

**TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE COMMITTEE**

TRPA Offices
Stateline, NV

December 13, 2011

MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Shute called the meeting to order on December 13, 2011 at 1:03 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Ms. Fortier

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista asked for an update on the committee membership of Ms. Bresnick.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore is concerned with some of the definitions that were discussed at the last meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Aldean moved approval.
Motion carried unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES & ACTION SHEETS FROM PRIOR MEETING (S)

None

V. PLANNING MATTERS

Mr. Shute said Ms. Bresnick has declined to participate in the Regional Plan Update Committee.

Ms. Aldean said her recommendation for the Governing Board is not to supplement the Regional Update Committee membership.

Ms. Aldean moved to approve the recommendation to the Governing Board that the Regional Plan Update Committee membership remain at six.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ms. Fortier, Mr. Sevison

Mr. Stockham gave an overview to the review order of topics for today's meeting.

Discussion on the Recreation Element

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above element.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean suggested changing the language in Goal R-5 from "between" to "among" in the first sentence "protect natural resources from overuse and rectify incapability between uses.

Mr. Shute said in a previous discussion, it was decided to that everything in the Plan has to meet the threshold, in order to avoid specifying it every time.

Mr. Stockham said staff's recommendation is to cover Thresholds more in summary and not repeat them in every Goal & Policy.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club is concerned that some of the items in the Recreation element do not meet the Threshold standards.

Lisa O'Daly, California Tahoe Conservancy said she concurs with the proposed Goals & Policies for Recreation.

Ms. Aldean moved to approve Recreation Goal with modifications, changing "between" to "among" in Goal R-5.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Shute
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ms. Fortier, Mr. Sevison

Discussion on the Public Service Element

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above element.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked for clarification on “modify the waiver for fire water supply” in Public Service-1.

Mr. Hitchcock said staff recommends an update to this waiver in order to be consistent with fire codes.

Mr. Shute asked if a sprinkler system was required in a home, who would impose that condition.

Mr. Hitchcock said it would be imposed by the fire districts.

Ms. Reedy asked if a homeowner could get a sprinkler waiver to build if the fire department signed off.

Mr. Stockham said staff recommends removing the current waiver in our Code because it is not permitted by the fire code.

Ms. Aldean asked what the Agency’s position is on the drilling of wells in the Basin.

Mr. Marshall said the Compact precludes the Agency from regulating water supply issues.

Mr. Hitchcock said in Zephyr Cove there was a situation of inadequate water supply and a waiver was granted to build a water supply tank.

Ms. Aldean said that we do not preclude that as a possibility, if they can demonstrate that there are sufficient fire flows.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista asked how an internal sprinkler system helps forest fires.

Mr. Stockham said this should not be limited to a forest fire, but fire protection in general.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said information on wells are in Chapter 64.

Lisa O’Daly, California Tahoe Conservancy said she agrees with the proposal that bike trails continue to be reviewed as public service facilities.

Mary Huggins, Cal Fire said she supports updating this waiver, as it brings the TRPA Plan & Code in conformance with current state laws.

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizens Action Alliance asked about what growth levels have been considered in Public Service-4.

Mason Overstreet, Friends of the West Shore is concerned with adequate water supplies in existing water rights in Public Service-2.1.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked if there has been any practical experience with sizing public service facilities over the life of the plan.

Mr. Stockham said staff recommendation is going to be limited to where that growth occurs, moving toward Town Centers. Service Agencies should plan for growth expected to occur.

Mr. Hitchcock said in the Environmental Impact Statement analysis will review growth projections in relationship to water rights and sewer capacities of the utility districts.

Mr. Robinson moved to approve Public Services Element

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Shute

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Fortier, Mr. Sevison

Discussion on Introduction

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above section.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean asked if staff is proposing to amend the language on page 1-4 regarding the four year cycle of plan evaluation to be more detailed as described in Mr. Stockham's presentation today.

Mr. Stockham said the intent was to keep it general as it will be further defined in the implementation section.

Ms. Reedy asked about the deletions on page I-9, Relationship to Other Plans.

Mr. Stockham said this was deleted as it is repetitive to prior section of the Introduction.

Mr. Shute suggested changing "most" to "area" in the second sentence, second

paragraph on page I-4.

Mr. Robinson asked for staff response to Mr. Shute's comment.

Ms. Marchetta said the TMDL report identifies fine sediment as the single largest pollutant that is having an effect on mid lake clarity. The TMDL does not set the same standards for phosphorous and nitrogen.

Mr. Robinson suggested that phosphorous and nitrogen be acknowledged.

Mr. Stockham said staff agrees to add other pollutants.

Ms. Reedy said changing it to "a" rather than leaving it as "most" is minimizing its importance. She does agree that the other pollutants should be referenced.

Ms. Aldean suggested we quote as verbatim from the report but add qualifying language to statement.

Mr. Stockham asked to defer the paragraph and staff will review the TMDL work and provide revised language.

Mr. Shute said he agrees with Ms. Aldean's suggestion.

Ms. Aldean suggested that staff also make the clerical changes to paragraph.

Mr. Shute said he would like to discuss sideboards for local plans in Land Use-4.12 as it is referenced on page I-8, "that before the local plan can take effect; it must be found in conformance with the Regional plan".

Mr. Stockham said Land Use-4.12 is going to the local government committee on December 15 and will be brought back to this board the same day.

Mr. Marshall said that Land Use-4.8 is the criteria for approval of the finding of conformance for the local plans.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Nicole Gergans, League to Save Lake Tahoe said it is also important to treat the nutrients in addition to find sediment.

Lisa O'Daly, California Tahoe Conservancy suggested to broaden the accomplishments list with other programs besides water quality.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident suggested a word correction on page I-3, second

paragraph from the bottom, change “that” to “than” in the sentence, “1987 plan established a “Carrying Capacity” for development in the Region that was dramatically lower.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Sierra Club asked if staff could provide and updated list of amendments from the Regional plan.

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizens Alliance is concerned that the Army Corp recommendations to achieve the TMDL are not in proposed documents.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe suggested adding local general plans and State and Federal master plans.

Jennifer Merchant, Placer County said on page 4, the last paragraph, it is the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization or the Tahoe Transportation Commission that would be responsible for the planning cycles, the Tahoe Transportation District would be the implementers.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Stockham said on the TMDL we still recommend that regulation alone is not enough to achieve and maintain Thresholds.

Ms. Marchetta said when we get to water quality we will have all of these discussions in detail.

Mr. Sevison is concerned that if private sector BMP’s are done, they may not be kept up. The roads would be the best benefit

Mr. Shute said how are street sweeping and measures discussed for removing fine sediment being handled in the draft plan.

Mr. Stockham said this was intended to be a general summary of what the rest of the plan would say in detail. He suggested this general summary be revisited by staff if substantive changes are made in other sections.

Ms. Marchetta said the TMDL adoption by the two states has shifted the emphasis of who is the primary regulator of water quality away from TRPA and put onus on the local jurisdictions to develop their own local plans.

Mr. Shute said he thought there was going to be state master plans and may federal master plans that are not part of the local planning process.

Mr. Stockham said staff will work on this.

Ms. Aldean said she feels that both the Prosperity Plan and the Visioning process are important external factors and that the Prosperity Plan still be included.

Mr. Stockham said staff agrees to add Prosperity Plan, local general/master plans, State and Federal master plans to the list.

Ms. Aldean said there is general agreement among the members of the committee that the changes as articulated by staff are consistent with our recommendations.

Mr. Shute asked staff to revise the Introduction to address a number of topics and for the committee to hold action on the chapter until they can review the modified draft at a later date.

Discussion on Land Use Land Use-2.5 & 2.6

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above policies.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said that Land Use-2.5 & 2.6 should be segregated; replacing and rebuilding on the same footprint is different than and enlargement that should have TRPA review.

Mr. Marshall said the reason why we still want to permit it is to ensure it is built back to the way it was.

Ms. Aldean said that the local jurisdictions could handle this.

Mr. Marshall said that is a different issue on whether or not they are subject to permitting.

Mr. Stockham suggested that staff could develop code and criteria that would specify what could be rebuilt versus what would require TRPA approval.

Ms. Aldean said that has to do with calamity and fire and that is defined in Land Use-2.4. She suggested extending that to "other" structures that are replaced or rebuilt not necessarily as a result of fire or calamity.

Mr. Marshall said the intent is if it becomes obsolete, you do not want to encourage the rebuilding.

Ms. Aldean said that obsolescence does not mean it not inhabitable. She wants to eliminate the disincentives and suggested staff to review further.

Mr. Sevison asked if that is non-conforming to coverage.

Mr. Marshall said we address non-conformance with coverage in excess coverage mitigation fees.

Mr. Stockham said staff would like to request time to prepare a recommendation on rebuilding non-conforming structures.

Mr. Sevison asked what would be the issue if a residential property were to build an addition that did not change the amount of non-conformity.

Mr. Stockham suggested we grant a blanket exception for certain rebuilding that would never require TRPA approval.

Ms. Marchetta said if you grant a blanket exemption to rebuild non-conformity in the Basin, then how you move toward conformity.

Mr. Stockham said it is common in development codes to embed the concept of closer conformance.

Ms. Aldean said it also may be a way to accelerate compliance with BMP's.

Ms. Reedy said she is concerned with a blanket in regards to non-conformance.

Mr. Stockham said with the local plans could include a form of summary exemptions within than plan area for certain types of improvements.

Ms. Aldean suggested that staff review the blanket exemption list.

Mr. Shute said he is concerned with height.

Ms. Aldean said language as proposed in Land Use-2.4; you could rebuild after a fire even if it non-conforming to height.

Mr. Sevison said the non-conforming commercial could be done through zoning.

Mr. Marshall said we need to be cautious about changing policies that are not part of a scoped alternative.

Mr. Stockham said that affordable housing and coverage are items that are not in the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement may be able to be on a post adoption list.

Mr. Shute asked if this applies to Land Use-2.6 uses or structures.

Ms. Marchetta said she believes it is limited to structures, but would like to review the line drawing.

Mr. Stockham asked for direction from the committee to pursue a broadening of a rebuilding summary approval for specific criteria.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Lisa O'Daly said property owners need to know what their options are, and we need to encourage the shift toward conformity.

Nicole Gergans said the League to Save Lake Tahoe suggested that through this process, staff go back to Thresholds and review the non-conforming uses.

Lew Feldman said Meeks Lumber is a good example of something in stream zone and a view shed and this policy as written may be the opportunity to create viable incentives.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident said in Land Use-2.6, item B there is concern with what may fall under this language. "nor resumed following a significant interruption without TRPA approval."

Hilary Roverud said the City of South Lake Tahoe suggested that staff simplify the list of non-conforming uses in Chapter 18 of the Code. Also, ensure that the local jurisdictions can do these reviews under a Memorandums of Understanding.

Mr. Sevison said we could identify these projects through the Community Plan process and provide incentives for them to move out of the Stream Environment Zones.

Mr. Stockham said in the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement are the local plans which we could set up requirements that could supersede Chapter 18.

Jennifer Merchant said as you go forward it would be good to simplify the list and better incentives for conformance.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Reedy asked if this language gives us the ability to look at each circumstance with the amendment of the Memorandum of Understanding in it.

Mr. Stockham said it does.

Ms. Aldean asked for a clarification on the language, “if the structure is subject to a specific program of renewable or modification by TRPA.”

Mr. Marshall said there is language in the existing Shorezone chapters that has a program for the removal of break waters, etc.

Ms. Aldean asked for the definition of “significant interruption” in Land Use-2.6.

Mr. Marshall said he believes it is if you discontinue use for one year, but will verify.

Mr. Shute suggested the language be accepted as proposed by staff.

Ms. Aldean said the non-conforming structures will be handled in more detail through the local planning process.

Mr. Marshall said you do not want to relax these standards since this section is about disincentives for maintaining non-conforming uses.

Ms. Reedy had a comment on Land Use-2.4, that as written, a non-conforming structure could be intentionally burned down and it could be rebuilt.

Mr. Stockham said staff will better define “calamity” in Land Use-2.4. He recommended new language in Land Use-2.5 & 2.6, “such approval shall occur through direct TRPA review, (delete “or”) through conformance review process for local plans, or through Memorandums of Understanding with local governments.”

Mr. Shute asked what the process is for approving Memorandums of Understanding.

Ms. Marchetta said Memorandums of Understanding go through the TRPA.

Ms. Reedy moved to approve Land Use-2.5 & 2.6 with modifications. Add Memorandums of Understanding.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Shute, Mr. Sevison

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Fortier

Discussion on Land Use Policies-2.9 & 2.16 and Land Use-2 Implementation Measures

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above policies.

Staffs recommends deleting Land Use-2.9 & 2.16 and add a new Implementation Measure.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Shute asked what is the additional implementation measure in Land Use Goal-2.

Mr. Stockham said it is referenced in the bullet point and if endorsed by the Committee. Staff will work Code Consultants to produce the Code language.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident asked if definition of “allowance” will be defined and codified for Town Centers and Regional Centers.

Mr. Stockham said it would be codified in the Code.

Mr. Shute asked if the allowances are similar to bonus units.

Mr. Hitchcock said it is allowances for height, density and project areas that are not contiguous.

Mr. Stockham said height for redevelopment areas are in heights for Regional and Town Centers.

Mr. Shute said if redevelopment as a concept is going to be eliminated, but allowances will be saved, what will they apply to?

Mr. Stockham said they could be applied to Town Center or Regional Center if those allowances meet the conformance review criteria.

Ms. Aldean asked if environmental redevelopment is still the catch word. Also, how would the existing redevelopment areas be affected?

Mr. Stockham said they are called Town Centers & Regional Centers instead of redevelopment areas. There is only one in South Lake Tahoe and it would remain in effect until superseded.

Ms. Aldean asked if Placer County has a redevelopment area in the Basin.

Jennifer Merchant, Placer County said it is not a TRPA redevelopment area.

Ms. Aldean asked if there would be a formal recognition of those areas.

Ms. Marchetta said those areas will continue to exist. We want to encourage environmental redevelopment with an “r” and eliminate duplication of the state laws.

Mr. Shute said he is concerned with putting this information off into the Code.

Ms. Marchetta said the policies show the allowances and the map will show where they may be applied with the local plans.

Steve Buelna, Placer County suggested that additional language be added to include Residential and Mixed Use.

Mr. Stockham said the recommendation is to include the redevelopment plan allowances in Town Centers, Regional Centers, High Density Tourist, Residential and Mixed Use areas outside those areas.

Jennifer Merchant, Placer County said the County is concerned that there is no discussion regarding the need for redevelopment of blighted areas in residential communities.

Mr. Stockham said there is some middle ground for current redevelopment allowances, but also providing opportunities for specific incentives.

Mr. Shute said he is concerned with expanding allowances, the Town Center benefits are supposed to be limited to certain urban area.

Jennifer Merchant said we do not want to close the doors on opportunities for multi-family housing in the mixed use areas.

Mr. Stockham said staff recommends leaving this specific language limited to the Town Centers, Regional Centers, etc. and recommendations on coverage, height, density will be provided on each topic.

Mr. Shute suggested that staff identify whether these are redevelopment plans that are proposed under the California or Nevada state laws.

Public Interest Comment & Questions

Nicole Gergans said the League to Save Lake Tahoe is concerned that the allowances were identified for a specific areas of redevelopment and it is now unclear if it is the entire Town Centers.

Dave McClure, North Tahoe Citizens Action Alliance asked if the allowances being

discussed, are they additional incentives or within current standards. He said that in the residential neighborhoods there are no sideboards or limits to density increases.

Mr. Stockham said the incentives are within the current standards

Mr. Shute said the proposed language staff is recommending would not do that. It will be discussed later as to whether redevelopment should have special incentives in residential or other areas.

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident said most of this will be done during the local plans and community planning process.

Lew Feldman said that Chapter 15 does not have relevance to this discussion.

Ms. Aldean moved to approve the deletion of Land Use-2.9 and Land Use-2.16 and to add modified language to Land Use-2 Implementation Measures. Delete existing Chapter 15 and amend the Code to include redevelopment plan allowances within Town Centers, Regional Centers and the High Density Tourist Districts, along with opportunities for priority processing and or fee reductions in conjunction with restoration activities.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Shute, Mr. Sevison

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Fortier

Discussion on Land Use Policies-2.13-2.15 - Coverage

Mr. Stockham gave an introduction to the above policies.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said even if someone were to relocate the coverage to a piece of land with higher land capability, there is a possibility it would still be non-conforming with respect to coverage.

Mr. Marshall said you could do it, but it would be non-conforming and you would have another non-conforming use but on a higher land capability.

Mr. Stockham said sub category H is a targeted exemption to the coverage rule to allow non-conforming language.

Mr. Shute asked staff to review sub item H.

Mr. Stockham gave an overview of sub item I.

Mr. Sevison asked if you would be allowed to transfer from one Community Plan to another.

Mr. Stockham said you could transfer in from where ever within our recommendation that is removing the HRA boundary.

Mr. Shute said he is not in support of the hydrologic boundary changes. Also, he would like the coverage reductions to occur as the plan is implemented.

Mr. Sevison asked if the coverage is project specific.

Mr. Shute said the project specific is fine, but standards should be met as you go along.

Ms. Aldean said the objective is to transfer a use out of a sensitive area on to a piece of property with higher land capability.

Mr. Stockham said staff agrees with Ms. Aldean's explanation.

Mr. Robinson asked for clarification on Mr. Shute's comments above.

Mr. Shute said he would like to see a stronger way of encouraging the reductions.

Mr. Sevison said we want to encourage redevelopment for other reasons also, e.g., water quality.

Mr. Stockham said this is inserting the concept of comprehensive planning and cumulative impacts into our coverage management system, which would add a planning step to add coverage community wide.

Ms. Marchetta said the implementation of the plan still needs to be flushed out in the local planning process.

Mr. Sevison asked if it would be permitted to transfer off a low capability parcel to a similar status parcel in a Town Center.

Mr. Stockham said it would not be strictly prohibited under this language.

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller, Tahoe Vista resident asked how you guarantee the restoration of a site if the funding does not happen and the transfer to the Town Center has already

been done.

Low Feldman said that much of the redevelopment has been done in the urbanized areas which you will see coverage reductions because these are the most intensely developed areas.

Lisa O'Daly, California Tahoe Conservancy said on item H, it an area outside that wants to transfer into one of the classified zones must be restored to a natural state; what is the environmental benefit of requiring restoration of high capability parcels?

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club is concerned with coverage Threshold and the lack of science in transferring across hydrological areas.

Nicole Gergans, League to Save Lake Tahoe is concerned that there is not an overall plan for coverage reduction.

Dave McClure, Tahoe Vista resident is concerned that coverage will become a commodity. Also, recommends that transferring stays within the hydrological zone and that local jurisdiction.

Lisa O'Daly, California Tahoe Conservancy said the hydrological boundary changes are important to Basin and making coverage more available and the land banks are more effective.

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Reedy said she wanted disclose that her daughter works for Meeks.

Ms. Aldean said the handout from Environmental Incentives is the qualitative study, which will be followed up by a more quantitative study.

Mr. Stockham said yes, there will be many more studies completed. The Environmental Impact Study will be the principal mechanism to evaluate these changes.

Mr. Shute said that since many individuals believe the local plans and Town Centers will result in coverage reduction, I do not think there would be any opposition to having a requirement for the local plans to demonstrate and implementable and enforceable means of reducing coverage, rather than having it as a goal.

Hilary Roverud, City of South Lake Tahoe said staff needs to define what qualifies as pervious coverage. She also suggested that staff review ratios in subsection B, as written it does not incentivize relocating coverage from a sensitive area. Also, she

asked for clarification on what a “credit” is that is referenced in subsection E.

Mr. Stockham said staff agrees with the City and other local governments that we are not being aggressive enough with our infill incentives.

Mr. Sevison asked if they would be allowed to transfer coverage in to class 3 parcels from this process.

Mr. Stockham said the intent on sub item I, was to require reduction in coverage in land capability districts 1 & 2. Suggested to delete “incentive areas” and replace with “reduce coverage in land capability districts 1 & 2.”

Public Interest Comments & Questions

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club said that pervious pavement is still experimental.

Jennifer Merchant said Placer County supports the language in Section I.

Mr. Shute said he raises the possibility of having some kind of implementation and enforceability to reduction in coverage over time in these plans.

Mr. Sevison said he does not believe we are equipped to deal with it at this time, we do not know what the communities are like as far as coverage.

Ms. Aldean said we can incorporate it as an objective; the theory is any impact can be mitigated. She does not object to Mr. Shute’s position to encourage the overall reduction of coverage, but she feels we should not mandate it.

Ms. Reedy said the total coverage we have in the Basin is 3% according to the “Hard coverage by Land capability Classes for Tahoe.” With all of the caps, it may be possible that we would not hit the 30% that has been quoted to where we need to be.

Ms. Reedy moved to approve Land Use Policies-2.13-2.14 with modifications. (Including coverage reduction language and typos corrected.)

Mr. Robinson asked if the language above that Ms. Aldean suggested is going to be included.

Mr. Shute said he does not support this language. It does not capture the complexity of the situation. Reduction needs to happen, not just an objective or goal.

Ms. Aldean asked what if there was net coverage reduction Basin wide.

Mr. Shute said the science for coverage is not getting enough importance.

Mr. Sevison said that the parcel evaluation system is where parcels in the Basin are evaluated and given a score was based on Bailey.

Mr. Marshall said that is the IPES is the residential system.

Mr. Stockham said we are recommending IPES remains unchanged.

Mr. Sevison said there was concern because Baily is only on a larger scale, yet we have parcel of parcel review.

Ms. Aldean said that sub item I says "in order to be found in conformance with the Regional Plan, the comprehensive coverage management system" which is by local plan "shall reduce coverage overall."

Mr. Shute said he is concerned that projects that would reduce coverage may never come along.

Ms. Aldean said from staff's point of view is it is going to take many years to achieve this.

Ms. Reedy said the plan is being reviewed every four years.

Ms. Aldean said this eviscerates the whole objective of transferring these over covered projects out of sensitive areas. Through the local plans you will achieve the overall objective to reduce coverage.

Mr. Robinson said that hopefully this will be a limited number on the list that will go to the Board in the future.

Mr. Shute said we had a motion to approve the language as proposed by staff with modifications.

Ms. Reedy moved to approve Land Use Policies-2.13 & 2.14 with modifications. Sub item I, is to delete from the second to last line "sensitive areas" and would read "reduce coverage in land capability districts 1 & 2." Minority opinion language will be drafted in coordination with Mr. Shute at a later date.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Reedy, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Sevison

Nays: Mr. Shute

Abstain: None

Absent: Ms. Fortier

Mr. Stockham said staff will develop alternative language.

Mr. Severson suggested to staff when they provide alternatives it would be helpful to have what the objective of the change is.

Ms. Aldean said this is mandatory; Mr. Shute's concern is the time frame.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Dave McClure, Tahoe Vista resident said it is going to be extremely difficult to reduce coverage.

Steve Teshara asked where agenda will start on Thursday, December 15

Mr. Stockham said we will start with the Land Use-2 Implementation Measures, for coverage and allocations.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Shute adjourned at 5:05 p.m.