

**TRPA
APC
PACKETS**

**FEBRUARY
2000**

Paul

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 regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on February 9, 2000, at the North Tahoe Conference Center, 8318 North Lake Boulevard, Kings Beach, California. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

January 31, 2000



Jerry Wells
Acting Executive Director

This agenda has been posted at the TRPA office and at the following post offices: Zephyr Cove and Stateline, Nevada, and Stateline and Al Tahoe, California. The agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office, and the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

North Tahoe Conference Center
8318 North Lake Boulevard
Kings Beach, California

February 9, 2000
9:30 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 (No Action)

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any agenda item not listed as a Public Hearing or a Planning Matter item, or on any other issue, may do so at this time. However, public comment on Public Hearing and Planning Matter items will be taken at the time those agenda items are heard.

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. PUBLIC HEARINGS
 - A. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 041, Incline Village #3, to Reduce Density in Special Area #1 **Pg 1**
 - B. Amendment of Plan Area Statement 009B, Dollar Hill, to Add Multi-Family Residential Units to the Special Designation **Pg 11**
 - C. Amendment of Community Plans for Tahoe City, Kings Beach Commercial, Incline Village Tourist, Incline Village Commercial, Round Hill, Kingsbury, and Bijou/Al Tahoe to Add Threshold-Related Research Facilities as a Special Use Under Public Service **Pg 19**
- VI. PLANNING MATTERS
 - A. Visibility Status Report and Discussion of Air Quality/Visibility Threshold Amendments and Recommendations **Pg 57**
 - B. Report and Discussion on Feb. 2 Workshop on Transit-Oriented Development, Urban Boundaries, and the Two-Step Subdivision Process **Pg 61**
 - C. Presentation on Annual Water Quality Report **Pg 63**

- D. Presentation on Science Advisory Committee to TRPA and the Tahoe Region

Pg 65

VII. REPORTS

- A. Executive Director

- 1. Report on Governing Board Actions Relative to APC Recommendations

- B. Legal Counsel

- C. APC Members

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

The Chateau
955 Fairway Boulevard
Incline Village, Nevada

January 12, 2000

MEETING MINUTES

Chairperson Gary Marchio called the regular January 12, 2000, meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") to order at 9:35 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Mr. Lohman, Ms. Moss, Mr. McDowell, Ms. Kemper, Mr. Porta,
Mr. Lane, Mr. Poppoff, Mr. McIntyre (arrived at 12:15 p.m.),
Mr. Morgan, Mr. Tolhurst, Ms. Kvas, Mr. Combs, Mr. Marchio, Mr. Jepsen

Members Absent: Mr. Kehne, Mr. Cole, Ms. Baldrice, Mr. Barham, Mr. Joiner

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Director Jerry Wells stated that there were no changes to the agenda, but suggested that Item 6.A. be heard first and then followed by Item 6.C.

MOTION by Ms. Kvas, with a second by Mr. Porta, to approve the agenda as modified. The motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – None

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

The December 8, 1999, APC minutes would be presented at the February APC meeting for approval.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Report and Discussion on Proposed Modifications to the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES)

Agency Counsel John Marshall presented a report and had a handout on the proposed modifications to the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES).

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Marchio opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Phil Gilanfarr, an architect in Incline Village, suggested that the jurisdictional boundary be removed and a transfer fee be imposed so a different jurisdiction can utilize the development right, thus lowering the number of development rights. He encouraged the Nevada State Lands to implement an organization similar to the California Tahoe Conservancy.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

Mr. Wells stated that TRPA is actively working with the Nevada State Lands to enter into an MOU to establish a very similar land bank situation on the Nevada side.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Marchio closed the public hearing.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Amendment of Map Showing Need for Water Quality Improvements Pursuant to Requirements of Chapter 37, Individual Parcel Evaluation System, Section 37.10.A, Installation of Water Quality Improvements in Vicinity of Parcels, El Dorado and Placer Counties

Senior Planner Joe Pepi presented the amendment of the map showing the need for water quality improvements pursuant to requirements of Chapter 37, Individual Parcel Evaluation System, Section 37.10.A, installation of water quality improvements in vicinity of parcels, El Dorado and Placer Counties.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Marchio opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Marchio closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Mr. Jepsen, with a second by Mr. Porta, to recommend approval to the Governing Board to amend the map showing the need for water quality improvements pursuant to requirements of Chapter 37, Individual Parcel Evaluation System, Section 37.10.A, installation of water quality improvements in vicinity of parcels, El Dorado and Placer Counties. The motion carried unanimously.

(Break taken at 11:15 a.m.)

(Reconvened at 11:20 a.m.)

Chairperson Marchio stated that Mr. Bob Sellman would be replacing Ms. Kvas from Washoe County on the next agenda item.

Mr. Lane stepped down from the dais due to a conflict of interest with the next agenda item, as well.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

- B. Finding that the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and Douglas County Have Demonstrated a Commitment to Assume Their Fair Share Responsibility to Provide Low And Very Low Income Housing

Mr. Peter Eichar, Associate Planner with the Long Range Planning Division, presented the staff summary finding that the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and Douglas County have demonstrated a commitment to assume their fair share responsibility to provide low and very low income housing.

A discussion ensued.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

Mr. Sellman stated that he was concerned that Washoe County was under a moratorium because they were not performing based on the Code criteria. The County believes that no standards of performance or lack of performance have been made. He believed there were substantial omissions in the staff report relative to Washoe County's willingness and consideration of their desire to have low and moderate income housing. He stated that the County has leveraged over a 115 million dollars worth of low and moderate income housing that translates to well over 2,000 affordable units that are one, two, three and four bedrooms, affordable housing units through their home consortium; those are commitments for thirty to fifty years of affordability. He stated that he would challenge most of the counties in this basin to present their overall housing program and see if it matches that. He agreed that there is a problem in the Tahoe Basin; there is a major problem in the Tahoe Basin, and starting off with discussions of how to solve that problem with sanctions is an inappropriate way of dealing with the problem.

Mr. Sellman stated that the County had a commitment, but the County cannot meet the development requirements that are necessary in order to build reasonably, economic, affordable housing for the long term. This is not a lack of will on the part of the County; there are certain economic realities that are dominated by the policies of the TRPA. The County has met their 30% reduction in lots; they are committed to the environmental side of this program. The problem is that this is in direct opposition to the other side of affordable housing; you cannot do both with the same set of rules. There are tremendous opportunities to create real incentives to retire lots if they are environmentally a problem and at the same time, create a real incentive for the jurisdictions to provide affordable housing. Mr. Sellman stated that the County's basic concern is there isn't a program. The County is being challenged to succeed and then judged when they don't know what the rules are and no one else knows what the rules are. None of the jurisdictions can point to anything that says "this is what we have to do and how we have to do it". Mr. Sellman questioned how TRPA determines that the County's lack of redevelopment is inappropriate when they don't qualify for redevelopment.

There has to have a rational program that the County can look at and determine whether or not: 1) the County is complying with; or, 2) there are extenuating circumstances that clearly make it so the County could not comply with and therefore should not be judged harshly about. The County requests that the moratorium be lifted. He was of the opinion that a program should be implemented that is tailored for this Basin and addresses the needs of the jurisdictions and implemented. Jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction is probably not the answer; together as a Basin is probably the correct answer that has worked for Washoe County.

Mr. Sellman requested that TRPA not sanction the Counties; both Washoe and Douglas; and directed staff to work on setting these programs up and working with the jurisdictions to truly get affordable housing.

Ms. Moss agreed with Mr. Sellman and welcomed the opportunity to meet with TRPA's staff and look at the criteria that Douglas County can use to meet the affordable housing responsibility. She believed that each jurisdiction should be dealt with on their own merit and own individual elements for development. The problem is that the needs assessment that was approved in 1996 and 1997 identified certain parcels that were developable or not and, in actuality, that number is very low. Staff needs to look at that document and reevaluate the area; especially the Kingsbury area, and see what is available to participate in this program.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

Ms. Moss stated that absent a redevelopment agency in the Tahoe Basin and absent subsidies providing funding for that type of agency, Douglas County at this point is not able to participate in that program. She welcomed any suggestions that the TRPA staff had and meeting with staff to meet the criteria for affordable housing. She was of the opinion that the moratorium is not the answer. The issue should be looked at on a basin-wide scale.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Marchio opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. John Frank, a small developer in Incline Village, he was under the impression that they had 30 days to get this item resolved before any moratorium would be put into place. He stated that he has been in an escrow on a piece of property that is in that area where there is low-income housing and he has been waiting for that to get out because it is only a two unit development which really does not qualify for low-income housing. He called TRPA and he talked to Peter Eichar and he told him that they could possibly work something out on this unit and go ahead and wait for this meeting. He wrote out a check for \$362,500 and he bought that property based on the information that he received from both Peter and Washoe County. He commented that no one from TRPA informed anyone, not even Washoe County, that there would be a moratorium; TRPA was going to wait and now they arbitrarily went ahead on December 31st and did it. He was still on his period of due diligence and he could have backed out, but no one told Washoe County and now he is guilty until proven innocent. The lot is in a multi-housing development and he is allowed to put condominiums on there; two of them; he can't put on two units and sell them to one owner because the value is virtually cut in half. His building costs won't go down; TRPA will not give him a break on development rights; they will not give him a break on water or TRPA fees or anything else; now he will have to sit there and hold this piece of property.

Mr. Gilanfar, architect in Incline Village, suggested that TRPA should create a fix before they create a moratorium. He stated that if TRPA were willing to give us commercial floor area, attach a housing requirement to that commercial floor, and then TRPA might see some generation occur for employee housing. He believed that there needs to be a Code amendment to address density, coverage, height, and water rights. There is no minimum standard or criteria for affordable housing and/or low income housing in each jurisdiction; the bar needs to be set.

He encouraged there be no subdivision restrictions until some criteria is set.

Ms. Christina Hill, representing Sierra Nevada College, stated that she is here to support Washoe County and that approximately 168 affordable housing projects have been constructed or at least approved. At Sierra Nevada College, 51 affordable housing units have been constructed. It seemed ridiculous to her that Washoe County has approved and constructed 168 affordable housing units; that is more than any other jurisdiction around the Lake; and they are being penalized. The subdivision moratorium only affects those areas in community plans that are designated as preferred alternative or affordable housing areas; other lots outside those areas can be subdivided.

Mr. Mark Heckee, Redevelopment Manager for Placer County, responded to the progress report that Placer County received on the affordable housing issue.

Mr. Jim Seymore, a homeowner at College Park Mobile Home Park, stated that in terms of the 168 units constructed, 98 of those units are simply conversions of apartments to condominiums,

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

which may help people who are seeking to purchase a lower priced home, but it does not help the housing stock in Incline Village. He believed that something needs to be done by Washoe County in terms of affordable housing within the Basin.

Ms. Hill, on behalf of Sierra Nevada College, said that one can consider the 168 units if you want to ignore the 19 R.V. units. It then gets down to 149 units as new affordable housing units because they are now being deed restricted and controlled and restricted as affordable housing units, as well as the dorms at the college. She stated that the reason the college is closing the trailer park is because they found it unusable as student housing since the students don't want to live in the mobile homes and prefer to live in houses.

Mr. Gilanfar stated that the main issues that need to be addressed are: 1) increase in density; 2) coverage; 3) height; 4) parking; 5) expand the terminology as to what affordable housing is; and, 6) take accessory dwellings and let them be brought into conformance.

Mr. Lew Feldman, appearing on behalf of Falcon Capital, stated that affordable housing at the Lake is restricted by land costs. The reality of the market place is there is no economic viability to construct these kinds of housing projects. If we are going to get creative and solve the problem, we are going to have to recognize that people don't do it to go broke, and we will have to strike some balance if that is a legitimate goal to achieve. He believed that this kind of housing is good for the environment, and is something we need to provide further incentives to achieve.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Marchio closed the public hearing.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Sellman stated that it is inappropriate to make the sort of judgments that lead to moratoriums without a firm and clear expression of what standards the jurisdiction are going to be judged by. He believed that criteria needed to be set so that they can be looked at objectively so that jurisdictions are not put in jeopardy of these kinds of strong actions. Mr. Sellman said that until we get some objective standards, moratoriums should not be placed.

MOTION by Mr. Sellman to recommend to the Governing Board that all jurisdictions are found committed to assuming their fair share of affordable housing.

MOTION by Mr. Sellman to recommend to the Governing Board that at the appropriate time, would request and/or direct, as appropriate, the TRPA staff to work with all of the jurisdictions and the Governing Board to develop those appropriate standards before the next review period. Mr. Morgan seconded both motions.

Mr. Wells questioned if there was a time limit on that, and Mr. Sellman stated no.

The first motion carried on the following votes:

| | |
|----------|---|
| Ayes: | Lohman, Moss, Poppoff, McIntyre, Morgan, Sellman, Combs, Jepsen |
| Nays: | McDowell, Kemper, Porta, Tolhurst, Marchio |
| Abstain: | Lane |
| Absent: | Kehne, Cole, Baldrice, Barham, Joiner |

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

The second motion carried unanimously.

Mr. McDowell stated that he voted no because the bottom line is that it's a matter of performance, and he felt uncomfortable making an affirmative vote based on subjective things.

Mr. Combs stated that he voted yes with some reservation because he believed that the criteria for the past, could have been better defined. The repercussions for not passing are pretty severe. He believed that there might be a weakness in the requirements of what was required or expected to get a passing score; it could have been better explained so that it wasn't perhaps as subjective as it seem to be. He hoped that when this is reevaluated in a year, it is very clear as to what is expected, or as clear as it can be made so that people will have a better expectation of what they need to try to do get a passing score for the next year's performance.

Mr. Marchio stated that the reason he voted no was because the Governing Board dealt with this with issue with a consequence at the end, and for whatever reason, that was not met. He believed that the jurisdictions were notified of the consequences all along, in spite of the program.

Ms. Kvas stated that Washoe County would have one of their staff people bring this item forward to the Governing Board.

(Break for lunch at 1:15 p.m.)

(Mr. Lane left the meeting at 1:15 p.m.)

(Reconvened at 2:30 p.m.)

C. Report and Discussion on January 5 Workshop on Transit-Oriented Development, Urban Boundaries, and the Two-Step Subdivision Process

Mr. Peter Eichar, Associated Planner with the Long Range Planning Division, presented the report and discussion on the January 5th Workshop on Transit-Oriented Development, Urban Boundaries, and the Two-Step Subdivision process.

A discussion ensued.

D. Discussion on Contract with California State Water Resources Control Board for Federal 319(h) Grand Funding of Best Management Practices Retrofit Program

Mr. Doug Smith, Senior Environmental Specialist and BMP Coordinator with the Compliance Division, presented a discussion on the contract with the California State Water Resources Control Board for Federal 319(h) Grant Funding of Best Management Practices Retrofit Program. He and Matt Graham, also with the Compliance Division, presented a slide show on the program.

A discussion ensued.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

E. Environmental Documentation Scoping for a Proposed Amendment to PAS 006, Fish Hatchery, to Add Research Facilities as a Permissible Use

Ms. Coleen Shade, Senior Planner with the Long Range Planning Division, presented the environmental documentation scoping for a proposed amendment to PAS 006, Fish Hatchery to add research facilities as a permissible use.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Marchio opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Lew Feldman, representing U.C. Davis, stated that he was not asking for an approval. He believed that an environmental document is not necessary because they were not changing the existing use as proposed and there were no environmental impacts, and for that reason, the APC should conclude that a separate environmental document is not warranted for this limited purpose.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Marchio closed the public hearing.

Mr. McIntyre stated that he supported the project and saw this project as a positive step for the Agency and would be a net benefit to Lake Tahoe.

Ms. Moss believed that there were two issues being addressed: 1) whether a property owner can apply for a plan amendment; and; 2) whether a plan amendment is appropriate by a property owner. She didn't believe that it was the APC's position to make this call; they review each project as it comes forward based on its merits and determine whether the findings of approval can be made.

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Ms. Kemper, that the APC follow the suggestion by the TRPA staff to merge the two processes; the plan amendment and the project amendment; for consideration and for purposes of environmental review.

A discussion ensued.

MOTION by Mr. Combs, with a second by Mr. Morgan, recommending to the Governing Board that they recognize the existing facility, take away the stigma of conformity, and deal with the project at a later date. In addition, he was of the opinion that the TRPA staff should craft some language in the Plan Area Statement stating "this is to recognize that research facilities in existence as of the date of the plan area statement adoption are recognized as legal uses" so we know that it is to accommodate this particular request. He stated that he would amend his previous motion to be replaced with the above-stated motion. The motion carried with Ms. Kemper voting no.

Ms. Kemper stated that she voted no because the motion would have been fine a year ago, but she is not sure of what the significance is because the existing use is there and it is okay. In addition, she rescinded her first motion.

Mr. Wells stated that this item would be brought back to the APC in March.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Report on Process for Selection of New Existing Director

Mr. Wells stated that the deadline for applications is January 31st. The committee hoped to have the resume cut done by February 28th. The new Executive Director should be on board by May 15th. Mr. McIntyre stated that he had been selected by the TTD to be on the interview panel. Mr. Morgan expressed interest in being involved in the interview process.

VIII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

1. Report on Governing Board Actions Relative to APC Recommendations

Mr. Wells stated that the affordable housing issue would be presented to the Governing Board this month. The source water protection ordinance was approved and TRPA staff did pass on the APC's discussion to the Governing Board on the two issues that were raised: 1) monitoring issue which the Board did consider but decided not to include at this time; and, 2) the redundancy issue as to whether or not there needs to be a double review, and staff did add some language to change that to eliminate, in most all cases, redundancy. The Board did approve that revised language, and it will go into effect in another 30 days.

B. Legal Counsel

Mr. Wells stated that TRPA has been sued, but have not been served yet, by Larry Hoffman on behalf of 250 property owners.

C. APC Members

Ms. Kvas requested that the seating arrangement in the room be moved around for the next meeting.

Mr. McDowell asked Mr. Wells what the status was on the science advisory board committee group, and Ms. Kemper replied that they were meeting next week. Mr. McDowell requested an update in February and Mr. Wells replied yes.

Ms. Kemper stated that the State of California agencies involved in the Environmental Improvement Program have gotten a blessing from the cabinet level people, the resource agency and the housing and transportation agency. There will be a coordination meeting next week representing the different agencies.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES JANUARY 12, 2000

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sue Mikanovich".

Sue Mikanovich
Clerk to the Commission

This meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes may call (775) 588-4547 to make an appointment. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA office, 308 Dorla Court, Zephyr Cove, Nevada.

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

North Tahoe Conference Center
8318 North Lake Boulevard
Kings Beach, California

December 8, 1999

MEETING MINUTES

Chairperson Robert Jepsen called the regular December 8, 1999, meeting of the Advisory Planning Commission ("APC") to order at 9:35 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Members Present: Mr. Kehne, Mr. Lohman, Ms. Moss, Mr. Cole, Ms. Baldrice, Mr. McDowell, Ms. Kemper (arrived at 9:37 a.m.), Mr. Porta, Mr. Lane (arrived at 9:37 a.m.), Mr. Poppoff, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Tolhurst, Ms. Kvas, Mr. Combs, Mr. Marchio

Members Absent: Mr. Barham, Mr. Joiner

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Deputy Director Jerry Wells stated that there were no changes to the agenda. He noted that there was a time certain item at 11:30 a.m. regarding Streamlining Update.

MOTION by Mr. Cole, with a second by Mr. Porta, to approve the agenda as presented.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS – None

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

MOTION by Ms. Baldrice, with a second by Mr. Morgan, to approve the July 14, 1999, APC minutes as presented. The motion carried with Ms. Kvas and Mr. Cole abstaining.

MOTION by Ms. Baldrice, with a second by Ms. Kvas, to approve the October 13, 1999, APC minutes as presented. The motion carried with Mr. Jepsen and Ms. Kemper abstaining.

Mr. Wells commented that Agenda Item No. V.B. had been postponed and would not be heard today.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Adoption of Code Chapter 83, Source Water Protection, and Related Amendment of Code Chapter 12, TRPA Regional Plan Maps, and Code Chapter 25, Best Management Practice Requirements

Associate Planner/Water Quality Program Manager Jon Paul Kiel presented the staff summary adopting the Code Chapter 83, Source Water Protection, and Related Amendment of Code Chapter 12, TRPA Regional Plan Maps, and Code Chapter 25, Best Management Practice Requirements. In addition, Mr. Kiel presented a slide show of the organization of his presentation.

APC REGULAR MEETING MINUTES DECEMBER 8, 1999

A discussion ensued.

Mr. McIntyre complimented the TRPA staff for the thoroughness on the staff presentation and appreciated the changes that had been made. He believed that 25% was a lot in terms of the duplication of effort, and suggested that the words "may be waived" in paragraph 83.2.D(4) be changed to "will be waived". He commented that he would vote for the adoption of the Code even if they are were not changed, but would prefer it to be changed.

Agency Counsel John Marshall stated that staff would look into changing the language.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing.

Mr. Dave Roberts, representing the League to Save Lake Tahoe, stated that the League supported the Code adoption, and he was concerned about the BMP deadline and hoped that the TPRA staff would hold fast on those deadlines.

Since no one else wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Ms. Kemper, with a second by Mr. Poppoff, to recommend approval to the Governing Board to adopt Code Chapter 83, Source Water Protection, and Related Amendment of Code Chapter 12, TRPA Regional Plan Maps, and Code Chapter 25, Best Management Practice Requirements. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. McIntyre commented that the watershed assessment stated that the BMPs may or may not be a practical application of what TRPA is doing, and he hoped that we all make sure we are doing the right thing before we start throwing people in jail.

VI. PLANNING MATTERS

A. Movement of the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) Line

Mr. Joe Pepi, Senior Planner with the Long Range Planning Division, presented the staff summary on movement of the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES) Line.

A discussion ensued.

Chairperson Jepsen opened the meeting up for a public hearing. Since no one wished to comment, Chairperson Jepsen closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Ms. Baldrice, with a second by Mr. Morgan, to recommend approval to the Governing Board that the findings required for lowering the IPES line may only be made for Douglas County and action should be taken to lower the numerical level in that jurisdiction. The motion carried unanimously.

(Break taken at 10:59 a.m.)

(Reconvened at 11:14 a.m.)

B. Finding that the City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County, Placer County, Carson City, Washoe County, and Douglas County have Demonstrated a