

**Public Comment TRPA Operations and Governance 2.24.21 Agenda Item 4  
and TRPA Governing Board/TMPO 2.24.21 Agenda Item: VI. Consent Calendar #1  
Re: 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Approval**

*Submitted by Carole Black Incline Village Resident*

My comments relate to two project items:

- pg 242 of packet/ 276 of download: Multi-Use Center (Planning and Design of a mobility hub located within the Incline Village area of Washoe County.) ~\$213,000 budgeted for planning 2020-21
- pg 253 of packet/ 287 of download: SR 28 Central Corridor - Sand Harbor to Spooner-Parking and Safety Improvements (Relocation of on-highway parking, trailhead improvements, parking lot expansions and transit stops along the corridor) ~\$1.51M budgeted 2020-21 NDOT

**First, I want to briefly present my sense of community feedback to date re proposed Mobility Hub at the OES site (and, if significant size/traffic, anywhere) in Incline:**

- *TTD, TRPA Governing Board has received much opposing public comment in meetings over the last several months and in solicited feedback both for RTP and FTIP*
- *2 of 4 Town Halls have occurred to date with operational challenges, modest participation (some related to operational issues) and many questions, some answered, many pending*
- *46 of 61 public comments received in response to the FTIP draft related to IV Hub proposal: one was in favor; one was from TTD staff; 44 were opposed or strongly opposed with responses focused on concerns with site; concern with use of Incline Village small area for overflow Rte 28 corridor parking/a "destination parking lot" > move closer to where people want to go/alternative site outside of IV/park, public land/elsewhere on Rte 28.50; need comprehensive parking/ traffic/transit/evacuation plan with transient inflow traffic captured outside of Incline Village*
- *Quoting from one detailed resident feedback letter: "[Require] ... disclosure to the federal government of the widespread opposition of the Incline Village community to the use of the School Site as a transportation hub, and a disclosure that this site has not been implemented at all and has been put on hold by the Governing Board of the TTD pending public outreach in Incline Village and investigation of other potential sites. THE 2021 DRAFT FTIP NEEDS TO BE REVISED TO FULLY AND ACCURATELY SET FORTH THE CURRENT STATE OF AFFAIRS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND TO THE PUBLIC, SO AS TO ASSURE GENUINE PUBLIC OUTREACH TO INCLINE VILLAGE AND TO NOT TO UNFAIRLY PREJUDICE THE INCLINE VILLAGE COMMUNITY ..."*
- *Further " ... materially incorrect statements have been made by Mr. Hasty and his consultant, Karen Mullin, to other governmental entities to get funding." One specifically related to "statements allegedly made by Indra Winquest, TRPA and definitively denied by him".*
- *Additional concerns regarding failures to obtain appropriate permits and apparent misrepresentations were submitted to TRPA Governing Board for today's meeting*
- *An on line petition opposing the proposal has resulted in an overwhelming community response*

**Next > Recommendations:**

- 1) Revise the Incline Village project statement as follows to more accurately reflect the current situation as has been represented to the community: Planning and Design of a sustainable Traffic, Parking and Transit Program for Incline Village locale and for effective Management of northern Rte 28 Corridor visitors
- 2) Review the NDOT project for additional parking options along Rte 28 to address the Rte 28 Corridor visitor volume/parking
- 3) Review historic events and develop a Federal disclosure as appropriate

Dear Board of Governors of TRPA,

I have listed below several Incline Village community concerns with the Tahoe Area Plan. The first two are by far the most critical to the Incline community.

**1. Objection to Change in Map 2.4 to provide for Transportation Hub at School Site.** A major zoning change was made to the Plan in Map 2.4 at page 2-12 of the Plan, titled "Incline Village Commercial Center" (a copy is attached), which has not been disclosed to the public and which is contrary to past representations to the public. This Map changed the zoning of the former Incline Village elementary school site ("School Site") to "Public Service" under which transportation hub is an "Allowable Use", which is different than the zoning on the maps previously shown to the public at the single noticed public meeting, which took place at the Chateau in December, 2019. There has been no public notice or discussion of this material change. The change was made in response to a request from TRPA, and **in opposition to what the County knew the Incline community wished to do with the School Site, which was find a developer to develop the School Site into workforce/affordable housing for our community. A change in the designation had been specifically requested of the County, and we were advised that that change could not be made on the earlier version of that map.** I believe that the School Site was shown in the earlier maps in light green, in the same color as the adjacent properties. The prior version was Figure 110.220.013 "Incline Village Residential Neighborhood Location Map" and 110.220.235 "Stateline Point Neighborhood". This is from my notes as I do not have a copy of that earlier map. Now the School Site is called "Public Service" and it is in blue, but the adjacent properties are red with a different designation. The change was made at the Washoe County Planning Committee Meeting which reviewed and approved the Plan. The Planning Commission meeting took place immediately before the Board of Commissioners' first reading of the Ordinance. Incline residents submitted written public comments on what we knew was before the Planning Commission, but this was not in the map that was publicly available before the Planning Commission meeting. Incline's District 1 seat on the Planning Commission had not been filled and was vacant at the time, and objection was made to this issue going forward without our representative present. There was no notice to the Incline community before or after the Planning Commission meeting of this material change to the map. Prior to that change, one of our Incline Village community members asked Eric Young in connection with the Plan, that the School Site would be best used for workforce housing to benefit the community, and asked if the zoning could be changed as noted on the Map in the Plan. Eric had explained to the community member when the issue was raised about the possibility of the School Site being designated for workforce housing, long before the new Map, that designating the School Site as workforce housing would not be done on a map in the Plan but should be addressed later with the County. There had been discussion of IVGID purchasing the property for workforce housing at or around that time. At the Planning Commission meeting, unknown to the Incline community (the meeting was not on zoom), TRPA made a presentation to change the designation of the School Site on the Map from town center commercial designation identical to the adjacent parcels (they were all the same color) to "Public Service" (you can see that the School Site is in blue on the attached Map, to allow for the transportation hub at the School Site, while the adjacent parcels are in red). There was no prior notice to the Incline community. This change in zoning and this change is contrary to the representation made by the County representative and concurred in by the TRPA representative at public meeting at the Chateau and at the earlier representation at the CAB (which had no public notice) concerning the lack of zoning changes made by the Plan, except for three (or four) changes which Eric Young described to us and showed us. This change did not come up until much later in early 2020, during the same time that TRPA AND TTD were pushing the County Planning staff to agree that the School Site could

be used as a transportation hub to solve problems outside of Incline. TRPA and TTD were not including any Incline public engagement and were not disclosing these plans to the Incline community, and were ignoring the requests by the then Incline District 1 Commissioner to engage in public outreach so that the community would be aware of these plans. I only discovered this change in reading the Plan when the January 26, 2021 meeting was noticed and I sat down to read the current version. This zoning change was solely for benefit of TRPA/ TTD and there was no public outreach or disclosure in Incline, and as you know the Incline community is strongly opposed to this. You have seen my longer emails (one is also attached) about the secrecy with which Mr. Hasty of TTD has operated and the community urges that the Plan not be adopted with this changed Map pending public outreach and the TTD finalizing selection of a site. We really need workforce housing in Incline and this is the only available site and I would like to discuss the history of the site with you. TRPA, the TTD, and the County have been talking about making the School Site into a transit hub without inviting the Incline Village community or notifying the community since 2019, and the community is almost universally opposed to this site.

**2. Objection to Failure to Reference Community Concerns Re Short Term Rentals in Plan.** The Incline community has requested that the County add that fulltime Incline residents have a community concern about the negative impacts of STRs on the residential neighborhoods in Incline, a negative impact on traffic, a negative impact on parking, and a negative impact on emergency disaster exit from Incline. This request was made at the time of the first mention of a proposed Plan at the unannounced discussion at the CAB meeting, even though we had never seen any written Plan document at that time. Eric Young has repeatedly explained that the Plan could not refer to short term rentals anywhere in Plan per direction of others at the County. But in a much later draft, the Plan, at the direction of TRPA, he added a single reference to STRs to the parking rules at Appendix A, page BA-1 in the Plan, and allowed 1/2 parking space per bedroom for STRs, which is lower than the number of parking spaces required for residences. Even after the addition of that reference, our requests to add our concerns about STRs to the sections on Land Use, Traffic and Public Services was rejected. You have heard what a huge issue STRs are in Incline and we have only asked that this single community concern be added to the Plan, identified as a concern, analyzed in the future, and addressed if needed in the future. This is an example of how the Plan is a document to satisfy TRPA, but is not a Plan which addresses Incline community concerns.

**3. Objection to Failure to Include Mandatory Traffic and Parking Mitigation Measures When Adopting Loosened TRPA Town Center Standards.** The plan adopts TRPA standards for town centers which allow for environmental development, channeling development to the town centers by giving town centers increased density and height, and reducing coverage requirements at town centers. There is no mention of or limitation for the concerns raised at the Chateau meeting re providing mitigation measures for traffic and parking in these areas in the Plan. The town center increases were raised at the Chateau meeting, and it was requested by the attendees that parking and traffic mitigation be addressed but we were told that these are TRPA required standards and no changes would be made. We were not asking to eliminate or change the development standards, just to protect this small, mountainous community with stringent parking and traffic standards/mitigation measures at the same time that the other TRPA mandated standards are included. Mandatory traffic and parking mitigation measures could be added, while still accommodating TRPA's desire for dense environmental development focused in town centers.

**4. Need for Public Meetings.** The community has asked for a public meeting to have the Plan explained to them, and to give public input, since the Plan is so technical, and since it had so

many changes since the one noticed public meeting at the Chateau. That request has been consistently rejected. I even asked if we could have a public outreach meeting on the Plan on zoom during the COVID hiatus of public attendance at the Commission meetings, since we were told that the Plan would not come back to the Commission until the chamber was again opened, and were told no. I would like to review with you if we can speak telephonically, the numerous requests and refusals to have public outreach after the single Chateau meeting, as the Plan changed and became more and more difficult to understand. I would also like to explain that the earlier public meetings many years ago had nothing to do with this Plan. The plan that resulted from the meetings prior to the single CAB attendance in 2019 and the single noticed public meeting at the Chateau in December 2019, was rejected by TRPA and for several years the County did not work on a draft Plan. The prior plan rejected by TRPA was very very different then this Plan, and those meetings were irrelevant to this effort at drafting this Plan. Circumstances in Incline have greatly changed since 2018, and the three issues discussed above were not even issues for inclusion in any plan. This would be a great project to come to our CAB to do public outreach and take public input. This Plan directly effects the citizens of Incline. It is a Plan solely between TRPA and the County, and has excluded Incline interests. It should be a Plan between Incline, TRPA and the County. Please keep in mind TRPA Code of Ordinance 12.7 which provides "In consultation with local governments **and the community**, TRPA shall set priorities for the development and updating of community plans."

**5. Add Incline Village Representation to Measures Related to Incline Village.** The Plan at page 7-4 discusses establishing cooperation between the stakeholders, and we have seen that this is truly one of your personal goals as our Commissioner, but Incline has never been considered a stakeholder in the past. Would it be possible to add a goal something to memorialize this, like "Include the Incline Village Crystal Bay public in discussions of decisions related to Incline Village Crystal Bay from the outset of projects in that area, for transparency and valuable input."

**6. Workforce Housing.** At page 7-5, could something be added like "Washoe County shall undertake an analysis of the existing allowable uses of the site of the former Incline Village elementary School to determine if its zoning should be amended to allow for workforce house to better reflect the current lack of workforce housing in Incline."

This Plan relates to Incline Village, and we urge you to consider Incline Village concerns. Thank you in advance for your serious consideration of these points.

Very truly yours,

Diane Becker

805-290-2779