

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Zoom

December 6, 2023

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Ferry called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

Members present: Mr. Alling, Ms. Carr, Ms. Chandler, Mr. Drake, Mr. Drew, Mr. Ferry, Mr. Hill, Ms. Jacobsen, Mr. Hitchcock (for Ms. Roverud), Ms. Simon, Ms. Stahler, Mr. Drennan (for Mr. Stephen), Mr. Teshara, Mr. Young

Members absent: Ms. Ferris, Mr. Letton, Ms. Moroles-O'Neil, Mr. Smokey

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Ferry deemed the agenda approved as posted.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Ms. Ellie Waller said she wanted to address the overarching theme of regional growth, and how it directly relates to both agenda items, particularly focusing on Truckee, Carson City, and Reno.

Reno has had over 35,000 permits in recent years, and it does affect the basin. She said the current economic issues have a widespread impact, affecting both residents and the tourist population. It's often a roller coaster ride for developers navigating through these challenges.

She is conscientious about the cost of living in Tahoe. Although she no longer reside there, this remains her backyard, and she is happy to continue participating.

Shifting to the second topic about recusal, Ms. Waller said that yesterday, Placer County Supervisor Gustafson, who also happens to be the TRPA Governing Board Chair, had to recuse herself from discussions on two Kings Beach projects. Ms. Waller said her recusal was related to financial issues, highlighting the importance of addressing such matters. She understands that from time to time, similar situations may arise for each local jurisdiction, and it's important to be prepared for these occurrences. Ms. Waller proposed that we consider delving into further discussions about recusal policies to ensure transparency and fair representation in our future endeavors

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

November minutes continued to the next Advisory Planning Commission meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

[Agenda Item No. V.A. US Census Demographics Tahoe Region](#)

Mr. Ken Kasman, TRPA Research and Analysis Department Manager presented the item. He said he was there to discuss critical issues within our community, specifically addressing concerns related to overuse of resources, traffic problems, and a perceived gap between local sentiments and actual data.

Mr. Kasman said the efforts involve a comprehensive analysis of diverse datasets, attempting to better understand the concerns expressed by community members during public meetings and engagements.

At a national level, the repercussions of COVID-19 have significantly impacted outdoor recreation, with approximately 7 million new participants since 2019. This surge has not only enriched the local economy but has also strained the region's infrastructure. Challenges have become evident, ranging from overcrowded national parks to increased litter on beaches post-holidays. The inadequacy of infrastructure to support this influx has become apparent, particularly concerning parking and overall facility management.

Mr. Kasman said that Tahoe's economic landscape has shifted from a focus on gaming to prioritizing outdoor recreation. This transition is reflected in the decline of casino-related employment and revenue. The impact extends beyond casinos, affecting schools, population dynamics, and the broader employment sector.

Mr. Kasman said the data also shows that climate change has positioned Tahoe as a refuge for communities seeking respite from valley heat. Data from the Science Council indicates a doubling in traffic to Tahoe when temperatures rise in the valleys, emphasizing the region's appeal during temperature spikes.

Addressing concerns about the 2020 census data, Mr. Kasman said it is crucial to recognize that the US Census Bureau conducts a census every 10 years. The 2020 census data stands as the most accurate and up-to-date information available for understanding the region's population dynamics as of December 2023. He said the Census Bureau produces other products that are slightly timelier than the decennial census. The American Community Survey, conducted annually, has the current vintage of information from 2021. The 2022 data is expected to be released next week, providing updated population information for the country and for Tahoe.

Mr. Kasman said we acknowledge the importance of using the 2020 census data, as it is the latest available information. While we await more recent data, we are exploring various

indicators and datasets to address the observed disconnects between public perceptions and actual population trends.

The regional population in 2020 was 55,800 full-time residents, showing a relatively flat trend from 2010. Notably, between 1990 and 2000, there was a nearly 20% increase, but since then, one in every nine residents has left the region, leading to a significant decline.

Drilling deeper into the data, on the Nevada side, there was a 7% increase in population from 2010 to 2020. In contrast, the California side experienced a 2% drop, while the state of California grew by 6%. This divergence is noteworthy and runs counter to statewide trends.

Examining the North and South Shores separately, the North Shore saw a 2% increase overall, with Incline Village and Crystal Bay contributing most to this growth - Incline Village experienced the fastest growth at about 8%. On the South Shore, the population remained flat.

Mr. Kasman said that contrary to some public perceptions of a significant population increase, the census data indicates an average annual growth of about 1% between 2010 and 2020, showing a more modest change than what some community members have reported.

Looking at age demographics, slide 9, a notable trend is that Tahoe's population has been aging, indicating a significant shift in population composition beyond the natural process of aging. The median age in Tahoe is currently 44 years old, with more residents over 50 than under 35. This signifies a significant shift from the peak in 2000, when 40% of the population was under 30. The region gained 8,000 residents over 55 but lost 15,000 residents under 30, illustrating a substantial demographic change.

Mr. Kasman said another trend is the doubling of high-earning households since 2000. While this may initially seem positive, it indicates a loss of lower-income residents, not just an increase in income levels. The data reveals a 44% increase in households earning more than \$75,000 and a 35% decrease in lower-income areas.

Ms. Jacobsen asked if they have data on local job trends versus commuters? Mr. Kasman replied that the American Community Survey provides insights into commute patterns and work locations. However, due to the five-year average nature of the data, the most recent available is from 2017 to 2021. We anticipate more accurate post-COVID trends with the 2022 data, and efforts are underway to collaborate with employers for additional insights.

Moving on to various data sets, Mr. Kasman said they explored different patterns to bridge gaps between census data and community perceptions. Analyzing entry and exit volumes, slide 12, it was noted that traffic volumes have not yet reached historical peaks, even with the post-COVID recovery. Looking to hotel rooms rented, slide 13, there's a consistent theme of recovery post-recession and post-COVID, but numbers remain below historical highs. Passenger volumes at Reno Tahoe Airport, slide 14, show a similar pattern, with a slow recovery, expected to surpass 2019 but remain below early 2000's levels.

On slide 15, regional employment data reveals a 20% drop since 2000, with over 9,000 jobs lost. Twice as many jobs were lost on the south shore compared to the north shore, directly related

to decreases in casino employment. While the number of business establishments is slowly increasing, the employee count continues to decrease.

Mr. Kasman said this troubling trend persists in K-12 school enrollment, with a 46% loss on the Nevada side and a 22% decrease overall since the peak in the 2000's.

In seeking additional insights, Mr. Kasman said they examined regional water use data, indicating fluctuations but no clear pattern pointing to a substantial increase in population. A travel time analysis on various road segments throughout the region revealed that congestion is more linked to seasonal factors like road construction and winter conditions, rather than a fundamental increase in population.

Mr. Kasman said the perception of overcrowding might stem from changes in behavior and an increase in second home use, impacting popular areas such as trails and beaches. He added that second homes account for 50% of the residential units in the region, many of them vacation home rentals, with up to 80% on the West Shore. Even a 1% change in usage of those second homes could represent 500-600 additional people. Day use visitation has certainly increased, with a lot more activity on the east shore. Mr. Kasman said they are seeing that people recreate in different places because of the availability of information, so locals are feeling that their hidden spots are now overrun, and there are more people out on the trails and beaches where they didn't use to be. That makes it feel more crowded.

Traffic patterns on Highway 50 showed a 30% decrease in southbound traffic (towards South Shore Casinos) and a 50% increase in northbound traffic (towards Incline and the East Shore). In some data, there's a significant change in the number of trips ending in certain corridors. Although volumes are not large, we're witnessing an increase in traffic going north on the East Shore, leading to issues like roadside parking.

Mr. Kasman said trips to Sand Harbor during COVID showed record visitation in 2020, with a potential to surpass in 2021. However, closures due to the Caldor fire in 2021 and a drop in 2022 indicate that the COVID peaks did not sustain, and visitation has subsided in recent years.

Changes in behavior show earlier trips ending at Sand Harbor on weekends, aligning with earlier parking lot occupancy. Another pattern shift is seen in the distribution of trips through casino corridors, indicating people are exploring different locations rather than staying at casino parking lots. In the late 1980's-1990's, for every 100 vehicles that came into the region, we would have 120 vehicles pass through the casino corridors. Today it is half that, at 60 trips through the casino corridors, but the volumes are the same. People are going to different places, so the strategic focus is on accommodating these shifts in usage patterns and managing behaviors rather than focusing solely on capacity.

Mr. Kasman closed by thanking his team, and providing links to interactive tools accessible through the open data page, providing access to census data and more:

Demographics Data: <https://data-trpa.opendata.arcgis.com/pages/demographics>

2020 Census Report: <https://monitoring.laketahoeinfo.org/socioecon>

Tahoe Roadway Congestion Report:

<https://monitoring.laketahoeinfo.org/MonitoringProgram/Detail/77>

APC Comments/Questions

Mr. Drew said there's a need to differentiate between macro and micro data, especially in regions like Placer County, El Dorado County, and the Truckee Meadows. The population growth and trends at a micro-level may differ from broader regional perspectives. The bottom line is that the populations of both California and Nevada have grown substantially, but the areas adjacent to the Lake Tahoe basin have grown substantially faster, and those have direct impacts.

Mr. Drew added that the shift in travel patterns, like the number of people per car, is challenging to obtain but crucial. Some places in the country have observed more people per vehicle, increasing the number of individuals. That data is really important to a place like Tahoe with limitations in physical growth. There will never be enough beaches or trails for the amount of people. Mr. Drew highlighted the challenge of managing this increasing visitation. The impact of population changes and outdoor activities on existing resources is a significant concern.

Mr. Drews suggested that the change in how people interact with Tahoe is related to how Tahoe is being marketed. Fundamentally, visitors are going to where they are being directed. He said it would be interesting to explore the relationship between marketing campaigns, outdoor recreation amenities, and visitor behavior. The impact of marketing efforts on trailhead and parking lot usage could provide valuable insights.

Ms. Jacobsen said she appreciates the data presentation and finds the shift from casinos to recreation encouraging. She emphasized the need to manage the increasing tourism and focus on strategies to bring back locals to support the service industry. Ms. Jacobsen expressed concern about the decline in local employees and businesses facing challenges due to a lack of workforce. She suggested they think strategically about projects and programs to address housing issues and make the region more affordable for locals.

Mr. Kasman added that one of the reasons for this item/presentation was due to its relevance in connecting the various TRPA strategic priorities, including transportation, destination stewardship, and workforce housing.

Ms. Stahler agreed this was very valuable information and inquired about any plans to share the information with other groups, such as the Tahoe Executive Interagency Steering Committee, or the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). She noted an emphasis on the Nevada side examples (Sand Harbor, SR 28 Corridor, Incline Village), and said there are a lot of planning efforts underway to address visitation and enhance recreation facilities along the corridor. Mr. Kasman said this presentation has also been given to the TRPA Governing Board and the Tahoe CEO roundtable. He emphasized TRPA's willingness to share this data, and added that the detailed information is available on the TRPA website.

Mr. Drake commended the presentation and asked about micro-level data, specifically about data on employees in the Tahoe Basin and commuting patterns. Mr. Kasman referred to the upcoming American Community Survey for updated information. It is a five-year average, so he acknowledged the research gap. They would like to have more data and are reaching out to local employers for more precise data. Mr. Kasman said they are also exploring big data tools,

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

especially regarding changes in commute patterns post-casino job loss, and post-pandemic work schedules. Mr. Hester added that 25% of TRPA employees are from outside the basin, and he imagines that is fairly typical depending on job type.

Mr. Young expressed gratitude to TRPA for maintaining a science-based approach. He appreciates the data presentation, and its role in raising important questions. Mr. Young said it validates the perception that homes in the region are marketed based on proximity and access to Tahoe, not for gaming participation but to enjoy outdoor recreation. It's in every real estate brochure and the data shows some of the impact of that.

Mr. Young questioned whether local employment is coming back. He said that with the redevelopment efforts in Crystal Bay there are significant environmental redevelopment opportunities aligned with the Regional Plan, and the number one barrier is finding employees willing to work the projects due to housing and commuting affordability issues.

Mr. Young raised concern about the potential for unintentional invalidation of community members' feelings and experiences. He acknowledged the importance of being careful in framing presentations and project discussions. He said while it is important for us all to know that the data doesn't always show what we are hearing, we must be careful to not accidentally invalidate community members' emotions and experiences. He requested careful consideration in how information is presented in future interactions with community members.

Ms. Simon agreed with Mr. Young's remarks and described her direct experience of sitting in traffic for four hours for what used to be a 20-minute drive, so people do have these real-life experiences. She suggested staff explore the influence of technology, such as computer-based systems in gaming and restaurants, on employment trends. She also recognized the role of social media in influencing visitation patterns and activities in the region. When the spring flowers bloom everyone heads up to see them and there is now a sign to Chickadee Ridge, so they will be very well fed this year.

Looking to demographic shifts Ms. Simon said we do have an aging population in the United States and that's reflected in the demographic statistics presented. She noted the implications of an aging population on travel, residence choices, and the need for senior services.

Ms. Chandler questioned if any consideration had been given to undocumented workers and how that might affect the data presented. Mr. Kasman said they used data from the Census Bureau Report, and he doesn't know how that report treats illegal workers – his guess is that it does not, but he will investigate

Ms. Chandler also asked about water use in the basin, and whether any consideration was given to factors like drought, watering restrictions, and water usage during events like fires and evacuations. Mr. Kasman said the data showed some of the efficiency improvements in water use, which he believes are indicative of conservation measures. But the drops in overall water use exceeds those efficiency improvements so it does show a larger reduced use of water.

Mr. Drake said we have two seasons in Tahoe – snow removal and construction. He expressed concern about the impact of road construction on travel times and suggested a need for better coordination. He asked if there were any interagency efforts to coordinate construction projects

and strategic discussions about optimizing the timing and execution of such projects. Mr. Ferry said El Dorado County does attend coordination meetings, but it's far from perfect. He acknowledged the challenges in achieving perfect coordination due to factors like funding availability, environmental documents, and workload balancing. Ms. Jacobsen said Placer County also have coordination meetings but it's a limited season so it's a constant challenge to keep up on that. Mr. Drew said the single biggest impact on coordination is the low bid contracting that local governments are forced to use. If they could use best value, and have more flexibility it would provide tremendous opportunity for improved coordination.

Public Comment

Ms. Ellie Waller thanked Mr. Kasman for the American Community Update and what that 5-year data may change in all our planning documents going forward. Lots of conundrums of things to address and manage. She has been in Tahoe for 20 years and is part of the aging demographic that tries to stay put in the region. There's also not just finding employees but keeping them – each jurisdiction has different levels of employment payment, and we lose good people to different states. Lots of conundrums with short term rentals and how we look at them, is it high season when the people are feeling more compacted in their local neighborhoods. Just the general impacts of short-term rentals that should be analyzed more. We have an event center now, we're going to get a hockey team, what is that going to do to the South Shore. Our shoulder seasons don't look like shoulder seasons anymore. We're all discussing different ways to look at this data, and how the general public lives there, the general public commutes. A report from the Reno-Tahoe regional airport said they are expanding their market. Lots of things lend not just to the specific data in Tahoe, but also to regional issues. Technology has changed our lives, COVID has changed our lives.

Ms. Yolanda Knaak said the most important thing is that there is no evaluation of the South Lake Tahoe evacuation for the Caldor Fire. There's also no evaluation of the Hawaii fire or the Paradise fire. These are really serious issues, evacuating us on a 2-lane road, that cannot be widened. Her community has had meetings about how they will evacuate and even though they are working on plans, the bottom line is that there are 3 exits from Incline Village. She said that when South Lake Tahoe evacuated it was like a parking lot. We want to be able to get out, these are our lives we're talking about.

Ms. Knaak said that the data presented is flawed. Some people up here work in Reno or Carson City. You have not taken into consideration that Nevada schools are dead last in the nation. Some people go to private schools in Reno and Carson City. She added that the last few years have seen tons of parking on SR 28, all the way from Incline Village to US 50. It was totally dangerous. They are starting to make that no parking and build a bigger lot at Chimney Beach, she is not sure if all of that was taken into consideration.

Ms. Knaak said if we are not a congested area she wants her money back from the Animal Control. They say that all congested areas have to have dogs licensed and she has her dogs licensed. She doesn't think they're congested but because of the fires NV Energy has spent a lot more time trimming the trees around the power lines. Plus there are multiyear developments going in at Crystal Bay and Incline Village and that is going to affect traffic. The bottom line is that we need to be able to evacuate and as it is she is not sure she could get out alive.

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

Ms. Jacobsen said she appreciates the public comments and appreciates people's fear, particularly around evacuation. She said that Placer County emergency responders and planners have been testing and modifying evacuation methodology based on lessons learned from other fires. Even with the Caldor evacuation, they had looked at what happened in Paradise, and changed their methodology to make sure people got out. Ms. Jacobsen added that Placer County conducted a recent town hall workshop focused on evacuation, which was deemed super helpful for the community. She suggested it might be possible to provide a similar presentation at the APC to enhance understanding of the coordination, mutual aid, and methodologies involved during evacuation events.

In response to the comment about the data being flawed, Ms. Jacobsen asked that commenters describe how it is flawed, and request that they suggest alternative data sources that may provide more accurate information. Mr. Kasman added a request for local jurisdictions to share relevant data that could contribute to the modeling effort for the regional transportation plan and forecasts. He also expressed their openness to consider various data sources and a willingness to incorporate additional information into the analysis.

Mr. John Hester said that in October 2023, the Tahoe Fire & Fuels Team (TFFT) and the MAC (Multi Agency Coordinating Committee), representing law enforcement and fire officials from across the basin, provided the TRPA Governing Board a presentation on their work. The Governing Board members asked them what TRPA can do. They responded with two things, one is to prioritize thinning around evacuation routes to enhance fire safety measures, and the second is to support ongoing efforts to improve the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) for better communication during emergencies. TRPA have submitted a grant to pursue those activities.

This item was informational only.

VI.A. [Agenda Item No VI.A. Tahoe Basin Area Plan Economic Sustainability and Housing Amendments](#)

TRPA Senior Planner Jacob Stock introduced the item. Mr. Stock said that Placer County staff have developed both policy and implementing code changes aimed at adapting the Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) to achieve housing and economic development goals initially envisioned when the plan was adopted in 2017. Building on years of study, these amendments aim to provide a systemic approach to encourage desired investment in environmentally and economically beneficial redevelopment and workforce housing.

Mr. Stock was joined by Placer County staff, Interim Community Development Director Crystal Jacobson, and Principal Planner Stacy Wydra to present a detailed summary of the amendment package. Mr. Stock said that after reviewing the proposal, the Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), conformance documents and findings, TRPA staff have determined that the proposed amendments are in conformance with the Regional Plan and will not result in significant environmental effects.

Ms. Jacobsen said the revisions proposed in the amendment package focus on economic sustainability, redevelopment in town centers, and the production of workforce housing. The Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) was adopted in January 2017, and has been adaptively

managed since that time.

Ms. Jacobsen said that this amendment process began in mid-2021, and included extensive public outreach meetings, workshops, hearings, and engagement with stakeholders and associations. Work on the package included preparation of an environmental analysis and a CEQA addendum to the 2017 EIR/EIS. An errata to the CEQA addendum addressed cumulative analysis. In addition, an implementation report and written responses to public comments were also prepared. Ms. Jacobsen walked through the public outreach timeline (slide 3).

Ms. Jacobsen said that these amendments are the result of years of feedback about the lack of reinvestment and redevelopment in town centers. The TBAP was adopted in 2017 and included allowances for increased height and density allowances with aim of shifting redevelopment into the town centers to meet Regional Plan goals. The TBAP is comprised of two documents, a Policy Document, and Implementing Regulations Document, which serves as the zoning ordinance for the Tahoe area of Placer County. Since then the county has spent a lot of public money on town center streetscape improvements and water quality improvements, and had hoped to see similar reinvestment from the private sector. That hasn't happened. A 2020 Economic Study was initiated to look at this issue and identified key recommended actions, one of which was to look at the TBAP for areas of improvement.

Ms. Jacobsen said these amendments are minor in nature, and are intended to move the needle and redevelopment and investment. She outlined what the amendments do and do not do:

What the amendments do:

Businesses in Town Centers:

- The amendments help small businesses, entrepreneurs, and starts-ups in Placer County's Tahoe basin town centers of Kings Beach and Tahoe City by:
 - Complying with SB 946 to legalize sidewalk vending and clarifying mobile food truck requirements
 - Streamlining new small-scale hotels, restaurants, retail, and other local-serving land uses
 - Enhancing compatibility between mixed use/commercial zone districts and adjacent residential zone districts
 - Increasing creative solutions to address parking, transit, and mobility needs for projects in town centers

Workforce Housing:

- The amendments help promote the construction of workforce housing by:
 - Streamlining permitting of deed-restricted workforce housing
 - Limiting new single-family housing in town centers if not deed restricted for workforce housing
 - Clarifying requirements for tiny homes

What the amendments do not do:

- Increase density standards (allowed units per acre)
- Increase building height (no change proposed from current TBAP allowance of 56' in

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

- town centers)
- Increase carrying capacity (build out of TBAP area)
- Increase overall development potential, as this is capped by TRPA growth control system; as such, the amendments do not result in uses or activities that increase wildfire risk
- Conflict with TRPA scenic or environmental thresholds, including traffic/VMT
- Create a change of circumstances requiring CEQA supplemental analysis
- The amendments are not connected to any specific project and do not result in piecemealing under CEQA

Ms. Jacobsen clarified that staff had initially proposed height and building length increases in town centers; however, this proposal has been removed from these amendments. She added that they may look to add those to targeted areas in town centers in the future, but they are not part of this package.

Ms. Jacobsen stressed that there is a cost to doing nothing. There is a lot aging infrastructure in our town centers, that includes some blighted county-owned properties in Kings Beach. But if we're not trying to move the needle on getting redevelopment on those sites, we're not getting environmental improvements to help with runoff to the lake. Ms. Jacobsen said they're focusing on moving lodging into the town centers - trying to get the short-term rentals out of the neighborhoods, and put them in the town centers where people can walk. These amendments are intended to help revitalize and redevelop those town centers.

Regarding congestion, they are trying to focus keeping local workers here, so that they're not driving from distant areas such Carson City or Reno or Auburn. How can we promote the construction of housing workforce, deed restricted housing, to keep workers local and reduce congestion and VMT.

These amendments are also just one tool to address the lack of vibrancy, vitality, and walkability in the town centers. We have town centers that are deteriorating, and we're trying to address it.

Ms. Jacobsen described the amendments to the TBAP Policy Document (slide 8):

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Scenic Resources | Policy to support for: TRPA Scenic Evaluation to direct private reinvestment into Town Centers |
| Vegetation | Policy to support for hardening, green waste, and defensible space incentive and/or rebate programs |
| Socio Economic | Policies to support for: High-speed broadband infrastructure capacity; Childcare facilities to meet the needs of the local workforce; Mechanisms to prevent ongoing blight |
| Land Use | Policies to support for: Reservation and conversion manual for the allocation and conversion of TRPA development rights; Funding sources for infrastructure such as sidewalks, curbs, and gutters; Parking management plans; Community-wide snow storage plan |
| Mixed Use | Policy to support to encourage mixed use, and residential components in business park, and light industrial space |

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Town Centers | Policies to support for: Active ground floor uses; Mobile vendors and food trucks in Town Centers; Retention and expansion of businesses from the North Tahoe-Truckee region; Relocate industrial and public utility land uses in the Town Centers to free up Town Center sites; Parking maximums and creative parking solutions |
| Community Design | Policy to support for Local public art in North Tahoe |
| Redevelopment | Policies to support for Adaptive reuse of vacant or underutilized retail and office space; Revitalize and create new high-quality lodging; Multipurpose and flexible gathering spaces in private and public parking areas; Expedite building permit processes; New business innovation space and flexible light industrial spaces |
| Housing | Policies to support for Streamline affordable, moderate, and achievable housing; Require that 50 percent of units converted from multifamily to condominiums be deed restricted to affordable, moderate or achievable housing; Monitor and track housing data in the region; Adaptive management of the short-term rental inventory to balance housing availability (each new lodging unit = decrease in STR cap); Allow local worker overnight camping in public and private parking lots; Build local worker housing above public and private public parking lots |

Ms. Jacobsen handed it over to Placer County Principal Planner, Stacy Wydra, to describe the changes to the Implementing Regulations.

Ms. Wydra acknowledged Ms. Jacobsen’s high-level (10,000-foot elevation) overview, and dove into the specifics (2,000-foot elevation) of the proposed amendments - how do we get some movement on the ground.

Starting with town center amendments:

| | |
|---|--|
| Allow small-scale uses “by-right” | No use permit for small projects that generate low VMT (projects “screen out” from TRPA VMT threshold); most would still require Design Review |
| Allow Food Trucks & Mobile Vendors | No Use Permit; no Design Review; would require permits from Environmental Health & cannot be parked in roadways |
| Prohibit Real Estate & Property Management Offices | Do not allow (new) on ground floor highway frontage |
| Allow Hotels/Motels/TAUs “by-right” | Allow by right if 20 units or less; would still require Design Review |
| Prohibit NEW Single Family units | Allow existing SF units; new SF units only allowed if part of mixed-use project or if SF are deed restricted for affordable/workforce housing |
| Prohibit ADUs | Allow existing ADUs; new ADUs not allowed on highway ground floor frontage |
| Allow MF, Multi-person, Employee | Allow “by-right” if 100% of units are deed restricted for affordable/workforce housing; would require Design Review |

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

| | |
|---|--|
| Housing Units | |
| Clarified Streetscape/Roadway Requirements | Added references to County Code related to roadway standards |
| Clarified Frontage Improvements | Added language to provide consistency with County Code related to sidewalk, curb, gutter requirements |
| Shorezone Requirements | Added references to County Code “Lake Tahoe Shorezone Ordinance” |
| Building Length | Added language to provide consistency/clarity; decreased length for commercial buildings adjacent to residential zone districts |
| Building Height | Maintain allowed height of 56’; eliminated reference to number of “stories” allowed |
| Setbacks | Removed rear setbacks when adjacent to residential zones with substantial rear setbacks; addresses constraints of small-town center lots |
| Ground Water/Snow Storage | Allow ground water interception for below-grade parking; require snow storage for projects |

Looking to other sections of the TBAP, to ensure that they are being consistent throughout the document, Ms. Wydra described some additional amendments to the Implementing Regulations:

| | |
|--|--|
| Community Service Zone Districts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow SF, MF, multi-person, employee housing and encourage deed restricted housing • Allow mobile vending uses • Modify/modernize development standards to encourage affordable housing |
| Recreation and Tourist Zone Districts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow employee housing within 64-Acre Tract Zone District • Allow residential uses within Granlibakken Zone District if 100% deed restricted |
| West Shore Mixed-Use Zone Districts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow mobile vending within Tahoma, Homewood, and Sunnyside Zone Districts |
| Parking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modernize/reduce parking requirements for residential uses • Eliminate parking requirements for projects that add under 1,000 SF in town centers • Allow parking management plans for projects in town centers to provide parking flexibility if project contributes to transit and mobility and commits to participating in community-wide parking management program |
| Tiny Homes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added Movable Tiny House uses and development standards |
| Signage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removed sign requirements and refer instead to TRPA requirements |
| Various Revisions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified areas of miscellaneous cleanup, typos, etc. |

Finally, looking to housing related amendments:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Allow MF, Multi-Person, Employee Housing “by-right” where currently allowed with a use permit</p> | <p>No use permit required if in a residential district currently designated as preferable areas for workforce housing and if 100% deed restricted; may require Design Review</p> |
| <p>Modified/Modernized Development Standards within Residential Zone Districts</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matched minimum lot size to existing density maximums • Reduced minimum lot width to match existing development patterns and encourage smaller scale development • Deleted minimum lot area per dwelling unit (excessive restrictions, rely instead on setbacks and coverage) • Allow for zero-foot setbacks to accommodate duplexes • Cleanup: Matched multiple family density with existing employee housing density in Fairway Tract Northeast |

Ms. Wydra emphasized that they have received some great public comments along the way, recognized some of the key topics and environmental concerns around food trucks, parking, lake clarity, carrying capacity, piecemealing, wildfire risk traffic and VMT. All of these comments were taken into consideration, and vetted through the environmental review.

Regarding the environmental review, the county prepared an addendum and errata to the TBAP EIR/EIS, in compliance with CEQA. It concluded that none of the conditions described in CEQA guidelines 15162 called for the preparation of a subsequent EIR. It further concluded that the proposed amendments would not result in any new, or substantially more severe significant impacts than those identified in the original 2017 Area Plan EIR.

The errata, which was prepared as a result of additional public comments, concluded that no alterations to the conclusions of the EIR addendum were found. As a result, the Board of Supervisors did adopt and certify the addendum and the errata for the TBAP amendments.

Similarly, coming before TRPA, Placer County staff prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), in accordance with the TRPA Rules of Procedure and the Code of Ordinances, and found that there was no conflicts. As a result, we need to make the required findings, and those findings were prepared in accordance with the Code of Ordinances. As such, those findings made the following conclusions about the proposed amendments:

- No significant effect on the environment,
- Consistent with, and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable goals and policies, community plans/plan area statements, the TRPA Code, and other TRPA plans and programs,
- The Amendments would not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceed,
- The Amendments do not affect or change the federal, state, or local air and water quality standards applicable for the Region and projects developed under the Area Plan will meet the strictest applicable standards and will be attained, maintained, or exceeded pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact,
- The Amendments continue to achieve and maintain the thresholds of the Regional Plan,

December 6, 2023

- The Amendments are consistent with and furthers the goals and policies of the Regional Plan.

APC Comments/Questions

Chair Ferry thanked staff for a thorough, clear presentation and invited questions and comments from Commissioners.

Mr. Drake acknowledged the need for these amendments. He said they don't go as far as he could see them going, but they are a step in the right direction. He added that staff did a good job in clarifying that these amendments are not proposing an increase in density in the area, it is shifting the priorities and trying to streamline the process for the type for the types of development we need to see.

Ms. Stahler thanked staff for the presentation and applauded Placer County for taking a step forward – she is looking forward to a more vibrant and walkable future in Tahoe City and surrounding areas. Ms. Stahler inquired about the frequency and process for evaluating the impact of amendments. Ms. Jacobsen said they don't have a formal structure in place, but their agency focuses on adaptive management. They track projects annually, and TRPA has a re-certification process. Placer County focuses on what is happening in their region and areas of needed change. Since 2017 they have already made one set of changes in 2021 related to housing. There is no specific timeline, but there is a process for tracking what is happening in town centers and reprioritizing for necessary amendments.

Ms. Stahler said she works for the Nevada Division of State Lands (NDSL), where the state owns 500+ parcels within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). So while this does not pertain to the Placer County jurisdiction, she asked if they had received any feedback from the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC) who also own urban lots, about changes to setback requirements. NDSL experience is that sometimes when variances are issued adjacent to state-owned lots it can have some impacts to sensitive forested parcels. Ms. Jacobsen replied that they had not received feedback from CTC.

Mr. John Hitchcock said these changes seem like common sense amendments to the TBAP. It tracks well with the City of South Lake Tahoe who will be proposing similar changes, particularly around parking, employee housing, and multi-family development.

Mr. Drew asked about any feedback the county had received on the prohibition of real estate offices on frontage parcels. Ms. Wydra said the issue was raised by the public as a result of a new structure occupied by a real estate office in Tahoe City. Others had been trying to occupy the building and it caused some anger. The public came to the county to question what uses were allowed on the ground floor. That resulted in the proposed language to allow no new real estate offices on the ground floor, while recognizing a for these services in town centers but with limitations on dominating frontages. Mr. Drew asked if they had considered the possibility of variances, especially in cases where spaces might remain vacant. Ms. Wydra replied that the amendment only applies to new property managers or real estate offices. Ms. Jacobsen added that you cannot apply variances to use, so they have not considered that, but it was something that is very important to the constituency base. Mr. Drew said it might be important for other local jurisdictions to think about – you don't want to get into a situation where you're telling a

property owner what they can/cannot do about leases when they may or may not be able to do. Maybe you find other ways to incentivize other businesses than property management and real estate, but you don't prohibit it.

Vice Chair, Ms. Jennifer Carr, said she appreciated the part of the presentation on what the proposed amendments are not doing, it definitely provided some clarity. One of the comments she read yesterday talked about the allowance or requirement for zero parking for some development. She couldn't tell if that was for new residential, and assuming people aren't going to have a car, or if it was more of the shared bank/restaurant type concept.

Ms. Jacobsen replied that there were a couple of things around parking. One is to bring the parking requirements for residential units more consistent with where the state is going with parking. So we didn't eliminate, we reduced the number of stalls for both multi-family and single-family. It's not eliminated. It's just reduced. She added that what you may be hearing in the comments could be about what we're doing in town centers. Our board adopted a pilot program a couple of years ago that applies only to town centers, and allows for projects to propose a waiver of parking. It's a case-by-case basis, where they would come in with a request that is reviewed by staff, and has a plan for parking. It's mostly for mixed use projects, where they might have a hotel and also some residential and some commercial. We could look at that that project and potentially allow a waiver for the units that would have been allowed for the retail piece, understanding that we need to make sure the project is parked right for the lot, because you need to have stalls for that hotel use. But the waiver is only allowed if that use is contributing on an annual basis to transit. We want to promote transit, so if you're reducing the parking in your town centers for retail uses, you want those people to be using transit/micro shuttles and such, so we're collecting fees for that.

The other thing that they are required to do is to participate in the county's parking management program currently under development. We want to bring those sites into a comprehensive management program that has public/private use in the town center so that we get better use of our stalls. So there's some stipulations around when you can have a waiver, on a case-by-case basis. That was a pilot program that has now been memorialized in these amendments.

Ms. Carr said she wanted to be sensitive to the idea of Tahoe being an exclusive destination or the over gentrification of basin areas. As we saw earlier today - the housing costs, the age and income of people in Tahoe is higher. And yet, coming out of Carson City, there are a lot of folks that work for me, and barely making ends meet, that may want to go to a sandwich shop, and take it to Tahoe. If paid parking becomes a limitation to their ability to access those sorts of activities, that's a real concern. I want to protect against the over gentrification of the basin, and maybe look at local discounts and other ways that keep the basin accessible for everyone.

Ms. Jacobsen replied that the paid parking program is separate and apart from what we're bringing forward today. It is something being worked on out of our Department of Public Works Office in Tahoe. It's coupled with our micro-shuttle programs where we're trying to get people to shuttle instead of hopping in their car. It's not just the paid parking, reducing VMT is the intent.

Mr. Young said Washoe County are working on similar Area Plan amendments and thinking

December 6, 2023

through many of the same challenges. He appreciates what Placer County are doing and hopes to learn from that.

Public Comment

Ms. Ellie Waller said she has participated in many planning processes since 2007 with the Regional Plan Update. She expressed concern that community members are not being equally represented in what is being heard. She believes the process had a breakdown in the first two years. You have had comments submitted from the Sierra Club, TahoeCleanAir.org, and Mountain Area Preservation, all with concerns that have been inadequately addressed in my opinion. Three minutes will not give adequate perspective, there is a lawsuit.

Ms. Rhonda Tyser said Cascadia's primary suggestion for making affordable housing in Tahoe is to eliminate minimums for parking lots and garages for living units. In fact, eliminating parking garages was more critical to making development affordable than increasing height, coverage, or density.

She continued; Cascadia presented several visuals that showed how many more living units could be included on a parcel if the old mandate for at least one parcel space was eliminated. Cascadia relied on research showing how other towns had managed to eliminate parking garages and increase units, thus decreasing developers per unit cost. But eliminating parking for a low-income Tahoe resident worker is a non-starter. She can't think of anyone in Incline who doesn't need a car, except maybe temporary J1's using micro-transit for summer months.

Ms. Tyser said, Cascadia published a memorandum, "Parking Management for Housing Affordability and Complete Communities". They estimate people would pay a rent on a tiny unit of less than 700 sq. ft. of \$2,400 per month. She was struck by the idea that these residents would need to make about \$85,000, assuming housing makes up a third of their salary, and tried to imagine who would live in these units without a car. Cascadia refers to many other towns that have eliminated minimal parking on site, but the references are for almost 99% urban settings. Those areas don't have Tahoe's topography or weather.

Ms. Tyser said that with red flag days in winter there is no place for on-street parking when the snow falls. Nor can workers walk in snow. So the idea of eliminating parking for affordable housing in Tahoe town centers is wishful thinking. Resident workers need their cars. They have to park somewhere. Developers need to build one covered parking space per unit on a lower floor of any affordable development in Tahoe - even if it means getting public money. Jennifer Carr is right, paid parking is a limitation to access for locals. It will create a lack of accessibility. And shuttles don't work for shopping especially in winter. We need at least one parking space per unit in Tahoe.

Ms. Suzanne Pechi said is a resident of Elk Grove, and has been a second homeowner in Tahoe Vista for 50+ years. She moved to the rural community of Elk Grove in 1978. Since the incorporation of her area in 1978, planning and development had increased density to almost 200,000 people. Time across town used to take 10 minutes, now it takes 20-30 minutes. They left urbanization in the bay area but are experiencing it now. Listening to this presentation from Placer County sounds like the same playbook over the last 20 years – destination city, outdoor by-right wine and beer venues, by-right worker housing on farmland, sidewalk venues, industrial

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

uses in sensitive areas, unlimited food trucks, packing in high-density housing without appropriate environmental review, vibrant, walkable communities, transit centers. Nothing about this is new except this if for Lake Tahoe and not Elk Grove.

As a long-time property owner I remember when TRPA was formed, with a lofty mission of saving the lake for future generations. This is very disappointing because nothing is new or tailored to a unique natural resource. Nothing supports the reason that TRPA was formed. When will there ever be enough development in Lake Tahoe. Sounds like the TRPA is already contemplating changes to the very amendment they're looking for approval today.

Mr. Gavin Feiger, Policy Director, League to Save Lake Tahoe (LTSLT), said they submitted a detailed comment letter, and he wanted to summarize briefly. Basically, we're just not seeing the need or justification or additional environmental benefits from these amendments. We asked repeatedly to the county for some specific information on progress since the TBAP was first adopted in 2017 - how implementation is going, effectiveness of mitigation measures, what's working, what's not. We haven't seen that information. Economic development isn't part of our mission - our mission is to protect and improve the environment. With that said, we do very much support the proposed parking changes and some of the focus on providing affordable housing, and would have liked to see the amendments limited just to that.

Mr. Feiger said he doesn't want to spend too much time talking about parking, but is more than happy to get into detail about the importance of parking management, including paid parking and reduced parking requirements. This is for as all area plans amendments coming along in the next year or two. I lived car free in Tahoe for 6 years. I currently drive very infrequently. I have a lot of stories and real-life experiences. I can share stories from others who are not car dependent by choice, or not by choice. There is demand out there for car free living.

Focusing on area plan conformity, Mr. Feiger said community character is a big one. We put some detail on our comment letter on this. The role of TRPA by allowing area plans, means that the local jurisdictions still have to align with TRPA's Regional Plan, and the whole series of documents. That includes community character with a conformity checklist. I can't speak for the North Shore in detail because I live on the South Shore, but I'm hearing a lot of pushback from the community about conforming with their vision for their community character.

Mr. Feiger said that thresholds is the big one. I could talk an hour about the (VMT) vehicle miles travel threshold. But there is a 2021 VMT threshold, and achieving that threshold is paramount to all of our transportation efforts. TRPA needs to be the backstop, and require the due diligence to achieve and maintain them. The TBAP amendments as proposed were not analyzed under the current VMT threshold, and that is probably the biggest shortcoming in our opinion.

Ms. Kristina Hill, a former TRPA Shorezone planner at TRPA for 4 years, and planning consultant in Tahoe for 43 years said she is against these amendments. The adequate environmental analysis of what these amendments will result in has not been done. An Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC), are you kidding me? This is just a checklist. There needs to be a comprehensive environmental analysis done such as an EIR or EIS to evaluate these far-reaching, growth inducing impacts on the proposals to change the character of our communities. An EIR/EIS would have alternatives to the preferred alternative, it would have cumulative impacts analyzed. It would be a much easier pill to swallow if this environmental documentation had

December 6, 2023

been done correctly. With just an environmental checklist I can't buy off on there is going to be no significant environmental impact based on these amendments. And, I think having that presentation by Ken Kasman prior to the presentation of the amendments was kind of interesting. To see that the population has decreased. The basis for his analysis was the 2020 census data, which is so outdated, it's hard to believe that anybody can swallow that. I live in Incline Village. I've seen increases in traffic, in population, in garbage, in parking, and it's been very disheartening to see the whole basis for this. These changes are based on inadequate information such as the 2020 data. Since then there's been the COVID migration, and we have been at the end of our rope trying to deal with all these tremendous changes in our community.

Ms. Pamela Tsgdinos said she is also a full-time Incline Village resident who has seen tremendous impact over the last several years. She urged the APC to vote against any motion to recommend adoption and to reject staff findings. Ms Tsgdinos said that there has not been sufficient analysis on the environmental analysis, or the infrastructure's overall limitations. Ms. Tsgdinos said she would encourage people to take a listen to this presentation on rewind. She heard the word food trucks mentioned more often than she did any other concern, and wished there had been similar amounts of time given to accessibility for residents to leave the basin in the event of an emergency. Accessibility of residents to move around the basin, to just get to doctor appointments, or to get shopping, but not competing with food trucks and visitors.

Ms. Tsgdinos continued, the growth inducing component of this particular set of amendments boggles the mind. She encouraged all to watch the 60 Minutes episode that aired on November 16, 2023. There was an extensive analysis of the lack of sufficient planning of infrastructure for Lahaina. And there was absolutely tragic discussion about the lack of available infrastructure for residents and visitors on roads. There were fire hydrants that ran out of water. These are real life concerns; this is not an academic exercise. Relying on consultants who don't live here, who don't understand the topography, the climate, the extreme weather risks, frankly, is a bit of an insult to those of us who live here. It is really critical; you are our public servants; you are the individuals who we rely on to make good policy. I would encourage you to table and go back to the drawing board and take into consideration all of the valid concerns that have been raised both by the public and some of the commission members. You don't have a chance to do this twice – once these buildings are in place and the roads are jammed, our lives are at risk.

Ms. Sophia Heidrich, Advocacy Director for Mountain Area Preservation said there is a wide variety of proposals in this package of amendments - everything from code cleanups to roadway frontage standards to prohibiting new single family uses in town centers And I actually don't think there's a lot of concern or controversy related to many of these proposals. But there are concerns related to the changes in setback requirements, allowing deed restricted multifamily housing projects by right, and associated impacts, and particularly related to the incomplete environmental analysis. We've heard from Placer County staff that the county just isn't seeing the redevelopment that was envisioned in the 2017 TBAP, or the 2021 amendments. I think that's a tough argument to make given that it's only been 6 years since the TBAP was adopted and two years since the amendments were adopted. And we went through a global pandemic which slowed down everything.

There are a number of projects that have already submitted applications or in the hopper and so we don't understand what projects made these amendments to be viable. We pointed that out last year, but that's still an outstanding question.

In terms of environmental analysis, we feel that the review of the cumulative impacts is still lacking. The EIR addendum and errata did not consider the cumulative impacts of increase VMT, particularly related to the projected growth in the town of Truckee's recently adopted general plan. There was some discussion of the village of Palisades plan, but it essentially says that because a different project has been taken off the books, that somehow offsets the impact from the Palisades development. We feel that that is an insufficient analysis. And there are a number of other projects proposed in the reasonably foreseeable future and their cumulative impacts must be considered as well.

I also wanted to briefly comment on the building height discussion, and I think that the reason that there is so much confusion and concern on that particular issue is because of the TRPA's parallel housing amendments planning process. Following Placer County's workshop in March, the proposed increase in building height was taken out of the proposal, and we super appreciated and supported that. Since then we've learned about the TRPA's proposed housing amendments which would put those heights right back on the table. And I just don't think that feels transparent to the community. It's created a lot of confusion, a lot of concern.

And then finally, I wanted to bring up wildfire, and I hope that a key takeaway from these various planning processes is that wildfire is a very real threat in the Tahoe Basin, and the community is asking for more analysis. We want to know how the potential development allowed under the TRPA's regional plan will impact evacuation and what can be done to better prepare and plan for wildfire. I think we keep bringing this up, hoping that this analysis will be part of these planning processes and evaluated under CEQA, but we keep hearing that because overall density will not increase, that's not an impact the jurisdictions need to consider at this point. Please hear the community on this one; evaluate wildfire, if it's not in this process then through an alternative planning process.

Ms. Nyobe Burden said I am just a resident of Tahoe Vista, having come back to the Tahoe area after 10 years away. I just found that it was an extreme difference from what I knew prior to when I was living here in the early 2000's. To say that there's no increase in tourism and population is just absolutely crazy, especially with Truckee, Reno, and Carson also involved.

I want to reiterate Mr. Feiger of the League's public comment, and I think it's great that they're supporting some changes. We've come a long way, but it's not where it needs to be. Parking management needs to be in place before zero parking in town centers and 0.75 per unit in multifamily zones is put into place. I submitted a comment showing pictures of Incline Village and parking on the roads everywhere. Who's to say that doesn't happen as we go forward without parking management in place.

The achievable definition is a loophole, which has already been brought up many times. It's being advertised in three projects, Alpine View Estates, Alpine Estates, and another one. It's a loophole that is going to allow a lot of development that's not intended for the real need. We need affordable and moderate housing units, and this achievable is going to take away that possibility because, of course, developers are going to go for the achievable. Why would they go for affordable and moderate? It's not an incentive at all.

Thank you to Sophia of MAP, for clarifying the height issue. Yes, the parallel TRPA amendments

December 6, 2023

are just going to put it right back in, so that's a huge concern. And lastly, the environmental analysis, why is an EIR required for an area plan and rezoning for Reno housing requirements, but not for these amendments? I think this is why there's a lawsuit. Please consider taking this back for more detailed analysis, the devil is in the details.

APC Comments/Questions

Chair Ferry thanked the public commenters and said themes included questioning the environmental analysis, which staff talked about with the addendum and the errata to CEQA, along with the IEC, lots of comments about growth inducing and expansion, but I think staff addressed that head-on by saying nothing is expanded beyond what was already approved and contemplated in the 2017 TBAP. Also, continued concerns about wildfire evacuation. I think all of us are always concerned about that. We live here, our families live here, that's a peak concern for all of us. And then the VMT discussion that continues to come up in the comments we're hearing, including the league's comments. Does staff want to respond to any public comment to clarify anything?

Ms. Jacobsen said that on CEQA, the Placer County board acted on the CEQA document and felt that those were appropriate. When we look at preparing CEQA documents, and when EIRs and EIS's come into play, it's typically when you have land use changes – when you're rezoning land, you're changing colors on a map, you're increasing density, you're putting residential where maybe there was recreation or something. And so you really need to look at what does that density increase do? What are the impacts associated with that on the environment? But we are not doing that here. We are not increasing density, we are not rezoning land, we're not changing any designations. We are making mostly changes to development standards to try to achieve the goals of the former plan. So from a CEQA perspective, our Board is very comfortable with the addendum that was prepared. We're comfortable with the IEC, it's appropriate in this case. These are very minor changes related to standards to try to meet the overall goal of the TBAP and of other regional plans. And that goal really is what was analyzed before, that build-out and the carrying capacity has not changed. So that would be the comment on CEQA.

Ms. Jacobsen said that growth inducing is the same. Again, we're not increasing density. I know some folks may think we're trying to encourage redevelopment. The fact is that those projects in the town centers can come in today under the existing code and develop, but they're not. We're seeing some people come in, but they're not moving forward fast. So the opportunity for them to come in has not changed. They were allowed today, and they would be allowed with these amendments. So from a growth-inducing perspective again, we're not changing the build-out of the plan.

On the VMT, again, it's the same thing. These amendments are not increasing density, not increasing population, not increasing the VMT - that analysis had been done in the area plan. Same thing with wildfire and evacuation. The former 2017 EIR/EIS that was prepared for the TBAP did analyze wildfire risk and evacuation based on the population that would have been associated with that build-out. That build-out is not changing, so the addendum then relies on that analysis, because that population base associated with that density is not changing as a result of these amendments.

Ms. Ferry said that Mr. Feiger from the League to Save Lake Tahoe (the League) requested an implementation report from Placer County. Mr. Ferry said that is Attachment K in the staff report for this item. Ms. Jacobsen said the implementation report was prepared in response to those comments from the League. She said they wanted to try to provide a written summary of what they have done to implement. When you're talking about implementation of mitigation measures, that occurs with development. So the EIR/EIS that was prepared as part of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan looked at the impacts of future development that could occur under that area plan, right. And then it identified mitigation measures that you would apply to those projects as they come forward. The fact is we haven't seen projects come forward. So those mitigation measures that are in that EIR/EIS will happen when the development comes forward. But there are a lot of policies and programs in the area plan that we have been working on, and so we have tried to summarize that in the Implementation Report.

Ms. Jacobsen said that Placer County have spent millions of dollars on improvements in Placer County. The Implementation Report illustrates where those dollars have gone, we have had improvements in transit and mobility, active transit, trails, and housing. In addition, there's an implementation plan chapter that's part of our document, that lists different projects that mostly public agencies are working on, and we have provided a status of every one of those. A lot of them are water quality improvement or trail projects, and 24 of them have been completed. So while the mitigation measures maybe have not been implemented as much as we would have liked to see because we haven't seen that development, we have been actively working on the implementation of the TBAP, actively working on the implementation of TRPA's Regional Plan, and really meeting regional goals around housing and transportation. Those are two of the big areas of focus for us.

Mr. Garth Alling referred to last month's APC meeting where we were talking about area-wide stormwater plans that have been approved. I think there's one that's active in South Lake Tahoe and asked if the active one was in Tahoe City. Mr. Ferry confirmed that there is an active regional treatment system in Tahoe City. Mr. Alling asked about the status of such a plan in the Kings Beach area. Ms. Jacobsen said the Implementation Report has a section on TMDL and talks about work in that area. She's not sure on the specifics but will track that down. Mr. Alling said the reason for the question was the same comment he made last month in regard to reducing parking. I think you're just kicking the can down the road. You're going to have people that end up parking in non-paved areas, and you have the potential for increased erosion associated with that. I didn't see any of that covered in the IEC, so I think there's a small deficiency there.

Mr. Alling asked about all of these public comments that we've been hearing, and also received via email - were all of these comments, or the majority of these comments, also given in response to the draft EIR that was prepared, and were those comments all responded to? I think there are some comments that people have made where they feel a little frustrated that there has been no response. Ms. Jacobsen replied that when you prepare an EIR, and you prepare a draft, that goes out for public comment. So when that was prepared back in 2016, we were obligated to respond to those. So that final document that was adopted and certified included those responses. In an addendum, it's a little bit different. We don't have that requirement of preparing formal responses. What I can say is that we have sifted through stacks and stacks of comments. Along with a traffic study that was submitted to our board on October 16, 2023, right before the board hearing. And that was one of the reasons the board said we're going to press pause, we're going to come back on October 30, 2023, because we want staff to look at

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

this. So that written response that has been submitted here is the result of sifting through those comments, identifying themes, and then providing written response. Do we have to do that legally? No, but we did it because we felt it was important to include for our board's consideration, and for the Commission here today, and moving forward to the Governing Board.

Mr. Alling asked for clarification for the public, if when people make comments and send comments to us right now, is there a requirement that a response is given to them for each comment that they make. Mr. Marshall confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Teshara said he thinks the attachment Ms. Jacobsen was referring to is Attachment M. Attachment M came from the Board of Supervisors review of all the comments received. He thought Attachment M was a very comprehensive detailed analysis of response. Even though not legally required, he thought it was prudent. As part of our record here, there's a whole section about wildfire and evacuation which was spoken to by the people responsible for that in Placer County. He encouraged people to read that Attachment.

He added that he has lived and worked in the area, and it is sad to see the state of Tahoe City and Kings Beach – these communities are much less lively than they were back in the 1970's-80's. They're more walkable, and there's some environmental improvement to stormwater, but they are a shadow of their former selves. Yes you can walk, but where do you walk to? Buildings that are boarded up, lots that are fenced off. Those are not environmentally appropriate communities, and I do believe, as Mr. Drake said, that this is a step in the right direction. Having talked with people that are trying to build affordable housing, deed-restricted housing, achievable housing, they see this as a step forward to building the housing we need. It doesn't come easy, we're trying to break the addiction a lot of developers have to just build things that are big, that people will pay a lot of money for. I believe the package before us today is an attempt to break that cycle. I appreciate Placer County's leadership on this, it hasn't been easy, it's tough to be vilified and excoriated for trying to do something. I have a strong feeling of wanting to see the communities of Tahoe City and Kings Beach come back to the vibrancy they used to have, in a way that is environmentally appropriate – that's not happening now.

Mr. Alling thanked Mr. Teshara for bringing up Attachment M, and that all that information is there because I think it's important for the public to know that that comments are being responded to and are being listened to. He also thanked Ms. Jacobsen for reiterating all of that, and what has happened during the CEQA process. That's extremely important.

Mr. Drake said he feels compelled to put some of the minimum parking language in context. I hear Ms. Carr's comments loud and clear about it seeming impractical to build without at least one car per person. I heard that many times in the community. People are fearful of this. But the reality is that there is, as Mr. Feiger said, a demand for car-free living. It's a tiny minority, but guess what, that minority is the population that needs housing as well. And giving our developers the opportunity to decouple parking from a living space, just gives people the option. It doesn't mean building a 50-unit place with zero parking, it might mean 25 spaces and you pay an extra \$400 a month if you want a parking space, and if you don't you get much more affordable rent. I can speak from experience, because when I was in graduate school I got a very inexpensive apartment without parking. It was very convenient, and I was willing to give up the convenience of having dedicated parking, for a very affordable place to live. That was a long time ago, but there's still people who work for me today who don't own cars and are not J1s

and they walk to work. It's a small percentage, but they exist. If you live in central Incline, you can probably walk to Raley's or the new Grocery Outlet, or soon the new Natural Groceries. If you live in Kings Beach, it's pretty easy to walk to Safeway when the paths are plowed. There is a small segment of our population that would benefit from this, and those are the people at the low end of the income spectrum. If we take the maybe 5% of people who don't own cars they are almost certainly going to be in that lower income bracket. If that can help to move these projects forward, I think it's important. The other thing is that Kings Beach has quite a bit of underutilized parking, as I think most of our communities do. For broad numbers, last I checked, Kings Beach had twice the number of parking spaces as Truckee, and half the amount of commercial floor area. We're talking about the need to better utilize the parking we have, and figure out how to do that between businesses, between a bank and a brewery for example.

Mr. Drake added that everyone is on edge about wildfire evacuation. It's an ongoing concern and we do a lot of modeling. There are plans in place, and I know our agencies are doing their best to figure out what the best options are. I think the reality is that the proposed changes before us today are about creating vibrant town centers and affordable housing. Stopping that progress will definitely keep our towns from becoming the vibrant towns that everybody deserves for people who live here. We need to be addressing the day use visitors. We need to be addressing the number of people who can freely drive into the basin any time, and pack the basin full of as many cars as we can literally fit. We need to be talking about a basin entry fee or some type of system like that. For the public who are very concerned and vocal about wildfire evacuation I want to steer the focus back to the bigger conversation about how we manage day use visitors and inter-regional transportation. Because if we let our fears about evacuation stop progress in our town centers, we're going to lose our schools, we're going to lose the ability for this to be a year-round community. That's my fear, that we're throwing the baby out with the bathwater by lawsuit after lawsuit stopping progress to make our small-town centers more vibrant. They're related, but they're separate issues with separate solutions.

Mr. Drake made a motion to recommend approval of the Required Findings, as described in Attachment D, including a Finding of No Significant Effect, for adoption of the Area Plan amendment as described in the staff summary

Mr. Young seconded the motion.

Ayes: Ms. Chandler, Mr. Alling, Ms. Carr, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Drake, Mr. Hill, Ms. Simon, Mr. Young, Mr. Teshara, Ms. Stahler, Mr. Ferry

Motion Passed.

Mr. Drake made a motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2024-___, amending Ordinance 2021-02, to amend the Tahoe Basin Area Plan as shown in Attachment C.

Mr. Hitchcock seconded the motion.

Ayes: Ms. Chandler, Mr. Alling, Ms. Carr, Mr. Drew, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Drake, Mr. Hill, Ms. Simon, Mr. Young, Mr. Teshara, Ms. Stahler, Mr. Ferry

Motion Passed.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

TRPA Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Director, Mr. John Hester provided an update on what Governing Board actions have been taken on recent APC recommendations. Firstly, APC actions on the Phase 2 housing amendments were forwarded to what is now called the Regional Planning Committee, previously known as the Regional Planning Implementation Committee (RPIC), who moved it on to the Governing Board, who will be hearing that next week. The motion from the Regional Planning Committee had a few explanatory text clarifications added to the code, but nothing significant.

Upcoming, the APC is the lead entity delegated for the Threshold Update Initiative Stakeholder Working Group (TUISWG). The APC Vice Chair is the Chair of that working group, and that group will be meeting on December 19, 2023. The other working group is the Tahoe Living Working Group, and the APC Chair is also the chair of that committee who will meet on January 30, 2024.

As Mr. Hitchcock mentioned, there are some area plan amendments coming from the City of South Lake Tahoe, and we anticipate some other area plan amendments, as well as some climate amendments coming forward, but specific dates are unknown.

The report on how the local governments are doing on delegated area planning will be sent to the Governing Board next week on the consent agenda. It recommends all of the area plans continue to be certified. If anyone wants to get that report, I can send you the link or you can find it in the Governing Board Packet.

Finally, the two-year terms of your Chair and Vice-Chair have come to an end as of today. One of the two has asked to step back from being an officer, and the other member is willing to serve in either position. We thought we would open it up to anybody who wants to be considered. You can call me or email me or contact Mr. Ferry to discuss what it really takes to be chair. From the staff perspective, we appreciate what you do as chair and work closely to plan the agenda and presentations to make these meetings as meaningful and smooth as possible. We hope some others will step up. Not that we don't want Mr. Ferry to continue, but just wanted to invite you to contact me or Mr. Ferry, and we'll get in touch and try to have a slate of officers for your next meeting. Mr. Ferry encouraged his colleagues, if anyone wants to step into this role, don't hesitate to call me.

Mr. Alling added that he thinks it would be very important for the APC to do a field visit to the NV Energy project implemented underneath the power lines. He attended the Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District board meeting last week, and NV Energy gave a presentation on the project. With all the talk of wildfire and evacuation concern, I think it's very timely and important that everyone on the APC understands the project. I have some contacts, and I think it would be a great field visit, maybe even having NV Energy come and give us a presentation.

Ms. Carr offered another idea. She went on a legislative tour around the time of the Lake Tahoe Summit, and one of the stop was the Meeks Bay area to learn about fire management and forest management from the Washoe Tribe. She had some awareness of those topics, but until she

December 6, 2023

was out there hearing from the tribe and seeing it on the ground, it made a different impact. It might be another opportunity to bundle those ideas together.

B. General Counsel

Mr. Marshall said as you have heard referenced today, a lawsuit has been filed. The North Shore Citizens, Green Friends of West Shore, TahoeCleanAir.org, and North Tahoe Preservation Alliance has sued the County of Placer over the county's adoption of the area plan that you just recommended. That's been filed in state court as a lawsuit based under CEQA. Basically, the complaint is that conditions regarding fire risk and population in the basin have changed such that you could no longer rely on the 2012 Regional Plan Update or the 2016 Tahoe Basin Area Plan EIS/EIR.

Ms. Simon asked if in the event the lawsuit prevails what would that do to the motions that we passed today. Mr. Marshall said that's an interesting question because we have the County acting under its own state laws and CEQA, and then APC, as part of TRPA are acting under TRPA ordinances and Article 7 of the compact, which is the environmental documentation procedures. The lawsuit is just about CEQA and the Placer County Board of Supervisors' action under state law. We anticipate that if the TRPA Governing Board approves these amendments, and perhaps even the housing amendments that are coming next week, there will be another lawsuit associated with that approval. So, in some sense, it may not matter. But assuming there is not a secondary lawsuit, and the plaintiffs do prevail, then that only impacts the Placer County decision. If the TRPA has taken an action by the time that is not sued, then those changes to the Regional Plan and the Area Plan will be made, because those are within the discretion of the Governing Board. It maybe that any additional provisions that are purely related to state law may be stayed, or they may choose to pull back some of the things associated with why there was a deficiency, or they may just go back and do additional environmental documentation. So in that aspect it probably depends on what the decision is.

Ms. Simon asked if there was any idea of the timeline of the lawsuit. Mr. Marshall said it will depend on whether the suit stays in state court. CEQA cases are given precedence under state law. It takes a while to prepare the record, to brief, then have oral arguments, so I wouldn't expect anything before 9 to 18 months.

C. APC Member Reports

Ms. Carr said the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) has developed a new outreach listserv for people that want to sign up for Army Corps 404 actions that require 401 state certification. The federal government updated the 401 rules and procedures, and we're reacting accordingly by developing a new method of doing public comment periods on our 401 state certification decisions. If you're interested in NDEPs 401 actions, you can go to our website and sign up for our listserv going forward, and those 401 state certification applications will be publicly noticed for 30 days going forward.

Mr. Teshara, speaking as Chair of the Board of Directors South Shore Transportation Management Association said that as an outgrowth of their work on micro-transit Lake Link

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

service had a couple of notes. One is that the City Council recently approved an additional allocation of funds, so they'll be able to expand the Lake Link service area within the City. Not all the way to the Y yet, that's our collective goal, but significantly farther into town. And we did get funding from Douglas County, and we'll have a slight expansion to Round Hill Mall in the Round Hill neighborhood and a little farther up lower Kingsbury. So those are positive signs. We have also established a partnership with Commute with Enterprise, which is a branch of Enterprise rental cars to do van pools that connect Carson Valley, Carson City, and even Reno to the South Shore. I know there are similar efforts underway on the North Shore through the Truckee North Tahoe TMA, and the town of Truckee is working to get van pools in place. The interesting thing is that we've learned if we can position the van pools correctly, they would become part of the public transit services that we provide as a region. If we can increase the amount of public service or public transit that we do, there's actually a potential that we could get more formula money for transit services by doing so. So right now, if people are van pooling or carpooling separately, this is great, but if it can go into an overall program that can increase the transit services that we provide as a region, there's another benefit to that. So we're excited about the opportunity. Not to give them a commercial plug, but Commute with Enterprise has this down, and it's a program that we strongly believe in. We're working now with Caesar's Tahoe and others to launch the program and make it available to any employer or any group that would be interested.

Ms. Carr said that they learned, once we started to promote more commuting from Reno for our staff when telework went away for state workers, was the Reno RTC provides a benefit where if you are in a carpool or van pool, and for some reason there's an emergency, for example, your kid breaks their leg at school, and you've got to get home and the van pool's not leaving until 5. If you subscribe to a certain level, they will pay for an Uber to you to get home. I don't know if that's an aspect that's been discussed here, but it really gives you a lot of assurance that if something goes wrong you have the ability to get home.

Mr. Teshara said he appreciated the point, it's called 'Guaranteed Ride Home', and they will have a similar benefit for family emergencies. The other thing that Washoe RTC provides is an incentive. So any van pool that leaves Washoe County or comes back into Washoe County, gets a \$400 incentive, which draws down the overall cost of the program. So many employers put up money, the employees put up money, and then there's this incentive. Through the South Shore TMA, maybe in partnership with TDD, we're looking at providing a similar incentive. Because we want to encourage anything that takes down the costs of commuting.

Mr. Drake said that Placer County is throwing a parking party on January 10, 2024, 5:00-7:00 p.m. at the North Tahoe Event Center, and all are invited. It's a public meeting about the parking management pilot project that's happening in the North Shore, primarily Kings Beach, and it's been a long time coming. There's a very savvy, experienced consultant facilitating the meeting. We're excited to have them on board. One of the big topics will be dynamic pricing and how to make it work for residents, visitors, seasonality, on peak-off peak, and just be easy to use.

Ms. Jacobsen said Placer County recently engaged with Dixon Consulting to work on formulating the parking management program. They've done outreach, and King's Beach seems a little bit more interested in moving forward with paid parking than Tahoe City. So we're focusing our efforts there as a pilot. She also wanted to mention that Palisades Tahoe reached out about partnering with them on parking management of their lots. You may have heard they're moving

ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 6, 2023

to a paid parking reservation system, and we are taking an agreement to our board to help them with enforcement. The Tahoe Office code team currently manages parking enforcement in the basin area, and they're excited about the first public-private partnership related to parking.

Regarding the Short-Term Rental (STR) Program, Ms. Jacobsen said that board discussions in October led to key policy considerations for the STR program. Creation of a formal structure for the STR stakeholder working group to address cap reduction (currently at 3,900) and spatial distribution of STRs in neighborhoods.

Ms. Simon suggested a field trip related to invasive species, potential locations could be the Tahoe Keys or Emerald Bay. Regarding the Boulder Bay project in Crystal Bay, she said it is moving excruciatingly slowly but a proposal is going to the Washoe County Board of Adjustment tomorrow, maybe we'll see some movement on that.

Mr. Young said he appreciated the work and effective leadership of the current APC Chair.

Ms. Chandler agreed and said they hoped he would continue in his role as chair. That said, it would be helpful to share job descriptions for Chair and Vice Chair roles. Ms. Chandler added that she was pleased to share that the Tahoe Keys Property Owners decided to fund the Control Methods Test for Year 3 following excellent Year 2 results. They would gladly host a field trip in the summer.

Mr. Ferry said El Dorado recently completed a big EIP project, the San Bernardino bike path project, a major and high-use connection point.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Ellie Waller, quoting Mr. Thomas Edison said, "being busy does not always mean real work, the object of all work is production or accomplishment, and to either of these ends there must be forethought, system, planning, intelligence and honest purpose". She said she would like Placer County to come back on the failed community enhancement program. We are now going back with 2017 changes as perceived failures. The BBLCC project, which is now Kingsbarn is going into another two-year extension due to another developer. The 1990's had parking management plans – never brought forward into the 2017 planning cycle for accomplishment. La Lima is being piecemealed, sold. Fast forward, Tahoe City Lodge – it's shameful that putting in porte-cochere posts is progress. Sandy Beach did the same thing, it's a long age-old lawsuit. Creating new programs with no benchmarks doesn't help bring all of these new changes. She thanked Ms. Tyser on urban vs rural, Ms. Tsigdinos. All of the commenters have spent many hours reviewing these documents that will be going to the Regional Planning Committee in January. She was really surprised that TRPA Counsel brought up that there may be a lawsuit against the housing amendments.

Ms. Pamela Tsigdinos said she wanted to comment on a comment made by a commissioner about walking in Incline Village to Raley's etc. It's very important to know that our existing multi-use paths are very rarely plowed in the winter, which means people are walking in the already crowded two lane streets. In the summer e-bikes race by and there are very poor pedestrian crossings, making multi-use paths rather deadly if you want to cross the road.

December 6, 2023

Secondly, Ms. Tsigdinos said I'm very disappointed that the APC voted unanimously in favor of these inadequately researched amendments. It's clear from the public comment that the vast majority of Tahoe residents, particularly those not associated with commercial development, real estate, lobbyists, and attorneys, oppose the proposed amendments. If there had been a public referendum these amendments would have failed. I'd also like to highlight faulty logic and lack of intellectual honesty around the formation of these amendments. There is not a lack of housing in the Tahoe Basin. What there is, however, is a very poor short-term rental (STR) policy that favors tourists over residents. These policies favor T.O.T. collection over the needs of those who need a place to live. You just have to accept that is the truth. I'd also like to comment on some of the commission statements today. The commission has now approved these amendments, so I'd like to underscore Ms. Stahler's comments – it's imperative that the commission put in place strict and regular monitoring of the amendment impacts. I'd like to suggest monthly updates, with a formal annual review. As for one commission member's comment on blight in Tahoe communities, keep in mind the public is not responsible for the blight, it is the result of bad policy, and private developers looking for the highest return on investment. Please don't conflate bad policy and public resistance to these amendments. The public has legitimate concerns about the changes in our environment, in overall visitation, and the climate, and we should not be thrown into a category of resisters for the sake of resistance when we're asking meaningful questions and requesting more analysis.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Teshara moved to adjourn

Chair Ferry adjourned the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tracy Campbell

Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

The above meeting was recorded in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the recording of the above-mentioned meeting may find it at <https://www.trpa.gov/meeting-materials/>. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review. If you require assistance locating this information, please contact the TRPA at (775) 588-4547 or virtualmeetinghelp@trpa.gov.