

Tahoe Meadows

A Historic District

July 23, 2021
Ron Yank
President, Tahoe Meadows
3850 Pine Road
South Lake Tahoe

Dear Members of the Board of the Tahoe Regional Planning Authority,

I write as the President of the Tahoe Meadows Association. I write to urge the Board to explicitly limit the use of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) to workforce or low-income housing.

First, a bit about Tahoe Meadows. We're a National Historic District, listed by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior. We have ninety-eight members, on ninety-nine acres, right on the lake, in South Lake Tahoe. All but six of us are here part-time, using our cabins as vacation homes.

As a Historic District, we worry that ADU's in our neighborhood will dilute the appearance of our contributing historic cabins and structures. (We have many cabins 80-90 years old. In two years, our neighborhood celebrates its centennial.) The designation by the Secretary of the Interior is based on the appearance of the neighborhood and the look of its historic structures. We don't want to lose our status as a Historic District.

Why should TRPA allow my family to build an ADU, so that we can have bigger family reunions? That does nothing to solve the housing crisis here in the Basin.

So, I've stated the self-interest of our community. But I write, because so many of us have gotten to know over the decades the owners and staff members of the shops, pubs, restaurants, and the like, here in South Lake Tahoe. They have become friends or friendly acquaintances. They have told us how expensive it is to live in the Basin, how tough it is to live here, causing many to commute in.

In short, as I write this on behalf of our membership, it is with a sincere motive of helping the working people and low-income people in the Basin find better housing options as well as the self-interest motive described above. Two Januarys ago, one of you Board members raised the possibility of limiting ADU's to workforce or low-income housing. I was in the audience, and I spoke in favor of that criterion.

However, staff has not gone in that direction. In part, that may be because California did not require that criterion when it passed its ADU legislation. You know that, as a federally and state-created agency, you can have rules different, and more stringent, than the State of California. But staff may be concerned that California might be upset if TRPA has a more stringent standard.

Tahoe Meadows

A Historic District

That California would not readily understand the problem the Basin has in providing workforce and low-income housing, is unlikely in the extreme. I cannot imagine anybody in California's Executive Branch or in its Legislative Branch would be upset one bit if TRPA had a slightly more restrictive standard for ADU's than California did, especially if it benefits affordable housing construction. The California statute was to increase housing in general, throughout a very diverse state. California representatives would understand the unique problem here in the Basin.

One or another of us in Tahoe Meadows has attended all TRPA meetings regarding ADU's ever since that January, 2020 meeting. At least a couple of times I've asked Karen Fink words to the effect, "Why not limit ADU's to workforce and low-income housing?" Her answers, as I read them, were that coverage issues, decisions by cities, counties, or other licensing entities would weed out vacation home owners' requests for, essentially, more vacation home housing on their properties.

But if that is the goal of TRPA and its staff, as it should be, why not be up front? Why get up the hopes of owners who don't intend their ADU's for rental use including low-income or workforce housing? Why have them spend the time and money to submit their applications for an ADU? And last, and as important, why waste the time and effort of the staffs for ADU approval entities throughout the Basin, only to deny the applications in the end.

A couple of closing comments: We love your staff. Early on, in January, 2020, John Marshall took a call from me re ADU's, what TRPA might do regarding same, etc. He then set up a meeting with three of us Tahoe Meadows representatives, involving Karen Fink, another staff member, and himself. We were seeking to keep the "one acre minimum rule," to build an ADU, for historic districts. They were candid in opposing such a "carve out" for a historic district.

Thereafter, Karen Fink kept us in the loop regarding any and all TRPA-sponsored meetings re ADU's. As I said, one or another of us attended all ADU-related meetings. We marvel at, and applaud, Karen's efforts in working with the myriad of stakeholders involved in the deliberations. "Herding cats" doesn't do it justice.

I close, again urging you to require all ADU applications to be for workforce or low-income housing in order to be granted.

Very truly yours,

Ronald Yank, President of the Tahoe Meadows Association

Hello Governing Board Members, I'm Chase Janvrin, Program Manager for the Tahoe Prosperity Center, and active member of the TRPA's Housing Work Group. I want to start by thanking you and TRPA staff for staying so focused on addressing the housing crisis in the basin.

There has been some great progress out of the workgroup that I want to acknowledge. Allowing tourist density to grandfather in to residential density should allow developers to pencil hotel/motel conversions. We have so many old, dilapidated hotels and motels that are already serving as defacto affordable housing because we have such limited housing stock, I hope this spurs a new wave of redevelopment in the coming years. However, these types of projects are probably years away.

That said, I don't think we've done enough to incentivize ADUs, which is one of the easiest, cheapest, and fastest types of housing that could be provided. Expanding the bonus unit boundaries is a step in the right direction for the City of South Lake, but it doesn't go far enough for residents of Meyers as it omits most of the area due to lack of transit.

But the biggest issue is with development rights. Requiring a full development right to permit an ADU serves as a deterrent to affordable by design development. I understand that coverage is a core tenant of the TRPA, so when the existing footprint of an already constructed home can include an ADU, why should a development right be required? Attached ADUs, junior ADUs, and existing construction shouldn't require a second development right, period. I've submitted a couple pictures of examples where this could apply.

There is a critical need for workforce housing here. It's truly become a crisis, and we need to find ways to allow new, affordable by design housing as quickly as possible so the local workforce can afford to stay here. Simply allowing already constructed space to become legal ADUs is the ***fastest path to increasing housing that has no impact on coverage, requires no government subsidies, allows our community to participate in the solution, and the net result is simply increased density, which is exactly what the other recommendations are already incentivizing.*** We should be doing all that we can to not just allow, but to incentivize "affordable by design" housing, and not depend solely on "affordable by government subsidy" housing.

As one of the regional conveners on housing in Lake Tahoe, the Tahoe Prosperity Center strongly supports the recommendations made by TRPA staff, but we encourage an amendment to allow for ADUs in already constructed space to not require a development right.

Thank you for your time today and keep up the great work.

Chase Janvrin
Program Manager, Tahoe Prosperity Center



**Public Comment TRPA RPIC and Governing Board Meetings July 29, 2021
RPIC Agenda item # 3 and Governing Board Agenda item #6 re proposed Housing Code
Amendments**

Submitted by Carole Black, Incline Village Resident

The Housing Initiative has produced thoughtful and important recommendations for improving access and accessibility to workforce housing as well as moderate and affordable housing, including longer/long-term rentals for residents in the Tahoe area. A component of the resulting recommendations involves expanded availability and access to ADUs.

Unfortunately today's proposal fails to fully consider a significant competing element which has dramatically impacted availability of more affordable residential units for longer/long-term rentals by local workers and other residents, namely the burgeoning STR/Vacation Rental market. In addition, the resulting high frequency, high occupancy, transient use of residences has never been fully evaluated with comprehensive assessment of environmental/pollution, safety/evacuation, congestion/traffic, etc. impacts

The immediate related risk posed by the proposal before committees today is the following:

Without TRPA inclusion of Tahoe Area-wide restriction on the use of added ADUs as STRs,

- **Desired housing objective will likely not be achieved particularly in the NV jurisdictions**
- **Challenges to obtaining local housing for safety officials and public services (e.g., fire, police, teachers, ...), businesses and recreation venues, etc. will persist or worsen**
- **Added area occupancy related to STRs with impacts on pollution, congestion, traffic, safety, evacuation will be magnified along with increased demand on local services**

The many IEC assessments and environmental reports unfortunately do not appear to fully, quantitatively evaluate the impacts of the added seasonal area occupancy which STR growth has brought. Some TRPA thresholds are unmet. Recent change in a key metric to a per population denominator while understandable risks obscuring overall added occupancy/vehicle impact. I noticed the following comment in a recent UC Davis Tahoe press release:

"... Measurements show Lake Tahoe's annual clarity has plateaued over the past 20 years. Despite this progress, summer clarity continues to decline by over a half-foot per year."

From <https://tahoe.ucdavis.edu/secchi> *Press Release - July 8, 2021 (PDF)*

Although there may be multiple competing drivers including climate change, we have also noticed significant increases in trash and debris both on shore and in the lake.

I therefore ask that you:

1. **Add a Housing Restriction precluding use of added ADUs for rentals \leq 30 days** as has already been included in CA regulations governing much of the Tahoe area
2. **Commit to robust on-going study of the impacts of proposed Housing initiatives** to ensure goals are achieved and adverse impacts addressed
3. **Complete a comprehensive Environmental Impact Study of the STR use** to fully understand benefits and collateral adverse impacts of added occupancy and resource usage implications with further adjustment of regulations to mitigate

Thank you.

Judith Tornese, President of Friends of the West Shore, speaking on behalf of FOWS

We appreciate the involvement of the community in the process for this project. We like the idea of taking the best features of all 4 alternatives and having the ability to mix & match the features. Approximately 2/3 of our membership is in favor of Alternative 3 (non-motorized recreation) with some modifications as follows:

1. Paddleboard/kayak storage for day-users should be installed on both beaches. All water activities should be available & launched from both beaches and not concentrated on one beach.
2. We do not favor the relocation of the day-use parking on the south beach. Parking should remain close to the beach "as it is now" for the easy access & convenience of day-users. We also favor increased parking for day-users to avoid over-flow parking on Hwy 89.
3. We suggest getting feedback and recent statistics on summer activity from the Meeks Bay staff.
4. We favor the idea of moving the cabins on the North beach to increase the beach area.
5. We do not favor a paddlecraft launch. It's not needed and would cause confusion and congestion in one area of the beach vs spreading the launch area across the entire area for both beaches as is done now.

Thank you for the opportunity to make comments on this important public project.

My name is Pamela Mahoney Tsigdinos. I am a full-time resident of Incline Village, NV, and homeowner since 2004.

Let me start by revisiting TRPA's stated mission to "... lead the cooperative effort to **preserve**, **restore**, and **enhance** the unique natural and human **environment** of the **Lake Tahoe Region**..."

While it is commendable that TRPA wants to create affordable workplace housing through ADUs, it's critical that TRPA first acknowledge that it is addressing the symptom of a larger housing problem it helped create.

In 2004 TRPA made the decision to approve short-term rentals (STRs) as a permitted 'residential use.' This unfortunate action led to the elimination of significant numbers of housing units from the reach of long-term renters. That's because commercial interests seized on the more financially lucrative ability to generate rental income from high-throughput transient short-term rental use.

More ADUs raise the threat of more de facto hotels, STRs, without strict TRPA controls.

Today Nevada and California counties surrounding Lake Tahoe struggle to mitigate the negative impacts of short-term rentals – from housing deficits for long-term renters to greater overall pollution, overtourism and related vehicle congestion, and increased risk of wildfires from oblivious tourists. It's well-known that tourists, by virtue of being 'on vacation' use trails and lake access more intensely than full-time residents creating excess wear and tear and escalating adverse environmental impacts.

That's why I ask three things today as you look to address affordable housing needs:

- 1) In keeping with California's existing law, please ensure that all new ADUs *not* be allowed to rent for less than 30 days.
- 2) Please conduct a comprehensive environmental impact study to measure, quantitatively and qualitatively, the negative environmental impact that unlimited short-term rentals have on Lake Tahoe's communities.
- 3) Please update your 2009 study assessing the ozone concentrations within and near Lake Tahoe. This study noted concern for "the potential contribution of regional emission sources to the ozone concentrations observed in the Tahoe Basin." (link: [An assessment of ozone concentrations within and near the Lake Tahoe Air Basin \(trpa.org\)](http://trpa.org))

Thank you for prioritizing Tahoe community's long-term housing needs and for your recommitment to the overall health and wellbeing of Tahoe's communities and our surrounding environment.

From: [Doug Flaherty](#)
To: [Marja Ambler](#); [Katherine Hangeland](#); [Marja Ambler](#)
Subject: Use This Verison 2 Public Interest Comments - TRPA Gov Board and Committee - July 29, 2021
Date: Thursday, July 29, 2021 8:23:58 AM

To: Clerk of the Governing Board

Please disregard the previous version of my Public Interest Comments sent to TRPA a few minutes ago and please use the this version of my Public Interest Comments in connection the with the following TRPA Public Meetings taking place today July 29, 2021,

This version has corrected 1 important typo.

Thank you,
Doug Flaherty
Nevada Lake Tahoe Resident
TahoeBlue365@gmail.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Doug Flaherty <tahoeblue365@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 29, 2021 at 8:01 AM
Subject: Public Interest Comments - TRPA Gov Board and Committee - July 29, 2021
To: <Mambler@trpa.org>, <Mambler@trpa.gov>, Katherine Hangeland <khangeland@trpa.gov>

To: Clerk of the Governing Board and TRPA Governing Board and Committee Members and TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee

Please enter this entire email as part of the Public Interest Comments in connection the with the following TRPA Public Meetings taking place today July 29, 2021 as follows:

Public Interest Comment in connection with:
TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee (Agenda Item 3. a), b), c) and d) and Public Interest Comments below concerning TRPA Public Noticing and Meeting Agenda Process)
TRPA Governing Board (Agenda Item VI. A. and Public Interest Comments below concerning TRPA Public Noticing and Meeting Agenda Process)
TRPA Forest Health & Wildfire Committee (Public Interest Comments below concerning TRPA Public Noticing and Meeting Agenda Process)
TRPA Legal Committee General Comments (Public Interest Comments below concerning TRPA Public Noticing and Meeting Agenda Process)
TRPA Operations & Governance Committee (Public Interest Comments below

concerning TRPA Public Noticing and Meeting Agenda Process)
TRPA Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee
(Public Interest Comments below concerning TRPA Public Noticing and
Meeting Agenda Process)

Dear TRPA Governing Board and Committee Chairs and Members:

While I support a reasonable and sustainable effective path towards providing the Lake Tahoe Basin with the necessary workforce capacity needed, any solution must be based on:

- Sound data, rather than speculative opinions shaped to resemble data
- Attained within the applicable laws and regulations of both California and Nevada
- Be free of significant adverse **cumulative** environmental effects and impacts
- Include a range of options based on data rather than opinion and speculation that will prevent or minimize significant and adverse cumulative environmental effects and impacts on the waters of the Lake Tahoe

While TRPA itself does not reside within the umbrella of the National Environmental Quality Act. most of the Land in the Tahoe Basin does.

I allege that TRPA has not performed it's due diligence to at least cause it's environmental cumulative effect and impact ordinances to, at minimum, line up with NEPA Federal Regulations. In fact, TRPA's environmental checklist in this case, is really a subjective paper tiger and the responses concocted by TRPA Staff to support moving ahead with various Code Amendments in this case are **speculative and uncertain in both context and intensity, vague, arbitrary, subjective, opinionated without any supporting hard data whatsoever that indicates that the Phase 1 Housing Project will result in no significant impact on the Lake Tahoe Watershed and environment.**

Unfortunately, since it's inception, the **TRPA has failed to achieve the goals of improving Lake Clarity** as TRPA and it's government "partners" have enjoyed the luxury of a 50 year tyranny of small decisions by approving a multitude of small and seemingly unrelated decisions at the expense of the degradation of Lake Tahoe's waters.

Significant and adverse cumulative effect impact occurs from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions. The definition according to

the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) analysis **ensures agencies do not “impermissibly subject the decision making process to the tyranny of small decisions.”**

TRPA Staff Reports Indicate, among other speculative (crystal ball) type allegations, that the various foundations for the proposed code change amendments include:

- Highly speculative and opinionated concept on how the interactions between required density, height, coverage, fees and unit size can be better managed to **incentivize workforce housing and walkable, sustainable development.**
- Additionally to support Regional Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy goals of walkable, transit-supportive communities **that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental impacts.**
- This then leading to a focus on smaller homes, such as ADUs, **better incentivizing tourist and commercial conversions to residential, and permitting parity between housing types, among other priority actions.**

Phrases like "to incentivize workforce housing and walkable, sustainable development," "reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental impacts", "better incentivizing tourist and commercial conversions to residential, and permitting parity between housing types", among other priority actions are, highly speculative and uncertain in both context and intensity, vague, arbitrary, subjective, opinionated without any supporting hard data whatsoever.

Additionally, the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist Items 1 through 20, of the Phase 1 Housing Amendments Project, including the determinations below are based on TRPA responses that are "crystal ball" **speculative and uncertain in both context and intensity, vague, arbitrary, subjective, opinionated without any supporting hard data whatsoever that indicates that the Phase 1 Housing Project will result in no significant impact on the Lake Tahoe Watershed environment. TRPA States as follows:**

INITIAL DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST/THRESHOLD INDICATORS

Project Name: Phase 1 Housing Amendments Project

Location: The Tahoe Region within the planning area of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

20. Findings of Significance

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment,

- substantially reduce the habitat of a fish population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California or Nevada history or prehistory? **NO**
- b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time, while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.) **NO**
- c. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environmental is significant?) **NO**
- d. Does the project have environmental impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human being, either directly or indirectly? **NO**

DETERMINATION

Determination: On the basis of this evaluation:

- a. The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment and a finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules of Procedure **YES**
- b. The proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but due to the listed mitigation measures which have been added to the project, could have no significant effect on the environment and a mitigated finding of no significant effect shall be prepared in accordance with TRPA's Rules and Procedures. **NO**
- c. The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an environmental impact statement shall be prepared in accordance with this chapter and TRPA's Rules of Procedures. **NO**

Next, I allege that there were no real options provided within the TRPA Phase 1 Process toward achieving the capacity needed for a healthy and robust workforce within the Lake Tahoe Basin.

And lastly and unfortunately, and as mentioned above, any solutions to sustainable workforce capacity and any activity on the part of the TRPA to conduct the people's business, must be attained within the applicable laws and regulations of both California and Nevada, so I therefore allege that the the Governing Board meeting today as well as all TRPA committee meetings today appear to be in violation of the Nevada Open Meeting Law with regard to NRS 241.020 3(c), (d)(1), (2), (3) (I),(II) and in the case of the TRPA Environmental Improvement, Transportation, & Public Outreach Committee, TRPA Operations & Governance Committee, the TRPA Legal Committee and the TRPA Forest Health & Wildfire Committee Nevada OML violations also include 241.035 1. (a)(b)(c)(d) (e).

Sincerely,
Doug Flaherty
Nevada Lake Tahoe Resident

From: Ann Marie Henriouille <ahenriouille43@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 28, 2021 3:06:02 PM
To: Jeff Cowen <jcowen@trpa.gov>
Subject: Re: Tahoe fire transportation limitations & employee access

On Wed, Jul 28, 2021 at 10:50 AM Ann Marie Henriouille <ahenriouille43@gmail.com> wrote:
Hello Mr. Kasler & Tahoe Planners. Also for Hon. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board et al

Our family's home in South Lake Tahoe was purchased in June 1977. The BEE articles on Tahoe gentrification and employee hardship is in context of -many- decades of less than adequate transportation enhancements in and around Lake Tahoe. As far back as 1987 California Assembly Speaker Brown offered modern electric railway access for Tahoe, but local partisans and resorts rejected his kind offer. Again, similar occurrences with Senator Feinstein offer circa 1993.

Worldwide, destination resorts comparable with Lake Tahoe have rail access, as a "Second Dimension Surface Transport Logistics Platform". WWII era language for an apolitical railway option over and above rubber tire mode.

2 lane US 50 segments MANDATED BT TRPA are bottlenecks assuring mass disaster loss of life in the summer/fall wildfire scenario. The new Chamber of Commerce Director at South Lake Tahoe, Mr. Sreve Teshara, is well aware of Tahoe transportation submittals from this writer over decades going back to 1990.

To wit:

North/South Shore ferry service using craft similar to SF/Alameda.

Rail access- Truckee to waterborne connection at Tahoe City on original 1942 Southern Pacific service footprint. South shore light rail including Stateline/Ski Run/ Camp Richardson waterborne links as aforementioned. More than tourist amenities, these rail/water links will help the employee commutes.

Wildfire *de minimus* highway capacity upgrades, beginning 4 laning US 50 SLT City limits to foot of Meyers Grade. TRPA has been instrumental in delays to these critica road capacity imperativs, and faces full liability in fire evacuation loss of lives owing to road bottlenecks described.

This input is not new for Mr. Teshara, a long-time "Transportation Advocate" at Lake Tahoe. TRPA and the City of South Lake Tahoe as well have political ways and means of expediting these first world transportation services. Destination Resorts at Lake Tahoe have called for access/egress improvements for decades. \

In 1997 Mr. Rodney Slater, President Clinton's Secretary of Transportation expressed Federal willingness to bring a modern electric rail connection to Lake Tahoe, ignored by resorts hoping to maintain their monopolies on dedicated bus and automobile parking facilities.

For all parties' information, included CC is Christopher Swan, a featured speaker at the 1993 Tahoe Rail Symposium" at the Sahara Resort, Stateline NV.. <swantrain@comcast.net> Mr. Swan spoke at Symposium at invitation of Mr. Steve Teshara, a resort consultant at the time.

Perhaps these particulars will appear as a BEE follow-up on their Tahoe Gentrification series. With updated interviews of concerned and involved responsible parties... There is a dereliction of duty hereabouts...

Sincerely

Gunnar Henrioulle (530-847-8156)
P.O. Box 2020
Colfax CA 95713

From: [kathie julian](#)
To: [Mark Bruce](#); [Cindy Gustafson](#); [Belinda Faustinos](#); [Bill Yeates](#); [shelly@tristatecommercial.com](#); [Alexis Hill](#); [Barbara Cegavske](#); [bosfive@edcgov.us](#); [Wesley Rice](#); [John Friedrich](#); [Hayley Williamson](#)
Cc: [Marja Ambler](#); [Karen Fink](#)
Subject: Comment on Accessory Dwelling Units Code Change as Potentially Applied to Incline Village
Date: Thursday, July 29, 2021 12:52:30 AM

I am a full-time resident of Incline Village. On the subject of **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)**, I am concerned that, after the proposed TRPA code recommendation passes to allow ADUs on parcels less than 1 acre, we will see Washoe County moving (as they did earlier this year) to make Washoe County's code in Incline Village and Crystal Bay consistent with TRPA's new code in this respect. **But I am doubtful Washoe County will insert the California provision that restricts ADU's from being rented for less than 30 days.** The California provision prevents these ADUs (intended for workforce housing) from being used as Short-Term Rentals (STRs). **This is good.**

But, Nevada tends not to place such restrictions on private property. Further, Washoe County has strong financial interest in Incline Village and Crystal Bay generating maximum tourism tax revenue from STRs. So there may be little incentive for Washoe County to place restrictions on the use of these new ADUs for tourist accommodation.

As such, we may end up with these new ADUs being allowed in Incline Village and Crystal Bay on lots smaller than 1 acre **AND** being allowed for use as STRs. **This would exacerbate the "hotelification" of residential areas in Incline Village and Crystal Bay, and do nothing to increase the inventory of affordable housing units for our workers, which is the rationale for TRPA's code change.**

I support the concept of ADU development for long-term workforce housing. **I do not support allowing construction of new ADUs to provide more STRs in Incline Village and Crystal Bay.**

TRPA should make a strong statement to discourage the misuse of this ADU code change to bolster tourism and STRs at the expense of our residential neighborhoods and our local workers. **Please consider adding a provision to the proposal you vote on today to require any new ADUs under the code change to be rented for periods of 30 days or more.**

Thanks and regards

From: [kathie julian](#)
To: [Mark Bruce](#); [Cindy.Gustafson](#); [Belinda Faustinos](#); [Bill Yeates](#); [shelly@tristatecommercial.com](#); [Alexis Hill](#); [Barbara Cegavske](#); [bosfive@edcgov.us](#); [Wesley Rice](#); [John Friedrich](#); [Hayley Williamson](#)
Cc: [Karen Fink](#); [Marja Ambler](#)
Subject: ADUs in Incline Village --- Data from TRPA staff on Potential Properties for ADUs
Date: Thursday, July 29, 2021 12:01:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Chairman Bruce:

During the previous meeting of TRPA one member expressed doubt that there would be many opportunities for ADUs in Incline Village/Crystal Bay because of existing coverage limits.

This is not the case. As per TRPA staff, **there are about 1200 residential, single family parcels in Incline Village/Crystal Bay that have sufficient coverage available for adding an ADU (see email thread below).**

Further one does not need coverage for building vertically — adding a story onto a garage or house, so that would be on top of the 1200 properties with at least 500 sq ft of developable space. **Thus, there is considerable scope for development of ADUs in Incline Village and Crystal Bay — both adjacent to the existing unit or above.**

Please also note, while TRPA staff think that there will be limits on ADU development owing to limited bank-financing, I question this assumption. Real estate investors (either corporate or private individuals) who buy in Incline Village have considerable resources to develop an ADU property without bank financing, particularly if this is an investment in a tourist accommodation on AirBnb.

Further, the assumptions about ADU take up in California may not apply to Incline Village as it is a different market with different financial incentives—particularly if such ADUs can be used as STRs.

As previously conveyed to the TRPA Governing Board, our concern in Incline Village is that these ADUs allowed under a revised code on parcels of 1 acre or less will encourage the development of ADUs as short-term rentals rather than affordable workforce housing — given that Washoe County may not include a limitation on rentals under 30 days for these new ADUs.

While supportive of ADUs for worker housing in Incline Village and Crystal Bay, this code change as applied to Washoe County will likely undermine efforts to promote work force housing unless there are restrictions on ADUs being used for short-term rentals for tourists.

Please do factor this into your discussions today.

Thanks and regards.

Kathie M. Julian
PO Box 5477
Incline Village, NV 89450

Begin forwarded message:

From: Karen Fink <kfink@trpa.gov>
Subject: RE: parcels in Washoe County- follow up queries
Date: July 12, 2021 at 8:58:58 AM PDT
To: "kathiejulian@gmail.com" <kathiejulian@gmail.com>

Hi Kathie –

There are 1208 parcels in the Tahoe portion of Washoe County that meet the following criteria:

- Development potential greater than 500 sf (this means they have more than 500 sf of base allowable coverage left).
- Landuse is Single Family Residential
- Residential Units is equal to 1
- Ownership is "Private"

Single-family parcels can sometimes transfer in more coverage. If they are on high-capability land (LCV 4-7 or buildable IPES), they can transfer in coverage up to the amounts allowed by the table below from [Code of Ordinances](#) Section 30.4.2, but as the parcel gets larger it's usually not much more, if any, than the base allowable. For smaller parcels there is more of an advantage. They need to buy that coverage in order to transfer it in.

A. **General Standards Applicable in All Locations**
1. **Residential Facilities (One to Four Units)**
The maximum land coverage allowed on a parcel for residential facilities of four units or less shall be the land coverage allowed pursuant to the coefficients in Table 30.4.1-1, or as follows, whichever is greater:

a. **Maximum Parcel Coverages**

TABLE 30.4.2-1: MAXIMUM PARCEL COVERAGE	
Project Area (Sq. Ft.)	Maximum Land Coverage
0 - 4,000	Base Land Coverage Only
4,001 - 9,000	1,800 sq. ft.
9,001 - 14,000	20% of Project Area
14,001 - 16,000	2,900 sq. ft.
16,001 - 20,000	3,000 sq. ft.
20,001 - 25,000	3,100 sq. ft.
25,001 - 30,000	3,200 sq. ft.
30,001 - 40,000	3,300 sq. ft.
40,001 - 50,000	3,400 sq. ft.
50,001 - 70,000	3,500 sq. ft.
70,001 - 90,000	3,600 sq. ft.
90,001 - 120,000	3,700 sq. ft.
120,001 - 150,000	3,800 sq. ft.
150,001 - 200,000	3,900 sq. ft.
200,001 - 400,000	4,000 sq. ft.

What we have heard from other areas is that the limiting factor for building an ADU is usually financing – i.e., banks aren't used to providing construction loans for ADUs, so they don't have loans tailored to this type of product. In Tahoe it seems that coverage and development rights would also provide some additional limiting factors.

The other parcels are, yes, as you mentioned, publicly owned land, land zoned commercial, tourist, recreation, etc.

Karen Fink, AICP
Housing Program Manager/Housing Ombudsperson
Office: 775-589-5258
Cell: 530-545-3214
kfink@trpa.gov



From: kathie julian <kathiejulian@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 8, 2021 11:33 PM
To: Karen Fink <kfink@trpa.gov>
Subject: Re: parcels in Washoe County- follow up queries

Hi Karen

A very belated thanks for this data. Just to clarify, under the proposed TRPA code with respect to ADUs:

Some 3,432 single family parcels are 1 acre or less, and these could accommodate and ADU, provided there is adequate land coverage available on the parcel.

Could such single family parcels buy coverage?

While the study you attach suggests only 150 - 200 parcels in the above category are estimated to take advantage of this ADU option, the actual limiting factor would be sufficient "coverage" available for a detached ADU or the ability to built vertically, correct?

Have we any idea how many of these 3,432 single family parcels of 1 acre or less have sufficient coverage for a detached ADU?

Are the other parcels (9,416-3,604) multi-family units, forest lands, IVGID land, etc?

Thanks!

Kathie M. Julian
PO Box 5477

Incline Village, NV 89450

On Jun 17, 2021, at 9:13 AM, Karen Fink <kfink@trpa.gov> wrote:

Hi Kathie and Alexis,

I wanted to follow up on your question about how many parcels would be eligible for an ADU if Washoe County changes their regulations to allow them on less than one acre at some point in the future, after TRPA finishes action on this current housing package.

There are 9,416 parcels total in the Tahoe Basin portion of Washoe County.

Of those, 3,604 are single-family.

Of those, 172 are greater than 1 acre.

Based on ADU construction rate data from other areas, TRPA has estimated that we might see between 150-200 ADUs built basin-wide over an 8-year period. See Attachment A from the November Tahoe Living Working Group meeting: https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/documents/archive/03_Attachment-A-Land-Use-Evaluation-Sheets.pdf.

Karen Fink, AICP

Housing Program Manager/Housing Ombudsperson

Office: 775-589-5258

Cell: 530-545-3214

kfink@trpa.gov

<image001.jpg>

Kathie M. Julian
PO Box 5477
Incline Village, NV 89450

From: rondatycer@aol.com
To: [Marja Ambler](#); [Katherine Hangeland](#)
Subject: Public Comment for today's TRPA Board meeting
Date: Thursday, July 29, 2021 10:20:13 AM

Thank you for reading and including this comment in the meeting today:

TRPA Governing Board:

We have all been governed by the rule that "coverage kills the lake" and adding covering can only be done through strict policies that protect runoff into the lake.

Even with these TRPA policies in effect, TRPA has not succeeded in its mission to enhance lake clarity.

According to the TERC 2020 State of the Lake Report by Geoff Schladow,

"Lake Tahoe's water clarity measurements, which are indicators of the health of the watershed, averaged 62.9 feet through 2020, the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency announced today.

Lake Tahoe's clarity peaked in February 2020 when it was deeper than 80 feet. It was at its lowest in mid-May when it measured at slightly more than 50 feet. These readings were within the average range of the last decade. Average clarity in 2020 was just slightly better than the previous year's average of 62.7 feet.

Clarity has been measured by UC Davis researchers since the 1960s as the depth to which a 10-inch white disk, called a Secchi disk, remains visible when lowered through the water. Because lake clarity measurements vary from day to day and year to year, managers and scientists remain focused on long-term trends as an indicator of the lake's health.

Measurements show Lake Tahoe's annual clarity has plateaued over the past 20 years. Despite this progress, summer clarity continues to decline by over a half-foot per year."

Adding ADUs on parcels around Lake Tahoe will greatly add to allowed coverage, how can TRPA justify approving hundreds of ADUs? How can hundreds of developers adding more coverage result in a clearer lake?

The whole argument is illogical. Please save Lake Tahoe from the ravages of ill-conceived California legislation.

Ronda Tycer
814 Toni Court
Incline Village, NV