

Date: May 23, 2023

To: TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee

From: Helen Neff, Incline Village Resident

Dear Committee Members,

Please include this message as public comment for the May 24, 2023 meeting of the TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee.

First of all, thank you to the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission and the Regional Plan Implementation Committee for recognizing the importance of defining “mixed-use development” as it applies to the proposed amendment to the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan **and** future planning for the Lake Tahoe basin. Thank you also to Jacob Stock and to TRPA staff for their thorough work on providing guidelines for the definition.

Below are a few comments regarding the staff report:

- FAR (Floor Area Ratio) is a well-accepted practice, as evidenced by its use in numerous jurisdictions. As noted, scaled parameters need to be discussed and established. The suggestions and recommendations in the staff report are a good starting point.
 - **Enforcement is the key to deed-restricted affordable housing.** Also, what is done when someone buys a deed-restricted property and then achieves income gains that dictate they should no longer reside in the property? Are they forced to sell? I believe TRPA staff are working on these issues and **they are important.**
- Thank you for recognizing that ground floor street frontage designed for pedestrian-orientated, non-residential uses is needed. **This, in combination with smart and safe street design, such as recommended by “Complete Streets,” is critical to creating a walkable town center.**
- A broad definition of non-residential use, such as the one in the report, provides flexibility: “... retail, restaurant, personal services, and office uses.” Please preserve this key point.
- Parking parameters require more discussion. Although there are many plans for improved mass transit in the Lake Tahoe basin, the reality is that currently residents don’t have ideal mass or micro transit options for every situation, especially trade workers who require a vehicle for their work. Nor does alternative municipal parking exist (or should be built!) for extra vehicles. Winter restrictions regarding street parking for snow clearance and storage hinder the availability of street parking and there is no real parking enforcement, summer or winter leading to widespread illegal parking.
- Design Standards listed in the memo are reasonable. One suggestion is to add a dimension to “blank visible exterior walls” to avoid confusion as to when a mural (or other detail) is required.

Once again, thank you to this committee and staff for your attention to providing a needed definition of mixed-use development.

From: [Ann Nichols](#)
To: [Marja Ambler](#)
Cc: "[Hill, Alexis](#)"; [Cindy Gustafson](#); "[rinnn](#)"; "[C Munch](#)"; [Julie Regan](#)
Subject: TRPA's Dangerous New Multi-family Code 5/1/2023
Date: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 3:07:34 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[TRPA Multi family Code .pdf](#)

Marja,

Please distribute to GB and APC.

Backup source information:

https://www.washoecounty.gov/CABS/IVCB_CAB/2023/files/IVCAB_May1_2023.pdf

It's important to carefully consider and evaluate the potential environmental impacts of any changes to a regional plan. Traffic: Changes that increase traffic congestion or alter transportation patterns without adequate mitigation measures could have adverse effects on the environment. Increased vehicular emissions can contribute to air pollution, and traffic congestion can lead to longer commute times, wasted fuel, and increased greenhouse gas emissions.

1. Wildfire evacuation: If the proposed changes do not adequately consider and address wildfire evacuation routes and procedures, they could potentially hinder the ability of residents to evacuate safely during fire emergencies. This could put lives at risk and result in negative environmental impacts due to loss of habitats and increased fire damage.
2. Air quality: Any modifications to the plan that result in increased emissions from transportation or other sources could contribute to air pollution. Poor air quality can have detrimental effects on human health, ecosystem balance, and the overall quality of life in the region.
3. Water quality: Changes to the plan that affect land use, development, or stormwater management could impact water quality. Poorly planned development can lead to increased runoff of pollutants into water bodies, causing contamination and ecological harm. Alterations to natural landscapes, such as deforestation or alteration of watersheds, can also negatively impact water quality and disrupt ecosystems.

To mitigate these potential negative impacts, it's crucial for decision-makers to thoroughly assess and consider the environmental consequences of any proposed changes. Proper environmental impact assessments, consultation with experts, and the inclusion of appropriate mitigation measures are essential for minimizing harm and ensuring sustainable development and resource management.

Thank you,

Ann Nichols



North Tahoe Preservation Alliance

P.O. Box 4

Crystal Bay, Nv. 89402

preserve@ntpac.org

775-831-0625

www.ntpac.org

“Helping preserve the natural beauty and rural character of North Lake Tahoe”

Preserve Lake Tahoe (Video): <https://youtu.be/WKzPL-EwEUw>

TikTok Video: https://www.tiktok.com/@northtahoepreservation?_t=8XCElbNFbSt&_r=1

Instagram Video: <https://www.instagram.com/northtahoepreservation/>

DANGEROUS NEW MULTI-FAMILY CODE PROPOSED BY TRPA May 2023



These radical changes to TRPA's Regional Plan will result in significant negative environmental impacts to traffic (wildfire evacuation) air and water quality.

	Land Uses					
	Inside Town Centers			Outside Town Centers		
	Current	Proposed	Change	Current	Proposed	Change
Density units P/Acre	25	unlimited	unlimited	25	60	240%
Height stories	4	5	25%	3	4	37%
Coverage	70%	100%	43%	30-50	70	75%
Setbacks	Front - 20 Rear - 10 Sides - 5	Front - 0 Rear - 0 Sides - 0	Front - 100% Rear - 100% Sides - 100%	Front - 20 Rear - 10 Sides - 15	Front - 0 Rear - 0 Sides - 0	Front - 100% Rear - 100% Sides - 100%
Parking Spaces P/Unit	2.25	0.75	66%	2.25	0.75	66%

Affects:

Incline Village, Portions of the Kings Beach Grid, Tahoe Vista, Carnelian Bay, Dollar Hill, Lake Forest, Tahoe City, Tahoma, Homewood etc.

From: [Alyssa Reilly](#)
To: [Marja Ambler](#); [Cindy Gustafson](#); [Rebecca Taber](#); [Shannon Friedman](#); [Shay Navarro](#); [Jeff Cowen](#)
Subject: Kings Beach Secline Water Quality and Parking Project Letter
Date: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 12:13:26 PM
Attachments: [TRPA Secline letter_NTBA EVC.docx](#)
[NTBA EVC Secline Letter_Final.docx](#)

Dear Chair Gustafson and Members of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board,

The Economic Vitality Committee of the North Tahoe Business Association (NTBA) formally requests that the attached letters be sent to your Governing Board members for tomorrow's Board meeting. There's a second letter attached that is referenced in the letter to your governing board to show our prior communications with Placer County and other stakeholders. This is in regards to Consent Item No. 2 Release of Placer County Water Quality Mitigation Funds (\$500,000.00), towards the Kings Beach Water Quality Improvement Project we ask that it be removed from consent for further consideration and discussion.

Please find a copy of our letters attached to this email to be sent to the TRPA Governing Board.

We thank you all for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

--

Alyssa E. Reilly
Executive Director
North Tahoe Business Association (NTBA)
530.546.9000 / cell 530.318.3809
www.NorthTahoeBusiness.org

***ATTN: MEMBERS** [click for how to maximize your benefits, news + more!](#)*



NTBA Economic Vitality Committee

8401 N. Lake Blvd #203
Kings Beach, CA 96143

April 27, 2023

To:
Rebecca Taber, P.E.
Deputy Director, Department of Public Works
Tahoe Engineering Division

RE: Lower Secline Water Quality Improvement Project

Dear Mrs. Taber-

Welcome to North Lake Tahoe, we look forward to working with you on Lower Secline and other projects that strengthen and revitalize our community as envisioned in the Kings Beach Vision Plan and Tahoe Basin Area Plan. While the Secline project requires our immediate attention to assure the beneficial outcomes identified in these plans are achieved, we hope to continue the conversation to help prioritize investments in our community. Given that you were recently hired as the Deputy Director, we understand that you are familiarizing yourself with the project, our community, and understanding what has transpired to date. While the project planning and CEQA document for the WIP focused on a program of water quality improvement projects in Kings Beach, there was no mention of parking facilities in the analysis of the Lower Secline project. Once this ISMND was completed in 2008 no additional community engagement or analysis occurred for the project proposed.

Fast forward to today's timeline of events:

- Aug. 9, 2022 - NTPUD board meeting for license agreement
- Aug 25, 2022 - NTBA EVC Secline site visit
- Aug 30, 2022 - Secline site visit with EVC, NTPUD and DPW
- Dec 14, 2022 - Secline public meeting hosted by DPW

The proposed project diverges from the types of improvements outlined in the WIP. If parking can improve water quality, so can a boardwalk, sidewalks, drop off areas, ADA and transit drop off that shifts modes of access from the automobile and reduces VMT. DPW should have provided proactive public outreach, from 2019 to 2022, when this

project was being designed in-house to assure the project moving forward was consistent with approved plans envisioned by our community and adopted by the Placer BOS. Outreach should have easily included: NTBA, NTRAC, NTDRC, monthly EVC meetings, and Placer County's own Planning Department.

This lack of outreach led to our being caught off guard by the Lower Secline Project going to the NTPUD Board on 9/9/22. It would have been our desire for the DPW to have engaged locally and let the community and NTBA Economic Vitality Committee know what the plans were at this location.

At each of the above meetings, EVC members expressed support for water quality improvements and noted that investment in shorezone parking and lakefront parking infrastructure was opposite of the multimodal and pedestrian future described in the adopted plans. The EVC is in complete support of water quality improvements, however, the current title "Lower Secline Water Quality Improvement Project" does not reflect the complete proposed scope per TBAP section 3.07.A.1 parking facility definition:

A parking facility is a clearly identifiable location for vehicular parking. A parking facility may be a parking area, parking lot, or parking structure.

Within the TBAP there is no determination for offsite or onsite parking or association with land use for the definition of a parking facility. This parking facility would be used for recreation. A parking facility is simply a clearly identifiable location for vehicular parking which matches with the project goals as publicly stated by DPW. For accurate public disclosure, the project could be named the Lower Secline Water Quality and Parking Facility Improvement Project, similar to other projects identified in LTinfo.org, TRPAs project tracking system. This current design does not meet numerous parking facility requirements listed in the TBAP and other applicable codes. The proposed design has far too many missing requirements for a volunteer committee to list in detail (eg. landscaping, lighting, aisle widths, parking setbacks, bike racks, screening, layout, and many more) nor is it the public's responsibility to confirm adherence to approved plans. There are additional TRPA shorezone and sensitive land requirements that appear to be omitted (e.g. fill in backshore, scenic compliance, screening, coverage mitigation). The responsibility to understand the TBAP/Code requirements and to address compliance with them lies with DPW and Agency Staff. Each applicable section of the TBAP and TRPA Code of Ordinances should have an associated written finding stating compliance, mitigation, or variance/alternate.

If the DPW is not building a parking facility with the welcomed water quality improvements, then TBAP section 3.07.B.c applies:

New on-street parking along public roads should be considered in commercial districts only when approved by CALTRANS and / or the Department of Public Works, and limited to

parallel parking only. Parallel parking spaces shall measure nine feet wide by 22 feet in length.

The EVC is here to support private and public projects that are aligned with the Placer BOS-adopted Area Plan and Placer BOS-adopted Vision Plan. Through the development of both documents a wide portion of the community participated and provided 1000s of hours of community input. The Board of Supervisors adopted those documents as Plans to give direction to the community, to developers, and to Agencies including departments within the Agencies. The EVC has been advocating for the implementation of those plans and we aim to work with you to prioritize investments to achieve the beneficial outcomes of those plans. All EVC comments made are consistent with both plans and it is the proposed DPW project that is inconsistent. Our review of public documents does not show proposed parking formalization, increases in parking, parking facility designation, and/or environmental review for Lower Secline parking in TBAP, KB Vision Plan, KBCCIP EIR, Kings Beach WIP ISMND, TRPA RPU, TRPA RTP/SCS, and previous 1996 Kings Beach Community Plan. Placer's more recent RTTP does not identify Secline as a paid parking lot location or recommend parking facility improvements. The proposed parking facility is a new proposal and should be adequately reviewed and planned through a public process.

Our review of the TBAP and Vision plans would expect the following to be part of the Lower Secline project documents. Project elements we would like to see include:

- Brockway Vista alignment shifted southerly to accommodate the boardwalk on the north side. Boardwalk would benefit from sun exposure and front the commercial land uses on north vs fronting residential to south as proposed. A northern alignment of the boardwalk helps to mitigate the recent DPW relinquishment of public ROW to a private lakefront residence that negatively impacts public access to Lake Tahoe.
- Stakeholders encourage DPW to provide plans that show the proposed project does not impede a future boardwalk or includes a boardwalk demonstration as part of the water quality improvements. Planning to demolish pavement and curb and gutter in the future would be a waste of USFS funding that could be redirected to water quality improvements. Design plan linework is inexpensive, appropriate now, and relatively easy.
- A drop-off area for TART Connect and bike racks to reduce automobile dependency consistent with VMT policy. TART Connect is often touted by the CEO's office and DPW as a success, let's build on the success.
- Bollards or parking barriers that allow pedestrian access but restrict public vehicle access. NTPUD would have bollard control.
- Signage for local transportation options and public parking
- Parking enforcement and management
- Shifting the dumpster location and addition of enclosure and trash cans

- Provide a maintenance document that outlines responsibility of KB BAD, Placer County, CTC, and NTPUD as it relates to garbage, snow removal, and BMP maintenance.

Our hope is that DPW and EVC can work together and bring multi-modal and water quality investment to Secline Beach. We see this request for consistency with approved Plans as readily achievable with relatively minor modifications to project plans.

Sincerely,

NTBA EVC

NTBA Economic Vitality Committee

8401 N. Lake Blvd #203
Kings Beach, CA 96143

May 22, 2023

To: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board

From: North Tahoe Business Association Kings Beach Economic Vitality Committee (EVC)

RE: OPERATIONS AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM NO. 4 & CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM NO. 2 - Release of Placer County Water Quality Mitigation Funds (\$500,000.00), towards the Kings Beach Water Quality Improvement Project

Dear Chair Gustafson and Members of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board,

The Economic Vitality Committee of the North Tahoe Business Association (NTBA) formally requests that Item No. 2 Release of Placer County Water Quality Mitigation Funds (\$500,000.00), towards the Kings Beach Water Quality Improvement Project be removed from consent for further consideration and discussion.

TRPA along with Placer County jointly adopted the Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) from the result of thousands of hours of broad stakeholder engagement.

TRPA as the funding and permitting agency must assure that the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) and other projects within the Town Center are consistent with the TBAP, the Regional Transportation Plan, and other adopted plans. The project includes elements beyond water quality treatment infrastructure that require further design consideration including operations and maintenance of parking facilities and design standards including shorezone requirements, landscape, screening (dumpster), and parking barriers.

As the Economic Vitality Committee, we advocate that when allocations of public space are being made that be equal value be placed on pedestrian walkways, cycling paths, and transit to the value placed on motorists and automobiles. We also recognize that to shift the trend in the auto-dominant Kings Beach commercial core choices need to be made that counterbalance the existing paradigm.

We appreciate ongoing conversations with Placer County, TRPA EIP, and other entities that have an interest in the project, in particular the proactive efforts of Rebecca Taber, the new Deputy Director of Public Works. Rebecca continues to foster a positive dialogue between the community and

stakeholders leading us towards a solution that protects water quality and promotes the vision of our community. We ask that TRPA support these efforts by conditioning the project funding award to assure a positive outcome for all.

Our committee has identified multi-use connectivity as the most available (lowest hanging fruit) improvements to implement for immediate environmental, community, and economic benefits. As such, any Town Center project should include provisions for the planned shared-use path/boardwalk, supporting more sustainable and inclusive modes of transportation and a more walkable Town Center that can facilitate connections with our businesses and recreation areas managed by the North Tahoe Public Utility District, the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC), and the California State Park

A comprehensive operations and maintenance plan, outlining roles for snow removal, landscaping, BMPs, parking enforcement, and general upkeep among Placer County, NTPUD, and CTC is essential for this location. The photos below document recent issues where illegal camping (without sanitary facilities) have occurred and dumpsters that were the responsibility of CTC/State Parks but in the Placer right of way required cleanup response by NTPUD in order to protect our wildlife, and water quality.



Providing clarity on parking ordinances, enforcement responsibilities, trash, maintenance, and other operational elements of this project will create a more successful project. We also recommend that the TRPA's BMP team certify the performance of proposed permanent BMPs, underscoring our commitment to protecting natural resources.

In summary, we ask that TRPA enact conditions on the water quality funding and EIP permit that address the following:

- Ensure consistency with requirements for parking facilities or parallel parking per TBAP.
- Shift the alignment of paving along Brockway Vista Ave. as far south as possible:
 - Allows boardwalk to front commercial properties to north and shifts activity away from residential.
 - Allows for 13-15ft of appropriate width for future shared use path success.
 - Protects water quality by physically limiting the ability/space to off park off pavement along southern edge of Brockway Vista Ave.
 - A northern boardwalk benefits from solar exposure and allows greater year-round multi-modal use.
 - A northern boardwalk alignment can complete its connection easterly to KBSRA.
- Require a comprehensive operations and maintenance plan with clear responsibilities.

By adopting these requirements and considering these strategies with future projects in our Town Center, we are confident that our publicly funded investments will bolster economic vitality, community,

environmental sustainability, and transportation equity. We appreciate your consideration and look forward to fostering a vibrant, accessible Kings Beach together.

Best Regards,

NTBA EVC

Please reference attachment EVC April 27, 2023 letter to Placer County

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency May 24, 2023 Regional Plan Implementation Committee
Informational Presentation on Proposed Amendments to the Tourist Core Area Plan

Placer County has been in the process of proposing many height, density, massing, parking standard, etc. amendments to the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan. I have attended several meetings; the public has come out in force against the potential growth inducing measures without adequate environmental requirements.

Similarly, before you today, The City of South Lake Tahoe (the City) will provide an overview of the proposed amendments to the Tourist Core Area Plan (TCAP). This item is for informational purposes and no action is required. **Staff has not reviewed the proposed amendments for conformance with the Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances.** Staff requests comments from the Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) before beginning the hearing process for final consideration of the area plan amendment by the City Council and TRPA.

You as RPIC members should be asking about basin-wide proposed changes and the impacts related to basin-wide capacity, basin-wide vehicle miles traveled, basin-wide scenic changes, and the effects on water quality, air quality, recreational experience, etc. with more than one Area Plan in the amendment process. In all presentations staff should be providing the most up-to-date information on how much CFA, how many residential units available, how many TAUs, etc. are available to each jurisdiction. An analysis of how much CFA or how many TAU's can be converted by each local jurisdiction. Does the conversion process unintentionally exceed any TRPA codes? What mitigations will be required with increased density etc.?

From Staff report

1). "Area plans enable TRPA to focus on regional issues and empower local jurisdictions to define and manage their own local land use." 2). " Should there be inconsistencies that have regional implications (i.e., beyond the jurisdiction proposing the amendments) staff will recommend those proposals not be approved when the amendments come through the formal adoption process."

EMPOWERING AND ALLOWING THE MANAGEMENT OF LOCAL ISSUES RELATED TO LAND USE DOES NOT NEGATE THE TRPA'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ENSURE BASIN-WIDE (REGIONAL) MITIGATIONS ARE SUCCESSFULLY BEING IMPLEMENTED . FURTHERMORE, ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR MANY OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES COMING FORTH IN AREA PLANS MUST BE COMPLETED. IF EACH INDIVIDUAL AREA PLAN INCREASES HEIGHT, DENSITY, ETC. THERE ARE NEW CUMULATIVE IMPACTS THAT WERE NOT ENVISIONED OR ANALYZED IN THE 2012 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE AND MUST BE REQUIRED.

DID THE 2012 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE ACHIEVE ENVIRONMENTAL GAIN THROUGH MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS?

Examples for consideration that must require environmental analysis is not just the local nexus issues of increased density in individual neighborhoods, with less parking which could create the unintended consequence of overburdening nearby neighbors and businesses', drastic scenic changes that may or may not violate scenic standards from the lake or roadways, etc. but the entire basin making these changes systematically without TRPA or the local jurisdictions requiring the necessary analysis is unacceptable. Add all the proposed projects on the books that have been approved but not built and little to no analysis of short-term rental impacts and there must be some impacts that do not meet the thresholds. Please cite analysis in the 2012 Regional Plan Update where these proposed changes have been analyzed.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency May 24, 2023 Regional Plan Implementation Committee
Informational Presentation on Proposed Amendments to the Tourist Core Area Plan

Before you today: Some of the requested changes, similar to Placer County.

Policy amendments under consideration (presented below in categories and in more detail within Attachment A):

Residential density: Increase residential density to 60 units per acre in town centers, paired with a minimum density of 8 units per acre.

Design standards: Implement design standards for residential projects, ADUs and new commercial construction or major commercial façade improvements.

Permissible uses: Update permissible uses to encourage employee, senior, and affordable housing.

Parking: Reduce parking requirements where feasible.

Area Plan boundary: Amend the area plan boundary to include three underutilized parcels that could benefit from incorporation into the area plan.

Zoning change: Rezone one parcel from recreation to tourist center mixed use to accommodate higher density housing opportunities

The City is proposing that where one of the following is currently allowed, all shall be allowed uses: multiple-family dwelling, multi-person dwelling, and employee housing.

Encouraging rental housing developers to unbundle parking and rent parking spaces separately from the units.

Allowing housing developers to pay an in-lieu fee to support public transportation access to the project site in-lieu of some of the parking requirements.

Decrease in parking requirements for qualifying projects located within a distance of a transportation hub.

DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS

Currently, affordable housing projects require a higher level of decision maker consideration than market rate housing projects (TRPA Code Section 2.2). Proposed amendments would include new criteria for residential project review levels that treat affordable housing equal to market rate housing, **exempting residential projects up to three units and residential projects that comply with objective development and design standards from discretionary and public hearing procedures.**

This is a dangerous request: Eliminating the public from the process is not acceptable