Attachment G: Responses to Questions and Comments on the Phase 2 Housing Amendments

How will this proposal be implemented with the local jurisdictions? What will apply at the regional level and what will local jurisdictions have control over?
If approved, changes to the TRPA Code will go into effect 60 days after adoption. Some of the existing area plans set their own development standards for centers and areas zoned for multi-family, while others refer to the TRPA Code. Where area plans defer to the TRPA Code, the changes will be effective 60 days after Governing Board approval. For standards that are set in area plans, and inconsistent following Governing Board adoption of these amendments, the local jurisdiction will have one year to amend their area plan to demonstrate conformity with TRPA standards, consistent with Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code or make alternative amendments, described below. If inconsistent standards have not been amended in the area plan within one year, TRPA can act to amend the applicable policies and provisions.

Local jurisdictions can set alternative height, density, and parking standards from what is proposed in TRPA's Phase 2 amendments through an area plan amendment. However, TRPA will require that any changes to the standards consider the financial impact the alternatives have on building deed-restricted housing in their jurisdiction. If the jurisdiction is reducing density or height standards, or increasing parking requirements, they will need to show reasonable alternative strategies that either reduce the cost to build or provide subsidies to deed restricted units. These alternatives can include, but are not limited to, an approved inclusionary housing ordinance, zoning additional areas for multi-family, providing donated land or other public subsidies, and/or installation of area-wide stormwater systems in preferred affordable and workforce housing areas.

How does the proposal change the "achievable" deed-restriction definition?
In the three different categories of deed-restricted workforce housing bonus units, "achievable" deed restrictions use local employment rather than household income as the criteria for renting or selling. Many of Tahoe's young professionals and skilled workers are stuck between low-income requirements and being able to afford the median priced home or market-rate rental unit. Having this additional deed-restriction category is critical if housing solutions are going to serve the range of workforce housing needs in the region. "Achievable" deed restrictions have been part of the residential bonus unit program since 2018.

The Regional Planning Committee recently directed staff to propose additional criteria to be added to the "achievable" definition in the code of ordinances that requires the employee's physical presence within the boundaries of the Tahoe region in order to complete the tasks associated with the employment. This language was modelled after Summit County, Colorado.

The revised definition that will be included in the December 13 Governing Board packet is:

"Achievable" Housing:

Single or multi-family residential development to be used exclusively as a residential dwelling by permanent residents who meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Have a household income not in excess of 120 percent of the respective county's area median income (A~~M~~I~~M~~) (moderate income households and below); or
2. At least one occupant of the household works at least 30 hours per week or full-time equivalency for an employer with a business license or tax address within the Tahoe region or Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District (TTUSD), including but not limited to public agencies and not-for-profit employers, and which requires the employee's physical presence within the boundaries of the Tahoe region or TTUSD in order to complete the task or furnish the service for an average of at least 30 hours per week on an annual basis, or seasonal basis for seasonal work. Full-time equivalency may be confirmed by employer; or
3. Is a retired person who has lived in a deed-restricted unit in the Tahoe Basin for more than seven years.

The employment requirement may be waived for accessory dwelling units when the unit is occupied by a family member related by birth, marriage or adoption to the owner of the primary dwelling. TRPA may include asset limits for purchasers of deed-restricted homes.

Achievable housing units shall meet the criteria and restrictions in accordance with Chapter 52: *Bonus Unit Incentive Program*.

Achievable deed-restrictions issued before ~~June 26, 2023~~ [date amendments go into effect] may utilize this definition or the definition of "achievable" described in the recorded deed-restriction language ~~in effect from December 20, 2018 to June 26, 2023~~.

How can we ensure that achievable units won't be built as million-dollar luxury units?
At the meeting on November 13, RPC directed staff to add additional criteria to the achievable deed restriction that requires the physical presence of an employee within the basin. Additionally, RPC requested that projects submit the anticipated unit size with a comparison to other deed restricted units in the basin early in the permitting process. In addition to these changes, there are several aspects of the current deed restriction that reduce the likelihood:

- A home with an achievable deed-restriction must be used as the occupant's primary residence.
- Homes with deed-restrictions cannot garner the same increases in value over time that a non-deed restricted home can, and the pool of buyers is much more limited. Because the pool of buyers or renters is smaller and restricted to households that qualify based on their income or employment location, TRPA does not anticipate a large demand for these homes from anyone who can afford to purchase an unrestricted home. Nevertheless, TRPA may consider additional, reasonable restrictions that can be added to the achievable definition in the future. Any changes to deed-restrictions must be approved by TRPA.

The achievable definition is targeted at households that do not qualify for affordable or moderate housing but work locally and cannot afford to buy or rent a home. A local employment requirement has been used in other mountain communities, including Summit County and Vail, Colorado. TRPA will continue to adaptively manage deed restrictions and make changes where needed.

How is the TRPA "beefing up" its deed restriction enforcement? What percentage of deed restricted housing will be audited and by whom?

TRPA has hired a third-party consultant to assist with deed restriction auditing and enforcement. Housing units that received a TRPA deed restriction after 2018 are required to submit an annual compliance report certifying they are complying with the program requirements. TRPA will audit a minimum of 10 percent of deed-restricted units annually and 100 percent of complaints about deed restricted properties. The TRPA board may direct staff to audit more units annually. TRPA has hired a new staff member to oversee deed restriction monitoring and is actively recruiting for another legal position, a portion of that staff members time will be spent on deed restriction compliance.

What is the compliance to-date, what enforcement has been done to-date?
In October of 2018 TRPA passed code amendments that required that all units receiving a bonus unit after December 17, 2018, in exchange for a deed-restriction be part of an annual compliance monitoring program, whereby they must submit a form annually certifying that the home complies with the requirements of the deed-restriction. These amendments also stipulated that bonus unit property owners may be subject to a fine of up to 1/10 of the current cost of a residential unit of use (RUU) annually for failure to submit the compliance report or deed-restriction disclosure form. These units are also subject to complaint-based or random audit in which they are required to furnish documentation demonstrating compliance with the terms of the deed-restriction.

Units that were issued deed-restrictions prior to 2019 are not subject to the annual compliance monitoring requirements, however they may be audited randomly or in response to a complaint, as with the post-2018 deed-restricted units.

All units are subject to penalties for violations identified in the TRPA Compact (Public Law 96-551), and that is that failure to comply with the requirements of a deed-restriction may result in a civil penalty of up to $5,000 per day for each day the violation persists.

Annual compliance form:

Three properties were required to submit the online compliance form by April 15, 2023. All three properties submitted the form and stated that they are in compliance. These results will be certified by the third-party consultant and included in the TRPA's annual Performance Measures report that goes to the board in February of each year.

Audit and complaint-based enforcement:

In 2022 and 2023 TRPA sent a reminder letter to all owners of deed-restricted properties noting the terms of their deed-restriction and compliance requirements, followed up in the spring of 2023 by formal letters to owners of 70 properties in Incline Village requesting them to submit documentation to verify program compliance. TRPA sent certified mail responses in June of 2023 to those that had not responded.

This action alone resulted in three homes in Incline Village that were listed for over the allowable amount being removed from the market and resulted in another home price being lowered and ultimately sold within the limits of the allowable sales price.

The third-party consultant is working with TRPA to complete this audit and to make recommendations for next steps. The results will be included in the TRPA's annual performance measures report that will go to the TRPA Governing Board in February.

How does this proposal relate to developments with mixed use and/or market rate, and/or all three?
The incentives included in the Phase 2 amendments apply only to mixed-use projects that have commercial uses on the ground floor with 100 percent deed restricted housing above. The commercial component can be no more than 50 percent of the total building square footage.

The proposed amendments would only apply to residential and mixed-use projects that are building 100% deed restricted housing. However, if a local jurisdiction would like to apply these incentives more broadly, for example to residential developments that are building market rate and deed restricted units, they could amend their development standards through an area plan amendment, or creation of a new area plan. The jurisdiction must demonstrate that the alternative standards are at least as effective as TRPA standards in reducing the cost for the construction of deed-restricted affordable, moderate, and achievable housing in the applicable jurisdiction.

What level of environmental review is required for the amendments? Why is TRPA not preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS)? How does the IEC take into account changes in the region since 2012?
TRPA follows guidelines and policies adopted by the TRPA Governing Board when assessing the level of environmental review required for a project or action. In this case, the agency has prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed amendments. An IEC is often used to evaluate Regional Plan amendments. If an IEC identifies potential impacts that warrant further analysis and discussion, the agency must prepare an Environmental Assessment, or an EIS.

The Phase 2 Housing Amendments propose to modify development standards for a small portion of the development capacity already authorized. The 2012 and prior Regional Plans authorized residential bonus units to be built in the basin as incentives for certain environmental and community benefits. There are 946 residential bonus units for deed-restricted workforce housing remaining in the pool. No additional units of use will be added to the basin from the proposed policy changes. The findings in the IEC indicate no adverse environmental impacts and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

While conditions in the Lake Tahoe Region have changed since 2012, none have been significantly different from buildout assumptions and therefore an EIS is not necessary to analyze the proposed changes. Cumulative progress in the basin is always being scientifically monitored. Every four years, TRPA prepares an Environmental Threshold report that evaluates changes in the basin and the effectiveness of the Regional Plan, which includes conservation programs, Environmental Improvement Program projects, and policies that manage development.

The Phase 2 proposal only applies to the 946 remaining Bonus Units. Can TRPA replenish these by adding more development later to which these new standards will apply?
Yes. The Governing Board can always add more bonus units (or other development capacity) but that action will require a public process and its own environmental analysis. For these amendments TRPA is not increasing the total amount of development, but rather working within the existing development cap system.

To what income level have bonus units been distributed and to where?
In 2018 the TRPA amended Section 52.3.1 of the TRPA code to specify that of the remaining 1,124 bonus units, 562 shall be used for affordable income projects, and 562 may be used for moderate and achievable projects. Affordable projects may draw from the moderate/achievable pool, but not the other way around. Since 2018, some key projects that have been either constructed or are in permitting and have either used or reserved bonus units include:

- Sugar Pine Village, South Lake Tahoe – 248 "Affordable" Bonus Units (126 units are in phases that have been acknowledged, remaining units are reserved for a future phase)
- Lake Tahoe Community College Dorms, South Lake Tahoe – 19 "Affordable" Bonus Units (21 "affordable" units are reserved for a future phase, plus 1 "achievable")
- Dollar Creek Crossings, Dollar Creek – 80 "Affordable" Units
- ADUs – constructed, conditional or acknowledged permits, 12 "achievable" units
- Tahoe City Marina/Boatworks – 8 "moderate" income units (complete)
- 941 Silver Dollar, South Lake Tahoe – 20 "achievable" units (permit acknowledged)
- Alpine View Estates in Tahoe Vista – 4 "achievable" units (permit acknowledged)
- Saint Joseph Community Land Trust Riverside homes – 3 "moderate" units (complete)
- Dollar Creek Crossings, Placer County – 60 "achievable" units (reserved)
- Crossings at the "Y", South Lake Tahoe – 70 "achievable" units (reserved)

This list is not exhaustive but includes major projects that are using or reserving a significant number of bonus units. Projects do not reserve bonus units until they have submitted a complete application.

How will the remaining Bonus Units be distributed?
Every new unit of use built in the Tahoe Basin requires a development right in order to be permitted. The Regional Plan set caps on the number of development rights allowed in the basin and allocates them to local jurisdictions at a measured rate so that environmental improvements such as stormwater and transportation infrastructure come forward at a similar rate (visit the Regional Plan progress webpage mentioned above).

Housing units that receive bonus units are required to be built within the Bonus Unit Boundary, an area that encompasses a ½-mile buffer from existing transit and includes town centers and areas zoned for multi-family. There are 946 bonus units left, available on a first come first served basis from the TRPA pool, and of these, many are already reserved for projects that are in the permitting process.

When community plans were created in 1987, 317 affordable housing bonus units were assigned to pools within local jurisdictions. As community plans have been converted into area plans, these assigned bonus units have carried over to area plans. The following table shows the remaining pools of bonus units.

Jurisdiction/Pool	Number
City of SLT	89
Douglas County	67
Placer County	41
Washoe County	120
TRPA Pool – Centers	377

TRPA Pool – Other	104
TRPA Pool – currently reserved for permitted projects	148
Total	**946**

TRPA Code section 52.3.1 requires that half (562) of the 1,400 bonus units allocated in 2012 be distributed to affordable housing units. The other half are set aside for moderate or achievable units.

What outreach was conducted for the Phase 2 Amendments?
The following outreach was conducted between 2021 and 2023:

- 8 public hearings:
    - October 2021 Tahoe Living Working Group,
    - March 2022 Tahoe Living Working Group
    - July 2022 Governing Board workshop
    - April 2023 Tahoe Living Working Group
    - June 2023 Local Government Housing Committee
    - September 2023 Regional Plan Implementation Committee
    - November 2023 Advisory Planning Commission
    - November 2023 Regional Plan Implementation Committee
- 7 pop-up booths at Farmer's Markets around the basin, social service organizations, and Live at Lakeview
- 1 public webinar
- 1 public survey
- 8 newspaper columns, 6 newspaper ads
- Over 20 one-on-one meetings with community groups, including community advisory boards

The draft Regional Plan amendments and Code were included in four public hearing packets:

- First code version available in RPIC packet – meeting 9/27, packet released 9/20
- Second code version available in APC packet – meeting 11/8, packet released 11/1
- Third code version available in RPIC packet – meeting 11/15, packet released 11/8
- Final code version will be available in GB packet – meeting 12/13, packet released 12/6

Who are the stakeholders working with TRPA to determine housing needs?
In 2020, the TRPA Governing Board appointed the Tahoe Living Working Group as a committee of the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) to advise TRPA in developing policy and codes as part of the Tahoe Living strategic priority. The 20-member working group consists of representatives with expertise in housing or that are directly affected by the housing issues in the region, including representatives from the affordable housing development community, a community land trust, public lands managers, the builders' association, the environmental community, social service organizations, community collaboratives, the realtors, and large employers. The Working Group also includes representatives from the TRPA Governing Board, local jurisdiction staff, and the APC. The full Tahoe Living Working Group roster can be found here.

Where is your stated local housing assessment study? Does it substantiate the need for the "achievable" category? Where does this category come from?
There have been three needs assessments developed for portions of the basin (South Shore, Placer County, and Washoe County). A summary and link to each individual needs assessment can be found here. The achievable category was adopted by the TRPA Governing Board in 2018 as response to the Mountain Housing Council recommendation that more subsidies were needed for the "missing middle:" households that make too much money to qualify for federally and state subsidized affordable and moderate housing, but not enough to afford a market rate home. According to the needs assessments, 2,735 households need housing units in the affordable category (below 80 percent area median income), 1,512 households need housing units in the moderate category (between 80% - 120 percent area median income), and 1,575 households need housing units in the achievable category (above 120% area median income). The total of these three categories is 5,822.

What does a typical affordable and moderate workforce unit look like (height, # of rooms, floor plan design)?
Staff have shown a series of slides with graphics showing current development standards and a range of other possible scenarios. The slides convey that the cost for construction and the resulting cost to local households changes depending on the development standards in place. Exact rental or sale prices are outside of TRPA's purview, as they are driven by numerous market factors. The presentations show that because the costs to construct are so high under existing development standards, the rents needed to make a project profitable are far above market rents, and builders have no interest in projects that do not provide a profit. The ranges show that with more flexibility in development standards on a parcel more smaller units can be built, hence lowering the construction cost per unit and lowering the rents needed. That makes it more likely that either a private builder will be able to make a project work financially, or that a local jurisdiction can participate in building projects with a lower subsidy.
There are a few examples of "achievable" units in Tahoe. All permitted or constructed "achievable" units so far are ADUs, and there are not many to date. Six have completed permitting and two have completed construction.

Other achievable projects in the permitting process include:

- The Crossings at the "Y" in South Lake Tahoe: 70 units at 800 square feet, on average (application incomplete). More information can be found here: https://parcels.laketahoeinfo.org/Parcel/Detail/023-231-003
- Alpine View Estates in Tahoe Vista: Four 3-Bedrooms at 1,415 square feet (project acknowledged). More information can be found here: https://parcels.laketahoeinfo.org/AccelaCAPRecord/Detail/ERSP2020-1404-01
- 3160 Lake Tahoe Blvd in Dollar Hill: Twenty-four units made up of 1-Bedrooms at 660 square feet, 2-Bedrooms at 891 square feet, and 3-Bedrooms at 1098 square feet (application incomplete). More information can be found here: https://parcels.laketahoeinfo.org/Parcel/Detail/093-130-026
- 941 Silver Dollar, South Lake Tahoe: Twenty duplexes and triplexes, 1488 sf each unit (project acknowledged but not constructed). More information can be found here: https://parcels.laketahoeinfo.org/AccelaCAPRecord/Detail/ERSP2020-1763

What "suggested parameters" for rents will be in the ordinance?
TRPA does not set mandated rental prices because rent is driven by a variety of market factors outside of TRPA purview. However, TRPA suggests using Fair Market Rents by number of bedrooms to develop rents, published by the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). A household is "cost burdened" when they are spending more than 1/3 of the household's gross income on housing. The affordable and moderate-income levels are set at 80% AMI and 120% AMI respectively. The achievable category is based on local employment instead of income, so rent charged will vary depending on a variety of factors including size, location, # of parking spaces, etc. Staff have included suggested rental and sale prices for affordable, moderate, and higher than 120% AMI in the Residential Bonus Unit Factsheet on the TRPA website.

For example, a 1-person household in the moderate-income category which occupies a studio will need to have a gross income of less than $6,646 per month. A household which is paying more than 1/3 of their income on housing is considered cost burdened; in this example that would be paying more than $2,215 per month. Since 2020, staff have included suggested rental and sale prices in the Residential Bonus Unit Factsheet on the TRPA website.

In what locations will builders be able to take advantage of the coverage incentives under this proposal?
Within town centers, projects can have coverage above 70% of the parcel(s) if the runoff from the project parcel(s) can be treated through an area-wide stormwater system. Area-wide stormwater systems are offsite treatments that typically treat water from multiple parcels, rather than treating water on one specific parcel using best management practices (BMPs). As of 2023, town centers with an active area-wide treatment shown in blue on the map here would be the only areas eligible for the additional coverage. As more area-wide treatment systems are built over time, these areas could expand.

Outside of town centers, projects can get up to 70% coverage of the parcel(s) if the runoff from the parcel(s) is treated through an area-wide stormwater system or treated onsite through BMPs. In order to implement that latter, a public entity must assume responsibility for the monitoring and maintenance of the onsite BMPs and must have an ongoing funding source.

Explain the reduction in parking requirements in town centers and multi-family zones. Can a developer provide less parking than this? Can they provide more?
Requiring a set number of parking spaces is a significant barrier to building more affordable types of multi-family housing, according to studies and consultants working with TRPA on housing amendments. Currently, local jurisdictions require 1 to 2 parking spaces per residential unit. The number of spaces can be a fraction when multiple units are proposed, i.e., 1.5 parking spaces per unit. The TRPA proposal would allow a project applicant to construct less than 1 to 2 spaces per unit. However, this does not mean that the developer is not allowed to include parking. In order to construct fewer parking spaces than the 1 to 2 spaces per unit required today, the project applicant would be required to:

- Identify the anticipated parking demand from the project through a parking analysis or information from a similarly situated project or projects, and
- Demonstrate either that adequate parking will be provided, or that the project will implement solutions like shared parking agreements, implementation of car sharing, or contributions to alternative transportation options.

More information on parking can be found in the memo presented to the Regional Planning Committee in September.

Why are we focusing on multi-family areas outside of town centers? Isn't development outside of town centers considered sprawl?

Because town centers are relatively small and typically only encompass commercial areas, the vast majority of vacant, developable parcels that are close to transit are in multi-family areas. These are the areas where "missing middle" housing – duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes are appropriate. Also, survey responses from an online survey conducted by TRPA using Flashvote indicated that this is the preferred type of development. The 946 remaining bonus units that are the focus of this proposal can already be built within the bonus unit boundary, which is a larger area than town centers and areas zoned for multi-family. The proposed amendments incentivize the buildout of these units in areas closer to transit and evacuation routes thereby reducing the potential effect from these already authorized units.

Why doesn't TRPA conduct a site-specific analysis to identify opportunity sites within Town Centers rather than the chosen approach?

TRPA embarked on a process more than two years ago to review and update land use policies in the Regional Plan that are barriers to deed-restricted affordable and workforce housing in the basin. The status quo will result in less affordable and workforce housing units and less infill development and without more innovative policies, the dominance of larger, single-family residences is likely to continue. Conducting a basinwide site-specific analysis and crafting Code only for specific parcels is inefficient and not good planning. Town centers and areas zoned for multi-family have already been identified as areas where higher density is encouraged. These policy changes are already limited to only deed-restricted development in certain areas. Projects that want to take advantage of these incentives must go through the permitting process in which they have to meet requirements showing the project will not degrade viewsheds, natural resources, and public safety. Local governments can put in place alternative standards but they must show that they support the development of deed restricted housing.

Are subsidies still needed to make these projects financially feasible? If that's the case, then what is the point of these amendments?

Subsidies will likely still be needed to build housing at the affordable and moderate-income levels. However, these subsidies will be less, and these amendments will likely help facilitate achievable housing without subsidies. This is important because achievable housing does not qualify for the federal and state subsidies. Because public subsidies for any housing at all levels are scarce and competitive, reducing costs will benefit construction of these units in the Tahoe Basin.

What can we do to reduce barriers for smaller projects (4, 6, 10 units)?

The proposed amendments are designed to reduce barriers for all deed restricted housing types, including smaller projects. Increasing density and reducing parking requirements have shown to be the biggest impediments to housing projects on smaller lots. More information can be found in the analysis completed by Cascadia Partners.

Does the proposal change setbacks?

No. Setbacks are the minimum distance a building or other structure must be set back from the street, sidewalk, and property lines. Local jurisdictions regulate setbacks ranging from 5 feet to 20 feet on all sides of the property, which allow for access to underground utilities, adequate distance between properties, and areas for snow storage. The Phase 2 Housing Amendments *do not change current setback requirements.*

The amendments allow greater than 70% land coverage in centers if TRPA and local jurisdiction water quality requirements can be met. However, these amendments would not allow a building to cover 100% of the parcel because setbacks still apply.

The proposal includes "stepbacks" that require that any building height above what is allowed today be stepped back one foot horizontally for each additional foot of vertical height.

Will the proposal increase traffic?

No. The proposal would encourage affordable and workforce housing to be built in town centers and close to transit but would not change the overall amount of development that can be built in Tahoe. The majority of the proposal applies to housing that would be occupied by people already working in Tahoe, either commuting in, in overcrowded conditions, or paying too much for housing. In 2021, about 13 percent of all trips in Tahoe were from commuters to work[1]. This proposal could help reduce or eliminate some of those trips. Individual projects are still subject to individual project review and traffic analysis.

Why doesn't TRPA just require employers to provide housing, or more requirements for employers to contribute to housing?

The Phase 2 Amendments focus on making it more financially feasible to build affordable and workforce housing units for anyone building housing, whether it's a local employer, developer or existing homeowner building an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). Some local governments (e.g., Placer County) and TRPA have imposed requirements for employers to provide housing (e.g., Waldorf-Astoria project recently reviewed by the TRPA Governing Board), however this is not part of the proposed Phase 2 changes. This strategy may be considered in Phase 3 of the Tahoe Living Priority, which begins in 2023.

Can't we solve the housing crisis by banning Short Term Rentals (STRs)?

The central focus of the Tahoe Living strategic priority is to create more affordable and workforce housing that is protected in perpetuity through deed-restrictions. Reducing STR permits does not guarantee housing will be put on the long-term rental market or be affordable to most local workers. Recent studies from within the City of South Lake Tahoe shows that between 10-25% of homes that were STRs converted to long-term rentals or owner-occupied units. Moreover, only 3% of vacation home rentals in Tahoe are currently located in town centers. TRPA's policy amendments are geared to locate more of the region's allowed workforce housing bonus units in walkable, bikeable, and transit-oriented town centers. Additionally, STRs are currently managed and permitted by local governments in the basin. The TRPA Governing Board examined the issue at length not too long ago and ultimately approved adding neighborhood compatibility regulations to the bi-annual residential allocation approval process. All local jurisdictions have STR permitting and enforcement programs and some have put caps on available permits.

[1] TRPA Transportation Model

How will evacuation be considered?

As part of the 2012 Regional Plan environmental review, TRPA conducted an analysis of wildfire risk and its impact on emergency evacuation, considering the amount of growth forecast for the region. This amendment does not propose additional growth, but rather encourages the remaining bonus units to be built in and near centers. Because these are not "new" units, these amendments do not exacerbate wildfire risk from the buildout of new residential housing. New housing developments are subject to fire marshal approval and local building standards that incorporate best practices and materials for home hardening to help withstand fire.

How will we ensure that we don't get large, ugly buildings that don't fit community character?

TRPA is not proposing any change to the project-level TRPA and/or local discretionary processes that include design and scenic requirements. These reviews often include review by planning commissions and councils/board of directors, etc. TRPA existing and proposed review include:

- Proposed Code language that requires 1:1 stepback for heights over what is allowed now in town centers, in addition to building articulation and use of earthtone materials.
- Height findings that prevent boxy buildings, ensure the building is consistent with surrounding uses, and minimizes interference with existing views.
- TRPA Design Guidelines which planners use to improve building design.
- If the project is visible from a scenic corridor, the project must make additional scenic findings that the building will not block views, extend above the forest canopy or ridgeline, or be visible from the lake.

What public outreach has been done throughout the fall of 2023?
In addition to the four public hearings planned for the fall, staff have continued to meet one-on-one with interested groups, have published two articles, one press release, and placed print ads in the Tribune and Sierra Sun over 6 weeks leading up to public hearings.

Where is the specific language of the amendments that the public can refer to, to suggest changes?

The Regional Plan and Code language can be found in previous meeting packets at trpa.gov and in Attachment B of the December Governing Board agenda packet.

How many people participated in the Innovative Housing Solutions webinar in September?
87 people participated in the webinar.

How many yes, no, and maybes were there when the participants were polled regarding the question of allowing additional (unstated) height for deed restricted housing?
During the public webinar in September 2023, one of the poll questions asked:

"Are you OK with taller and denser buildings in and near our town centers if it meant that there were more affordable housing options?" The responses are as follows:

- Yes – 30
- No – 19
- Maybe – 8