

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

TRPA/Zoom

December 14, 2022

Meeting Minutes

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Yeates called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Diss, Ms. Gustafson, Ms. Hill, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Hester said items three and four are informational only and not action items.
Mr. Yeates deemed the agenda approved as amended.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean moved approval of the July 27, 2022, minutes as presented.

Motion carried.

IV. Item 3: Informational Briefing on Proposal to Amend Douglas County's South Shore Area Plan Implementing Regulations to Include Religious Assemblies as an Allowed Use in the Kingsbury Commercial Town Center District

TRPA staff Mr. Stock and Ms. Moroles-O'Neil, Douglas County provided the presentation.

Mr. Stock said since the 2012 Regional Plan Update, TRPA has encouraged local jurisdictions to develop area plans that replace local planning documents. This allows jurisdictions greater autonomy, to define and manage local land use, while remaining compliant with TRPA's Regional Plan requirements and Thresholds. The South Shore Area Plan was approved in 2013 and encompasses the south Stateline area of Douglas County from the shoreline of the Lake to Pine Crest Drive and from the California Stateline to around Burke Creek near the UPS Store is. The plan includes two Town Centers: the Casino core resort area and the Kingsbury Commercial Town Center along lower Kingsbury including this building.

The proposal amendment aims to change religious assemblies, from a special use to an allowed use in the Town Center along lower Kingsbury and would eliminate the requirement for Hearings Officer review of Religious Assembly buildings but would maintain other staff level review and approval for those facilities. Staff believes that this is an important amendment to maintain conformance with Federal law.

A text amendment applying this change to the Douglas County Code, was adopted on September 1,

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

2022 but Governing Board approval is still required for the amendment to go into effect. TRPA staff have reviewed a draft of the Initial Environmental Assessment and returned comments to Douglas County staff, and they don't anticipate any conformance issues with the County's proposal based on what they've seen.

Based on the Regional Plan Implementation Committee's comments today, Douglas County will work with them to complete revisions and bring an amendment proposal back to RPIC for a formal hearing hopefully next month. If RPIC recommends adoption, they anticipate holding the Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board hearings in February.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Moroles-O'Neill said she'll provide staff recommendations to assess and approve a zoning modification in the Tahoe mixed-use zoning. Currently Religious Assemblies require a Special Use Permit, and they feel that it is imperative that they eliminate the need for a Special Use Permit.

In November of 2021, a Synagogue located in the Tahoe mixed-use zoning was required to get a Special Use Permit in order to hold their religious assemblies. While staff was processing the application, it became apparent that there were strikingly similarities between the two definitions for religious assembly and membership organizations. Both promote the interests of its respective group, and both are consistent with the zones use. Staff also discovered while processing the application that based on the definitions, religious assembly use is entirely consistent with the Tahoe mixed-use zoning district which specifically allows public service use. Code states that religious assemblies are required to obtain a Special Use Permit while membership organizations are permitted as an allowed use.

In conclusion and most importantly, approving this amendment would eliminate any perception of discrimination based on the Federal law known as their LUPA, Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act. Staff believes it is imperative that they stay consistent with Area Plan regulations and Federal law.

Presentation can be found at:

[RPIC-Agenda-Item-No-3-Douglas-County-South-Shore-Area-Plan.pdf](#)

Committee Comments & Questions

None.

Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber of Commerce said they've followed this item through the Douglas County process and knows it's informational only today, but they do support the proposed change. It's not only consistent with TRPA and Douglas County rules, as they should be, but also to avoid any thought of a discrimination against a particular religious group. They support this proposal when it comes back for action.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

- V. Item 4: Informational Briefing on Proposal to Amend Placer County's Tahoe Basin Area Plan to Support Economic Sustainability and Local Housing. The Proposal Includes Amendments to Parts 2.6, 2.7, 3.4, 3.5, 4.3, 4.7, and 8.2 of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan Policies and Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of the Implementing Regulations

Mr. Yeates said TRPA has had a workshop on the issue of what he would say the crisis in the Tahoe Basin regarding workforce housing. The workshop has several flipcharts that they place dots on certain things, they reconvened after this workshop, and thinks that the Governing Board made it clear to our staff that they wanted to deal with this issue in a rather aggressive way. In that regard, he hopes when people consider what Placer County is doing in that they are addressing issues that they are having problems with the implementation of a Regional Plan. They wanted to concentrate development in Town Centers and want to provide housing necessary for people who work and live in this community. It's a challenge because of costs and rules that they have and that they're going to have to reevaluate those. He understands that change is an issue, but the reality is that to maintain a sustainable community they're going to have to at least have an open discussion, give peace a chance. Have open discussions about things like the North Shore doesn't want to be like South Shore, etc. He finds it difficult that when he reads a staff report that says that 70 percent of the homes in the North Lake are vacant, not being used second homes or are short term rentals, that's not community members living in that community and hears that people coming as far away as Nevada City and Grass Valley to work in the Tahoe Basin, and knows that they come from Minden and Gardnerville to work on the east side. That's a lot of Vehicle Miles Traveled on top of that. This is something that we in the basin and as TRPA will deal with.

Mr. Hester said today is informational only and is for input only. The formal adoption process will happen where Placer County will go back to their Planning Commission, they've continued this item and then to their Board of Supervisors before coming back to TRPA's Advisory Planning Commission, the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, and the Governing Board.

Placer County staff, Ms. Holloway, Deputy CEO for Tahoe, Ms. Jacobsen, Deputy Director of Community Economic Development Resources Agency, and Ms. Wydra and Ms. Setzer, Principal Planners provided the presentation.

Placer County is doing what they call adaptive management. They adopted this plan five years ago, and as some know, there are State statutes that require you to update plans every five years. They've taken a look at what's happened since the plan was adopted, they'll discuss a study they did to look at the economy and why things are or are not happening in that part of the basin. They present on why they need to make the amendments that they do. Some of the information that they'll talk about is related to the economy and to development rights and Mr. Hester will provide some regional context for that, so you'll know that these are not just Placer County numbers, but rather regional numbers.

Slide 4: There is a slight difference in the 2000 numbers to the 2020 numbers on Vehicle Miles Travelled because the Highway Performance Management system data that they have access to for California goes back to 2001. What you see is the population in the basin has declined by 11 percent since 2000, the employment, by 11 percent as well and typically those two stay in sync with each other. Vehicle Miles Travelled, 16.9 percent. There's a footnote there, in that number was in the middle of 2020, and they didn't know exactly what the Covid impact was so, they put the earlier number in there, which was a 5.4 percent decrease. Covid is interesting, some people were coming here to work remote so, you would think that the trips would have been up. But then a lot of people weren't traveling because things were closed down. They don't know if that was an indicative number,

but the point is that traffic and VMT in the region has decreased.

People also are concerned about how much development can happen. Growth and development in the basin are capped, and there is no new development allowed with centralized wastewater systems and TRPA has been directed to look at the concept of stormwater utilities as part of the Housing Initiative. The only type of development right that's been used and to a small extent 943 units is residential, the commercial and tourist accommodation units have declined. To be clear, you can move from one type of development right to the other. There may be more residential and less commercial for example, but the overall cap remains the same. So, there is not that much capacity for additional growth in the basin, and the economy and population has not been growing.

TRPA staff has enjoyed a great partnership with Placer County since they've adopted their area plan. The County has consulted with TRPA and asked for input every step of the way. On 307 of the packet is the Local Government Annual Report with the results of the audit and shows that Placer has done an excellent job permitting what's been delegated to them through the Memorandum of Understanding.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Holloway said the Placer County team works in close partnership with TRPA in advancing environmental and economic goals of the Region. She'll provide information on the work that Placer County is doing in the region and around policy, implementation of their goals, and investments within our region.

As they achieve and look to advance some of these environmental stewardship goals of economic liability, and community sustainability. The Placer County Board of Supervisors has been instrumental in making a commitment to Eastern Placer County and to this region around investments.

Since adoption of the 2 percent Transient Occupancy Tax on lodging in 1996, the amount of public dollars that the Placer County Board has Invested in the region leveraging State and Federal projects and dollars constructing Improvements. Slide 15 shows a lot of those such as the Tahoe City Transit Center, Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Investments, and also a multitude of transit service expansion with the TART systems plan, the recent Micro Mass Transit system, and numerous segments of the Regional Transportation Trail system, and vision. These projects have altered the framework in the Placer County region, but they aren't done yet.

Slide 16: They continue to push forward on community supporting service needs. The North Tahoe Justice Center. This map shows everything that they've presented to their Board and are working on collectively in Placer County in and out of the region.

The North Tahoe Justice Center is moving forward, they are actively working on upgrades to their libraries and catalyst projects, even one on the Commons Beach property in Tahoe City. A lot of community supporting projects that aren't just tourism, mitigation, and meeting environmental goals, but looking to sustain their communities, and provide support services. They're also striving forward on a number of other key issues in their region such as Forest Management, Transportation, and Workforce Housing. You'll hear today on how investment in their Town Centers and communities help them achieve and move those regional goals forward. Placer County isn't waiting for redevelopment to push forward on achieving those things.

Transportation and mobility services: They continue to grow and expand these services, including the

most recent success with the Micro Mass Transit and the TART Connect Program. They're also actively engaged and hopeful to deploy a parking management program and actively working with staff at the Tahoe Transportation District and TRPA to advance that within the region and is a lead out for more parking solutions in the region. Regional trails are infrastructure to facilitate transit and transit expansion and those goals and then their Complete Streets Projects.

She couldn't miss not touting the Regional Transportation Plan and the Resort Triangle Transportation Plan in Placer County as well.

Alternative transportation, vehicle trip reduction and safety round out, what the State of California, and Placer County is pushing on with Vehicle Miles Travelled reduction and goals all aligned with long standing practices and goals of TRPA in the region. Placer County has transitioned from a Traffic Mitigation Fee Program, to a VMT based Transportation fee following and coordinating with the VMT Threshold effort. They are looking to transition away from just addressing traffic, but also provide services that reduce VMT within the region. The Mobility Fee and Transportation fee is very much aligned to move them forward on VMT reduction.

Fanny Bridge is a very active, and important project to Placer County from a transportation perspective, and their partnership with the Tahoe Transportation District and Central Federal Lands, they are excited to advance this project to completion next fall.

Workforce Housing: They have a continued commitment to the community another area that they're advancing even parallel, or in front of private investments. Their Board has facilitated close to \$18 million to advance construction of nearly 300 units in the Placer County region.

The Dollar Creek Project is potentially 150 additional rental and workforce housing availability in the basin which is important for them to advance this project on the North Shore.

Their team is doing a lot of amazing work and their capacity as a public entity with public dollars has a limit. They're striving to form public private partnerships to bring in the private piece of this equation that helps them advance these regional goals. These projects, programs, and initiatives that they have put forward get better and expand with the private investment. Their work only goes so far and they're here to highlight the importance of that other piece of the equation.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Jacobsen said the reason they're bringing these amendments before the Board are in response to the lack of private redevelopment and reinvestment that they've seen in their Town Centers. The Tahoe Basin Area Plan was adopted in 2017 and was intended to implement the Regional Plan with the vision of accelerating environmentally beneficial redevelopment in their Town Centers and is a high priority. The County has made huge strides in investing public dollars into the implementation of the Regional Plan and meeting regional goals. However, they have not seen that same kind of investment in implementation of the Regional Plan in the Town Centers with that private reinvestment and redevelopment. There are a lot of projects in the hopper, however, each has met struggles along the way. They've met with those folks over the course of several years to figure out why they are struggling and not moving forward. The cost of doing nothing is a continued decline of the old development that they see in their Town Centers in some cases, there's blight in the Town Centers and with that comes increased runoff into the Lake with no BMPs coming forward on those private lots. Also, without quality lodging options in their Town Centers they see more short term rentals moving

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

into the neighborhoods over the past five to ten years. Also, with the lack of housing, there is

congestion on the roadway with their workers traveling from areas such as the Sacramento region to work for Placer County and other employers in the area. The Town Centers also lack that vibrancy and walkability that they'd like to see happen in their Town Centers and to help meet Regional Plan goals.

Their CEO office prepared an economic study around 2019 to better understand the problems that they're having and why they're not seeing that reinvestment. That study provided a set of recommended actions that their county could take to address the issue. One was to look at the Tahoe Basin Area Plan document for both policy and the implementing regulations. This serves as their zoning code to see if they could make some refinements and slight adjustments to help move these projects forward to get that environmentally beneficial redevelopment that they'd like to see. The idea is to help business owners and private landowners to redevelop and move the needle on realizing that reinvestment and implementing the Regional Plan.

The amendments are intended to harness that kind of redevelopment which they believe is aligned with the Regional Plan. You may hear some concerns today from folks that the amendments are wholesale changes, or that they're increasing density. They are not proposing to modify any density standards. These are small refinements to different standards and design and development standards to help move those projects forward.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Setzer said the amendments are attempting to target that environmentally beneficial redevelopment. Right now, they have aging dilapidated Town Centers, a lack of quality lodging. They haven't had one new hotel project since the 1960s in North Lake Tahoe. There's a lack of housing for local workers, they've also lost 2,000 residents since 2000. They have a lot of vacant commercial spaces; the North Tahoe Business Association has documented 30 commercial vacant spaces in Kings Beach Downtown alone. They've also seen businesses relocating elsewhere to places like Truckee, Reno, and Carson City.

They're trying to get this diverse business sector and new lodging products in their Town Centers, workforce housing and trying to support a year-round economy, not necessarily to induce growth, but to have enough full-time residents to support the mom and pop businesses who are having a hard time staying open year round without the full time residents. With this redevelopment they are expecting BMPs to do things like decrease run off into the Lake, shift lodging from short term rentals into lodging in the Town Centers, have more vibrancy, walkability, and what people think of as a mountain town. They are hoping to reduce congestion and vehicle miles traveled and allow people to live closer to their jobs and really have that steady customer base for businesses.

They are not increasing density. Placer staff is working closely with TRPA staff and the Tahoe Living Working Group, which is the regional collaboration to analyze things with TRPA for the entire basin for things like density or coverage, etc. to facilitate housing. They're not doing that necessarily with these amendments today. They're not trying to increase carrying capacity, they're limited in the amount of development rights, like Tourist Accommodation Units, Residential Units of Use, and Commercial Floor Area. The building forum doesn't necessarily change how much of that they still have to give out. They are not increasing building height for all buildings across their entire downtown and they are not conflicting with TRPA scenic or environmental thresholds, those scenic thresholds are strict and there for a reason. They coordinate their projects alongside TRPA to make sure applicants understand those thresholds. They are not eliminating project review for large projects. Where Ms. Wydra may talk

December 14, 2022

about things that are allowed by right with these amendments those are strategic infill, small scale projects, or businesses. Any large project still has to go through its environmental review.

Any project that would, for example, be trying to request a height increase, if those do go carried through these amendments would still require a land use permit. It would still have the public process, many hearing bodies, between Placer County and TRPA. It would require design review, environmental review for both California and TRPA. They would be required to look at things like emergency evacuation plans and those TRPA Scenic Standard Thresholds.

The proposed amendments are a result of years of feedback of things. The community has been telling them that these are problems, the businesses and residents are leaving. They had that EPS study done for the original Area Plan documented that they have a need in North Lake Tahoe of 300 to 500 new hotel units and they haven't had any.

There's been public engagement with the Placer County Planning Commission in September and December, the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council three times between October and November. They've also gone to the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, the North Tahoe Business Association, and the Tahoe City Downtown Association. They've had multiple stakeholder meetings with various groups.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Wydra said there are two documents that guide the Tahoe Basin and Placer County, and the policy document which contains the goals and policies. Within their policy amendment they are proposing some changes, and or additions including but not limited to the Town Centers, Land Use, Vegetation and Housing.

She'll also present on the implementing regulations which is the supporting document that helps achieve those goals and policies of the Area Plan.

In the Town Centers they have Land Use Tables that govern what type of land uses are allowed and what kind of process they have to go through. They are proposing to streamline those by their use and or square footage provided that they continue to meet the thresholds of the Vehicle Miles Traveled. It's important to note that projects that may be allowed by the size or the use but do not meet the VMT are still required to go through an environmental process, and or the permitting process. This is to get some of the mom and pops in and fill these vacancies in the Town Centers. They also looked at allowing food trucks and mobile vendors in all of the mixed-use land uses, and not allow for new Real Estate and or Property Management Offices along the frontages of North Lake Boulevard or State Route 28. This is to encourage different types of uses along the frontages, but those types of uses can be allowed on the second floor, sides, or the rear. For Hotels, Motels, and Transient Dwelling Units, there is also the need for these to be encouraged in the Town Centers. If a proposal comes in with 20 units, or less, could be considered as an allowed use provided that it meets all the thresholds. If it does not it will still go through a public process through the County which may or may not involve environmental review as well. For new single-family development which consists of over one unit, could be allowed if the single-family use is 25 percent or less of the entire project and or at least 50 percent of the single-family units are Deed restricted, to TRPA's affordable levels. Looking at all the other housing, they would consider them to be allowed in the Town Centers if a 100 percent of the units are Deed restricted again, to those affordable levels as defined by TRPA.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

They added a building length maximum to the Tahoe City Town Center where there otherwise was not one listed. This was to keep Kings Beach and Tahoe City in alignment with each other. They also looked at the compatibility with residential zone districts and they have recommended a maximum of 75 feet of a building length on parcels that are directly facing residential zone districts to ensure some compatibility. They're also proposing to decrease the building length from 350 feet to 250 feet for the Stateline Zoning District which consists of Mixed-Use Tourists.

They are also proposing a Mountains side building length so those properties that are not on the lake side could be considered up to 500 feet building length. In the Town Centers provided it's a mixed-use project and that it complies with both the County's Design Standards as well as TRPA Scenic Standards and requirements. It includes some separations in that length which is to help achieve some sort of outdoor spaces such as plaza areas or outdoor eating and drinking spaces. It also includes 15 percent of Deed restricted housing and public art. Similarly, on the Lake side, they're considering building lengths up to 250 feet for mixed-use projects provided that 50 percent of the building comprises housing that is 100 percent Deed restricted. They're still looking at building height in the Town Centers. They are keeping the same building height that's listed in the Code of 56 feet but are eliminating the reference to the stories. They found that sometimes that was causing confusion for some developers. They're also considering an additional 5 foot building height, up to 61 feet maximum for Town Center mixed-use projects that include a mixed use project only that is fronting State Route 28, has 50 or more hotel units, Deed restricted housing, public art, and complies with both Design and Scenic Standards. They are also considering an additional 11 feet in height, up to 72 foot building, maximum, again, for mixed-use projects in the Town Centers, provided that they meet the criteria mentioned. But this would only be for like rooftop appurtenances such as a rooftop deck, elevator shafts, or chimneys, and so forth.

Housing Amendments: They looked at their residential development standards for all of the residential zone districts and are proposing to eliminate the minimum lot area per dwelling unit, this is to refine usage of setbacks and coverage instead. Also reduce the minimum lot size to match their existing development, reduce the minimum lot width to further encourage these smaller type housing units which results in a more affordable type of residential units. Uniquely in their Area Plan they have these listed residential districts that contain a special designation which is the preferred affordable, moderate, and achievable housing areas. They looked at those development standards to understand what is prohibiting these types of residential development in the residential zone districts. Similar to what was mentioned for the other zone districts for residential, they also furthered those with these preferred areas, and are proposing to match the minimum lot size to the existing density maximums, they were inconsistent at the time, reduce the minimum lot width with to match existing conditions, deleted the minimum lot area, and then allow for zero foot setbacks to accommodate duplexes where a shared property line could have a zero foot setback without having to go through a variance, and then 10 feet on the opposite sides. For the remaining balance of the residential uses, multi-family, multi-person employee, they are recognizing those as allowed uses, removing that use permit process, if those units are proposed at a 100 percent Deed restricted.

Area Wide Standards and Guidelines: They looked at parking and are proposing an amendment to the plan which would allow for a waiver with offset to mobility programs, but this does exclude lodging units uses. They're modifying parking requirements for residential uses, and then in the Town Center parking areas, considering that no parking minimums be required for additions of existing buildings for up to 1,000 square feet, and encourage parking management programs. They see this as a potential to reduce parking, provide for some shared uses of those parking areas, and increase flexibility. They are also proposing to allow for below grade parking through interception of groundwater just in the Town

Centers. This could help achieve reducing coverage for these types of developments and would be aligned with TRPA's allowances for groundwater interception.

There are also the miscellaneous amendments such as adding the movable tiny houses to align with their adopted Ordinance, as well as South Lake Tahoe's. In the Sign Chapter, they are proposing to eliminate the sign regulations within the Area Plan but rather they are going to rely on TRPA's sign ordinance. TRPA will continue to review sign permits in accordance with their Memorandum of Understanding. It's just to ensure that they are consistent with TRPA's sign regulations. They've added Streetscape and roadway design characteristics to inform the reader of all the sections of the Area Plan that this type of development might be required of them. For frontage, they are proposing amendment to include single-family residences to also be required to provide frontage improvements. For the Shorezone requirements they recently adopted a Lake Tahoe Shorezone for the County. To align with TRPA's Shorezone requirements, they've added some amendments to notify the reader, for example, a fence is proposed in a shorezone, not only do they have to go through TRPA, but they also have to go through the County for that proposed structure. In addition, there'll be those miscellaneous cleanups and typos.

The proposed amendments are subject to the requirements of both the California Environmental Quality Act as well as TRPA's Initial Environmental Checklist which are currently being processed.

(Presentation continued)

Ms. Jacobsen said they had a lot of public engagement opportunities to date but there's a lot more to come. In terms of next steps, their staff will continue to meet with stakeholders, community members, business owners, environmental groups, etc. Also, reviewing the public comments that they've received to date and then start the public hearing process of going to their Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors and then back TRPA.

They've heard concerns from the community and stakeholders over the last few months, and the County is committed in finding solutions which move us forward as a region, while also being sensitive to the comments received.

Presentation can be found at:

[RPIC-Agenda-Item-No-4-Placer-County-Tahoe-Basin-Area-Plan.pdf](#)

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Gustafson said she appreciated that every time you have had the opportunity to present in public the presentation has been more clarified and responded to some of the public misconceptions, and or opinions that they've been hearing. She appreciated as representing this area now, how much passion and commitment there is from our community about preserving the Lake, about preserving our community identities, as well as trying to improve those. They've had a lot of public engagement on this, and they need to have continue to have more and they are doing that, and they are trying to respond to those and really think about is there another way to find the solution.

Ms. Aldean said she appreciated all the information that was provided. Obviously, there is a bit of a disconnect having reviewed all the letters that were received. There were some pretty serious misconceptions and appreciated the clarity that Placer staff brought to the conversation. In the past,

when they were dealing with workforce housing issues, they've always kind of mulled over the possibility of including large employers to take some action on their own to provide housing for their employees and she understands that Northstar has done that and commended them for doing that. Because it is in part, a problem that they have kind of inadvertently created, they're essential to the community but they do act as a bit of an attractant to people wanting to come and work in the basin. What sort of outreach have they had in Placer County to large employers to help us deal with a lack of workforce housing taking some initiatives on their own?

A lingering concern for her, and there may not be any way of effectively dealing with this, is how you can guarantee that these affordable units will be used to accommodate the local workforce population? If she were somebody who was retired and needing a subsidy to live, she'd love to come to the Tahoe Basin and call it home. But that's not the intent of these amendments. The intent of the amendments is to improve the circumstances of people who are already in the basin, who are working and helping to provide services. She doesn't know if state statutes in California prohibit that sort of preferential treatment of workforce population in connection with the affordable housing units in South Lake Tahoe. If they haven't committed, she encouraged them to reach out to major and minor employers and encourage them to encourage their workers who may be living in substandard units, or commuting in from outside of the basin, to put them on a waiting list. There has to be some creative ways of ensuring that these units are not going to be consumed by people who are not working in the basin, and that of course, does not apply to people who are working in the basin and then decide to retire. She does have a concern that these are going to be used for the wrong purpose.

In the materials, there was reference to eliminating all parking for multi-family dwellings and feels that is unrealistic. That would force the users of those units to either sell their automobiles or find alternate parking solutions which would mean they'd be pushed into adjacent commercial lots, or into residential neighborhoods.

Food trucks have become very popular, but they do create VMT. She's concerned about the competition they're going to be offered. Unless they are prevented for example, from parking in front of a brick-and-mortar restaurant and competing with that restaurant, she thinks you're shooting yourself in the Foot. Instead of aiding your existing businesses, you're encouraging competition immediately in front of their establishment. To the extent that you can restrict the movement or the parking of those vehicles next to existing restaurants, she would encourage them to do that. Obviously having a brick-and-mortar restaurant has a lot of downsides in terms of operating overhead.

A number of the people who provided comments, were kind of contrasting the process they've gone through with the Regional Plan update and with a number of members of the community who actively participated as stakeholders in these work groups, not just in the audience, but actually at the table reviewing these recommended changes and providing input. It's a lot more collaborative, it's a lot more inclusive. She's wondering if going forward and maybe it's too late in the process, if they could invite some actively involved community members who are coming to the table, not to criticize everything that's been done, but to offer reasonable solutions or reasonable accommodations for some of the concerns that have been expressed publicly.

Mr. Yeates said due to the limitation in time here today, he doesn't expect Placer staff to respond today but take them into consideration what consideration what they have to say and then respond either in some other fashion, or whenever they come back to RPIC.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

Ms. Gustafson said she thinks clarification on TRPA's affordability standards for the requirements should be clarified because not everybody and certainly not everybody in the public understands those. Specifically on the height they suggested only on State Route 28, there is some Town Center

just outside of Tahoe City known as the Williamson Yard, the Quarry Pit. That is an area that many people have looked at for potential affordable housing in the future and that fronts State Route 89. She's wondering if decisions on height there might be considered or not. That area as well, as the lumber yard were included in the Town Center for getting out of the river.

There were housing amendments referenced for Lake Forest Glen sub district, she's assuming, they meant Lake Forest sub district, but if they meant specifically the Glen Complex, or if you mean the whole Lake Forest area. She lives in near and in and would support this. Just as one for multi housing it used to be our biggest area of local housing.

Ms. Hill said she applauded the team and Supervisor Gustafson for looking at these best practices. She's reading a lot about planning lately and thinks ensuring that it's easier to develop multi-family is going to be the key to this and looking at the reason that they have such a proliferation of short term rentals is because they don't have sufficient lodging and is also an issue in her district.

Ms. Hill said Ms. Aldean brought up good points about distance from existing businesses, creating an area for them, or even creating a special event permit every time that they want to be in certain areas. Another jurisdiction has done this, and it's worked out very well.

Regarding mixed-use is just ensuring that if there's any changes that they're continuing to make it meaningful if there's mixed-use development that there's enough commercial that a real business could go there.

Mr. Hoenigman said thank you for all the work you're doing, it's incredibly hard to get out in front of the public and try to make changes to anything that impacts development. He believes, the Governing Board is on board. This Board is on the opposite side of that argument, even though they're not there, they'll be pushing you and you have our support and encouragement and are probably going to require it to go farther. We all know that the people who come and complain are really the vocal minority, the silent majority who support a lot of the changes, to protect the Lake, increase affordability in the housing, and help revitalize our communities. Those people just don't tend to show up at meetings. He wants to encourage them to go really bold, because he thinks a lot of these changes are great but doesn't think they're going to move the needle and, in some ways, he's worried they're setting us back as they currently are. You've done a lot to increase flexibility and reduce some costs for building which is great.

The big one that he worries about is they haven't had any multi-family in the core since he's been coming up here for 25 years. That's at market rate and now we're adding this requirement, which is a great one for 50 percent affordable or achievable, he would like to see it be a 100 percent, but they have to understand what that cost is and then how to make it profitable. Because if development were profitable, now, they would see development in our cities, and we've just made it even less profitable. In the future, Placer County and TRPA need to look at what the incentives are that will move the needle so, that they can require that housing to be some percentage of achievable. Fifty percent is great to say, but it's meaningless. There has to be studies to figure out what is economically feasible for someone to provide and that changes with different economic cycles. In San Francisco, they reevaluate their inclusionary percent every other year, it was randomly set by a Supervisor to 33

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

percent and all housing production stopped. This year it's going to be reevaluated and hopefully knocked down. They need to put that kind of process in place.

For affordability requirements, they going to have to give something to make that achievable. Height, density, and coverage, all those things that they're going to be looking at. They added some height, which is good. You need that extra five feet for mixed-use, because you want the commercial lids to be 15 feet and then at least ten feet for each floor. The most efficient buildings to build are five stories. If they want to get the most affordable, they need to find the most efficient building types.

Parking for most of developers is what sets the density of a project because it's a huge geometry, space, and cost problem. He believes in being much more flexible with parking and letting the developers set the amount that they want for development. If they've got to make money on it, they've got to understand their market. There are some people who won't have a car if they live and work in an area, while some people will need it. Instead of density, they should be looking at floor area ratios. You set the bulk of the building, and then let the developer figure out what units they want to put in. Now, there's density and they get projects like the Latitude 39 Project where they're building three and four bedroom units that are only going to be used for more for short term rentals. If it's a floor area ratio (FAR) driven, and there's not a huge parking requirement, it's more profitable for a developer to build smaller units and get more money, per square foot. That would tend to create more affordable housing for us of a certain type, for a couple or singles, or something. You'd have to look at also if they want to require some percentage to be larger for families.

They also need to work on creating projects that are by right development going forward because the uncertainty with having to go through these public processes is so huge, and the time that it takes is so costly. Both those things have a huge cost to the developer that if they didn't have them, they could take for something else, like more affordability, or more public benefits. The more they can make by right, the more they can squeeze out of developers.

Mr. Lawrence said he appreciated the presentation and the thought that went behind it especially the comments about adaptive management. Public agencies these days barely have enough funding to keep the doors open and do what's right in front of you, much less be proactive and look at these things. Along the lines of adaptive management, he understands that a lot of this is to move the needle in workforce housing. The presentation was really good regarding the why and the what the Amendments do but there will be some questions on how they ensure that these changes are going to actually effectuate affordable housing. He feels maybe a little more information on okay, here's the amendments and this is how it will move the needle. Same for lodging. There are a lot of lodging units in the basin but not the right types. What's missing up here is the middle income type of lodging. Not necessarily the high end or lower end but something in between.

A lot of the studies are showing that minimum parking requirements don't work, it really doesn't move the needle in a big way. More information on how they're going to do parking for multi housing. Maybe not a minimum of two spots per unit but a little bit of guidance on what they are thinking about parking, because it sounds good on paper, but people will still bring cars and park in the neighborhoods. He also had the same questions about Food Trucks and how it impacts VMTs, how is it going to impact traffic congestion, particularly during peak summer months.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

Public Comments & Questions

Ellie Waller said she was previously a Tahoe Vista resident and participated for several years on the North Tahoe West Area plan team. Change is welcome, it's the approach to keeping some of the community character and the scenic intact. They don't have a blank slate, there are mom and pop businesses that are going to get dwarfed by some of these heights, that should be taken consideration. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects are to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony to fulfill the social and economic requirements of the present and future generations. The intensity of some of the requested changes should require an Environmental Impact Report. Height and scenic specifically need more analysis.

There are 3,900 vacation home rentals that she knows of reported in Placer County. You can't stop that train; it is a public private right to own a vacation home rental. The rules need to be changed. She's on the Douglas County meeting line and in fact, she's going there today. If you cap them, you can do them over grandfathering. If you took 3,900 times, an average of four people that's 10,000 people. There's your 2,000 loss and people that live there. It's a risk choice as an investment. Definition of density, it's a conundrum. With that said, localized densities are increasing that's where some of the confusion is putting multi-family where it needs to go because they do need it into a primarily single-family zone area is increased density in a local area. They need to take in consideration those people that are commenting on that. You hear staff say, time and again that there are no new hotels in 50 years. Well staff continues to approve the luxury condominium portion of these larger projects, instead of conditioning the project to build the hotel component in phase one. Same could be said for the workforce housing, build it in phase one. It's very frustrating because it some of these projects are sold on those motels. Financial feasibility, a conundrum, building supply cost, and availability, interest rate changes, TRPA's restrictive Scenic Ordinance. This is not an excuse, if you can't build some of the sizes of these projects, make them a little smaller. There are many new California land use laws into 2023 coupled with adequate and accurate environmental, analysis that must be done. Developers have had an ample time to work with Placer County over the last couple of years. She asked Placer to reach out and engage some of the long-term Land Use Planners, the small developers, the community members, that were part of the original Area Plan Teams. She does her work; she wears the badge of vocal minority. She does attend and does her homework and does not take offense to that.

Jackson Realo, Land Use Planner for a small Land Use Planning firm based in of South Lake Tahoe. He's in broad support of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan Code Amendment package. Namely for the reasons that Placer County staff have done such a good job presenting. The TBAP was originally written and adopted to align Placer County's goals with the Regional Plan goals. As they've heard those were primarily folks around environmentally beneficial redevelopment efforts, concentrating development in Town Centers, which have the benefits of increased non-auto means of travel. Development on less sensitive parcels, as well as a vibrant active kind of Town Center feel for both for residents and visitors.

The TBAP has not accomplished that, unfortunately. He would like to speak to how this Code Amendment package improving those conditions to achieve what the TBAP was set out to do. As they've heard from everyone on this Committee, Placer County staff, and the public and the numerous public hearings, housing is the number one issue. It's very difficult to develop affordable or achievable housing without any type of government financing or incentives today. It doesn't pencil. They need to develop an incentive structure to create this reality. He believes that this Code Amendment package does that.

They've heard public comment in opposition to regards to height, building length, all of these things are incentives to give to achieve affordable housing. In addition, they've also heard the lack of lodging

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

and incentives is pushing visitors to short term rentals in residential areas. We're experiencing this problem all over the basin. He moved here three years ago and would like to make this my home long term, but property values are incredibly high and doesn't have a chance of purchasing any property for himself, anytime in the near future. Even rental rates are ridiculously high. These Amendments do a great job of addressing barriers that currently exist in the TBAP implementing regulations for development of affordable housing. All the kinds of concerns that they've heard, while he understands where they're coming from, there are extensive safeguards in place as they've heard from Placer

County staff. They have to go through environmental review processes, they have to go through all of these public hearing processes, again on a project specific basis, they have to meet the incredibly stringent TRPA Scenic Standards, etc.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said thanks to Placer County for all the work, and they've had a lot of discussions with them around these Amendments. There's a lot of things they like in the Amendments, the Regional Plan Update allocations. Placer has a limited amount of growth under the Regional Plan. They'd like to see that growth go into Town Centers, and Village Centers which is what these Amendments do. They like the Deed restricted housing requirements and mixed-use requirements in some cases in Town Centers. They really like the parking policies; they're looking for places for people not cars. This guide for the allocation and conversion of development rights, is something they're very interested in. A couple of things that are missing is an update on Mitigation Measures and Goals and Policies, since the TBAP was adopted in 2017. They look forward to seeing those as extra Justification for these Amendments and some visuals would be helpful like showing what some different heights scenarios would look like.

One of their concerns is height. It does seem pretty extreme to go up to 72 feet. There's a lot of opportunity with transition zones, different type of land uses and conditions being required to achieve that height. The cumulative impacts are something that they do have a concern about. Largely, because the Environmental Impact Report for the Regional Plan, and the TBAP originally, and the 2021 TBAP Amendments all use the old VMT Threshold which was a solid cap. Now, they're looking to reduce VMT per capita, and unless these projects are actually helping to reduce VMT per capita, the ones in the pipeline, the ones being considered under these amendments, they can't be approved. The same with Palisades, it's adding VMT to the basin, but it's not adding the capita side of that equation to the basin. It's been a burden on the basin, and Placer County, in particular, within the basin to alleviate those impacts. For those reasons they do think there needs to be a more detailed environmental review with the new TRPA Threshold. Lastly, the TRPA Tool Screening, the 1,300 VMT Threshold, they are in favor of those projects being screened out. They'll talk about this more on the Latitude 39 Project later today, but there are some concerns with the tool in its current form.

Kristina Hill appreciated Placer County's effort at making things more streamlined for the review process as a land use planner in Tahoe for 40 years, I couldn't get any more difficult. Her main concern is that they're amending the Regional Plan and when it's amended, you have to make findings that it is in compliance with the thresholds. She hasn't seen any of those findings in writing that support their assumptions that they meet the Thresholds. All these requirements for affordable housing, incomes, and Deed restrictions, that doesn't mean anything unless it's enforced. It seems that TRPA has a very limited enforcement department with Steve Sweet and maybe one other person. If they're going to have these new regulations, and they're not new, because they're existing today, they need to be enforced. Someone needs to keep track of who is renting these units, what their income is, and that needs to be in writing and show evidence to support their ability to live in these places. She's afraid that there is a housing crisis, however, building more million dollar condominiums is not going to solve

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

it and doesn't see how this is going to be prevented because it needs to be enforced, and it won't be. She doesn't think the idea that the population has declined is factual at this time in 2022. With Covid they became Zoom Towns, and their population in Incline Village has doubled. Those numbers need to be adjusted. She enforced that fact that the League to Save Lake Tahoe has mentioned that there needs to be more environmental review, an exception, isn't going to make it because it hasn't been done.

Steve Teshara, on behalf of his company Sustainable Community Advocates. He's attended Planning Commission meetings, North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council meetings on the subject and wanted to reinforce for Placer County, the importance of what has been done today in terms of providing context for these Amendments. TRPA does a good job on a number of issues of providing some context so that people, both those who make decisions on planning matters and projects and members of the public can understand the context, in which these Amendments are being put forward. He appreciated that approach and encourage the County to do more of that when they go back out to the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, etc. and back to TRPA. My Yeates' comments at the beginning in context were appropriate. He agreed with other comments including Mr. Hoenigman's comments about the difficulty of development and how that's done financially, not only with respect, to affordable housing, and how difficult that is. But there hasn't been a new hotel on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe since the Tahoe City Inn in 1964. Local investor, Mr. Tuma has spent ten years trying to get the Tahoe City Lodge under construction through all kinds of challenges.

These Amendments are appropriate, and more work needs to be done to explain to the public why they're needed and what they do. A couple of years ago, he participated in a height workshop which he believes was done by TRPA. Height is a very confusing issue and a lot of people and there may be a good opportunity to do a workshop, explaining to people the change from stories to feet, and what appurtenances are. It is important for private sector investors; they're going to be engaged to have some predictability. There is a cost of doing nothing which if there is a further environmental review that ought to be identified as well. Additionally, there were some comments about mobile vending, he understands those. A couple of years ago, the City of South Lake Tahoe did a good job of surveying local restaurants, taking input and coming up with what he thinks is a pretty good Mobile Vending Ordinance. It may be something that Placer County wants to look at as they move this package forward. They support the package with some additional work, and public outreach.

Ann Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said this is a little discouraging. She thinks there's several of you on this Committee and three have said that the public has misconceptions, and just complains about everything. She thinks the public has real concerns, and it's shared by nearly all the environmental groups, Sierra Club, Friends of the West Shore, Mountain Area Preservation, the League to Save Lake Tahoe. What good does it do for you guys to criticize the public and their concerns. This is a very complicated plan, and they've only had about a month and a half to work on its 800 pages. They've been trying to get explanations as they can, but the County has tried, but can't always answer stuff, particularly about this achievable and affordable income aspect. In Placer County, someone could make \$266,000 a year, and have single-family achievable Deed restricted housing. Only 5 percent of the working people in the United States make that kind of money. In Washoe County, someone can make just under \$500,000 and qualify for Deed Restricted housing. Only 1.8 percent of the working public qualifies for that. This has not been given out to the public. The public needs to understand what Deed Restriction means. If you're a builder, she's been a Realtor for 50 years, she built a commercial building and did it according to what was allowed and didn't have a problem.

They are going to build the most expensive units they can. For instance, Boulder Bay, Colony Inn Motel

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

room now, is a 6,000 square foot Penthouse through conversions, bonus, and CEP. All these pictures of all these terrible conditions in Kings Beach are CEP projects that have failed because the people didn't have the money to do them and are trying to build projects that are too big. This is a national problem, it's not unique to Tahoe and doesn't think they're pressing the right levers to fix it. All they're doing is relying again on development like they did in 2012 with that BAE study. They have to stop relying on deployers to do this stuff. Let developers develop, this is not the lever. She hopes that they throw out achievable housing and redo the methodology.

Tobi Tyler, Tahoe Area Group of the Sierra Club said they wrote two letters regarding the County's proposal to amend their Tahoe Basin Area Plan. They agreed that workforce housing is needed but achievable is not affordable to the workforce and there is no enforcement done to ensure the housing that's built is actually affordable. They agreed with the comments from the community members who have spoken against these Amendments. It's extremely important that the County comply fully with the California Environmental Quality Act, and not using CEQA exemptions for these Amendments. They are wide-ranging and given the information provided will most assuredly pose significant environmental impacts on Transportation, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Water Quality, Scenic, Climate, and Evacuation Hazards over a 72 square mile area. The public needs much more information than has been provided and needs to be able to review and comment on a thorough analysis of the impacts. Just saying that these Amendments don't increase density does not make it so. Details must be provided to prove this claim. The entire basin is in a high fire danger area so, relying on what was stated in the 2016 Environmental Impact Report. It's not acceptable since there was no actual evidence provided, only conjecture such as "Impacts would likely be unmeasurable" and roadways "Would likely be controlled by emergency personnel." Regarding, using TRPA VMT Standards were revised and no longer exist, as such and, therefore, a full analysis of how this plan would affect transportation in the basin needs to be done.

The climate change impacts need to be fully analyzed with permanent enforceable, verifiable, and quantifiable performance standards. Likewise, cumulative impacts must be fully analyzed. In addition, a thorough analysis of past mitigation measures that have not been completed or were ineffective needs to be done. Basing these amendments on a highly speculative economic study is also unacceptable.

Laura Miller, Homewood resident. Her Grandparents built a home on the West Shore over a 100 Years ago. She's a "complainer" and doesn't support the proposed Amendments. Looking today, at the beautiful Lake that in the 1920s and early teens of the last century was considered by Congress to become a National Park. These amendments are for developers and are not for the community and certainly doesn't think there's anything environmental about them. She thinks that the local contractors have met the Building Department's Requirements and isn't fair to take away those requirements so developers can put in something crappier and easier. She's reminded of Colorado's corridor on Highway 70 with these most efficient five-story condominiums that sit empty. She's concerned about affordable housing, but believes they gave that away with the short term rentals. It's funny that Ms. Holloway and Ms. Jacobson, a number of years ago were in charge of the short term rental project and now here they are, using the affordable housing paintbrush to push these amendments through. She's surprised that no one's mentioning a water treatment facility, with all these additional densities of people coming in. She's concerned about our water sources issues, the fire evacuation. They all remember the Caldor Fire last year, and the images of South Lake Tahoe. She doesn't like the idea of camping and recreational vehicles on our public roads. She's reminded of Blackwood and people going back there and dumping their brown water. She doesn't like the idea of Food Trucks and Street vendors. Where are they going to put their ice bucket slop and the hot dog cart

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

juices, and sludge. Where are the sewage treatment facilities, to support this increase. These Amendments are reckless and needs to be considered because their folks saying that they can't read the 800 page document.

Megan Chillemi said Kings Beach in the North Shore is a rural area. These Amendments look like urban planning 101. Her husband worked for 2.5 years on the original area plan, and they attended many committee meetings, and town hall meetings. As many have already voiced, height is a big concern. The original Area Plan Team envisioned 48 Feet or up five stories on the Mountains and 36 feet on the

Lake side. If they build five story buildings on the Lake side on the North Shore it will cause a huge shadowing effect for the sidewalks on the Beach side, for State Route 28, and a shadowing effect like here in Kings Beach, on all of the lower grid. A member of the community that lived there said It would be in a continual state of permafrost. They're also concerned about preserving the retail on the lake side. There are 22 structures in Kings Beach retail structures. What they've seen in the last five to ten years have been mostly residential to take advantage of the view of Lake Tahoe. That should be provided to all members of the public and visitors. They've got to make sure that if there are mixed-uses on the Lake side in the Town Centers, residential is the smallest percentage. We're Roseville, Auburn, Santa Clara, or San Jose, they want to maintain the rural character. In Kings Beach, since the 1960s, it's always been a lake side community, a funky little beach town, and they want to maintain that rural character. Also, the roads and infrastructure cannot support increased density as proposed in these plans. These Amendments need more review and discussion.

Samir Tuma is on the Board of Directors for the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association and developer for hotels and workforce housing. The last time a hotel was built in North Lake Tahoe was 1964 and the population in the State of California was 17 million people. Today, there's 39 million people in the State of California. This growth is what is driving additional tourism into the basin. Since that time, they've not built any hotels and very little workforce housing. The consequence of this is they have forced the tourists who are coming anyway, into the neighborhoods and they've displaced workforce from those houses. The failure to build the hotels has also led to very little activity in our Town Centers, which the consequences are blighted downtowns, traffic goes into the neighborhoods, and they also have a decreasing population and failing businesses. They have to accept the fact that the growth is going to continue to happen in population and that means more people will come to the area. Building, hotels and housing doesn't bring more people to the area, what it does is delivers a better quality of life to the residents. Better quality of life, because they can concentrate the activity in the Town Centers and in the cores and get it out of the neighborhoods There's uniform support for building more housing and on the hotel front, he feels there is a lot of support for that.

However, there's some very significant, continued impediments to doing that. Some of the comments from Board member Mr. Hoenigman made which one was height. The additional five feet of height that's being asked for, he commented the fact that it helps with the head height for retail on the ground floor but it's also extremely important to the head height for rooms in hotels. The Cal Neva which sits on the lakefront of Lake Tahoe, traded hand several times, still hasn't been developed because of the number one reason is, you cannot put luxury high end hotel rooms that exist because of their head height, eight to nine feet doesn't work. The other comment that he made was related to floor area ratio, and he is spot on. The incentives that they have in the community right now, incentivize large houses that are expensive. They have to go to a floor area ratio calculation, and they also have to scale fees, not per unit, but we're based on the size of the units.

Nick Exline, South Lake Tahoe resident and local Land Use Planning Consultant said he's supportive of

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

these Amendment measures. He too would like to compliment Placer County and TRPA staffs on these efforts to start to address these challenges, specifically the challenges of bringing affordable housing to the community. Working on land use planning projects he can attest to the challenges of bringing an affordable housing to the basin. Fundamentally, the systems that exist does not incentivize affordable, it incentivizes highest best use. If they're going to be looking to require and incentivize people to bring affordable housing to our communities, they need to create incentive mechanisms within those projects to allow for them to finance that affordable housing process and projects. That's exactly what these efforts do. It's a very positive step to bring incentives to where the need to exist and that being affordable housing. He's also in favor of the Height Amendment for many reasons others have cited. There's many TRPA and Scenic regulatory processes that exist that will ensure that the scenic concerns brought up by many that question the additional height, will be addressed as far as examples of breaking up ridgeline, not extending above the forest canopy, etc. In addition, there's been many comments about the shadowing effect. He would argue the addition of five extra feet to incentivize affordable housing from shadow effect is non-existent. He would submit that the issues with freeze thaw that exists in these communities is because of poor water flow and redevelopment would help to incentivize better water flow.

Most of these parcels that would be sought to be redeveloped, do not maintain existing BMPs today. The single greatest contributor to Greenhouse Gases in the Tahoe Basin is energy inefficient structures. These would be the structures that would be incentivized to be redeveloped. As they look to solve the Greenhouse Gas issue challenges, redevelopment is at the heart of that solution. Fire preparedness has been referenced by many and feels that is a valuable concern as a South Lake Tahoe resident. However, it's very important, that they make sure they provide housing so those individuals working at the Fire Department can live in our communities and help direct us out of in the event of a fire. He's in broad support of these.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Hoenigman said he didn't mean to disparage people who voice their concerns. He feels that your input makes things better and we all appreciate it. So, I just wanted to clarify that I also wanted to clarify, an understanding. In addition, he wanted to clarify an understanding he has about what they're talking about doing because people have referenced it as if it's potential new development. But they're really talking about right now, everything that's being built around the Lake is pretty much a single-family home, and they're getting bigger, they cover a lot of land, they're in the Wildland Urban Interface, and they're all auto dependent, not possibly served by transit or walkable to anything. What they're talking about doing, is not adding more development, he believes but consolidating it in our downtowns, to the extent possible and making it for people who live here instead of second homeowners and short term rentals. To him, it's environmental and a traffic win, win, win. An affordability win will end up with actually less built environment because the units will be smaller, they won't be 5,000 square foot, single-family homes. They'll be some of them studios, 1,000 square foot, two bedrooms, etc. He wanted to confirm that this is the tradeoff that they're talking about that and not adding anything. It will also be better for fire, all around a win.

Mr. Yeates said he's been on the Board for ten years and thinks that the Regional Plan was trying its best to focus on Town Centers. It created the Town Centers, the Area Plans that were developed to focus on Town Centers. But as pointed out by Placer County staff report, they're having difficulty getting the kind of development they thought would occur and maybe there's some additional changes that need to be made.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

Ms. Gustafson thanked Mr. Hoenigman for clarifying his comments because she doesn't want the public to feel that because they think there are some comments that they've received that had misconceptions, that all did. She certainly doesn't think that everybody who comments, or the vast majority are just complainers, but they do want to make sure that they're looking out beyond just to comments here and all the other meetings, and work that is going on constantly to address community and preserve the Lake and communities in North Lake Tahoe.

She had the benefit of serving on the first Community Plan Team in the basin when the Tahoe City Advisory Plan Team was set up and might have been the first or second one adopted by TRPA. At that time, they were talking about many of the same Issues. What they did not only as plan team members write the plan, but they also then fought to implement it by raising money, getting Bond measures, and getting the extra two percent allocated for the Transient Occupancy Tax. What that did was free up many millions of dollars to public infrastructure. They paved the way, they hoped for new investment because they identified that was a problem. In 1986, they started, and the Plan was adopted in 1992. They built sidewalks, they built the first area-wide storm drainage program in the basin, for the whole Tahoe City core. They said if they raise the money for that, now private investment can come in on top of that and take advantage of an area-wide drainage system and area-wide sidewalks. By the way, they have the largest bike trail network in the basin not driven by new development, driven by their community's desire to address issues far in advance of requirements that later now, they see, have come into Code where they must build complete streets. They were building those because they were the right things to do many years before they were required, but they still didn't see private investment mirroring what this Lake demands. She appreciated that staff has tried to address some of those issues.

She takes great, great pride in what they have done on the North Shore to preserve our community, but unfortunately, they're preserving antiquated Infrastructure. The Boatworks Mall is almost empty. They have less businesses and more vacancy on the North Shore than ever in 40 years of living there, and that includes Kings Beach and Tahoe, City. They have less full time residents, what caused that - housing values. When she came here, she could still buy a house on a local middle class wage. Seventy three percent are second homes, they can pay more for these homes than a local can pay. Fifteen percent are short term rentals and they've taken dramatic steps to regulate short term rentals and are willing to go further. If they can get new hotels, they can further cap and reduce short term rentals and not affect what they're getting the millions of dollars to do in infrastructure.

They have the first Micromass Transit System. Nobody required it, the Event Center required Micromass Transit, they did it on their own. They are doing a lot to proactively address within the limits of the funding they have. But without private investment, they can't sustain it. They can't go on forever solving these issues on government subsidy, unless the locals want to pass taxes on themselves, and they found that two-thirds majority in California doesn't want to do that and end up relying on new development and conditions to make it. She thinks they have room to address the community's concerns. They need to clarify more and try to help where there are misconceptions corrections. They may not change people's opinions, but let's get the facts, clearer to those folks, and she's saying this to her County staff, as much as to all of us. They need to work together, and they need everybody at least understanding the challenges and see if they can find solutions that moderated but still help get to those goals. Doing nothing isn't helping to get there. It goes beyond the five years of the Area Plan, many of them were working on Area Plans, Area Plans, Community Plans, and Plan Area Statements going way back and still nothing has happened. Those developments that have happened have been the multi-million dollar luxury product, and that is not helping our communities be sustainable. Let's work together, but let's recognize that many of these mitigations

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

have already been done trying to incentivize that development.

Mr. Yeates said he appreciated the fact because there's changes to the Regional Plan and Area Plan, that's why it would come to the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, but this issue probably should also go to the Local Government and Housing Committee. This is a basin wide problem and knows that our staff has started it, but they need to work together. Hopefully, in the near future, something like this is going to happen before the Housing Committee, and especially making sure the public understands the overall issue and to hear their legitimate concerns for people that have roots into Lake Tahoe. Change is an issue, but this is for the future of the Lake and to also address the community concerns. The Regional Plan was a difference that really was ten years ago and adopting that Plan. They want to focus the development into Town Centers. They want to get them off the stream environment zones. It still needs to be implemented and enforced.

VI. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

None.

VII. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Elisabeth Lernhardt, Zephyr Cover resident made comments against the Corridor Management Plan Highway 50 East Shore Lane Reduction Plan as proposed by the Nevada Department of Transportation. She's a stakeholder living on that road, and this road being their main access and evacuation road. She has great reservation about the integrity of NDOT regarding their public outreach and the way they negotiate this with Douglas County. Residents have tried to get NDOT to Improve safety along Highway 50, especially for Cave Rock to Round Hill for 22 years. She pulled an article out of the Tahoe Tribune from 2001 that asked for exactly the same thing they're asking today. NDOT was not interested in it. Now, as the repurposing of the road comes up in plain English, reducing the lanes from four lanes to two lanes, they're all on board. This is not what residents want or need. Biking or hiking lanes are fine but not at the expense of the general traffic. Their public outreach has been a joke despite requests from several attendees never received return calls from NDOT. Negotiations were behind their backs in secrecy with Douglas County except for Glenbrook HOA. As you mentioned in your August 24th meeting, these people are tougher to please. How fair is that? She lives in Skyland, their chairperson found out during the process that after seven years of negotiating with NDOT and other agencies, including this one, to rebuild the fence along Highway 50 which was completed this October, NDOT now realizes it's in conflict with their plans and wants to take it back out.

There's also a complete disregard to the concerns of the public for Fire evacuation, and for ambulance access by reducing the lanes. This negative feedback will be filtered out by NDOT and disregarded. None of their six models on their brochure even mentions locals. Despite the multitude of traffic issues that clearly are here and the possible diverse solution, NDOT has only one answer, lane reductions to accommodate bikers. Consultant, Wood Rodgers have said TRPA made the decision to change the execution of the way the Stateline to Stateline Bike Path will be realized from Spooners Summit to Round Hill. You need to revisit that decision, especially because it's it sounded to her that It was solely driven by cost, against discriminating Douglas County residents versus Washoe County. Why are you an all the other government agencies so keen of destroying the basin? Do you really lack the insight that visitors are going to be okay with these changes? They have the same response as the locals, congestion, lack of parking, over development, is not why they come here. Fodor has called for a break for Tahoe, so has the Reno Gazette. They clearly lay the fault at

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

government agencies over development in the area in the search of revenue. She's not trying to slight Placer County; they obviously have a different intention. But when it comes to the East Shore, this seems to be the case.

Ellie Waller thanked Mr. Yeates. He has a long list of accolades, she's sure it's going to be presented later today but she may not be able to attend at that time. Thank you personally Bill, for what you've done for the State of California with that long list, and for what you have brought to their Regional Plan Update, and to this Committee. Most people that don't know you, it's a loss.

Leah Kaufman thanked Placer County and TRPA and she does agree with many of the Amendments. One of the things that she would caution is she doesn't believe the silent majority is supportive of five story high buildings. When you talk to tourists and the local community, they're appalled. She agreed with Mr. Teshara about having a workshop which might help. She believes that you can be pretty creative and that she's talked to several architects. She's also researched the Town of Windsor, Sonoma, and Carmel and has a lot of information. She would be glad to share with the County if they could enact some of their original plan team members. She echoed what Ms. Tyler said about the conversion of Commercial Floor Area to other entitlements. She doesn't know if it's tracked, for example, 3,500 square feet of CFA equals 17.5 multiple-family units. For example, a restaurant would require five parking spaces, or 17 Spaces, a professional office, would be 12.25. The multi-family would require 35 spaces. There is morphing and doesn't know if it's within the context of having been evaluated.

In her opinion, there are density increases simply because now, and it's not necessarily bad. You are allowed to have a tiny home an Accessory Dwelling Unit and Accessory Junior Dwelling Unit. That's three, whereas, it's always been one. Increasing lot size, is kind of a morphing of density. There's been great redevelopment projects, they have been slow, but they haven't been given the money by the County that the larger project has. Cedar Glenn Lodge was purchased for \$1.8 million less than ten years ago, upgraded for \$1.5 million, and it just sold for \$10 million. It's penciling at 32 units at a \$10 million dollar price tag because it's cute, updated, has beautiful amenities, and that's what a lot of the people come here to see. She's opposed to homogenizing the North Shore. If the North Shore doesn't want to be homogenized, and if people are opposed to five stories, try to make things work within the 2017 Plan. She thinks Samir Tuma's project has been approved under that height and maybe projects don't move forward because of economy, or financing, she doesn't know. But they're not unique, and if you talk to other Counties, Cities, and Municipalities, they will tell you that they are having these same problems. There's one more project in Tahoe City called Evo, that bought America's Best Value Inn and the Blue Agave. They go around all over in Ski Communities and retrofit existing, and they seem to be making a profit. She's retired and has no hand in any of these projects and would be glad to offer her services and help craft some of these ordinances to be a little more realistic.

Anne Nichols, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance said thanks so much Bill, you help me out in 2007, it was very good, she appreciated it. There's been a lot of redoing of businesses in Kings Beach. They make it sound like they're just a hole, the Chalet was redone which was Boutique Lodging, the Burrito Window remodeled, the White Caps, there's a lot of cute businesses. The only problems are the community enhancement program projects, they're still not going. The 14 projects that are on the books, will supply thousands of units. So, if they're only short, what did they say, 400 hotel units, something like that, they're looking at a couple of thousand. There's Boulder Bay, Kings Beach Redevelopment, Kings Beach mixed-use, Ferrari Laulima, and Martis Valley West is not dead, there's 760 units. There's Homewood and Tahoe City Lodge, guess Samir's short on money. Then there's the

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

December 14, 2022

Boatworks Redevelopment and Squaw Valley. There are thousands of units, thousands of cars, thousands of trips.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn

Chair Mr. Yeates adjourned the meeting at 11:16 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marja Ambler".

Marja Ambler
Clerk to the Board

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.