

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

TRPA/Zoom

January 24, 2024

Meeting Minutes

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Hoenigman called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Diss, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Ms. Leumer, Mr. Settelmeyer

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Hester said there are no changes to the agenda.
Mr. Hoenigman deemed the agenda approved as posted.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Settelmeyer moved approval of the December 13, 2023 minutes as posted.
Ms. Aldean abstained.
Motion carried.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Discussion and possible recommendation on Economic sustainability and housing amendments to Placer County's Tahoe Basin Area Plan

Ms. Gustafson acknowledged the public comments that expressed concerns about her potential financial conflicts of interest. She directed individuals to the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Form 700, which discloses all reportable financial interests under the penalty of the law including her spouse's business clients. She regularly checks with Placer County and TRPA Legal Counsel to ensure adherence to recusal guidelines and ethical standards. She's committed to high ethical standards based on personal and spiritual beliefs. Public perceptions may vary, and she's willing to discuss and address concerns. Today, she can participate in this discussion and there is no distinguishable personal financial gain from these area plan amendments. She's fully transparent about this issue and doesn't have an issue talking about it but there is an appropriate time and place for such discussions.

Mr. Stock introduced the proposed amendments to the Tahoe Basin Area Plan aimed at achieving housing and economic development goals envisioned in the plan's adoption in 2017. This is building on years of study and monitoring of plan outcomes. The amendments aim to provide a systemic approach to encourage desired investment in environmentally and economically beneficial redevelopment in workforce housing. TRPA staff have reviewed the proposed Initial Environmental Checklist and conformance documents and found them to be in

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

January 24, 2024

compliance and conformance with the Regional Plan and will not result in any significant effects on the environment.

Ms. Jacobsen, Acting Director for Placer County's Community Development Resource Agency. This is a county initiated amendment package to the Tahoe Basin Area Plan. It includes revisions aimed at promoting and encouraging environmentally beneficial economic sustainability in the town centers and housing production. They are targeted at looking to encourage small scale redevelopment in the town centers and workforce housing.

This amendment package was initiated in mid-2021 after an economic study was completed for the "why" behind the lack of reinvestment and redevelopment in town centers. The Tahoe Basin Area Plan was adopted in 2017 with the hopes of seeing redevelopment in the town centers. Public investments were made in the town centers for environmental and streetscape improvements, but private reinvestment has been lacking. A study in 2021 identified the need for regulatory adjustments to facilitate redevelopment.

Since 2021, there's been a lot of public outreach that included multiple public meetings, workshops, and hearings. The county completed environmental analysis, including a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) addendum to the 2017 Tahoe Basin Area Plan Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. Placer County also prepared an errata that focused on cumulative impacts and an Initial Environmental Checklist for TRPA approvals. Also included in the packet is an a TBAP Implementation Report done in response to comments showing everything that outlines everything done to implement the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and achieve regional goals.

In October 2023, Placer County continued the consideration of the amendment package to allow time for Placer County staff to review all the comments. Placer County Board adopted the amendment package on October 31, 2023.

(presentation continued)

Ms. Setzer, Principal Planner, Placer County said these amendments were built on years of feedback from various stakeholders and an economic analysis. Placer County has a lot of processing barriers, strict development standards, site improvements and zoning restrictions hindering housing and business development. They've worked closely with their business associations, TRPA staff, the Tahoe Living Working Group, Mountain Housing Council, North Lake Tahoe Chamber, and Tahoe Prosperity playbook.

The amendments focus on fostering small businesses, entrepreneurs, and startups in town centers of Kings Beach and Tahoe City. It would also comply with Senate Bill 946, legalizing sidewalk vending and streamlining regulations for mobile food trucks to support small food businesses. They want to streamline to facilitate small-scale hotels, restaurants, and retail development. It also enhances compatibility between mixed-use commercial and adjacent residential zone districts. They are addressing parking and transit needs for better mobility in town centers. In most of their zone districts right now you need a use permit to build a duplex. They are trying to facilitate workforce housing by streamlining deed-restricted workforce housing without use permits in some zone districts. They are also trying to limit new single-family housing in town centers if it is not deed-restricted to workforce housing. And clarifying requirements for tiny homes alongside accessory dwelling units.

These amendments do not increase units per acre, building height, carrying capacity, or buildout of the region. They do target more development toward town centers. They do not increase overall development because of the growth control system and therefore, do not result in uses or activities that would increase wildfire risk. They do not conflict with TRPA scenic or environmental thresholds, including traffic and vehicle miles traveled. No change of circumstances requiring additional California Environmental Quality Act supplemental analysis and not connect to any specific project and do not result piecemealing under CEQA.

At one point, there were additional proposed amendments related to height and building increases in town centers but have been removed.

Doing nothing could result in increased runoff into the lake, more short-term rentals, congestion, and reduced vibrancy in town centers.

They have proposed amendments to work with TRPA to preserve the scenic resource thresholds and target that development into the town centers. There's the addition of vegetation management policies related to hardening and wildfire risk. Included socio-economic policies supporting childcare, and new businesses. They've added amendments on land use and mixed-use to encourage mixed-use development. They've added amendments to the policy document on town centers and community design to promote vibrant, walkable storefronts. Emphasis on redevelopment and housing to target properties that already have development that is old or not currently in use and foster policies to support workforce housing. A lot of these policies derived from community input.

(presentation continued)

Ms. Wydra, Placer County said the implementing regulations are part of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) and functions as the zoning ordinance for the basin area and guiding document for development standards and guidelines.

During our Housing Amendments discussion in December, we've been focusing on linking our policies to implementing regulations to ensure they are both sensible and achievable. We've identified several barriers, particularly within the town centers, where small-scale uses such as eating and drinking establishments require zoning clearance. To address this, we're streamlining the process by allowing such uses by right, provided they meet vehicle miles traveled (VMT) screening and environmental thresholds. We've also recognized the need to diversify businesses in our town centers, aiming to reduce the prevalence of real estate and property management offices on ground floors, while still allowing them on other levels.

Furthermore, we've been working on encouraging mixed-use development in town centers and clarifying development standards. For instance, we're simplifying building height regulations by removing the confusing reference to the number of stories. Additionally, we're revising setbacks to facilitate development without compromising environmental standards. These changes align with TRPA requirements and aim to make the regulatory process more transparent and consistent.

Moving beyond town centers, we've reviewed various zone districts to ensure alignment with our overall objectives. This includes permitting mobile vendors and tiny homes and updating signage ordinances. We've also addressed concerns regarding housing development by allowing

housing by right, provided it's 100 percent deed restricted, and modernizing development standards to accommodate different types of housing.

The County adopted a shorezone requirement ordinance which was aligned with TRPA and added references to it throughout the Tahoe Basin Area Plan. They also clarified building length where there were inconsistencies but didn't increase building length. They did not increase height beyond the 56 feet that is currently allowed per the TBAP. The TBAP uniquely also provided 56 feet or 4 stories which created confusion. To eliminate confusion, they eliminated the stories reference. There were some setbacks in the town centers that were unattainable. The side setback took on the wedding cake look. It was required to be applied as a tiering setback but based on the adjoining parcel and its land uses. This was difficult to apply that interior side setback. Those have been adjusted to be more for what they would like to see in the town centers.

Their signage ordinance was outdated and not aligned with TRPA. They've opted to eliminate the current sign regulations and are now referencing TRPA's Code of Ordinances.

Requirements were added for ground water and snow storage. This was to align with TRPA's allowances for groundwater and snow storage.

Throughout this process, we've engaged with the public, addressing their concerns and providing responses as summarized in the provided Attachment M. Environmental reviews conducted pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and TRPA regulations have determined that these amendments will have no significant adverse impacts, ensuring consistency with regional plans and environmental standards.

An environmental review was done in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) along with an addendum and errata to the 2017 Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Project Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report. For TRPA, they prepared an Initial Environmental Checklist and developed findings.

Presentation: [Regional-Planning-Committee-Agenda-Item-No-3-Placer-County-Tahoe-Basin-Area-Plan-Amendments.pdf](#)

Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean said there's a mention about exempting multi-family housing of fewer than 15 units from design review, but it doesn't say that these are affordable units. A typical application submission includes elevation plans in addition to site plans, etc. There's also an emphasis on ensuring compatibility and that would also apply to architectural style.

Ms. Setzer said we've heard a lot of feedback that the design review process can add a lot of cost and time to smaller housing projects. Staff have talked internally about how we can help the smaller housing multi-family projects. We thought that this could be a good proposal to help speed them forward through the design review process. It has held up some projects and those projects tend to be so small that the design and review might not be necessary. If they are still in a design corridor where design review is required of any project, they would still have to go through to the design review process. But if they're tucked back in a neighborhood and it's a duplex or triplex, it would not be subject to the design review process.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

January 24, 2024

Ms. Aldean said the County would weigh in on scenic corridors, but she's concerned about adjacent property owners. Theoretically, an igloo could be built if there's no design review. She would assume the Placer County code has examples of acceptable architectural styles.

Ms. Setzer said they would still have to comply with our development standards outlined in the Tahoe Basin Area Plan. It's similar to single-family homes that would still have to comply to the standards as well. What we found is that a lot of the smaller multi-family projects could be a similar size to some of the larger single-family homes where one has to go through it and the other one doesn't.

Ms. Jacobsen said when those projects come forward, they are reviewed by staff, and they're reviewed to the standard. There's an internal review by our land use planners but they wouldn't go through the public design review process.

Ms. Aldean said some sidewalk vendors may be more responsible than others. They could be either a steppingstone as you've alluded to or a vendor that will transition into a brick and mortar location. But they can also be a detriment to brick and mortar restaurants in particular, if they're allowed to sell their goods within a certain distance of a competitor. Does Senate Bill 946 provide the County with enough latitude to implement requirements to protect existing businesses?

Ms. Wydra said Placer County is mandated by the state but there are parameters that those mobile vendors have to abide by. Unfortunately, there's nothing specific like they can't be in front of a competitor or something along those lines. We have seen some success with food trucks that have designed themselves in like a little courtyard for example, and it's becoming quite successful. It will be evaluated as they come in. But they also have to get permits from the Department of Public Works if they're on a public sidewalk. There are some checks and balances, but it is a state mandate that we're under.

Ms. Aldean said often times there are unforeseen consequences.

Ms. Jacobsen said we have a code enforcement team in our Tahoe office and respond to complaints about these types of things.

Ms. Aldean asked if these sidewalk vendors are required to report their sales tax transactions. There's a lot of overhead for the privilege of being in a brick and mortar location and some of those folks may be resentful if they think that these vendors are not paying their own way. Will the County have to expand their sidewalks in certain areas to accommodate these vendors? She assumes that the code compliance department would also address aggressive or harassing behavior from these sidewalk vendors.

Ms. Jacobsen said yes, that's correct.

Ms. Aldean asked how they'll control the use of public and private parking lots from transitioning into a homeless camp.

Ms. Setzer said that is not compelled by the state, but it is happening now, and they don't have any parameters, no requirements, and very little enforcement. We have heard a lot of feedback, particularly from the Mountain Housing Council of other mountain towns such as Telluride that have created formal programs in certain locations. A person would have to prove they're a local

worker and show where they're going to park. They designate where to put the waste and where to use the restroom and how long you can be parked there. This formal program addresses what is already happening on the ground, and it has been successful. It's similar to Palisades, who have been working with one of our campgrounds. It's a policy at this point. So, it doesn't allow it if these were to pass, a formal program would have to be developed. There are examples in other jurisdictions where it's been successful.

Ms. Gustafson said an important point is developing that program. But understanding people are parking out in the woods, building fires and cooking on the land without a paved surface. We've had fire danger, health and safety needs, and environmental impacts. Because we have such a shortage of housing. The County is not ready to move forward on that yet but wanted to have that option. We've heard that from a lot of our housing advocates to be open to that in the future for our local workers.

Ms. Gustafson said she's heard a lot of public comment through various meetings she's attended. It's still challenging for us to fully understand. She spent several weekends going through every one of these in detail and didn't see the kinds of controversy that we have seen expressed and the concerns. There are a lot of cleanup language in here, which is confusing but it's usually coming into conformity with TRPA. It's very important that the public was heard on the issues of height, density, and massing and that was all taken out.

Ms. Jacobsen said that's correct. It was taken out of this amendment package. However, that is an area that we might explore as a separate package. Are there areas in our town centers that might be appropriate for some additional height.

Ms. Gustafson said some of the other issues are much more broad scale regional issues that you'll see comments on such as fire evacuation. But it's not about what these particular amendments are and how they're going to add to those issues. The public concerns are valid but not on these particular amendments. Lastly, the County has been sued on these amendments.

Public Comments

Adam Wilson, North Tahoe Community Alliance said these plans have been vetted and commended staff as they have listened, and they have made adjustments along the way. They may have been perfect depending on the point of view but were very thoughtful and meaningful. Second, our business community is looking for opportunities to revitalize our town centers and these amendments comply with that along with Senate Bill 946 but encourage new business opportunities. Third, we have a workforce housing issue, and this is one positive step in the right direction. This creates opportunity for smaller developers, which is what we are hearing is preferred. We need development in our town centers specifically on the North Shore with mixed-use projects that also help serve the commercial needs. These projects that create workforce housing will reduce VMTs. We've seen a reduction, especially in Kings Beach and available hotel rooms over the past 20 years. These amendments at least provide an opportunity to regain some of those lost rooms by providing an easier way to do small developments that encourage mixed-use motel and lodging. These amendments allow us to be more creative or innovative as we think about tiny homes and accessory dwelling units, etc. towards workforce housing solutions. He encouraged the community regardless of your positions that we come together and work towards solutions.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

January 24, 2024

Steve Teshara, Sustainable Community Advocates said he's attended many of the meetings both at the county level, the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council level, the Placer County Planning Commission level, and various levels of TRPA meetings. He supports these proposed amendments. A lot of work has gone into them and it's time to move forward. People are the ingredient that we need in our town centers in Tahoe City and Kings Beach. They are ghost towns compared to what they used to be. There's a lot of boarded up buildings and you don't see a lot of vitality. These amendments are designed to help with the vitality from lodging properties and affordable workforce housing in the town centers.

Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanair.org said they are one of the three nonprofits involved in the writ of mandate (exhibit 2 in written comments) against Placer County. Attachments A through G are the same attachments that were provided to the Placer County Board of Supervisors. We have been consistent on our comments throughout that process, and we will remain consistent on our comments as it goes up through the Governing Board process. Having been a part of public service for many years and addressed many city councils on environmental issues, he's never seen it process of which the public has been so misled, especially on the issue of wildfire evacuation.

It's unconscionable that the Placer County Board Supervisor would say that this information has been significantly addressed. The Placer County environmental impact report in question and the addendum to the EIR have flawed traffic counts. This continues to be ignored. The documentation Placer provides talks about the number of vehicles that will be able to exit the area in case of a wildfire. Consistently, we've pointed out that it is flawed. For you to approve this today with that flawed information, is tragic. To allow denser town centers, choke points during wildfire evacuation based on flawed information is unconscionable. Which one of you are going to ask this question about those traffic counts and the number of vehicles that are being claimed to be able to move through not only the choke points but the traffic calming traffic circles. It's hard to believe that you're going to do this, but obviously many of you will choose to ignore it and eventually could cause somebody significant injury or death.

Erin Casey, CEO for the Tahoe Housing Hub who are very focused on solutions to the housing crisis in our community. She commended staff for the work that they have done. It's not an easy process. It feels like perhaps some of the feedback you all have been receiving is about something much bigger than these amendments. We could spend a lot of time talking about that but are not sure that the feelings of fear and fire, and traffic and a variety of other things like tourism, etc. are much bigger issues. It makes it hard to see what staff have brought forward today. They are in support of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan amendments because we feel that it will make a difference in terms of our ability to address the housing crisis in our region. These changes today are not unusual. They're happening across the state of California and across the West so much so that the Turner Center for Housing Innovation at UC Berkeley has a program where they reward cities and counties that boost their housing supply. The primary criteria to receive a certain designation and funding include favorable zoning and land use policies, acceleration of housing production timeframes including streamlining of approval processes.

Also, reduction of construction and development costs in terms of promoting innovative housing types and trying to expedite the approval process for certain projects and providing financial subsidies. There is a lot of state legislation that has come out this year for certain qualifying housing projects that would exempt them from the California Environmental Quality Act or would allow for an expedited CEQA process. There is a strong desire in the state of California to support the development of workforce housing. The proposed code amendments

are consistent and aligned with a lot of what the state of California is doing as well as other states, cities, and counties in the Mountain West to address this critical problem.

Sophia Heidrich, Advocacy Director for Mountain Area Preservation said her comments are focused on the environmental review that was completed for this process and the new information and conditions that should have triggered additional environmental analysis. Last year community members pointed out that new environmental analysis is needed for a variety of reasons. We need to understand the full impacts of the amendments and wildfire risks, emergency evacuation, vehicle miles traveled and water quality. In reviewing the addendum and errata she was struck by one of the findings from the 2017 environmental impact report that said with mitigation the impact of wildfires was less than significant. Even with more mitigation in place that a finding could possibly be made that the impact of wildfires is less than significant. So, now you're trying to concentrate more people in a small and very constrained geographic area where wildfire is a constant threat. Concentrating more folks in a smaller area even for good reason can further constrain evacuation routes. Say that the impact is significant and avoidable say that the amendments outweigh the risks. Say you're doing everything you can to mitigate the risk, but don't say that it's less than significant. The 2017 EIR included mitigation measures to require individual projects to implement traffic control plans, as well as emergency preparedness and evacuation plans and those are not bad mitigation measures, but comprehensive wildfire planning has to consider the regional context.

This isn't an impact that can be fully analyzed at the project level. And there is new information and data available today, particularly about climate change and wildfire behavior that was not known back in 2016 when the baseline conditions for this EIR were established. Northern California has experienced two devastating fires with the Caldor and the Camp Fire. We have to use the lessons learned from those experiences to inform long-range planning. If you look back at the news reports from the Caldor Fire, it's striking how many officials say things like it didn't follow the plan and this is extreme wildfire behavior. Record breaking forest fires are becoming the new norm and we have to be thinking about planning in that context. We have to prepare for situations that we didn't think were possible. In addition to wildfire, we have new information about microplastics and mud snails in the lake. TRPA has a new vehicle miles traveled threshold. The Tahoe Basin Area Plan was not analyzed under that threshold. This would have been the perfect opportunity to come into compliance with that required analysis. These are just a couple of examples of new information and lessons learned that weren't available in 2017 and should be considered under CEQA to understand the implications of these amendments. These topics were brought up last year and Placer County agreed to do additional environmental analysis, but what came out was no new analysis, no new data, no new information. That's not the environmental review that the community asked for or what Placer County said that they would do and is not what is required under CEQA.

Melissa Soderston, Tahoe Forest Matter asked what regulations would be changing in the vegetation portion. She hopes it won't make it easier for people to log in the greater forest, which is not a great way to mitigate fire or doing anything to keep our communities safer. It is harming our forest health and adding sediment to our lake. There's talk about biomass facilities in Placer County and hopes that these vegetation amendments are not directed towards making it easier to bring in biomass facilities. Our forests are being decimated under the guise of forest health, yet we're seeing nothing done to provide us with safe evacuation routes, proper defensible space, buried utility lines, metal roofing, proper home hardening, infrastructure hardening, and methods that we know will protect our communities during an extreme fire event. It's been proven and collaborated on by studies done by the insurance institute, at the

Missoula Fire Lab. There's a great documentary on it called Elemental, Reimagine Wildfire. Thinning is not working and as you look at these regulations you take a strong look at how you're implementing fire wise practices, evacuation routes, and that it doesn't involve just a blanket economic reason to allow logging into our forest because that's what it is.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said the League has been providing comments on the Tahoe Basin Area Plan since the fall of 2023. Their concerns mirror a lot of what you've heard from the North Shore. But what they were hoping to see was the need for these amendments. We still have not seen how they really benefit the environment or the community. We don't have a stake in economic development. We asked for some specific things and Placer County did provide a little bit of information about implementation from the original TBAP in 2016. One thing we've asked for over and over again was to at least look at the TBAP amendments even if not through a whole new CEQA document of what it would look like under a new VMT threshold and nothing. It's another example of the frustration and the lack of commitment that we've seen from TRPA and partners on achieving and maintaining the new VMT threshold since it was adopted in 2021.

Staff Response:

Ms. Jacobsen said one that has come a lot is fire evacuation. These amendments do not propose to change any of the units per acre, the requirements of units per acre. In each zone district throughout the Placer County and the basin there is a requirement for how many units you can have per acre, whether it be lodging units or residential units, they're capped of like 15 dwelling units per acre. That's in the Tahoe Basin Area Plan with a standard for each district. We are not proposing to change any of those standards. The full number or build out, when we prepared the 2017 TBAP, environmental impact report/statement, we looked at the full build-out. We analyzed the maximum capacity. If you were to build out at that full amount of units per acre. What does that look like? We are not proposing any change. When you're looking at wildfire risk, a lot of the comments that we have heard are about population increase. The concern that these amendments are increasing population. But we are not proposing a change to those units per acre. We're not proposing population increases is a result of those units per acre. Getting back to the wildfire evacuation, that's tied to the fear and the comments that we hear are about, we're increasing population and therefore, the risk for wildfire and evacuation is higher because you're going to have more folks here, but that's not the case. In the response there's a section where we have coordinated with our emergency management team to in terms of what they would do in the event of an emergency and there's a lot that goes into it. They're always looking for the best management practices for wildfire risk.

Ms. Jacobsen said regarding the question about the need for the amendments. The need is that we haven't seen any change. The Regional Plan and the goal of the 2017 Tahoe Basin Area Plan was to try to focus redevelopment in the town centers because that is the built environment. What you get with that redevelopment is environmental benefits. You're going to get those private properties that come into redevelopment are held to very high development standards that improve the environment, whether it's contribution payment into traffic impact fees, putting in water quality improvements on site, there's all kinds of things that developers are held to. Those standards then go straight into environmental improvement. We're not seeing that reinvestment on the private lots and have only seen them on the county parcels because we've made a lot of improvements. In terms of streetscape improvements, water quality improvements, all kinds of public dollars have been put into the county properties in the Placer

County portion of the basin. But we're not seeing that same kind of reinvestment. It ties back to the goals of the Regional Plan and trying to improve lake clarity.

Ms. Setzer said regarding the vegetation policy, we have included policies to support hardening of commercial and residential uses in North Tahoe. There are policies to support green waste but currently North Tahoe does not have green waste bins. Policies to support individual green waste bins to try to increase defensible space on individual homeowner's properties. And policies to support defensible space incentives and or rebate programs. None of our policies focused on forest land at all but rather focused on the built environment.

Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Hoenigman said we heard the comment about buildings. We can't force anyone to retrofit their existing home with the latest technology. But would imagine if someone replaces a roof or builds a new house, it's not going to be shake shingle, it's going to be something with best practices.

Ms. Setzer said most of our housing and commercial stock is very dated and decades old. The more updated we get any of those structures, the better they will be resistant to wildfire risk.

Ms. Gustafson said when buildings are built to the California building code for fire, they survive wildland fire. She witnessed this at the River Fire in Colfax. We saw every house around one particular new house that burned to the ground around this house. Regarding the evacuation issue, we continue to hear this issue and are not sure how any jurisdiction in the state prepares to address in an environmental document the chances of earthquakes, flooding, or other kinds of catastrophic events that could occur. She's not sure how we as an agency or as a region address that. But in these area plan amendments, she's confident that we're not increasing density.

The largest fire in Placer County's history was the Mosquito Fire last year with the evacuation of Forest Hill and Todd Valley. Over 8,000 people were evacuated. But the difference is that we phase it based on those most at threat get out and now we hold the other side streets, paraphrasing what the letter says. She watched this being done and it was methodical, orderly and everybody was evacuated safely. We can't always guarantee the behavior of the fire, but we do know that we have time to phase which areas need to be evacuated and are not going to evacuate the entire basin at the same time. And that was one of the lessons learned from South Shore in the Caldor Fire. If you get the warning, or if there's a wildfire nearby, go ahead and evacuate if you can. Have you given any thought as to how we address this from an environmental viewpoint because it can't be on every single project we do.

Mr. Marshall said let's distinguish between two different kinds of consideration. One is just generally how are evacuation plans built and will they work and that's the bailiwick of the experts who do that kind of work. What we're talking about, and the Tahoe Basin Area Plan amendments is a good example of when we propose an action, we need to assess the effects of that action on a particular potential environmental impact. And one of those is a question in our checklist is will this action have any adverse effect on evacuation planning? That means you look at what the action is. Not the bigger question of are our plans adequate? But whether or not there's an adverse impact associated with what is being proposed. You've heard from the County that in their assessment, and we concur, there's nothing about this action that increases any risk. That's the conclusion that the environmental documentation looks at when going

through the analysis for these individual decisions that come before you. So, it's not a general assessment of fire risk and evacuation safety in the basin. You can ask for reports on that, and we can get the experts here. That's a separate process from the individual CEQA or TRPA, Article 7 process that we undertake for each project or decision that comes before you.

Mr. Hester said in terms of planning, there's two things. The kind of plans we do are more general plans or comprehensive plans you plan to avoid hazards. For example, in our plan, avalanche zones where we don't allow development. You see the Wildland Urban Interface to protect from forest fires getting on to structures as easily as they could? etc., Earthquake setbacks are required from fault lines and building codes, etc. Those kinds of things that go into plans and codes. Evacuation planning is really in the bailiwick of emergency responders. He was in two regional emergencies where the regional emergency operations center was stood up and typically very dynamic. For example, if a dam broke, that is something different than a forest fire coming down the side of a mountain.

What the emergency responders and public safety law do is to look at each situation. They simulate those a lot beforehand and then they figure out what to do. For example, in the Caldor Fire, we saw a lot of people stopped on Highway 50 evacuating. If you look at the pictures, there are two lanes that aren't being used because they didn't think it was a big enough deal to open the contraflow. But that was the next step that could have happened. Those are the kind of things that the first responders plan and are very dynamic. What the Tahoe Fire and Fuels team and the Multi-Agency Coordinating Committee asked us to do is plan for things like communications into underserved areas or thinning of the forest around evacuation routes. Those are the kind of things that are between what we do and what the first responders do. Hazard planning is something TRPA can do to protect from earthquake faults, landslides, etc. Evacuation is something they do.

Ms. Jacobsen said they do the same things through general plans. We have an Office of Emergency Services who prepares long range plans looking at how to mitigate hazards. In the event of an emergency, it's completely different because it's so dynamic.

Ms. Gustafson said she believes that the public confusion is that we're not thinking it's a serious issue.

Ms. Jacobsen said that's the assessment that we did as part of this package.

Ms. Gustafson said you could argue, and we've talked about this with new construction and sprinkler systems and hardening. Title 24 building standards requires this and is part of the driving cost of construction and why even affordable housing isn't affordable. Because as we build new units, they have to comply with those standards that are very costly to build. We do hear about this issue, and we are very concerned, but it's not necessarily on a project by project basis that we talk about that. These amendments are really minor. She hasn't seen any issue raised that indicates that there's something here that is dramatically going to change. We are hoping to nudge development back into our town centers. We don't have any significant project proposals at this point to do this. We don't have affordable housing developers knocking down our door. We don't have proposals coming in and permits being submitted and are trying to do some things to see if we can get some more housing built at a small scale, which is what the community said. Look at duplexes, four plex's, look in our neighborhoods, look at accessory dwelling units and other items.

January 24, 2024

Mr. Hoenigman said none of our plans are proposing that we increase the amount of development in this lake, we are just trying to guide it towards our town centers where it poses the least risk for fire, creates the least VMT, creates the best economic benefit, and it helps us revitalize our community and clean up the runoff into the lake from these old legacy projects. Every single thing is a win, and the public may think that we're advocating for so much more development. These are very small changes and he's disappointed in how small they are.

Ms. Aldean said part of the problem is people are conflating what local jurisdictions do in terms of their development policy, and how that may impact and increase the number of full term residents in the basin. It doesn't impact that number because there are development caps, but then you have the influx of 15 million people into the basin during the summer season. People are looking at the congested streets, traffic jams and that's what raises this issue to a greater level of concern. Until we can find some way of regulating the inflow of folks into the basin at any one time, it's going to continue to be a concern that we really have no control over at the moment.

Mr. Hoenigman said the multi-family units that you're encouraging are affordable, achievable and deed restricted so they cannot be used as short term rentals. They are full time residents only

Ms. Jacobsen said that is correct.

Mr. Marshall said he and the staff have been working with Placer County to clarify when they say by right and is it consistent with TRPA's language of either it's an exempt activity or you need to come in for an application. Please include in the motion that there may be some language changes to address that issue to make certain that it conforms to TRPA's Compact and Regional Plan.

Ms. Aldean 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.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Diss, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Settlemeyer

Absent: Ms. Leumer

Motion carried.

Ms. Aldean 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 with the proviso, the conforming language may be added to make the language within the amendment compliant with TRPA code.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Diss, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Hoenigman, Mr. Settlemeyer

Absent: Ms. Leumer

Motion carried.

IV. UPCOMING TOPICS

Mr. Hester said next month, we tentatively have planned an information item on the mixed-use definition, climate amendments and inclusionary when you subdivide. Tentatively for the following month, we'll have some amendments from the City of South Lake Tahoe and

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

January 24, 2024

amendments from Washoe County. Those dates are subject to change.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

Ms. Gustafson said Placer County is looking at how the Tahoe Basin Area plan amendments that Placer County just adopted and then housing amendments that the Governing Board adopted on how those will integrate. Because we do have as local jurisdictions a period of time to opt-in and opt-out and make sure we're consistent.

Mr. Hester said there is consideration of what you just recommended, not going to the board immediately, but waiting until the other amendment package catches up so the public can hear the whole thing at once.

Ms. Gustafson said they've heard a lot from the public about the confusion between the two different packages and are trying to see if we can better integrate those into one hearing process.

VI. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Doug Flaherty, TahoeCleanAir.org said it's amazing that the Placer County Supervisor falsely tells you that we're not increasing density with these amendments. There are at least four to six areas in the Placer County staff report that say, yes, they're increasing density. This is misleading. This isn't about housing amendments, it's about roadway capacity and increasing density in town centers that are going to cause choke points. If you read his report, at least Attachment A, there's no way you could have voted for this. There are the claims made by the various conservation groups versus your opinion which is jeopardizing public safety.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Settelmeyer moved to adjourn.

Mr. Hoenigman adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



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.