

HILL PLANNING, INC.
P.O. Box 6139 Incline Village, NV 89450
Cell Phone: (775) 544-4345
e-mail: tahoehills@att.net

MEMO

Date: December 5, 2022
To: Andrea Dashiell, Clerk for Placer Co. Planning Commission
From: Kristina Hill, Land Use Planner
Subject: Placer Co. Tahoe Basin Area Plan Proposed Amendments

Dear Ms. Dashiell,

Thank you in advance for circulating this memo to the Planning Commission prior to their meeting on December 8th. The purpose of which is to voice my concerns regarding the above referenced subject matter. As a former TRPA employee and long time (40 years) planning consultant in the Tahoe Basin, the proposed TBAP amendments should not be approved by the Planning Commission for the following reasons:

1. The TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 4.5 requires that any amendment to the Regional Plan (which this is) must make written findings demonstrating that the proposed plan will NOT cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded.

To my knowledge, this has not been done. In public meetings I've attended county staff states that the thresholds will not be exceeded but have not provided any substantive rationale.

2. Staff has made assumptions that the CEQA level of environmental review for the proposed amendments will be "categorically exempt". Categorical exemption shall not apply if; a) there is a reasonable possibility of a significant effect on the environment; b) significant cumulative impacts will result, or c) they will have impacts on a uniquely sensitive environment.

Surely the planning commission recognizes that the Tahoe Basin in general is a uniquely sensitive environment. In addition, I have heard nor seen any documentation from the county re: cumulative impacts of the proposed amendments.

For your convenience, the following are pertinent excerpts from the TRPA Code:

4.5. FINDINGS NECESSARY TO AMEND THE REGIONAL PLAN, INCLUDING THE GOALS AND POLICIES AND PLAN AREA STATEMENTS AND MAPS

To approve any amendment to the Regional Plan, TRPA shall find, in addition to the findings required pursuant to subparagraphs 4.4.1.A and 4.4.1.B, subsection 4.4.2, and

Sections 4.2 and 4.3, that the Regional Plan, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

4.4.1. Findings Necessary to Approve Any Project To approve any project TRPA shall find, in accordance with Sections 4.2 and 4.3, that:

A. The project is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, plan area statements and maps, the Code, and other TRPA plans and programs;

B. The project will not cause the environmental threshold carrying capacities to be exceeded; and

C. Wherever federal, state, or local air and water quality standards apply for the region, the strictest standards shall be attained, maintained, or exceeded pursuant to Article V(d) of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact

4.4.2. Making Specific Findings As part of the findings required by subparagraph 4.4.1, TRPA shall:

A. Identify the nature, extent, and timing or rate of effects of the project, using applicable measurement standards consistent with the available information, on all applicable:

1. Compliance measures (Section 16.6);
2. Indicators (Section 16.4);
3. Additional factors (subsection 16.4.5); and
4. Supplemental compliance measures (subsection 16.3.8).

B. Quantify any contribution of the project to any of the cumulative accounts for the items listed in subsection 16.8.2 and record that contribution in the current cumulative account;

C. Confirm that any resource capacity utilized by the project is within the amount of the remaining capacity available, as that remaining capacity has been identified in any environmental documentation applicable to the project, including the environmental impact statement for the Regional Plan package;

D. Confirm that the project will not prevent attainment of any adopted target date (subsection 16.5.1) or interim target (subsection 16.5.2);

E. For project-specific mitigation measures relied upon to confirm the matters in subparagraphs 4.4.1.B and C, TRPA shall identify an adequate means, including setting a baseline status, by which the mitigation measure's effectiveness shall be evaluated; and

F. Except for recreation projects in the EIP for which an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement is prepared, and that will use additional water supply, additional sewage capacity, or will create additional vehicle miles of travel greater than forecast in the environmental assessment for the most recent Evaluation Report, TRPA shall confirm that sufficient capacity remains in each of the respective capacities that are utilized by the project to permit development of recreation projects contained in the EIP.

4.6. FINDINGS NECESSARY TO AMEND OR ADOPT TRPA ORDINANCES, RULES, OR OTHER TRPA PLANS AND PROGRAMS To approve any amendment or adoption of the Code, Rules, or other TRPA plans and programs that implement the Regional Plan, TRPA shall find, in addition to the findings required pursuant to Section 4.4, and in accordance with Sections 4.2 and 4.3, that the Regional Plan and all of its elements, as implemented through the Code, Rules, and other TRPA plans and programs, as amended, achieves and maintains the thresholds.

Marja Ambler

From: Jacob Stock
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:30 AM
To: Marja Ambler
Subject: FW: Zoning Amendments

Hi Marja,

Forwarding letters I've received regarding the proposed Placer County AP amendment.

Thanks!

Jacob

From: Patricia Ferguson <tahoetownhouse@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2022 4:59 PM
To: Emily Setzer <ESetzer@placer.ca.gov>; SWydra@placer.ca.gov; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Crystal Jacobsen <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>; Jacob Stock <jstock@trpa.gov>
Subject: Zoning Amendments

As owners of a second home in Tahoe City who have loved and spent time in this area for 30+ years, we are very concerned about proposed zoning changes taking place without careful and thorough review and evaluation of environmental impacts, traffic/parking issues, and emergency/evacuation issues in the event of a wildfire. We are also very concerned about increasing development including larger buildings that completely change the character and charm of this part of Lake Tahoe. Please don't make North and West shore look like South shore; i.e. like a generic big city full of ski resorts, hotels, and condominiums rather than a mountain retreat where people can enjoy nature and the unspoiled beauty of the lake, the woods and the mountains. We support the need for increased housing to be available for locals, but believe this can be done without completely changing the character and the soul of this beautiful area.

Thank you for your consideration,
~ Patricia Ferguson and Ron Lopez

Marja Ambler

From: Jacob Stock
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:34 AM
To: Marja Ambler
Subject: FW: Public comment for 12-8-2022 Proposed TBAP amendments

Re. Placer County AP.

From: Ryan Wexler <epicwinter@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 10:44 PM
To: adashiel@placer.ca.gov; Shirlee Herrington <sherring@placer.ca.gov>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Kathy Hopkins <KHopkins@placer.ca.gov>; Stacy Wydra Placer County <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; Emily Setzer <ESetzer@placer.ca.gov>; Crystal Jacobsen <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>; planning@placer.ca.gov
Cc: Jacob Stock <jstock@trpa.gov>; John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Karen Fink <kfink@trpa.gov>
Subject: Public comment for 12-8-2022 Proposed TBAP amendments

Dear Placer County-

Please vote to reject the motion to amend the Eastern Placer County Plan modifications at this time. This is too much too fast.

The changes create more problems rather than solve the current ones.

We need to invest in our current infrastructure so we can grow our ability for more development before first approving the development.

The proposal does not consider the impact of existing approved projects before making changes to allow for new ones.

The height allowances would ruin the character of this beautiful community which is the timeless essence that draws the tourist revenue here and thereby to Placer County.

We cannot pretend to address the housing problem without reducing the existing number of STRs. This proposal does not do that at all.

Traffic, safety and fire emergency concerns need to be our priority. Not density and allowing developers to skip compliance requirements.

We should not be in a race to develop Tahoe. You elected officials are supposed to be the adults in the room and we are counting on your prudent well thought through decision making. You are serving custodians of one of the most precious geographic resources (Lake Tahoe) in the world. Please remember you can press the pause button and should if you are not 110% sure of every aspect of these proposed changes. Our grandchildren will never look back and say, "Tahoe would be better if they only developed and built it out faster."

Thank you for your consideration.

Ryan Wexler

Kings Beach Resident

Marja Ambler

From: Terry Maul <tmaul7@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 5:01 PM
To: Eric Young; Kevin Drake; John Hester; Julie Regan; John Marshall; Eric Guevin; ExecutiveAssistant Washoe; Steve Teshara; Cindy.Gustafson; Sophie Fox; Kathy Hopkins; swydra@placer.ca.gov; Emily Setzer; cjacobs@placer.ca.gov; Shirlee Herrington; bosfive@edcgov.us; Wesley Rice; jwtrpa@gmail.com; Hayley Williamson; shellyalean@gmail.com; bkcegavske@sos.nev.gov; ashley@alumni.princeton.edu; jdiss.trpa@gmail.com; John Friedrich; AHill@washoecountry.us; Vince Hoenigman; lawrence@dcr.nv.gov; JDrew@nconet.com; Susan Chandler; judymike@mac.c@gmail.com; Kevin Hill; Ben Letton; mwood@placer.ca.gov; Marja Ambler; Brendan Ferry; jcarr@adep.nv.gov; establer@lands.nv.gov; Hilary Roverud
Cc: tahoellie@yahoo.com; carolyntahoe@sbcglobal.net; Marcie@keeptahoeblue.org; TahoeSierraCleanAir@gmail.com; preserve@ntpac.org
Subject: Bad Proposed Amendments to the Tahoe Basin Area Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Important Decision-Makers:

I am a 44-year owner on Tahoe's west shore, and an observer of the full November 30 public NTRAC meeting.

I am in full agreement with the overwhelming majority of spoken and written comments made in response to the proposed amendments to TBAP: there are too many changes, rushed too quickly and without full publicly verifiable analysis.

In particular, I do not want to see any increase in the maximum allowable building height. And I do not favor new buildings of any height on the lakeside that would block existing lake views.

I do not want to see any increase in population density, and strongly doubt that the proposed changes will not increase the density. As a career social scientist I recommend publicly reporting the current definition and measure of local baseline density versus expected effects of each of the specific proposed changes.

Related, I would like to see publicly reported current and expected effects of specific changes on emergency evacuation details, lake water basin air quality, and population needs for water vs. current and future provider capacity.

Finally, I support all of the reservations to the proposed TBAP amendments expressed by the representatives of Friends of the West Shore, League to Save Lake Tahoe, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance, the local Sierra Club group, and Tahoe Sierra Clean Air.

Sincerely,
Terry Maul