1984**

1-84

NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE  
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on January 11, 1984 at  
9:30 a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe  
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South  
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of  
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for  
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

FURTHER, NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning  
Commission will continue this meeting to January 18, 19, 1984  
at 9:30 a.m. at the same location.

Dated: January 3, 1984

By: Gary D. Midkiff  
Gary D. Midkiff  
Acting Executive Director  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

*Counter Copy  
Please do not remove*

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  
South Lake Tahoe, California

January 11, 1984\*  
9:30 a.m.

---

NOTE: At 10:30 a.m. the APC Subcommittees will form core groups to discuss working draft ordinances for Transportation/Air Quality, Grading, Resource Management, and Water Quality.

\*The APC will continue this meeting to 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday and Thursday, January 18 and 19, 1984 in the same location.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV PLANNING MATTERS
  - A. Regional Plan and Matters Relating Thereto
  - B. Planning Area Statements, Hearing Process
  - C. Ordinance Development
  - D. Other
- V ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
- VI REPORTS
  - A. Staff Reports
  - B. Public Interest Comments
  - C. APC Members
- VII RESOLUTIONS
- VIII CORRESPONDENCE
- IX PENDING MATTERS
- X ADJOURNMENT

\*This meeting will recess to January 18 and 19, 1984 in the same location

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

El Dorado County Library  
Meeting Room, 1000 Rufus Allen Boulevard  
South Lake Tahoe, California

September 14, 1983 9:30 a.m.  
September 15, 1983 9:30 a.m.

I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Vice Chair Ann Bogush called the meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission to order at 10:00 a.m.

APC Members Present: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen  
(arrived at 10:05), Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Sparbel,  
Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris,  
Mr. Hansen, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Michael, Ms. Bogush,  
Mr. Harper (arrived at 10:10 a.m.)

APC Members Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Curtis (arrived at  
1:00 p.m.),

II APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The minutes for July 13, 14, 1983 and August 4, 5, 1983 were not completed due to time constraints as indicated in a memo dated September 7, 1983 to the APC.

IV PLANNING MATTERS

A. Amendments to Regional Plan Goals and Policies and  
Plan Area Statements

1. Transportation Element

Ms. Michael reported that the Transportation Subcommittee met with the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on August 30, 1983 to discuss proposed recommendations. Ms. Michael stated that there could be a problem with the proposed language and TTD as the lead agency. Ms. Michael also stated that the subcommittee met again with TAC prior to the APC meeting, and the TAC counter-proposed alternative language that both committee's agreed upon. The TAC will then go back to the TTD and ask for their recommendation after the APC reviewed these modifications. Ms. Michael noted that the TTD Board would present recommendations to the TRPA Governing Board on September 19.

The APC received copies of the revised Transportation Element dated September 13, 1983 and Ms. Michael explained that the APC would need to discuss the format and the incorporated changes from comments received from the Governing Board meeting on August 19, TAC-TTD, Federal Highways, Nevada Department of Transportation, Placer County, Caltrans, and the City of South Lake Tahoe.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 14 and 15, 1983

Keith Maki, Senior Planner, explained that the proposed language agreed upon by TAC and the subcommittee earlier was not reflected in the September 13 version because there had not been enough time to incorporate those revisions into the document.

Mr. Maki noted that the changes to the Transportation Element requested by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) clarified FHWA's transportation planning process. Mr. Maki pointed out, however, that NDOT and FHWA did not require submittal of transportation plans for areas of less than 50,000 population, but he explained that this was being done in order to be consistent with their planning process.

Ms. Michael stated that when the APC voted and adopted recommendations on mass transit, the objective of the rapid transit system in the Highway 50 corridor was to achieve bus headways of 10 minutes or less. The TAC and TTD felt that language would be too restrictive because in the first 5 years of operation it may be possible to achieve increases in ridership but requiring them to run buses every 10 minutes or less may not be the way to achieve it. Ms. Michael explained that extensive time was spent discussing this subject and modifying the language which still met the needs of the subcommittee in addition to identifying a ridership goal consistent with the Air Quality Plan that called for 8,300 passengers per day. Ms. Michael stated that if TTD determines that headways of 10 minutes or less may not be the way to achieve that ridership goal then they can come back to the TRPA with an alternative plan by June 1984 to implement other types of services to accomplish the goal of Policy 2 .

Ms. Michael explained the APC had recommended that TART be expanded and that the system be doubled in the first 5 years. The TTD felt that they were not sure that they could double the service within the first 5 years but they suggested adding another objective for overall north shore and west shore service which would (1) increase the frequency of service, (2) expand the hours of operations, and (3) implement strategies to improve the systems and increase ridership on the North Shore and West Shore by amending Policy 3. Ms. Michael pointed out that the transportation plan will be reevaluated through monitoring and revised after 5 years if the objectives are not meeting the goals.

John Eells, Caltrans and TAC Chairman, commented that Ms. Michael had correctly reported on the concerns of the TAC, and that the TAC felt comfortable with the compromises reached in the revised language which included detailed objectives and how those objectives will be achieved. Mr. Eells also stated that the process was set up so that if the TAC or TTD found that the objectives were infeasible they could offer alternative suggestions/proposals for TRPA's consideration.

Mr. Maki explained the revisions that had been made after August 18 to the Transportation Element responded to comments received, and he responded to questions raised by the APC. The APC discussed recommendations which further refined the terminology added to the Goals and Policies of the Transportation Element.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 14 and 15, 1983

Mr. Maki pointed out that the Governing Board had revised the language under Transportation Related Goal #2, Policy 5: Development may need to be adjusted based on the effectiveness of the transportation measures and programs being implemented to reduce vehicle trips and VMT. This is needed to ensure that development does not outstrip the ability of the transportation system to provide adequate service and alternatives, thereby hindering progress towards achievement of thresholds.

Ms. Michael stated that she would like to have the Governing Board reconsider the previous language under Transportation Related Goal #2, Policy 5: Phasing of construction permits shall be timed with completion of transportation system improvements or appropriate measures which reduce VMT and/or trips as necessary to accommodate increased trip demand. Mitigation of impacts may be either as public/private mass transportation and/or regional highway system improvements. Annual allotments under the building allocation system may need to be adjusted based on the effectiveness of the transportation measures and programs being implemented to reduce vehicle trips and VMT. This is needed to ensure that development does not outstrip the ability of the transportation system to provide adequate service and alternatives, thereby hindering progress towards achievement of thresholds.

Ms. Michael pointed out that construction phasing was closely tied to land use. Mr. Randolph added that he thought the word "annual" should have been left in.

MOTION by Ms. Michael, with a second by Mr. Randolph, under Transportation Related, that the Governing Board reconsider retaining the previous language in Goal #2, Policy 5 narrative.

Mr. Pyle commented that the APC made their recommendations to the Governing Board who have made their decisions, and no progress would be made if these issues are continually debated back and forth.

Ms. Michael withdrew her motion so that the APC could proceed to the major issues. She stated, if appropriate, they could come back to the motion.

MOTION by Mr. Randolph to delete the first sentence of Policy 5 and add the word annual to the Policy 5 narrative. There was no second to this motion.

Ms. Michael referred to Goal #4, Policy 2 (page 57) saying that this policy requires, at a minimum annual evaluation of public transit and paratransit system routes, schedules, service areas, and fare structure for recommended operational improvements.

MOTION by Ms. Michael, with a second by Mr. Poppoff, that the APC adopt the Transportation Element as revised September 14, 1983.

Amended by Mr. Sawyer to add to the motion the understanding that the Transportation Element needs to be a part of an integral plan, including issues other than implementation to achieve the objectives of the Compact.

Ms. Michael and Mr. Poppoff agreed to incorporate Mr. Sawyer's amendment to the motion.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 14 and 15, 1983

Mr. McMullen suggested that the Mass Transportation Subelement (page 47) second paragraph, fifth sentence be amended: Short term objectives are derived from the subelement and will be updated annually in a five year Transportation Improvement Program prepared by TTD and subject to approval by the TRPA. Mr. McMullen also suggested that (page 48) Goal #1, Policy 1 narrative be amended: The formation is ultimately to include the acquisition of the South Tahoe Area Ground Express (STAGE) and the Tahoe Area Rapid Transit (TART) systems and associated facilities, and financing for the local share of capital projects and continuing operating deficits. The first priority of the TTD will be to pursue funding sources consistent with the Compact in order to accomplish implementation of the transit portions of the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Hoefer suggested that Policies 2 and 3 be amended to include the ridership levels as part of the policies (pages 48 and 49) rather than in just the narrative sections as follows: Policy 2, amend: Implement a rapid transit system of high quality and intensity in the south shore along the Highway 50 corridor from the 'Y' to south Stateline casino core area that achieves a ridership level of 8,300 passengers per day. Policy 3, amend: Expand the Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) service by extending service areas and improving headways to achieve at least 450 average daily ridership.

Mr. Eells stated he thought that it would be better to leave Policies 2 and 3 the way they were written, and the APC members agreed.

The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Michael, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper  
Nayes: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Curtis

The minutes reflect that the members of the Technical Advisory Committee of the Tahoe Transportation District who were present supported the APC members and the Transportation Subcommittee's revised recommendations for the Transportation Element.

MOTION by Mr. Sawyer, with a second by Ms. Sparbel, to designate Mr. Combs as temporary acting chairman during the absence of Mr. Harper and Ms. Bogush. The motion carried on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Hoefer, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion, Mr. Pyle, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Michael  
Nayes: None  
Abstain: Mr. Curtis  
Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. McMorris, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper

2. Land Use Element

Gordon Barrett, Principal Planner, explained that the Land Use Subcommittee prepared reports for evaluating single family dwelling. With the use of a display chart Mr. Barrett outlined the five alternatives and the potential items to be considered in the review system recommended by the subcommittee:

ALTERNATIVE #1 -- LAND CAPABILITY SYSTEM

Description - High hazard areas are mapped by the Bailey System. Lots located in high hazard areas are not permitted to build. Low and moderate lots build and meet performance standards.

Evaluation Criteria - The Bailey Land Capability System relies on Soil Conservation Service soil mapping criteria, geomorphology and 208 stream environment zone criteria. Area/subdivision requirements apply to low and moderate areas.

Relationship to allocation systems - May be used with allocation system but not required.

ALTERNATIVE #2 -- PASS/FAIL (NO MITIGATION)

Description - Each lot is rated to determine the hazard rating; the high hazard rating is determined as a minimum passing score. Points are reduced after evaluation against set criteria. Passing lots meet performance standards.

Evaluation Criteria - Lots are evaluated on existing:

1. Environmental criteria
2. Area/Subdivision criteria

Relationship to Allocation System - Allocation system not required, however, it would facilitate the individual lot review and minimize risk.

ALTERNATIVE #3 -- PASS/FAIL (MITIGATION)

Description - Each lot is rated to determine the hazard rating as in Alternative #2, however, rating may be increased with additional mitigation. Points are received after evaluation against set criteria.

Evaluation Criteria - Lots are evaluated on:

1. Environmental Criteria
2. Area/Subdivision Criteria

3. Site Design Criteria
4. Off site mitigation criteria

Relationship to Allocation System - Allocation

System is not required but would facilitate individual lot review, minimize risk, encourage TDR, and time offsite mitigation.

ALTERNATIVE #4 -- RANKING

Description - All lots compete against each other based on number of points received after evaluation against set criteria.

Evaluation Criteria - Lots are evaluated on:

1. Environmental Criteria
2. Area/Subdivision Criteria
3. Site Design Criteria
4. Off-site Mitigation

Relationship to Allocation System - Allocation system is required to group competing lots.

ALTERNATIVE #5 -- PASS/MARGINAL PASS/FAIL

Description - Each lot is rated to determine the hazard rating as in Alternative #2, however, the rating may be increased through mitigation by a limited amount to allow marginally acceptable lots to build. Also minimum score may be adjusted for timed prioritization.

Evaluation Criteria - Lots are evaluated on:

1. Environmental Criteria
2. Area/Subdivision Criteria
3. Site Design Criteria
4. Off-site Mitigation Criteria

Relationship to Allocation System - Allocation System is required to allow prioritization, facilitate individual lot review, minimize risk, encourage TDR and time off-site mitigation.

Mr. Barrett clarified that the Best Management Practices would be required and that the land capability system would still provide for the land capability challenge process.

Mr. Pyle commented that so much money could be spent by the property owner on the engineering and architectural drawings in trying to compete against someone else on the site design criteria for those points. Mr. Pyle suggested that the site design requirements for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 should be kept simple to provide an equal chance for everyone. Mr. Pyle expressed that if everyone was given the opportunity to build based on the point priority system the property owner would be under the impression that property would hold its value for a buyout program and he did not see that happening. Mr. Pyle stated that there

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 14 and 15, 1983

was the possibility of complicating the appraisal system with the appraiser becoming more conservative by looking at the lower side of the property valuation which could result in more appeals and more unhappy people.

Mr. Harper returned to the meeting at 1:40 p.m. Mr. Harper stated that the point priority system could be refined the way the APC prefers to see the point priority system function and transmitted to the Governing Board as an endorsement for a method of reviewing building applications and implementing the Regional Plan. However, Mr. Harper pointed out that this is a very complex planning issue which could require a considerable amount of the APC's time. He suggested that the APC may prefer to recommend a simple priority system at this time and the Governing Board may agree this is appropriate and is the kind of system they think should be done, and refer it back to the APC for refinement in the implementing ordinances.

Mr. Pyle stated that, depending on the action, if the Governing Board referred this matter back to the APC he felt that Alternative 1 was adequate. If the Governing Board did not refer this back to the APC he felt they would have to go to Alternative 2. Mr. Pyle recommended that the remapping should be done to get it down to a reasonable and useable delineation of 1 to 5 acres which he felt was reasonable within the amount of \$240,000 to \$300,000 budgeted. Mr. Pyle stated that he did not feel comfortable with using just the land capability system and that a great deal more appeals would be processed through the Agency.

MOTION by Mr. Sawyer, with a second by Ms. Michael, that the APC recommend Alternative 1, the Land Capability Review System, to the Governing Board with the following provisos: (1) that the land capability maps be reviewed and corrected in accordance with the Advisory Planning Commission's recommendations for the Soil Subelement; (2) that this recommendation does not include a recommendation where the cutoff is between environmentally sensitive lands and lands which are non-environmentally sensitive, but should be used as a technical review system; and (3) that land capability challenges would be allowed.

Mr. Sawyer added that he did not think the priority system described any of the first three alternatives, and the first two alternatives did not necessarily depend on a point system, but the APC should decide when they get to the implementation element, and he suggested referring to it as a review system instead of a point priority system.

Mr. Curtis commented that this is one area that needs local community involvement because in some areas there are communities that have given up a lot of area to green belt and are clustered, and other areas are built strictly on a grid system where the lot by lot review may have some validity. Mr. Curtis stated that there too many variations around the Basin not to have some local input into just exactly what those increments are.

Mr. Sawyer clarified that during the interim period of three years for remapping, the subcommittee for the soils element contemplated to use the existing maps and allow the capability challenge.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 14 and 15, 1983

Ms. McMorris stated that she would be more in favor of the pass/fail with mitigation alternative, but modified to include land capabilities 3 through 7. She explained that land capability 3's would be included along with the 4 through 7's since the Bailey Report refers to the 3's as marginal, and that land capabilities 1 and 2 would be out. The 1's and 2's along with any lots that are denied could be purchased or scheduled for purchase within a certain time limit such as three years.

Mr. McMullen pointed out that there has to be some relationship with the acquisition program to this rating system; or in the absence of the rating or priority system, it is important that a fair process system be developed for the coming years that avoids the situation where people feel they are caught in the middle because they are not able to build and their property cannot be purchased. Mr. McMullen added that if the distinction is made on the basis of the mapping, the mapping will always be the key factor. It will always come down to what kind of parcel it is and the size. Mr. McMullen suggested a more applicable system would be one that relates easily to Alternative 3, pass/fail with mitigation or any of the pass/fail systems, but on a lot-by-lot basis because, remapping or not, an analysis still has to be done on the basis of that particular parcel. Mr. McMullen suggested to try to accommodate everything from adoption of the plan on a lot-by-lot basis, pass/fail with some mitigation ability, with a number of limiting factors. i.e., criteria, a cap on the mitigation points, so that no matter how it is rated there is only so much that can be done with mitigation, which is another decision point.

Mr. Combs agreed that each lot should be evaluated on a lot-by-lot basis which would provide an accurate verification as to what the land capability and is a better indication than the 400 scale map. Mr. Combs stated he was inclined to be more supportive of Alternative 2, but suggested adding another option by looking to the type of subdivision the property happens to be in. With a marginal capability 3 the staff might not want to release it if it is in a paper subdivision, but it might be appropriate to release it if it is in a subdivision with all utilities, paved roads, and the BMP's already installed.

Mr. Curtis stated that he was concerned about the Bailey system because it is a guide for planning. This guide for planning is being used to try to apply it to already existing subdivisions. We're not going out there and plan new subdivisions; that isn't going to happen and we already know that. Mr. Curtis stated the problem that seems to exist is that everybody is so worried about one person with a poor capability lot, spending money and being able to get it approved. There probably aren't 50 people out there that would be willing to throw money into a bad lot to the point where it would not be economically feasible for that lot to be developed on. If it is economically feasible they will spend up to \$10,000 or \$15,000 that would make it feasible. If it is not feasible then let them get bought out, but the problem right now is that there is no equitable way for that person to get out of this situation.

Ms. McMorris clarified that the reason she advocated a cut-off period of time was to be honest with the applicant. Instead of them spending their time and money, and the staff's time and money, because realistically the Governing Board is not going to allow building on 99% of the land capabilities 1's and 2's, we should make that a policy.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 14 and 15, 1983

Mr. Harper stated that Alternative 1 appeared to be an environmentally restrictive alternative and it did not take into account the time spent earlier to plan investing future money into certain infrastructures. If the public is going to be taxed to pay for certain infrastructures, they should at least get the most for their money. Mr. Harper stated that Alternative 2 provided that flexibility. Mr. Harper did not feel, however, that he could support Alternative 3 because he stated that a decision would have to be made whether to evaluate the criteria based upon what is there prior to the lot being developed. Mr. Harper also stated that more Agency staff would have to be hired in order to administer Alternative 3, and since both California and Nevada have gone through tax and staff cuts it would seem odd to suggest that the staff be increased at this time.

MOTION by Ms. McMorris, with a second by Ms. Michael, that a fourth condition be incorporated in Mr. Sawyer's motion: (4) that the Regional Plan recognizes the land purchase programs and other mechanisms which maintain the value of the property. There was a second by Ms. Michael.

Mr. Sawyer stated that he agreed with that condition, but felt that it should be voted on separately as an amendment.

Ms. Sparbel suggested that the amendment read: that the Regional Plan recognizes the land purchase programs. Ms. Sparbel stated that she was not sure that the APC's role was to say that certain things should or should not be maintaining property values. The APC should recognize the land purchase programs.

Ms. McMorris rephrased her motion. The Regional Plan recognizes the land purchase programs and other mechanisms to retire environmentally sensitive lots.

Mr. Sawyer stated that the APC had to be very careful of not implying that they were taking an action for the purpose of having the lots purchased and he suggested to modify Ms. McMorris's motion: The Regional Plan recognizes the existence of land purchase programs and other options for owners of environmentally sensitive lots. Ms. McMorris stated that the language was weak but she agreed to the amended language.

Mr. McMullen stated that the issue was to get some sort of link between acquisition and environmentally sensitive lands that is potentially set up with the U.S. Forest Service and Tahoe Area Land Acquisition Commission (TALAC). Mr. McMullen suggested modifying the language: that every avenue be pursued to obtain inter-local agreements between TALAC, the U.S. Government, and the Nevada Tahoe Bond Act, by which the purchasing authority gives reasonable priority and scheduling to those lots.

Ms. McMorris suggested: That the Regional Plan recognizes the existence of land purchase programs and other options to retire environmentally sensitive lots and actively pursues such funding/programs.

Gary Midkiff, Assistant Executive Director, stated that both suggestions might not meet legal counsel's approval, however, the Agency can provide information to those programs regarding the location of such lots. Mr. Midkiff suggested adding to the motion that the Agency shall provide information regarding the location and nature of these lots to those agencies.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 14 and 15, 1983

Since there was no agreement to the amended language proposed, Ms. McMorris withdrew her motion.

The original motion failed on the following vote:

Ayes: Mr. Randolph, Mr. Hoefler, Ms. Sparbel, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Dodgion,  
Ms. Michael  
Nayes: Mr. Renz, Mr. Combs, Mr. McMullen, Mr. Pyle, Ms. McMorris,  
Mr. Curtis, Mr. Poppoff, Ms. Bogush, Mr. Harper  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Mr. Milam, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Hansen

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Mr. Pyle, that the Advisory Planning Commission recommend to the Governing Board, adoption of a development priority system, in compliance with the provisions of Alternative 2, Pass/Fail (No Mitigation), with environmental criteria allowing consideration of development of moderate and low hazard lots being land capability classes 3 through 7, along with evaluating the status of the subdivision in which the property is located.

Mr. Harper suggested adding an amendment to the motion that the pass/fail system also takes into account the levels and rates of infrastructure provided. Mr. Pyle stated that he thought that the subdivision criteria took that into consideration. Mr. Combs added that if this motion passed the APC would have to go even farther and get more precise about what the subdivision criteria would include. Mr. Combs also clarified that this motion excluded development on land capability 1 and 2 lots.

Mr. Renz suggested to amend the motion to modify the language for land capability classes 3 through 7 to those which have the characteristics of those land capability districts. Mr. Combs and Mr. Pyle agreed to the amended language.

Mr. Sawyer stated that with the coverage situation on land capability 3, in relationship to transportation planning and to water use on the California side of the Basin, in opening up development on capability 3 lots consideration should be given to all of the impacts. He pointed out that on a Basin-wide basis and on a watershed association basis we are out of coverage on land capability 3 lots. The environmental threshold carrying capacities require that the coverage coefficients of the Bailey system be achieved. Mr. Sawyer further pointed out whether it is done Basin-wide or on a watershed association basis means don't build on capability 3 lots, except for approximately 100 land capability 3 lots in specific watersheds that have available coverage on land capability 3's. If development on lot-by-lot is done, 3's can be built on so long as coverage does not exceed more than 1% to 5% of the lot, but the thresholds for the land capabilities recommends not building on 3's.

Mr. Sawyer distributed a chart which depicted projected levels of urban water use including municipal, domestic and irrigation demand compared to the California-Nevada Interstate Compact limitation for the California portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin and other demands. Mr. Sawyer pointed out an important factor to consider was, even if development was completely shut down in the Tahoe Basin, significant increases in water use on the California side could be expected as a result of increased occupancy. Mr. Sawyer explained that what

used to be a summer cabin used on a few weekends during the year is now being used every weekend and also during the winter. The trend has been to use both tourist accommodations and second homes for a large percentage of the year and Mr. Sawyer believed that continued large increases in occupancy can be expected in the future. He stated that by looking at this chart we are nearly out of water, with no development on 1's and 2's. Even if there is no increase in occupancy, there is a need for significant water conservation programs to offset this. With these increases in occupancy, there was a figure assuming no building at all on 1's and 2's and a figure above it showing that which would result from development of 65% of the class 1 and 2 lands; 65% is the approximate approval rate for case-by-case review. Instead of talking about land with characteristics of 3 through 7 which means allowing construction on a very large number of 1's, 2's and 3's by the time those criteria get weakened enough for adoption they will be something like the case-by-case review, Mr. Sawyer stated that the California Water Resources Control Board is assuming no construction on 1's, 2's and 3's, and no construction on a significant number of land capability 4 through 7 lots with insufficient coverage under a lot-by-lot application of the Bailey requirements. Even under those standards it will be very difficult to keep water use within the limits of the California-Nevada Interstate Compact. If development on land capability 3 is added it is almost certain, even with a very minor increase in occupancy, we will end up with water use in excess of that available. The land use planning should be done consistent with the availability of water supply and, therefore, should not allow development of land capability 3 lots on the California side of the Basin.

Mr. Combs clarified that his motion was to allow consideration of development of low and moderate hazard as defined by Bailey. He explained that the intent of his motion was not an advocacy of building out on all capability 3 lots. There may be very few in fact that would stand the test of the land capability review but also the subdivision review as well. Mr. Combs commented that if the APC members needed to know exactly how many lots were being approved for buildout on capability 3 lots then he would be agreeable to deferring that decision until the APC knows exactly what those figures would be. Mr. Combs stated that there was an amendment to the motion that the wording be changed to lots exhibiting the characteristics of 3 through 7. Mr. Combs and Mr. Renz assured the APC that the intent of the amendment was to recommend restriction on high hazard lands. If the lot is a capability level 1 or 2 and it exhibits the characteristics of a 3 it should be reclassified. Mr. Combs added that he did not see this as an open window to allow development on 1's and 2's.

Mr. Sawyer stated that he felt the amendment to the motion was ambiguous and he suggested that the amendment be modified to say land capability 1's and 2's that are incorrectly classified are eligible to be reclassified in accordance with the land capability system.

Ms. McMorris commented that she did not feel that land capabilities 1's, 2's and possibly 3's should be built on, but she could not vote for a motion unless there was some clause that included what the options are for those land owners.